

A MANUAL OF CATHOLIC ACTION

ITS NATURE AND REQUIREMENTS

BY
AN IRISH PRIEST

"i>ubtin
M. H. GILL AND SON, LTD.
50 UPPER O'CONNELL STREET

1933

stibii Obstat :

PATRICIUS DARGAN,

Censor Theol. Deput.

imprimi poUst :

† EDUâ RDUS,

Archiep. Dublinen.,

1933
DUBLIN, *di' lr Alartii>* 1933

Hiberniae Primas.

*Printed and Bound in Ireland at the n
the ^ssof lbe Pubsher3*

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Introduction	vii

PART I

Forty Current Erroneous Systems :

I. Socialism	1
II. Communism	2
III. Anarchism	3
IV. Secularism	5
V. Materialism	6
VI. Darwinism	7
vu. Rationalism	9
vin. Pantheism	10
IX. Deism	12
X. Modernism	13
XI. Liberalism	15
XII. Indifferentism	17
XIII. Agnosticism	19
XIV. Scepticism	21

XV.	Evolution
XVI.	Freethought
XVI	Malthusianism
XVII	Naturalism
XIX	Syndicalism
XX	Utilitarianism
XXI	Pragmatism
XXII	Positivism
XXIII	Immanence
XXIV	Monism ...
XXV	Empiricism
XXVI	Spiritism
XXVII	Pessimism
xxviii	Theosophy
XXIX	Masonry ...
XXX	Atheism ...
XXXI.	Divorce ...
xxxii.	Eugenics ...
xxxiii.	Co-Education ...
XXXIV.	Cremation
XXXV.	Mechanism
XXXVI.	Christian Science

CONTENTS

V

	PAGE
XXXVII. Psycho-Analysis	63
XXXVIII. Individualism	66
XXXIX. Collectivism	69
XL. Euthanasia	71

PART II

| Catholic Sociology.

I. The Family—The Fundamental Unit of Society—A Most Sacred Bond	74
II. Conscience and Duty—Feelings Awakened by the Intimations of Conscience ...	79
III. Employer and Worker	84
IV. Wages	90
V. Arbitration	95
VI. The Strike	101
VII. The Boycott.....	107
VIII. Property	111

PART III

Organised Catholic Action and How it could be Strengthened	118
Soviet Propaganda	121

Authority and Allegiance—Source of Moral Power to Command in Human Society ...	p*
Rulers and Subjects—Catholic Church not Wedded to any Particular Form of Government	
Duty of Rulers and Subjects	
The Catholic Press—American Cardinal's Appeal to the People	p
Current Errors	1
Index	1

INTRODUCTION

THE object of this publication is to furnish those engaged in Catholic Action with the knowledge needed for combating the pernicious errors current at the present time and the unscrupulous propaganda by which these errors are disseminated in many countries. First of all, these errors must be known in order to be exposed and refuted. Then, the Catholic principles and teaching, showing the true Christian views on these subjects, must be known and expounded for the benefit of the large numbers of Catholics who do not understand them and who, consequently, are liable to be misled by the propagators of these erroneous systems.

The Popes, in recent times, and especially the present Pontiff, have been very insistent on Catholic Action in every country. It is to be carried on by the *united action* of clergy and laity, under the direction and guidance of the Hierarchy of each country. It embraces a large variety of Catholic activities, aiming at the promotion of Catholic principles, and of good works of every kind.

Many of these works consist in the formation and direction of societies of young people of both sexes which tend to safeguard the moral and religious well-being of all the members of these societies. These bodies, and other similar ones, form what may be called the rank and file—the soldiers, as it were,—of the Catholic army. But, over and above these, we have what may be called the officers—educated and cultured people—who lead the way, by attacking the enemy, refuting his erroneous teachings and expounding the Catholic view on these false teachings. It is to both these classes that such knowledge is offered in these pages as may prove useful to them in the twofold work of refuting error and expounding Truth.

PART I

FORTY CURRENT ERRONEOUS SYSTEMS

I.—Socialism

The fundamental principle of Socialism is the substitution of State monopoly for private ownership of property. Marx, a German Jew, published a book in 1867, on Capital, and his teachings in that book have formed the groundwork of Socialism in many countries.

The abolition of private ownership is in direct conflict with Catholic doctrine, and is condemned by Leo XIII in his Encyclical *Rerum Novarum* (1890). The vast majority of Socialists in all countries are adherents of the Marxian doctrine. Socialist leaders, popular literature, the Socialist Press, in Germany, France, the Netherlands, England, Austria, Spain, Russia, the United States, are avowedly anti-Christian and anti-Catholic. Christian Socialism is, therefore, a contradiction in terms.

Catholic democrats such as Ketteler, Manning

and others should not be styled Socialists at all, and no loyal and instructed Catholic should now claim or accept the title of Christian Socialist.

When shall we have in Ireland associations of working people based on Catholic principles such as exist in several European countries? The trade unions and Socialist associations of England are run on Godless principles, and our Irish working people (almost entirely Catholic) seem to be still under the domination of these bodies who “ call them out ” by “ lightning strikes ” much oftener than they “ call out ” the English and Scottish workers.

II.—C o m m u n i s m

COMMUNISM is a system which demands that production goods, such as land, railways and factories ; and consumption goods, such as dwellings, furniture, food, clothing and money, should be the property of the whole community rather than of individuals. It is closely allied to Socialism and Anarchism.

Its advocates compare it to Community Life in the Catholic Church. But there is an important difference in the two systems, namely, that while religious community life is based on

the free choice of every individual member of a religious community, modern Communism is based on compulsion, and aims at economic and utilitarian ends.

The verdict of experience and the natural rights of man make it certain that enforced Communism is utterly impracticable as a social system. Hence the Church condemns such Communism, and maintains the natural right of every individual to possess private property and goods of every kind.

The Red Flag is the ensign of Communism, and Communists are sometimes designated by the name of Reds.

III.—Anarchism

Anarchism, the offspring of Communism, is the modern theory which proposes to do away with all existing forms of government, and to organise a society which will exercise all its functions without any controlling or directing authority.

Proudhon, a French man of letters, is regarded as the author of the system. Two of his sayings are “Anarchy is order” and “All property is theft.” Under this system, criminals are not to be punished, but treated

as lunatics or sick men. There are to be no rulers in Church or State—no masters, no employers.

Religion is to be eliminated, because it introduces God as the basis of authority, and degrades man by inculcating meekness and submission, thus making man a slave and robbing him of his natural dignity. Free love is to take the place of marriage, and family life with its restrictions is to cease.

The Anarchists have newspapers in several languages, viz., fourteen in French, two in English (one in London and one in New York), three in German, ten in Italian, four in Spanish, one in Hebrew, two in Portuguese, two in Bohemian, and one in Dutch.

The apostacy from Christianity and the acceptance of Atheism have sown the seeds of this evil system. If there is no God there is no master. Here the Anarchist is logical. The Commandments of God are null and void. With Anarchism there can be no family, no State, no Church, no society of any kind.

In much of the literature and journalism of the day there exists almost a worship of human power and wealth, no matter with how much crime they may be associated. Again, the methods of education in some countries which

absolutely debar even the mention of the name of God from the schools, could not fail to develop a generation of Anarchists.

IV.—Secularism

SECULARISM is the system which advocates the rigid exclusion of God and Religion from all the concerns of life. Between Secularism and the Catholic Church there can be no possible compromise. The Secularist shouts : “ Things secular are as separate from the Church as land from the ocean.” The Church answers : “ The present life cannot be looked on as an end in itself, and as independent of the future life. Among the duties of the present life must be reckoned those which arise from the existence and nature of God, the fact of a Divine Revelation and the necessity of preparing for a future life.”

Only the Atheist can be a consistent Secularist. Hence the secularisation of education in school, college and university can never be acquiesced in by the Catholic Church, as she cannot renounce her mission to teach the truths she received from her Divine Founder.

Charles Bradlaugh (1833-1891), an English M.P., an extreme Secularist and Atheist, in his

farewell speech, spoke as follows : “ One element of danger in Europe is the approach of the Roman Catholic Church in political life. ... Beware when that great Church—whose power none can deny, the capacity of whose leading men is marked—tries to use the democracy as its weapon. There is danger to freedom of thought, to freedom of speech, to freedom of action. The great struggle in this country will not be between Free Thought and the Church of England, between Free Thought and Dissent, but, as I have always taught and now repeat, between Free Thought and Rome.”

V.—Materialism

Materialism starts with the theory that matter, a primordial substance without consciousness or life, is the origin and principle of all that exists from the inorganic stone up to man. Matter, the Materialist says, alone really exists ; it is eternal, contains all things, and beyond it there is nothing—no soul or conscience, no virtue or intelligence, no God.

The Materialist doctrine is only' the revival of the fallacy of the pagan philosopher Epicurus, that the world was created by the fortuitous encounter of atoms or molecules of

matter—infinite in number, independent of one another, and existing from eternity.

The German philosopher Hoffmann says of Materialism : “It hazards the most senseless theories of all kinds, such as time without beginning or end, space, an absolutely infinite number of atoms, as if these base infinities were not self-contradictory.”

The Vatican Council (Canon II) says: “ If any shall not blush to affirm that besides matter there is nothing, let him be anathema.” True Philosophy easily refutes Materialism. Thus Hoffmann again says: “ It would be hard to find, in any theory of creation, such a mass of contradictions as in that of Materialism. We are told that the mutable proceeds from the immutable, the finite from the infinite, movement from inaction, life from what is dead, sense from the senseless, spirit from that w'hich is unspiritual.”

From this extract alone we may gather how much Materialism is in conflict with Catholic teaching.

VI.—D a r w i n i s m

SIXTY years ago Darwinism had a strong vogue amongst scientists in the English-speaking

world, consequent upon the publication of Darwin's work, entitled "The Origin of Species" (1859). In late years his theories have been generally rejected by scientists as untenable and self-contradictory.

His main theory is that of the evolution of species by natural selection and heredity or descent. Natural selection with Darwin means "the struggle for existence" or "the survival of the fittest." This theory, called also transmutation, is founded on chance and excludes the idea of creation. In nature, the existence of species is an undoubted fact, absolutely incompatible with the theory of selection.

As a theory, Darwinism is scientifically inadequate since it does not account for the origin of attributes fitted to certain purposes, and which indicates design and thereby an intelligent Creator, that is, God. Darwinism as applied to man must be rejected both as atheistical and unphilosophical. No advocate of the system has as yet furnished any evidence that man's body was originally formed from animals such as apes. With those who hold this view we need not quarrel over their choice of ancestry.

VII.—Rationalism

FOR the Rationalist, nature is the sole and adequate revelation, and human reason the sole source of knowledge. Rationalism is opposed alike to science and to truth. The Rationalists' axiom is: "Reason includes all things; beyond it, there is nothing"—as uttered by Shelling, a German philosopher.

Pius IX, in the Brief *Gravissimus* (December, 1862), against the errors of Froschammer, wrote as follows: "True and sound philosophy holds a very exalted position. . . . But in such a matter of most grave importance we can never permit all things to be rashly confounded, or that reason should lay hold of and disturb matters belonging to Faith. . . . The use of reason precedes faith and leads man to faith with the aid of revelation and grace (S.C., 1855)."

Although faith be above reason, yet there can never be found any real strife or variance between them; for they both spring from the one and the same fount of immutable truth,—the great and good God, — and therefore mutually assist each other. The religion of Rationalism has no consecration of the past, nor is it the product of actual, real life. It is

but a cold and dead formula, and can never urge man to heroism in virtue or sustain him against the assaults of passion.

The office of philosophy is to search out truth ; carefully and correctly to teach human reason, which, though obscured by the fall, is by no means extinct. Thus philosophy demonstrates a number of those verities which the faith proposes to our belief, for example, the existence of God, His Nature, His Attributes, and demonstrates, justifies and defends these by arguments based on the premises of reason. Such is the function, such the subject matter of the austere and beautiful science of true philosophy.

Thus both reason and philosophy become the handmaids of faith and Religion.

VIII.—Pant heism

PANTHEISM is the system according to which God and the world are one. It is thus pure Atheism, as it denies a Personal Deity, distinct from the world—its Creator and constant preserver.

The Pantheist holds that God and Nature are one and the same substance, and that all external objects are nothing, or only modifications of the Supreme Substance.

Pantheism is refuted by the simple facts of experience. Each one of us can say confidently : “ I know myself to be one who freely determines to do good or evil. The choice of merit or demerit, reward or punishment, is mine. I am master of my lot. I feel in my innermost being that I am not a wave, tossed to and fro, nor a sand heap whirled together by blind necessity, to be again dispersed into the one hopeless ‘ absolute whole.’ I have a proper personal existence of my own, and that existence has a purpose. I am not a leaf of autumn blown down to make room for another, nor merely a means to an end ; but I have an end which is my own by right and belongs individually to myself.”

Pius IX, in his Allocution of June 9th, 1862, condemned Pantheism in these words : “ With a perversity only equalled by their folly, they venture to assert that the Supreme, All-Wise, All-Provident Deity has no existence apart from the visible universe ; that God and nature are the same, and similarly subject to change ; that God is modified in man and the world ; and that everything is God and possesses the very substance of the Divinity.

“ But God and the world then being one and the same thing, there is no difference between

spirit and matter, necessity and liberty, truth and falsehood, good and evil, right and wrong. In truth, nothing can be imagined, more insane, impious and irrational than this teaching.”

IX.—Deism

Deism as a system has for its fundamental tenet the denial of the presence and Providence of God in the world. He is apart from His Creation and unconcerned with its workings. He allows it to run its course without interference on His Part.

Deism originated in England in the latter part of the seventeenth century. Its chief protagonists were Lords Shaftesbury and Bolingbroke. The latter in his posthumous works argues against the truth and value of Scriptural history, and asserts that Christianity is a system foisted on the unlettered by the cunning of the clergy for their own ends. Shaftesbury rejects the Christian doctrine of rewards and punishments as not only useless but positively mischievous.

The English Deists criticised adversely the traditional Protestant teachings, and opposed the findings of reason to the truths of faith

and revelation. For this they were called rationalists. From their claim to unlimited freedom to criticise the doctrines set forth in the Bible and taught by the Churches, they were also called freethinkers. They denied the doctrine of the Trinity and of future rewards and punishments. They rejected the miraculous element in Scripture and Tradition, and the Mediatorial character of Christ.

The atonement and the doctrine of the “imputed righteousness of Christ” — then popular with Protestant orthodoxy—shared the same fate as the other Christological doctrines. They raised their voices against ecclesiastical authority, inveighed against “priest-craft,” and asserted that revealed religion was an imposture, an invention of the priestly caste, to subdue and more easily govern and exploit the ignorant.

X.—M O D E R N I S M

M O D E R N I S M as a system is based on Kant’s philosophy. It purports to reconstruct Catholicism in accordance with modern thought. Kant was a rationalist, and modern thought is mainly rationalistic. It is a difficult matter to interpret Catholicity in terms of

rationalism. Modernism has the hardihood to attempt this task, and herein lies its danger.

Catholicity can be reconciled with all that is sound in modern thought, but it is futile to propose to reconcile it with that form of modern thought which is imbued with the teaching of Kant and deeply tainted with rationalism.

Pius X, in his Encyclical *Pascendi* (September, 1907), calls Modernism “the synthesis (combination) of all heresies.” Kant lays down the principle that the human mind cannot have true knowledge of anything except what the senses experience—what we see, hear, taste, touch, etc. Such a theory of knowledge vitiated Kant’s whole system. He was a Protestant rationalist (1724-1804) who became Professor of Philosophy in Königsberg University in East Prussia. He held that the human mind knows appearances only. But God and the supernatural truths of faith are not appearances.

About the beginning of this century some Catholic savants, lay and clerical, seem to have fallen under the spell of Kant, and set about reconciling Catholicity with Kant’s theory of knowledge. What was the upshot of their efforts? In France and Italy a considerable number of the younger clergy fell into the

snare of “ modern thought ” and “ scientific progress.” Whilst France and Italy became infected with Modernist errors, and England did not escape them, Belgium and Ireland steered clear of them.

The extreme Modernists rejected the main dogmas and tenets of Catholicism, viz. : Revelation, Faith, Dogma, the Church, and Authority. For Revelation they substituted the “Religious Sentiment” of each one; for Faith, “ Vital Immanence ” ; for Dogma, a tentative and provisional “ formula ” ; for the Visible Church, the “ Collective Conscience.” For the Vicar of Christ and Church Authority, the Modernist says: “the entire Christian people is the true and immediate Vicar of Christ.”

Modernism would turn Christianity topsy-turvy. It is the Gospel according to Kant.

XL—Liberalism

LIBERALISM is a many-sided system and its various phases and meanings are sponsored by an attractive title. In the seventeenth century' it meant “ worthy of a free man ” ; and even now people speak of a liberal education,” the “ liberal arts,” and so on. It also meant,

intellectually broad-minded, frank, open, and genial. Politically, it may mean a system opposed to absolutism and centralization of power. In all these senses, Liberalism is not at variance with the spirit and teaching of the Catholic Church.

Since the end of the eighteenth century it has generally signified a partial or total liberation of man from the supernatural, moral and Divine Order. The Magna Charta of this new form of Liberalism was proclaimed by the French Revolution in 1789. It preached, and practised, an unrestrained freedom of speech, thought, conscience, creed, press and politics. This led to the abolition of Divine Right and Authority and the investing of man with Supreme authority.

But it is in the domain of Religion and Morality that Liberalism is most dangerous and has wrought the greatest evils. This religious Liberalism was the forerunner of Modernism. It logically leads to a denial of God by putting deified humanity in His place. All phases of this Liberalism were condemned in the Constitution *de Fide* of the Vatican Council (1870), and the definition of Papal Infallibility¹ was a further condemnation of it.

XII.—INDIFFERENTISM

INDIFFERENTISM is the system which denies that it is the duty of man to worship God by believing and practising the true religion. Political indifferentism means the State policy which treats all religions within its borders as being on equal footing in the eyes of the law. While not an ideal system of statesmanship, it is not to be condemned so long as it accords to the different religious bodies complete liberty in belief and practice. In most countries this is a necessity in the present religious state of human society.

Religious Indifference is mainly of three kinds: absolute, restricted and liberal. The first rejects the fundamental basis of religion, that is, man's dependence on a personal Creator, Whom, in consequence of this dependence, he is bound to worship, obey and serve. This error is common to all atheistic, materialistic, pantheistic and agnostic philosophies.

Restricted Indifference admits the necessity of religion on account of its salutary influence on human life. But it holds that all religions are equally worthy, equally beneficial to man, and equally pleasing to God. The absurdity of this view is clear from the fact that various

religions are in disagreement ; and where they disagree, if one possesses the truth, the other must be in error.

They are often in conflict over moral issues. Thus, Mohammedanism approves polygamy, whilst Christianity condemns it. If these two teachers are equally trustworthy, it follows that there are no moral values at all, and that the Deity to Whom they are equally pleasing must be devoid of all moral attributes.

To say that all religions are equally good is tantamount to saying that religion is good for nothing.

Liberal Indifferentism holds that it does not matter what Church or sect one belongs to, that all forms of Christianity are on the same footing, are equally pleasing to God and serviceable to man. It follows from this that a Catholic might abandon Catholicism and join another Christian sect, or one which calls itself Christian, without committing any sin. Such a view is manifestly untenable.

Indifferentism springs from Rationalism, which rejects a Divine Revelation containing religious truths, which are, to a great extent, beyond the unaided powers of reason, and which must be learned from the body commissioned by God to teach and expound these

truths. That body is the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church. To leave that Church and join another is to abandon religious and Divine Truth, and to embrace falsehood and error.

XIII.—Agnosticism

AGNOSTICISM is the theory which limits the extent and validity of knowledge. With special reference to theology, it is the system which denies that it is possible for man to acquire the knowledge of God.

Recent Agnosticism is, to a great extent, anti-religious, criticising adversely, not only the knowledge we have of God, but the grounds of belief in Him as well. A combination of Agnosticism with Atheism rather than with sentimental irrational belief is the course adopted by many Agnostics. The idea of God is eliminated from the systematic view taken of the world and of life. The attitude of solemnly “suspended judgment” — “we simply don’t know”—shades off firstly into indifference towards Religion, and next into unbelief.

On the plea of insufficient evidence, the Agnostic ceases even to believe that God exists.

With Theism (natural religion) the idea of God—inadequate and solely proportional as it is—is, nevertheless, positive, true and valid, according to the laws which govern all our knowing.

Four distinct questions arise out of the question of God's knowableness, viz., existence, nature, knowledge and definition. The Agnostic separates the first two, which he should combine, and combines the last two, which should be separated. By treating the question of God's nature apart from the question of God's existence, he cuts himself off from the only possible means of knowing, and then turns his fault of method into a philosophy of the unknowable. That is Agnosticism.

The idea of God cannot be analysed wholly apart from the evidences or "proofs" bearing on it. By identifying the knowing of God with the question of defining Him, the Agnostic confounds the one with the other. They are distinct problems to be treated separately, since knowledge may fall short of definition and still be knowledge. Reason is competent, therefore, to know God from His works, and this refutes the theory of Agnosticism, or the unknowableness of God.

XIV.—Scepticism

SCEPTICISM is the system which denies the possibility of attaining truth. It is a denial of the capacity of the human intellect to know anything whatever with certainty. It existed amongst the Greek philosophers whose contradictory theories inevitably led to Scepticism.

Aristotle propounded the doctrine of axiomatic or self-evident truths. This doctrine, later on, proved a severe check on Scepticism. There must be some self-evident principles which underlie the structure of human knowledge and are presupposed by the very nature of things.

In regard to Religious truth the Renaissance revived the Scepticism of the Greeks. Its aim was to discredit reason on the old grounds of contradiction and the impossibility of proving anything. Saint Thomas and the Scholastics met Scepticism by a rational, coherent and systematic theory of the ultimate nature of things, based on self-evident truths, but consistent with the facts of experience and the truths of Revelation. Faith understood in the Catholic sense was, and still is, the chief target for the attacks of the Sceptics.

The late A. J. Balfour, in his “Defence of Philosophic Doubt,” seeks to uphold religious belief on the questionable ground that it is no less certain than the theory and method of scientific knowledge. The Sceptic contradicts himself at the outset. He lays down the inability of the mind to reach any certain knowledge, and at the same time assumes its capacity to criticise the faculty of knowledge. He knows and believes that nothing can be known for certain ; and yet he knows and holds as certain this important fact that nothing can be known. If nothing can be known, how can he know this fact to be true and certain? In other words, he knows a thing which cannot be known—a manifest contradiction.

The Sceptic confounds moral certainty and absolute certainty. The latter exists when evidence and proof are complete—the former when all reasonable grounds for doubt are excluded ; and this moral or practical certainty is sufficient for reasonable beings.

Axiomatic or self-evident truths must be accepted and acted on, as, although they cannot be proved, they are manifest to all reasonable minds. In these at least true and certain knowledge is contained, and they, therefore, refute Sceptics and Scepticism.

XV.—Evolution

The theory known as Evolution has occupied the public mind for upwards of a hundred years in more than one country. Its most important aspect is that which regards man and human beings in general.

How are Catholics to view this theory? In the first place, we must distinguish between the different meanings attributable to the term. Firstly, it may be taken as only a scientific hypothesis, or a philosophical conception or speculation. Again, it may be viewed as based on a theistic or atheistic foundation, and as applied only to the vegetable and lower animal kingdom, or to man.

As a scientific hypothesis, Evolution does not deal with the origin of life, and considers the existing species of plants and lower animals as developed from some pre-existing extinct species. This hypothesis is not opposed to the Christian conception of the universe.

As a philosophical conception, Evolution considers the entire history of the universe as a harmonious development, brought about by natural laws implanted in Nature by God the Creator. This agrees with the Christian view ; it is taught by St. Thomas, and rests on a theistic foundation.

Opposed to this is another theory of Evolution on an atheistic basis, and which rejects the doctrine of a Personal Creator. The Christian view demands a creative act for the origin of the universe and of man. The atheistic theory of Evolution rejects the existence of the soul as distinct from matter and sinks into blank materialism.

For the Catholic, the following conclusions are to be maintained :

1. The origin of life is unknown to science.
2. The origin of the main organic types, and their principal sub-divisions, are likewise unknown to science.
3. There is no evidence in favour of an ascending evolution of organic forms.
4. There is no trace of even a merely probable argument in favour of the animal origin of man's body.
5. The soul of every man is created by God, and, being spiritual, cannot have a material origin.

XVI.—FREETHOUGHT

FREETHOUGHT is the system professed and acted on by the class of people known as Freethinkers. They reject the religious truths and

moral dictates of Christian Revelation, and base their beliefs on the unfettered findings of human reason. They are typical rationalists.

They first received the name of freethinkers in connection with the English Deists in the early part of the eighteenth century. They all agree in refusing to accept the doctrines of an authoritative Christianity.

The early heretics were freethinkers in their rejection of the authority of the Church on questions connected with their heresies.

In the Middle Ages there were freethinkers and rationalists amongst Christian philosophers—Pantheists and others who reasoned away Revelation in true freethought style. Now, in the twentieth century, freethought and reliance on the sufficiency of human reason are far more prevalent than in past times.

In the latter centuries freethought has gained ground among the masses. In England, it began with the Deists, Aunett and Chubb, to become vulgarised and to reach the lower strata of society. Its main tenets are the denial of prophecy, miracle and inspiration (scriptural), its rejection of all external revelation, and its assertion of the right of free speculation in all rational matters. From the last-named, there often follows the denial of the existence of God

(Atheism, Agnosticism), of the immortality of the soul, and of the freedom of the will. In modern times, the chief freethinkers were Voltaire, Tom Payne, Renan, Strauss, Hækel, Bradlaugh and Holyoake.

XVII.—Malthusianism

THIS system takes its name from the Rev. Thomas Malthus, an Anglican divine (1766-1834). He published a book in 1798 entitled “An Essay on the Principle of Population.” His thesis was that population constantly tends to outrun subsistence and consequently should be curtailed. His chief means of doing this he called “moral restraint.”

His theory met with immediate and almost universal acceptance, and exerted a great influence on economics, sociology and legislation, during the first half of the nineteenth century. Besides a section of the Socialists, the most important group of writers who rejected his theory* were Catholic economists, such as Liberatore, Devas, Perin, Pesch and Antoine.

Neo-Malthusianism is the logical outcome of Malthusianism proper. The Neo-Malthusians urge married couples to use

artificial and immoral devices for preventing conception. Amongst the prominent leaders of this movement were Robert Dale Owen, John Stuart Mill, Charles Bradlaugh and Annie Besant. To-day we have others, but they are exposed and confounded as they arise. The motto of the Malthusians is “a small family or none at all.”

Catholic economists reject the Malthusian theory and the view of social facts on which it is founded. Their views may be thus summarised :

Where production is effectively organised, and wealth justly distributed ; where the morals of the people render them industrious, frugal, adverse to debilitating comforts, and willing to refrain from all immoral practices in the conjugal relation ; where a considerable proportion of the people embrace the condition of religious celibacy, and others live chastely, and yet defer marriage for a longer or shorter period, and many emigrate whenever the population of any region becomes congested—undue pressure of population will never occur except locally and temporarily.

As Father Pesch, the famous Jesuit, summarises it : “Where the quality[^] of the people is safeguarded, there need be no fear for its

quantity. *In countries where Birth Control has prevailed, thoughtful men see that these countries are confronted, not with the problem of excessive fecundity, but of race suicide.*"

XVIII.—*Naturalism*

Naturalism is a tendency common to a number of philosophical and religious systems to view nature as the one original and *fundamental* source of all that exists in terms of nature. All events find their adequate explanation within nature *itself*.

Materialistic naturalism asserts that matter is the *only reality*. It claims that all realities in the world, including mind and all mental processes, are *manifestations of matter, and obey the same necessary laws*. The general tendency of materialistic naturalism is towards Atheism. In such a system there is no room for *freedom of the will, responsibility and personal immortality*.

Pantheistic naturalism asserts that God is not transcendent and personal, but immanent in the world; and that everything in nature is but the manifestation of this one common substance. When we hear of savage peoples worshipping stones, trees and mountains, the Pantheistic

naturalists could not consistently condemn such idolatrous practices.

Deistic naturalism holds that God does not, never did, and never will interfere with the natural course of events. The fixed laws of nature can account for everything that happens in the world of mind or matter. It follows from this that miracles, that is, effects produced by God Himself and transcending the forces of nature, must be rejected.

Since natural reason is the only source of knowledge a Divine Revelation must also be rejected. No supernatural means are needed—such as divine grace to enlighten the mind, or strengthen the will. The Fall, the mysteries of the Incarnation and the Redemption find no place in a naturalistic creed.

Naturalism is, therefore, directly opposed to the Christian Religion. Leo XIII in the Encyclical *Immortale Dei* (1885), lays it down that "the integral profession of the Catholic Faith is in no way consistent with naturalistic and rationalistic opinions, the sum and substance of which is to do away altogether with Christian institutions, and, disregarding the rights of God, to attribute to men the supreme authority."

XIX—Syndicalism

SYNDICALISM implies the principles and practices of the French syndicates composing “the General Confederation of Labour.” It is called also “direct action,” and is a combination of revolutionary trades unionism, Anarchism and Socialism. It is founded mainly on the theories of Proudhon and Marx.

The primary objects of Syndicalism are the destruction of the existing order of society, the expropriation and abolition of Capital, and the elimination of the entire system of wages. The State is to be violently combated, even when it enacts measures beneficial to the labourer. There are only two classes, the employer and the employed, and anything which foments bitterness and disagreement between these two is a triumph for the worker.

All this is pure Marxian doctrine. The great and decisive end aimed at by Syndicalism is the general strike in all industries at the same time.

Already, even here in Ireland, we have felt a touch of Syndicalism in what has been called the sympathetic strike,” that is, the stopping and paralysing of all work and industries of a kindred nature with the aggrieved section’s work. Official Syndicalism aims at a general

strike in all kinds of work, in all countries at the same time.

A strike is to industry what war is to society in general, and must remain as abhorrent to everyone as military conflicts are to the peoples of all nations. There are, however, pacifist and reformist elements in the Syndicalist movement who are opposed to violent methods, who believe in securing better financial and social conditions for the worker by constitutional methods. Such seem to be the elements in the English and Australian Labour Parliamentary Parties, that are opposed to extreme Syndicalism and Communism.

XX.—Utilitarianism

Utilitarianism is the ethical theory which teaches that the end of human conduct is happiness; and that the norm which distinguishes conduct as right and wrong is pleasure and pain. In John Stuart Mill’s words: “The creed which accepts as the foundation of morals, utility, or the greatest happiness principle, holds that actions are right in proportion as they tend to promote happiness; wrong as they tend to produce the reverse of happiness.”

An English philosopher named Bentham was the first to give the system its name of Utili-

tarianism in his book, "The Principles of Morals and Legislation" (1789). Bentham and his disciples dissociated morality from its religious basis, and resolved moral obligation into a prejudice or feeling resulting from a long-continued association of disagreeable consequences attending some kinds of actions and advantages following from others.

The word "ought" Bentham calls "an authoritative impostor, the talisman of arrogance, insolence and ignorance."

Herbert Spencer's ethical construction is fundamentally Utilitarian. He holds pleasure and pain to be the standard which discriminates right from wrong, thereby viewing the moral value of actions as entirely dependent on their utility.

The weakness of Utilitarianism is that it fails to find the way from egoism (selfishness) to altruism, its identification of self-interest and benevolence, and its assumption that the useful and the morally right are identical.

XXI.—Pragmatism

PRAGMATISM as a system means the insistence on practical consequences as the test of truth. It sets up as the standard of truth some non-rational test, such as action, satisfaction of

needs, realisation of conduct, and judges reality by this norm to the exclusion of all others.

The origin of Pragmatism may be traced to Kant. From Kant's substitution of moral for theoretical consciousness came a progeny of non-rationalistic philosophies, which influenced the founders of Pragmatism, such as Latme's philosophy of value instead of validity. Also the trend of scientific thought in the second half of the nineteenth century is to be reckoned.

In ancient and mediaeval times, scientists aimed at the discovery of causes, laws and facts; the nineteenth century men were satisfied with improved hypotheses instead of a true cause or an established law. Such was the theory of materialistic evolution, which is still only a hypothesis or supposition. If the supposition functions satisfactorily, that is enough to declare it a truth.

With the Pragmatist there are truths but no truth—immutable, fixed and certain. As J. S. Mill teaches, "all truths are hypothetical," and depend on consequences, results and fruits.

As to God and Religion, Professor James, the high-priest of Pragmatism, says: "On Pragmatic principles, if the hypothesis of God works out satisfactorily in the widest sense of the word, it is true." But, as the Pragmatist

makes experience the test of “ the hypothesis of God,” if we attach any meaning to the idea of God, we must mean a Being Whose existence is not capable of *direct and intuitional experience* except in the supernatural order—an order which the Pragmatist does not admit,

Pragmatism sets up the principle that “ man is the measure of *all things*.” The consequences to you and me are the test of the meaning and truth *of our concepts, judgments and reasonings*. Pragmatism is nominalistic in denying *the validity of universal concepts*; it is sensistic, *for it restricts the functional value of concepts to sense experience. It is anarchistic, too.* Discarding intellectual logic, it discards principles and has no substitute *for them except individual experience. It appeals to future prosperity as a pragmatic test of truth, and leaves the verdict to time and a future generation.*

By claiming to be a system of philosophy, it introduces confusion into the relations between philosophy *and religion.*

XXII — *Positivism*

Positivism is both a philosophical and a religious system. As a philosophy it maintains

that the data of sense experience are the only objects and criteria of human knowledge. As a religion it denies the existence of a Personal God, and takes humanity “ the great being ” as the object of veneration and cult. It is the religion of humanity.

Its author was Auguste Comte (1798-1857), a French professor, who was deranged for one year (1826-27). His religion has for its object the “ great being ” (humanity), “ the great medium ” (world space), and the great fetish (the earth), which form the Positivist Trinity.

The absurdity of such a religion is self-evident. As to its philosophical tenets, they were accepted by leading philosophers in England (Mill, Harrison, Holt), France, Germany and other countries, and exercised a pernicious influence on philosophy during the nineteenth century. They led to systems of positive or scientific morality, utilitarianism in ethics and naturalism in religion. Positivism is thus a continuation of crude Empiricism, Associationism and Nominalism.

Positivism asserts that sense experiences are the sole criterion and object of human knowledge, but does not prove its assertion. It is true that all our knowledge starts from sense experience, but it is not proved that it stops

there. Above particular facts there are abstract notions, general laws, universal and necessary principles, which cannot be perceived by our senses, but can be understood and explained by our intelligence. Immaterial beings cannot be known in the same ways as material beings, but this is no reason for declaring them unknowable to our intelligence.

Positivism confounds images and ideas, experimental analogy and abstraction. Mere experience is insufficient to account for our general ideas. Abstract and universal ideas are the work of a purely intellectual and immaterial agent or being and not of sense experience. Hence Positivism as a philosophical system is as erroneous as its pretended religion with humanity as its God.

XXIII.—IMMANENCE

IMMANENCE as a modern system holds that God is contained in the world and in man—in other words, God is man and man is God.

This theory of Immanence is two-fold, namely, absolute and relative. These two kinds of Immanence have long struggled for supremacy—from the time of Socrates, who refused to look upon himself as part of the !

“Great AH,” and declared himself distinct from the universe. He professes the immanence of man, but not absolute immanence, for he recognises the fact that man is subject to external influences.

Absolute immanence fell back before the preaching of Christianity, which set forth the personality of man and the distinction between God and {he world—in other words, relative immanence. St. Augustine contends for relative immanence, and it triumphed in the Middle Ages under St. Thomas.

The seventeenth and eighteenth century philosophers set up absolute immanence as a dogma which still confronts revealed religion, and appears as one of the sources of Modernism and liberal Protestantism. The Encyclical of Pius X (1907), *Pascendi Gregis*, defines its two forms in the following words :

“For we ask does this immanence make God and man distinct or not? If it does, in what does it differ from the Catholic doctrine? or why does it reject what is taught in regard to Revelation? If it does not make God and man distinct, it is Pantheism. But this immanence of the Modernists would claim that every phenomenon of consciousness proceeds from man as man.”

This absolute immanence underlies all the forms of evolutionist monism. This monism sets aside the separateness between God and the world ; and the distinction between the natural and the supernatural. Here, then, we have the basis of liberal Protestantism and Modernism.

XXIV.—MONISM

MONISM is a philosophical term (one alone), which is opposed to Dualism. Dualism distinguishes between soul and body, matter and spirit, object and subject, matter and force; and the system which denies such a distinction, or merges both in a higher unity, is called Monism (oneness).

In Theology, Monism means Pantheism, that is, that there is no real distinction between God and the universe and that God is indwelling in it and part of it. Theism (natural religion) admits that He is indwelling in the universe, but denies that He is comprised in or identified with it.

Psychological Dualism maintains that man is one compound, consisting of body and soul, which are matter and form. The soul is the principle of life, energy and perfection ; the body the principle of decay, potentiality and

imperfection. Their union is substantial, not accidental. They are really distinct and even separable. Yet they act, and re-act on, and co-operate with, each other.

Monism tends to obliterate all distinction between soul and body. Materialistic Monism reduces the soul to matter and material conditions, and denies that there is any distinction between soul and body. Modern Materialism knows no soul except the nervous system. Cabanis proclaims his Materialism in this crude formula : “ The brain digests impressions and organically secretes thought.”

Idealistic Monism reduces matter to mind and mental conditions. It holds that all matter is non-existent, including the human body. Other equally absurd Materialistic theories are known as parallelism and occasionalism regarding the mutual operations of soul and body. Dualism leaves room for Faith. Monism leaves no room for Faith.

XXV.—Empiricism

Empiricism signifies the theory that the phenomena of consciousness are the product of sensuous experience ; and, secondly, that all human knowledge is derived exclusively from

experience, which includes external sense-percepts, and internal representations and inferences, without the aid of any superorganic intellectual factor.

Empiricism includes (1) materialism ; (2) sensism, and (3) positivism.

(1) Modern materialists hold that knowledge is accounted for either by cerebral secretion or motion, whilst Haeckel looks on it as “ a physiological process effected by certain brain cells.”

(2) It includes Sensism by denying any essential difference between sensations and ideas—logically involving materialism. Sensism was formulated by Locke, Bacon, Hobbs, and lastly by Berkeley. Berkeley denied the objective basis of universal ideas, and, indeed, of the whole material universe. They all teach that ideas are but images of the mind's subjective organic impressions. It follows that the supersensible is unknowable, and that the spiritual essence or substantial being of the soul is dissipated into a series of conscious states.

(3) Positivists declare the supersensible unknowable—the one source of cognition being sense-experience, experiment, and education from phenomena.

Catholic philosophy teaches that experience

is the primary source of human knowledge, but that there are other sources beyond sensations. Sensation and sensuous representation differ essentially from the idea produced by the intellect, which is an immaterial, supersensuous power, or faculty. Ideas, as representative of essences, are the terms whereof absolutely universal principles are constituted. Hence, ideas are universal, whereas sensations and images represent only objects that affect the sensory organs, that is, individual, physically existing objects.

Sensism implies scepticism. By it the principle of causality is either rejected or pronounced doubtful. Hence there can be no certainty of the objective existence of things. Sensism destroys the foundations of morality and religion. For, as Sensists and Positivists admit, their theories leave no proof of the soul's spirituality and immortality, of the existence of the moral law (with its obligations and sanctions of a future life) ; of the existence of God and His relation to man.

XXVI.—Spir it is m

SPIRITISM is the system which teaches that the living can communicate with the spirits of the

departed. It is also a species of religion based on the belief that the discarnate spirits in making known their condition also indicate the means of salvation.

Its phenomena are of two kinds, viz., physical and psychical. The former include the production of raps and other sounds ; movement of objects (tables, chairs), without contact ; apparitions of objects in a closed room without any visible agency to convey them ;

light or faces ; raising of the dead ; the appearance of a spirit photography in the forms of deceased persons along with the likeness of a living person.

Psychical phenomena are those which include messages, such as table-tipping, questions ; automatic writing ; trance-speaking, clairvoyance ; messages from the dead, and

spiritive messages, special messages, etc. The first medium was Margaret Fox, of Rochester, N. Y., in 1848. The gatherings are carried on

Allowing that some things occur at seances which are beyond natural agencies, the chief question is, are these spirits really those of the departed, or beings that were never embodied in human form?

The best explanation refers these communications to demoniac intervention. This view is confirmed from the nature of these communications, which antagonise the essential truths of religion, such as the Divinity of Christ, Redemption and Atonement, Judgment and future retribution ; and encourage agnosticism, pantheism and re-incarnation.

A Decree of the Holy Office, dated March 30th, 1898, condemns Spiritistic practices, even though intercourse with the demon be excluded and intercourse sought with good spirits only. What the Church condemns in Spiritism is superstition, with its evil consequences for religion and morality.

XXVII.—Pessimism

As a philosophical system, Pessimism may be taken as one of the many attempts to account for the presence of evil in the world.

With Schopenhauer, the originator of Pessimism as a system, evil in the full sense of the

word is a fundamental principle in the life of man. The world is, according to him, essentially bad, and “ought not to be.” Hence comes the ethical theory which may be summed up as the necessity for “denying the will to live.”

The pain of life can be abolished only by ceasing to live.” On this principle the poet Leopardi extolled suicide, and the philosopher Mainländer took his own life.

Pessimism may be judged by an estimate of the relative amount of pleasure and pain in average human life. Here a judgment of value is more to the point than a quantitative estimate of pleasure and pain. Can we discover any absolute standard, any safe estimate of the comparative importance of pleasures and pains which is the same for all?

Such a standard of value is found in religious belief, and in its complete form in the Faith of Catholics.

Religion fixes the scale of values by reference, not to varying individual sensibilities, but to an eternal law, which is always the ideal reason for individual judgment and guidance. The Christian law of duty gives to action in itself, possibly quite the reverse of pleasurable, a value far outweighing that of satisfaction

arising from any specific pleasure, whether sensuous or intellectual.

The gloomy outlook on this life is deeply modified by the “ eternal values ” which are the special province of Christianity. The unhappiness of the world is compensated by the satisfaction arising from a peaceful conscience and a sense of, harmony between individual action and eternal law. Faith and Love contribute an element of joy to life which cannot be destroyed, and may even be enhanced by temporal sufferings.

XXVII1.—Theosophy

THEOSOPHY is a system which claims to gain the knowledge of God by direct intuition of the Divine Essence. It is an offshoot of Spiritism. Madame Blavatsky, its founder, a Russian woman, practised as a spiritualistic medium in Cairo in 1872. She afterwards went to the United States, where she courted notoriety as a Spiritist, but owing to the exposure of certain fraudulent mediums, there was a slump in Spiritism, and needy occultists found it necessary to provide some new sensation. As a result, the Theosophical Society was founded by Madame Blavatsky in New York City in 1875. Its ostensible objects were :

1. To form the nucleus of a universal brotherhood of humanity without distinction of race, creed, sex, caste or colour.

2. To investigate the unexplained laws of nature and the powers latent in man. The latter includes magic, the occult, the uncanny, the marvellous in every shape and form.

Madame Blavatsky claimed the discovery of Tibetan occultism, or esoteric Buddhism. Her frauds were exposed by Columb and his wife, who had been in her service, and by the London Society of Psychical Research in 1884, when she was in India. Yet her teaching was continued by Mrs. Besant and others.

With the Theosophists there is no supernatural, no Personal God, and, for this reason, they say the system is more readily embraced by Atheists and Agnostics. It teaches also the absurd doctrine of re-incarnation and the law of Karma resulting from causes set in motion during the previous incarnations.

Theosophy, in spite of its Christian ethical phraseology, is a form of Pantheism, and denies a Personal God and immortality. It is a strange mixture of mysticism, charlatanism and thaumaturgie pretension, expressed in words borrowed from Christian ethics and scientific truths.

XXIX.—Masonry

Freemasonry as it exists at present had its beginning in the establishment of the Grand Lodge of England in the year 1717. Its pretended antiquity is a myth invented to give it prestige in the eyes of its votaries. Shortly after its establishment it adopted a new religious formula, viz., “ the universal religion of humanity ”—a purely naturalistic belief, which rejects the supernatural and tends to religious indifferentism. This formula is both anti-Christian and anti-Catholic, and Pope Clement XII gives this as the chief ground on which he condemned it and forbade Catholics to join it in his Constitution *Emmenti* (28th April, 1738). It is no less to be condemned for its inscrutable secrecy and intended deception by symbols ; its work by men “ who, like foxes, endeavour to root up the vineyard ” and pervert the heart of the simple. Such was Masonry in 1738—and such it is to-day wherever it is strongly rooted, as in some European countries.

Leo XIII, the sixth Pope who solemnly condemned it (1884), declared its ultimate purpose to be “ the overthrow of the whole religious, political and social order based on Christian institutions, and the establishment of a new state

of things according to their own ideas, and based in its principles and laws on pure Naturalism.”

Its oath of initiation is simply horrible, j
Taken on the Bible, it runs as follows :

“I, in the presence of the great architect of the Universe, . . . do hereby and hereon solemnly and sincerely swear that I will always hide, conceal and never reveal, any part or parts, any point or points, of the secrets or mysteries of or belonging to Free and Accepted Masons. . . . These several points I solemnly swear to observe under no less penalty than to have my throat cut across, my tongue torn out by the root, and my body buried in the sands of the sea. . . . So help me God, &c.”

The Master Mason swears to assist a Master Mason, and “«extricate him from any difficulty, whether it be right or wrong.” This oath obliges Masons to “ extricate ” a brother no matter how great a crime he is guilty of when he makes the sign of distress. Is it any wonder that eight Popes have condemned this society and have cut off from the Church those who join it?

XXX.—A t h e i s m

A t h e i s m is the system which is opposed to Theism, or belief in God. The God of Theism is a personal, supra-mundane, spiritual being, the First Cause, and Creator of the entire universe, including man. Hence those who masquerade under the names of Rationalists, Freethinkers, Deists, Materialists, Pantheists, Agnostics, Positivists, and the like, are rightly viewed as Atheists.

All such in practice implicitly deny a Personal God—the First, Efficient, Final Cause of all things and distinct from the universe. Fearing the name of atheist, they have invented a number of names to designate their God, such as the Absolute, the Unknowable, the Reality, the great Being (humanity), the Infinite, and so on.

Mr. Gladstone (*Contemporary Review*, 1876), aptly described the motley crew of Atheists when he wrote of them: “By the Atheist I understand the man who not only holds off, like the sceptic, from the affirmative, but who drives himself or is driven to the negative assertion in regard to the whole unseen, or to the existence of God.”

Then there is moral Atheism, of which a

Protestant writer (Flint) says: "Practical atheism is not a kind of thought or opinion, but a mode of life." This kind of atheism is more correctly called godlessness in conduct, irrespective of any philosophical, moral or religious belief.

Whilst materialists, agnostics and pantheists do not openly profess Atheism, it is clearly implied in all these systems. Giordano Bruno, Spinoza, and the French Encyclopedists of the eighteenth century; Huxley, Darwin, Spenser, Haeckel (Monist) of later times, may fairly be included in the category of practical atheists.

The Catholic Church teaches that human reason, used rightly, is able to establish the existence of God with complete certitude.

XXXI.—D I V O R C E

AMONGST the evils of modern times, one of the greatest and most far-reaching is Divorce. It had its origin in the rejection by the sixteenth century "Reformers" of the sacramental nature of Matrimony. By ceasing to regard it as a sacrament they soon came to view it as a civil and social contract—rescindable by public authority for certain reasons and causes.

This was simply going back to pagan ideas.

As they had rejected the authority of the Ecclesiastical Courts, they at first favoured taking appeals to the reigning prince or sovereign. Then mixed tribunals of laymen and clerics were tried, when various and conflicting decisions were arrived at.

In England, during Elizabeth's reign, new marriages were freely contracted after divorces were obtained. During Mary's reign this practice had ceased. From 1602 till 1857 marriage and divorce were dealt with by ecclesiastical courts when, in the latter year, an Act of Parliament was passed, establishing a new civil court to deal with divorce and matrimonial causes. This Act was confined to England, and Ireland so far has escaped this evil legislation. Hence, Irish Courts have no jurisdiction to grant absolute divorce, that is, the dissolution of the marriage bond with the right to re-marry. In Italy, Spain (so far) and Portugal, no absolute divorce is allowed. In Canada absolute divorce is very rare.

The countries where the ravages of divorce are most felt are England, the United States, France and Germany. In the United States its growth exceeds that of any modern nation except Japan—a pagan country.

The evil of divorce is increased in cases

where there are children. The Catholic Church's teaching throughout the centuries has been that the bond of a valid, consummated marriage between Catholics is for life, to be dissolved only by death. Christ's own words are decisive on this question: "What God has joined together, let no man put asunder." (*Matt*, xix, 6.)

XXXII.—Eugenics

EUGENICS is the name of a system which proposes to improve the racial qualities of future generations—physically and mentally. Its founder was Sir Francis Galton, a cousin of Charles Darwin. He published in 1869 a book on *Hereditary Genius*, an inquiry into laws and consequences."

Galton derived his main idea from the breeding of the race-horse. Just as we can breed horses for points, so also can we breed men for points. The movement includes more than study, and aims at legislation, administration and influencing human conduct.

The science is of two kinds, positive and negative. The one encourages the parenthood of the fit and worthy, and the other discourages, or rather prevents, the parentage of the unfit

and unworthy. Thus it concerns itself with marriage and marital relations and the eradication of hereditary diseases.

Scientists who engage in such schemes generally overlook the difference between the lower or irrational animals and human beings. There is a great difference between these two classes of beings, and they are separated by a wide chasm which human genius can never bridge over. Human beings are discriminated from the lower animals by the gifts of reason, free will, and speech, and are endowed with an eternal destiny.

The Church makes bodily and mental culture subservient to morality and religion, whilst modern eugenics makes morality and religion subservient to bodily and mental culture. To attain their aims, certain methods, such as surgical operations, are proposed by the Eugenicians, but the moral effects to which they lead cannot be approved. In fact, they would open the door to immoral practices which would be a worse evil than the one intended to be avoided.

Segregation, if carried out with due safeguards for the feeble-minded, would be a lawful method. The spirit of the Church is to extend, rather than to curtail, the freedom of the in-

dividual, and to oppose undue State interference with family rights.

XXXIII._ CO-EDUCATION

On this subject the Encyclical of Pope Pius XI, on *The Christian Education of Youth* contain the following passage :

“ False also and harmful to Christian Education is the so-called method of co-education. This, too, by many of its supporters, is founded upon naturalism and the denial of original sin, but by all upon a deplorable confusion of ideas that mistakes a levelling promiscuity and equality for the legitimate association of the sexes. The Creator has ordained and disposed perfect union of the sexes only in matrimony, and with varying degrees of contact in the family and society. Besides, there is not in nature itself, which fashions the two, quite different in organism, in temperament, in abilities, anything to suggest that there can be or ought to be promiscuity, and much less equality, in the training of the two sexes.

“ These, in keeping with the wonderful designs of the Creator, are destined to complement each other in the family and in society,

precisely in virtue of their differences, which, therefore, ought to be maintained and encouraged during their years of formation with the necessary distinction and corresponding separation, according to age and circumstances. These principles, with due regard to time and place, must, in accordance with Christian prudence, be applied to all schools, particularly in the most delicate and decisive period of formation, that, namely, of adolescence—and in gymnastic exercises and deportment special care must be had of Christian modesty in young women and girls, which is so gravely imperilled by any kind of exhibition in public.

“ Recalling the terrible words of the Divine Master: ‘Woe to the world because of scandals,’ We most earnestly appeal to your solicitude and your watchfulness, Venerable Brethren, against these pernicious errors, which, to the immense harm of youth, are spreading far and wide among Christian peoples.”

The Holy Father here raises a warning voice against co-education, firstly, during the period of adolescence, and secondly, within the domain of athletic and gymnastic exercises, The period of adolescence would, generally

speaking, correspond to the secondary school period ; and the practice of identical gymnastic exercises for boys and girls is quite inadmissible on grounds of modesty and morality.

Hence in secondary schools separation of the sexes is absolutely necessary, whilst in elementary schools and the universities co-education may be allowable provided the indispensable and effective safeguards of religious teaching, careful supervision, and separate residence are fully maintained. Hence schools, colleges and universities run on Godless lines should not be frequented by Catholic youths, and, above all, by Catholic girls. The Pope's words are decisive on this subject.

XXXIV.—Cremation

Cremation means the burning to ashes of the bodies of the dead. It is the revival in Europe and America, in recent times, of the practice of very ancient pagan nations. There is no trace of it among the Jewish people except in times of war and pestilence. The Romans and Greeks varied their practice—those believing in a future life buried their dead, whilst those who did not so believe, practised cremation.

Cicero tells us that burial was the oldest rite

with the Romans. The early Christians never burned their dead, but followed the personal example of their Divine Founder. The pagans, to destroy faith in the Resurrection of the body, often cast the bodies of the martyrs into the flames.

The third century writer, Minutius Felix, refutes the assertion that cremation makes the Resurrection impossible. "Nor do we fear," he writes, "as you suppose, the mode of burial, but we adhere to the old and better custom." Owing to the rapid progress of Christianity, the practice of cremation had entirely ceased by the fifth century.

During the Middle Ages the placing of the body in the earth or tomb was a part of Christian burial. By the sixth century, the Church, in Rome and other places, had so far conquered the prejudices of the past as to gain the privilege of burying her dead within the city walls and in the churchyards.

The Church has uniformly condemned the practice of cremation, and on good grounds ; for, in recent times, it is knit up with the spirit of irreligion and materialism. It was the Freemasons who first obtained from various governments the recognition of the practice. It began in Italy in 1873. The Church holds it un-

seemly that the human body, once the living temple of God, the instrument of heavenly virtue, sanctified so often by the Sacraments, should be finally subjected to a treatment which filial piety, conjugal and fraternal love, revolts against as inhuman.

A strong medico-legal argument against cremation is that it destroys all signs of violence, or traces of poison, thus making post-mortem examinations impossible, whereas such can be held months after inhumation, Cremation thus bars the way to the detection of violence and other grave crimes against the human person.

The advocates of cremation allege that cemeteries are a danger to public health by corrupting the soil, drinking water, and the air itself. These statements have been proved to be unfounded. The most eminent chemists and bacteriologists have shown by science and experiments that well-arranged cemeteries are not in the least injurious to the air or to water wells. The waters in the cemeteries of Leipzig, Hanover, Dresden and Berlin were found pure and clear—purer, in fact, than that of other wells outside the boundaries of the places of the experiments.

Cremation is an inhuman, revolting practice,

and has made very little progress in the countries where it is tolerated by law. Let us hope that it will never be seen in Ireland.

XXXV.—Mechanism

Mechanism — as at present held by its votaries—is a materialistic theory' which conceives the world or universe as a vast self-moving machine, self-existing from all eternity, devoid of all freedom or purpose, perpetually going through a series of changes, each new state necessarily emerging out of the previous one, and passing into the new one. All this assumes the absence of a Creator or Creation.

At one time, this theory rested mainly on two scientific props, namely, spontaneous generation and the conservation of energy. The former is now dead and buried, and the latter has been warned off from human beings by such eminent scientists as Lord Kelvin and Clerk Maxwell, and is therefore not very helpful to Mechanism.

Mechanism must be rejected as a formula for the universe and for man. The battle between Mechanism and its opposite, Vitalism, has centred mainly around human life—its origin, its nature, its composition and functions.

Mechanism holds that life is a product of physics and chemistry, that it can be reduced to two quantitative realities, viz., mass and motion, and these again can be further reduced to mathematical equations. It excludes from its scientific purview such realities as *forms, ends, causes, design, intelligence, mind, intellect, will, freedom, morality*. But to exclude them does not get rid of them, or prove their unreality.

Living bodies possess many qualities not possessed by inanimate or lifeless bodies. The latter consist mainly of quantity, which of itself has only quantitative properties, with no intrinsic, internal motive principle. We concede to the science of mechanics the merit due to many valuable discoveries and a multitude of valuable inventions for man's use and benefit, one of which should be mentioned here, namely, the Drumm Battery'.

Whilst Mechanism and Mechanists keep within their proper sphere, in their scientific pursuits—that is, within the material forces of nature, they are on safe ground—like MacGregor on his “ native heath.” But when they travel outside it and enter on the domains of philosophy, biology, psychology, etc., and limit their reasoning to their own pet science,

they deserve to be treated as trespassers, and to be requested to “ get out.”

Harvey’s maxim, “ omne vivum ex vivo
 I (all life is from life) has now been universally
 accepted by scientists, and has knocked
 the bottom out of spontaneous generation.
 Scientists also tell us that at one period of time
 no life could have subsisted on this earth of
 i ours. But the beginning of life must therefore
 have come from a living being, and the only
 living being then in existence was God, and
 He alone must have given life to the first living
 beings. This proof of Creation is a heavy blow
 to Mechanism and Mechanists.

The doctrine of the cell and its growth and functions prove clearly that life is not explicable by the mechanical, physical and chemical properties of matter. Within the germ-cell there is a principle which builds up the organism after a definite plan, which constitutes the manifold material of a single being ; which is intimately present in every part of it ; which is the source of its essential activities, and which determines its specific nature. Such is the vital principle. It is, therefore, in the scholastic terminology, the “ efficient cause of the living being.

XXXVI.—CHRISTIAN SCIENCE

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE, an American sect started in 1879 by Mrs. Mary Baker Eddy, is a theosophic, therapeutic, religious system of healing human ailments. It rejects doctrinal belief and medical treatment, and claims to depend on the application of scientific knowledge for the cure of sickness.

It also claims a revival of the Apostolic healing of Christ. It speaks of Christ the Scientist” and hence its name, “Christian Science.” It purports to be a church without any creed; and has as its official text-books Mrs. Eddy’s two works, “Science and Health” and the “Manual.” The former contains the teachings and the rules for the healing of the sick and the saving of the sinner; and the latter the tenets which must be subscribed to by those who obtain membership of the “Church.”

Christian Science claims to be essentially a method of healing—of curing both body and soul. It seeks “the mental, moral and physical regeneration of mankind.” Mrs. Eddy asserted that Christ gave a command binding on all His followers to “preach and heal.” Disease is mental error—the cure consists in convincing the patient of the error. Her

“ scientific statement of being ” is as follows :
 “ There is no life, truth, intelligence nor substance in matter. All is infinite mind and its infinite manifestation ; for God is all in all. Spirit is immortal truth ; matter is unreal and temporal. Spirit is God and man, His image and likeness. Therefore, man is not material, he is spiritual.”

In Christian Science there are no sacraments and no prayer. Its chief error is the assumption that the miracles of Christ were merely natural actions, and that Christian Science confers the same power on its adherents. Mrs Eddy claimed Divine revelation in her discovery of Christian Science. Revelation does not come to such as Mrs. Eddy. Her system is neither Christian nor scientific.

XXXVII .-P s y c h o -A n a l y s i s

P s y c h o -A n a l y s i s means a process which leads to the disclosing of mental contents—both conscious and unconscious. It began as a therapeutic treatment of nervous diseases, but quickly developed into a general science of the unconscious—that is, the investigation of the content and workings of the unconscious mind, and the relations between the unconscious and conscious mental operations,

It pretends to furnish a new basis for human activities, in art, education, morality and religion. "It has supplied," writes Dr. Tridon, not only physicians, but artists, thinkers, sociologists, educators and critics with a new point of view. It offers to the average man and woman a new rational code of behaviour based on science instead of faith." It puts the unconscious and abnormal mental states as only slightly different from the normal and conscious states. Thus what is most exalted in man is only a transformation of the vilest animal instincts.

It is easy to see that psycho-analysis, as now understood, follows the evolutionary and materialistic trend of modern psychology and seeks to establish man's relationship to the lower animal life. It thus strips man of everything that constitutes his unique dignity. It assumes that because nervous diseases affect the mind, nerves and mind are, therefore, identical. But nerves are material, whilst mind, with its chief faculty, intellect, is immaterial and spiritual.

Psycho-analysis has an elaborate technique and phraseology — complex, sublimation, symbols, dynamics, and the rest. Its advocates admit that in regard to abnormal mental states,

strong arguments may be drawn in favour of Catholic practices, such as Confession and Asceticism, which relieve the mind of remorse and other evil effects, and prevent future psychic disturbances.

Psycho-analysis promises more than it can perform. As an interpretation of life and a basis of conduct it must be rejected without reserve. As chief protagonist, Dr. Freud has entirely reversed psychology—by making the unconscious the dominant factor in our mental life, and exalting the instinctive life above the rational and intellectual life.

In this system, there is no room for freedom of the will which is the puppet of unconscious forces. For Freud, man is only a bundle of conflicting impulses, each of which is striving for mastery, whilst the mind is the passive on-looker. The animal life is not only the substratum, but the actual source of the rational and the spiritual life.

On such a basis it is impossible to erect an anthropology that will do justice to the dignity of man. It degrades him as few systems of philosophy have ever done. It blots out the boundary line between sanity and insanity. It explains the normal activities of the mind on the same basis as the phenomena of the dis-

eased mind. Art, religion, heroism, have the same source as crime, morbidity and perversion. The unconscious is the key to everything. The highest is nothing but the sublimation of the lowest.

The influence of such teaching cannot fail to be pernicious and subversive of morality and religion.

XXXVIII.—Individualism

Individualism may be defined as “the tendency to magnify individual liberty as against external authority, and individual activity against associated activity.” External authority here includes voluntary associations, and such forms of restraint as are found in general standards of conduct and belief.

Through ail forms of individualism runs the note of self in opposition to either restraint or assistance from without.

Individualism is three-fold—religious, ethical and political. Religious individualism is the mark of those who reject definite creeds or refuse to submit to any external religious authority, and who go by the name of free-thinkers. In a less degree, all Protestants are individualists in religion, as they regard their

individual interpretation of the Bible as their final authority.

On the other hand, Catholics accept the voice of the Church as the supreme authority and reject the principle of religious individualism.

Ethical individualism is the making of the individual conscience or reason the sole guide of moral conduct. Here also Catholics are not individualists, as they accept the Law of God as the supreme rule, and the Church as the final interpreter of that Law. The autonomous morality of Kant; the intuitionism of the Scottish school (Reid, Hamilton and Smith), the utilitarianism of Bentham, and Hedonism, are all forms of individualism.

Political individualism is historically and practically the most important form of the system. It varies in degree from pure anarchism to the view that the State's only proper functions are to maintain order and to enforce contracts. It is in the fields of economy and industry that individualists would reduce the functions of the State to a minimum that is consistent with the maintenance of social order and peace.

According to the "laissez faire," or "letalone" school of economists—known also as the "Manchester School"—the State should

permit unrestricted competition, contracts and work in the field of industry ; its advocates oppose not only such public enterprises as State railways and telegraphs, but such restrictive measures as factory regulations and laws governing the modes and times of employment for women and children. They also discouraged all associations of employers and of workers.

Both of these were expressly approved by Leo XIII in the Encyclical *Rerum Novarum* (1891). Such measures are manifestly necessary for the protection of both employers and workers. Without them, the individual employer is exposed to injustice and injury by unnecessary and unreasonable strikes, and the worker to extortionate contracts and inadequate wages.

Public necessity and public welfare are the best guides for politicians and legislators in all industrial and economic questions. There is no *a priori principle or rule by which they* can be decided. Legislation and State *control may lessen the liberties of* some individuals, but it may also increase the welfare and opportunities of the vast majority.

In regard to the functions of the State, the Catholic position is neither individualistic nor

anti-individualistic, but is determined by its conception of the requirements of individual and social welfare. In his Encyclical, *The Social Order: Its Reconstruction and Perfection*, Pope Pius XI puts forward for political and social reform the spiritual order of the Kingdom of God to be applied to the body politic.

XXXIX.—Collectivism

Collectivism means a system of industry in which the material agents of production would be owned and managed by the public—the collectivity. It is allied to Socialism on its economic side. Socialism goes far beyond Collectivism inasmuch as it comprises the international or Marxian ideological foundation and the concrete movement that is striving to carry it out. Collectivism does not, theoretically, necessitate the despotic supremacy of a highly centralised State.

The Collectivist ideal in general is a state organised on industrial lines in which each industry, whether local or national, and its workers, would be substantially autonomous, and in which government by persons would be replaced by administration of things. But the

vast scope given to local and provincial autonomy, and the very small part assigned to coercive and repressive activity, would prove fatal to its efficiency and stability.

In this way, the workers would lack the incentive to hard work that comes from fear of discharge, and would be under constant temptation to assume that they were more active and efficient than their equally-paid fellows in other workshops of the same class. Hence, sufficient centralisation to place the control of industry outside of the local unit or branch would seem to be indispensable. This would mean a combination of industrial and political power which could easily put an end to freedom of action, speech and writing.

In such circumstances, a bare majority of voters might impose intolerable conditions on a minority almost equal in numbers, or an unscrupulous, self-constituted oligarchy might act thus to the entire populace as is at present being done in Soviet Russia, not only in the industrial sphere, but in many other departments of life.

For Collectivism in practice there seems to be no middle course between inefficiency and despotism. Hence it would increase rather than lessen social ills and is obviously contrary to the interests of morality and religion.

Furthermore, any collectivist *régime* which would seize private land or capital without compensation would violate the Catholic doctrine of the lawfulness of private ownership, and the unlawfulness of theft.

In the Encyclical *Rerum Novarum* (on the conditions of labour) Pope Leo XIII clearly denounced those extreme forms of Socialism and Communism which aim at the abolition of all, or practically all, private property. In the same document he declares that man's welfare demands private ownership of "stable possessions," and of "lucrative property."

These pronouncements implicitly condemn Collectivism along with Socialism and Communism as contrary to natural justice and the welfare of society.

XL.—Euthanasia

Euthanasia, as the word implies, is a system devised to bring about an easy, painless death. Its advocates say that three classes of people—criminals, the incurably sick and the insane—are doomed to a life of suffering, are a useless expense to the State, and should not be permitted to live.

George Ives, an American writer, in his

“History of Penal Methods,” says: “All criminals who cannot ultimately lead useful, human, tolerably happy lives, should be destroyed as soon as their condition has been determined. Many doctors and lawyers in the United States favour the system, and attempts have been made to have it legalised in several States.”

The system is, without doubt, the outcome of the materialistic and atheistic teaching and training of State schools, colleges and universities in America. This system may be feasible enough when diseased dogs, horses and other animals are in question. Those who would apply it to human beings overlook the fact that human beings are in a totally different category from the lower animals—as possessing a soul as well as a body, reason, speech, with a future life and an eternal destiny—none of which the low’er animals possess. They also forget that there is a God, the Creator of human beings, Who alone has supreme dominion over the life which He gave to His creatures.

This dominion does not belong to the civil powers, and any law authorising a committee of doctors, nurses and social workers to enter public institutions—much less private houses—and do away with the lives of inmates under

any pretext or authority whatever, would contravene and usurp the rights and supreme dominion of God, the Creator, over the lives of His creatures.

Human life is from God, and belongs to Him alone. No one may, under any conditions, take the life of an innocent person.

PART II

CATHOLIC SOCIOLOGY

I.—The Family—The Fundamental Unit of Society—A Most Sacred Bond

Let us begin by asking: What is Sociology? Sociology is the science which treats of man *as a member of society*, and of the manifestations and laws which regulate, or should regulate, social life. It is governed by the requirements of ethics, of the moral conscience, and of the norms of human conduct. Modern sociology shows a marked tendency towards agnosticism, materialism and determinism—the last-named rejecting the freedom of the will in human conduct. This tendency is seen more particularly in its philosophical aspects. Hence a sociology based on Catholic principles and Catholic philosophy is very much required at the present time.

The devotees of modern sociology, even when viewing social facts and processes of a material nature, cannot refrain from assumptions contrary to the Christian outlook on life.

We may here take Christian and Catholic as practically identical.

The Christian view of life accepts, at the outset, as divinely warranted, the moral and social principles taught and re-enforced by Christ. Christian social philosophy did not derive its doctrine of human brotherhood from the logical process known as induction, but received it directly from the lips of Christ. A Christian sociology, therefore, is one that always carries with it the philosophy of Christ. While modern sociology seeks to classify and account for human interests and social requirements without relation to the Divine Laws, Christian sociology is concerned mainly about the relation of social schemes, views and theories to the Laws and Revelation of God. Of the many subjects included in the science of sociology the one which stands in the forefront is the family.

The family, and not the individual, is the fundamental unit of society. The Christian family is a supernatural institution founded upon the natural law. It has for its basis the permanent union of one man with one woman. This union in the Catholic Church is a Sacrament of the New Law—raised to that dignity by Christ Himself when on earth. It confers

supernatural help on these joint founders of a family, enabling them to discharge the duties of their state, and to realise the supernatural destiny of themselves and their children.

The man is the head of the family. The task of maintaining and protecting the family devolves on him and confers on him a certain authority. This authority is not an absolute power, but is in the nature of a trust, and neither wife nor children are his property.

Husband and wife united are, as it were, a single organism, and their joint and harmonious efforts are needed for the proper upbringing and training of their children. Even under the Mosaic Law the parents in family life received honour in the fourth of the Ten Commandments—“ Honour thy father and thy mother ” — the three first Commandments enjoining the honour due to God Himself. Here the parents come next after God.

It is true that divorce prevailed under the Old Law, but Our Lord swept away divorce and all its abuses by making Marriage a Sacrament and *indissoluble* by these words : “ What God has joined together let no man put asunder.” The bond remains till death, no matter how long or how far apart the parties may be separated from each other. *In true*

Christian Marriage, then, we have a position of stability and dignity given to woman which she never before enjoyed, and this position is the corner-stone of Christian civilisation.

Her position before the coming of Christ was very low among all nations, civilised and uncivilised. Among the barbarians, she frequently became a wife by capture or purchase ; and even amongst the more advanced peoples she was generally her husband's property, his chattel, his labourer. Infanticide, too, was practically universal, and the *patria potestas* of the Roman father gave him the right of life and death even over his grown-up children.

From the permanence and unity of the marriage bond there arises a real and definite equality of husband and wife. The wife is neither the slave nor the property* of the husband, but his consort and companion. The Christian family is supernatural inasmuch as it originates in a Sacrament. Its end and ideal are likewise supernatural, namely, the salvation of children and parents, and the union of Christ with His Church.

“Husbands,” says St. Paul, “love your wives as Christ also loved the Church and delivered Himself for it.” “So also ought men love their wives as their own bodies. He that

loveth his wife loveth himself.” (*Ephesians v* 25, 28.)

The union of the married couple is the highest and most sacred of all human unions. It is strengthened and cemented by mutual affection, which impels each of them to seek the welfare of the other. When the marital union is blest with children, both feel a strong stimulus to put forward their best efforts for the welfare of their children.

Amongst the dangers threatening the family are the following: divorce, birth control by artificial and immoral devices, undue State interference (Socialism and Communism), the idle and frivolous lives of women, both mothers and daughters; the cinemas, talkies, theatres, bad novels, magazines and newspapers; drunkenness, slum dwellings, industrial employment of women (especially mothers) and children. In regard to divorce, there has never been a divorce court in Ireland, although our neighbour, England, has been well supplied with such institutions since 1857. The Catholic ideal of *indissoluble marriage* is the only sure barrier against this pestiferous social evil and its dangers to family life.

II. — Conscience and Duty — Feelings
Awakened by the Intimations of
Conscience

The two words, Conscience and Duty, are quite familiar to all people of average intelligence and education. And yet there are very few who could, if asked, tell what these terms signify. Although they are really distinct, yet they are so connected that they can be best explained and understood when treated together. A third term arises out of them and is called *moral obligation*. We may take Conscience as holding first place and as being the basis and root of the other two.

What, then, is Conscience? Conscience is the practical judgment of right reason intimating the course of action to be followed in doing, or omitting, something, as conformable to the natural and Divine Law. Its functions and operations are manifold. That great philosopher and sociologist, Cardinal Newman, calls it :

A voice, or the echo of a voice, 'imperative' and 'constraining,' like no other dictate in the whole of our experience. . . . The feeling of Conscience being a certain keen sensibility—pleasant or painful—self-approval

and hope or compunction and fear—attendant on certain of our actions, which, in consequence, we call right or wrong, is two-fold; it is a moral sense and a sense of duty ; a judgment of the reason and a magisterial dictate.”

. . . Thus the phenomena of Conscience, as a dictate, avail to impress the imagination with the picture of a Supreme Governor, a Judge, holy, just, powerful, all-seeing, retributive.” (*Grammar of Assent*, c. V.)

Its intimations awake feelings of awe, reverence, love, fear, shame. When speaking of conscience, men call it a Judge, a voice,—they say that they must answer to their conscience for their conduct. Conscience is the accredited representative of God ; He is the original source of moral law and obligation, and disobedience to conscience is disobedience to Him. Infraction of the moral law is an offence against God and is called Sin. The sanctions of conscience, self-approbation and self-reproach, are reinforced by the supreme sanction—the Divine Nature itself.

Duty is “ something that one is bound to do or to avoid : obligatory service. ” When I say “ I ought to do it ” about a contemplated act, the judgment here asserts itself as *imperative* and *magisterial*. It assumes that there is a right

way and a wrong way open to me, and that the right way is better than the wrong way.

For man, the course of action to be followed by him is indicated by his own nature. Unlike the lower orders, he is master of his actions over that part of his life which is called conduct. He is free to choose between two opposite courses ; he can elect to do or not to do ; to do this action or another entirely opposed to, or different from, it. He can be guided in his choice of acts by the moral judgment involving the “ ought ”—directed and strengthened by conscience and its dictates.

It is a universal judgment that “ right is to be done and wrong is to be avoided.” The sentiment attending moral judgments is the highest of all ; it awakens in us the feeling of reverence, and demands that all other sentiments and desires, as motives of action, shall be made subordinate to the moral judgment.

† When action is conformed to this demand there arises a feeling of self-approbation, while an opposite course is followed by a feeling of self-reproach. As the order of the universe is the product of the Divine Will, so also is the moral law which is expressed in the rational nature. God wills that we shape our free action or conduct to that form. Reason teaches us that

we owe Him reverence, obedience, sendee, and that consequently we owe it to Him to observe that law which He has implanted within us as the ideal of our conduct.

As religious faith declined, the tendency to find a non-religious base for Duty became more pronounced. The idea of duty faded ; new systems arose which, like our present-day “ independent morality,” had no place for moral obligations. Morality became divorced from religion, and thereby lost its Divine basis and sanction.

By moral obligation we understand some sort of necessity, imposed on the will, of doing what is good and avoiding what is evil. This necessity urges us to adopt the means required by an end for attaining that end. If necessity requires me to pay a sum of money at a certain place and time—say to a bank—there is a moral obligation on me to pay it, and take the steps needed to pay it to the lender at the place and time required.

The obligation arising out of duty is peremptory, sacred and universal, and is explicable only by calling to mind what man is, his origin, and his destiny. He is a creature made by God, His Creator, with Whom he is destined to live for all eternity. Cardinal Newman, in his

letter to the Duke of Norfolk (in reply to Gladstone's " Vaticanism "), puts this doctrine in beautiful language :

" The Supreme Being is of a certain character which, expressed in human language, is called ethical. He has attributes of justice, truth, wisdom, sanctity, benevolence and mercy, as eternal characteristics in His Nature, the very law of His being identical with Himself; and next, when He became Creator, He implanted this Law, which is Himself, in the intelligence of all His rational creatures. The Divine Law, then, is the rule of ethical truth, the standard of right and wrong, a sovereign, irreversible, absolute authority in the presence of men and angels." This law is the rule of our conduct under the guidance of conscience. . . . " Conscience is not a long-sighted selfishness, nor a desire to be consistent with oneself; but it is a messenger from Him Who, both in nature and in grace, speaks to us behind a veil, and teaches and rules us by His representatives. Conscience is the aboriginal Vicar of Christ, a prophet in its informations, a monarch in its peremptoriness, a priest in its blessings and anathemas."

We can and do know that God, Whom as our Creator and Lord we are bound to obey, com-

mands us to do what is right and forbids us to do what is wrong. That is the eternal law, the Divine Reason or the Divine Will, which is the source of all moral obligations. Moral precepts are the commands of God, but they are also the behests of right reason, inasmuch as they are merely the rules of right conduct, by which a being such as man is should be guided.

III.—Employer and Worker

For practical purposes the two classes, employers and workers, comprise the great bulk of the peoples in all countries. The employing classes in point of numbers are only a small fraction as compared with the working classes. The latter class includes employees of different grades and kinds, but the social question is mainly concerned with what is known as the labourers or manual workers at toilsome occupations.

Although employers and their workers are specifically distinct in many respects, yet in the work of production they are joint co-operators towards the same end. Their interests are therefore identical, and neither class can be really effective without the help and co-operation of the other.

Pope Leo XIII (*Rerum Novarum*) advocates harmony between these two classes and condemns the teaching of the Marxist school in advocating a class war between employers and workers.

“The great mistake,” he says, “made in the matter now under consideration, is to take up with the notion that class is naturally hostile to class, and that the wealthy and the workingmen are intended by nature to live in mutual conflict. So irrational and so false is this view that the direct contrary is the truth. Just as the symmetry of the human frame is the result of the suitable arrangement of the different parts of the body, so, in a State, is it ordained by nature that these two classes should dwell in harmony and agreement so as to maintain the balance of the body politic. Each needs the other: Capital cannot do without Labour, nor Labour without Capital. Mutual agreement results in the beauty of good order, while perpetual conflict necessarily produces confusion and savage barbarity.

“Now, in preventing such strife as this, and in uprooting it, the efficacy of Christian institutions is marvellous and manifold. First of all, there is no intermediary more powerful than Religion (whereof the Church is the interpreter

and guardian), in drawing the rich and the working class together by reminding each of his duties to the other as enjoined by justice and charity. Thus Religion teaches the labourer and the artisan to carry out honestly and fairly all equitable agreements freely entered into; never to injure the property, nor to outrage the person, of an employer; never to resort to violence in defending their own cause, nor to engage in riot or disorder; and to have nothing to do with men of evil principles, who work upon the people with artful promises of great results, and excite foolish hopes which usually end in useless regrets and grievous loss.

Religion teaches the wealthy owner and the employer that their workpeople are not to be accounted their bondsmen; that in every man they must respect his dignity and work as a man and a Christian; that labour for wages is not a thing to be ashamed of, if we lend ear to right reason and to Christian philosophy, but is to a man's credit, enabling him to earn his living in an honourable way; and that it is shameful and inhuman to treat men like chattels to make money by, or to look upon them merely as so much muscle or physical strength.

“Hence the employer is bound to see that the worker has time for his religious duties;

that he be not exposed to corrupting influences and dangerous occasions, and that he be not led away, to neglect his home or to squander his earnings. Furthermore, the employer must never tax his workpeople beyond their strength, nor employ them in work unsuited to their age or sex. His great and principal duty is to give everyone what is just. Doubtless, before deciding whether wages are fair, many things have to be considered; but wealthy owners and all masters of labour should be mindful that to exercise pressure on the indigent and the destitute for the sake of gain, and to gather one's profit out of the need of another, is condemned by all laws human and divine.

“To defraud anyone of wages that are his due is a crime which cries to the avenging anger of heaven. ‘Behold, the hire of the labourers . . . which by fraud has been kept back by you, crieth; and the cry of them hath entered into the ears of the Lord of Sabaoth’ (*James v, 4*).

“Lastly, the rich must religiously refrain from cutting down the workman's earnings, whether by force, by fraud, or by usurious dealing, and comply with all the other obligations, and with greater reason, because the labouring man is, as a rule, weak and unprotected. and because his slender means

should, in proportion to their scantiness, be accounted sacred.

“ Were these precepts carefully obeyed and followed out, would they not be sufficient of themselves to keep under all strife and all its causes?”

Leo XIII lays down that both workers and employers have a right to form associations for all legitimate purposes. He praises the medieval guilds, and warmly commends existing associations, not only those which comprise both workers and employers, but also those confined to workers only. Herein he is opposed to the individualistic spirit and teaching of the classical economists.

The utility of well-directed unions amongst the working classes is unquestionable. Trade union organisation is necessary, in order that the average worker may be on a more equal footing for bargaining with the employer. Employers themselves are coming more and more to recognise that trade union organisation has advantages from their own point of view.

It is much easier to negotiate about wages and other conditions of labour with a union than with a large number of unauthorised workers. A standard wage-rate and uniform conditions of labour throughout an industry protect an

employer against unfair competition by his rivals, and enable him to forecast his costs of production with greater accuracy than if no standard rate or uniform conditions existed. The employers, too, have certain legitimate interests in common, and have a perfect right to unite for the defence or promotion of those interests.

In England there are employers' associations in all the chief industries, with distinct associations for manufacturers and merchants. There is no reason why the great organisations of capital and labour should be hostile to each other. By sincere and cordial co-operation they could render invaluable service to the cause of social order. The trade union organisation can be of service to the employer, and conversely the employers' associations can be of advantage to the workers.

If goodwill exists, the contact of organised labour with organised capital cannot fail to be beneficial to both. It is this contact which it is most essential to secure, for without it these organisations may prove a cause of class-hostility. By means of this contact the *de jacto* co-operation existing in industry will be strengthened by a consciousness of mutual interest.

IV,—Wages

Wages denote *the price paid by an employer for human exertion or labour. Wherever men have been free to sell their labour they have regarded compensation for it as involving questions of right and wrong; and this conviction has been shared by mankind generally in all Christian countries.*

To-day, Catholic teaching on the question of wages is quite precise on one aspect of the case, viz., the minimum or lowest standard payable. Pope Leo XIII, in the oft-quoted Encyclical Rerum Novarum, lays it down in these words:

There is a dictate of nature more ancient and more imperious than any bargain between man and man, that the remuneration must be sufficient to support the wage-earner in reasonable and frugal comfort. If through necessity or fear of a worse evil the workman accepts harder conditions, because an employer or contractor will give him no better, he is the victim of force and injustice."

Here the Pope lays down the principle of a minimum (lowest) wage for the labourer himself, but does not mention his wife and family. This omission has given rise to a good deal of controversy amongst Catholics. In another

part of the Encyclical, the Pope says: "If a workman's wages be sufficient to enable him to support himself, his wife and his children, he will find it easy, if he be a sensible man, to practise thrift and to put by some little savings, and thus secure a modest source of income." From this passage it would seem that the mind of the Pope is that wages should be sufficient to enable him to support his wife and family and save something in addition. This claim, however (for wife and family), seems to arise from charity rather than from strict justice.

In another place the Pope commends housework as more suitable for women than industry, and thereby implies that the wife must be supported out of her husband's wages. Hence a Catholic can hardly claim to be faithful to the instructions of *Rerum Novarum* unless he does all in his power to obtain for every honest and industrious worker a wage at least sufficient to enable him or her to live a decent life, together with the means to discharge his or her family obligations.

In order to carry out this duty, firstly, the conditions of industry should be normal, and secondly, the family allowance system by employers should be encouraged by both trade unions and employers' associations.

In England it is estimated that the urban population includes nearly half a million workers with families of three or more children with an income of less than 60/- a week. They are thus unable to pay the rents of decent sanitary houses, and are obliged to live in slum dwellings.

Authoritative Catholic teaching does not go beyond the minimum (lowest) wage, and does not declare what would be the completely just compensation. It admits that the worker may often receive more than the minimum, but does not attempt to define precisely this larger justice with regard to any class of wage-earners. And wisely so; for, owing to the many distinct features of production and distribution, the matter is exceedingly difficult and complicated. Different interests have to be considered. From the side of the employer: energy expended, risk undertaken, and a return on his capital; from the side of the labourer: needs, toil, productivity, sacrifices and skill; from that of the consumer: fair prices. In any just system of compensation, all these elements have to be considered. If all the factors concerning capital and labour were agreed on, the problem of the consumer or buyer would still remain.

The Pope did not lay down any fixed standard for just wages in the face of the various interests involved, but he indicated the road to a solution if the parties cannot agree, viz., *arbitration*. When wage disputes are submitted to fair arbitration, all the factors of the dispute are taken into account and accorded due weight in conformity with practical justice.

“Amongst the several purposes of a Society,” the Pope says, “one should be to arrange for a continuous supply of work at all times and seasons; as well as to create a fund out of which the members may be effectually helped in their needs, not only in cases of accident, but also in sickness, old age and distress.

It is clear that they must pay special and chief attention to the duties of religion and morality; and that social betterment should have this chiefly in view. Let our Associations, then, look first and before all things to God; let religious instruction have therein the foremost place, each one being carefully taught what is his duty to God; what he has to believe, what to hope for, and how he is to work out his salvation, and let all be warned and strengthened with special care against false principles and false teaching.

“Let the workingman be urged and led to

the worship of God, to the earnest practice of religion, and among other things to the keeping holy of Sundays and holy days. Let him learn to reverence and love Holy Church, the common mother of us all ; and hence to obey the precepts of the Church, and to frequent the Sacraments since they are the means ordained by God for obtaining forgiveness of sins and for leading a holy life. Some trade associations are managed on principles ill-according with Christianity and the public well-being ; they do their utmost to get within their grasp the whole field of labour, and force workingmen either to join them or starve. Under these circumstances, Christian workingmen must do one of two things : either join associations in which their religion will be exposed to peril or form associations among themselves.”

These are the very words of Pope Leo XIII, and should be laid to heart by Catholic workmen in every' country. He lays down this general principle, that “ neither justice nor humanity permits the exaction of so much work that the soul becomes deadened by excessive labour and the body succumbs to exhaustion.’ In fixing the maximum length of the working-day, the nature of the work and the age and sex of the worker must be taken into account.

In regard to the nature of the work, the Pope singles out the mining industry as one with strong claims to a shorter day. We might well add iron and steel works to that of mining.

An *international* scheme to secure uniform conditions of labour is very desirable in the interests of both workers and employers. Without it, home industries are constantly exposed to the competition of foreign goods produced under sweated conditions. Failing this, prohibitive tariffs should be imposed, to exclude such commodities altogether. Pope Leo XIII wrote to M. Decurtius in Belgium, as follows, in 1893 :

It is obvious that the protection given to the workers would be very imperfect if it were secured only by national legislation, for on account of international competition, the regulation of labour conditions here or there would lead to the expansion of the industry of one nation to the detriment of that of another."

On the point of the worker's age, the Pope utters a grave warning against child labour.

V.—Arbitration

Arbitration in general is a method of settling disputes between two parties by referring them

to the judgment and decision of one or more outsiders. The disputants, in agreeing to arbitration, thereby implicitly agree, in advance, to the decision of the arbitrators on the questions submitted to them for settlement.

Recourse to arbitration becomes necessary when the parties concerned obstinately refuse to come to terms. It is assumed that the sense of fairness is dulled in the disputants by self-interest and obstinacy; and that the judgment of a capable and disinterested outside party is more likely to conform to justice and equity.*

The good of society requires that economic force as a sanction of right should be set aside in the settlement of disputes; and that the ethical principles of right and wrong should be substituted for it. Law courts and their officials undertake the compulsory settlement of cases in which no other method of settlement can be devised.

Disputes between employers and labourers generally have reference to the rate of wages, the formal recognition of labour unions as having the right to a voice with the employer in determining the rate of wages, hours and methods of work, and kindred things, all of which seem reasonable enough in order to protect the rights and claims of the workers. As

a rule, the labour union, and not the individual worker, is a party to the industrial conflict.

The individual worker is not in a condition of equality with the employer. And so, on the other hand, a single employer is not on an equality with an organised labour union, and consequently organisations of employers have been established to deal with labour unions in their corporate capacity.

In past times, serious conflicts have arisen in the industrial world, and no legal enactments existed to terminate them. People then began to turn to non-legal, rather than legal, methods of procuring industrial peace. The methods adopted for this purpose have been arbitration, conciliation, mediation, trade agreements, joint conferences, and shop committees.

In a very large area of the industrial field, relations are peaceful. So also are the relations between employers and labour unions without any formal provisions in anticipation of trouble, whilst peaceful relations between these two classes exist through formal, mutual understandings, and oral or written contracts. In such cases, the accredited representatives of employers and of labour unions meet in a friendly spirit, discuss all questions bearing on the contract of labour, reach conclusions, and

embody them in some form of definite understanding for a given period. In such cases, provision is usually made for the peaceful settlement of unforeseen minor disputes.

All this shows that to a large extent industrial peace exists between employers and workers. However, it still remains possible that disagreement, estrangements and war may arise between employers and workers. The *possibility of a strike or lock-out must be envisaged* and, as far as possible, *provided against. The strike and the lock-out bring with them a trail of grave and varied evils. The war thus declared is analogous to that of military forces in action. It is a struggle of economic forces between employers and workers. The injuries thus inflicted are not confined to the actual combatants. The public at large suffer heavily from dislocation of business, social disorder and financial losses.*

If the parties at variance fail to reach a settlement, and the representatives of the public, civil, religious and charitable organisations fail to induce them to reach an agreement, then the disputants should be asked to place the issue with an outside disinterested tribunal and abide by the decision of such a body. When this is done, the process is called Arbitration,

When employers and labour unions arrange the terms *oi* the labour contract formally for a definite period the process is called Trade Agreement or collective bargaining. When differences of any kind arise, if the parties themselves arrange an amicable settlement, the process is called Conciliation. The intervention of outside parties who seek to induce the disputants to arrive at a peaceful settlement of their differences is called Mediation.

Compulsory arbitration is not favoured by labour unions, employers and the general public in any country. It is most strongly opposed in the United States. New Zealand is the only country where compulsory arbitration has been legalised. In the United States, organised labour speaks strongly in favour of voluntary arbitration. It deplors strikes, provides careful scrutiny and a thorough test of feeling before permitting strikes, and generally provides for an appeal to conciliation or arbitration in all industrial disputes.

A remarkable expression of public opinion is seen in the creation of the National Civic Federation (U.S.A.), which has worked well in the interests of industrial peace. Under its auspices, representatives of employers, of labouring men, of political life, of churches, of

academic circles, have met in conventions and endeavoured to establish industrial peace *through trade* agreements, conciliation and voluntary arbitration. The action of Cardinal Manning in the *London Dock Strike in 1889*; the activity of Archbishop Ireland in the National Civic Federation, and of several other Catholic Bishops; the public approbation of Cardinal Gibbons; the activity of many Catholic priests—all serve to show that Catholic leaders recognised the value of conciliation and arbitration in promoting industrial peace. In France, Germany, Belgium and Italy the Catholic attitude is equally strong. In these countries, the endorsement of the organisation of labour is emphatic, and representative Catholics demand the recognition of labour organisations, boards of conciliation and arbitration, all of which are in conformity with the spirit and teaching of Pope Leo XIII, who in his Encyclical on the condition of the working classes strongly approves of conciliatory methods in arranging disputes between labour and capital.

It is not to be inferred, however, that arbitration is a complete cure for industrial disputes. It generally covers only a term or period for which the decision is made. It does not

eradicate the evils to which it is applied. Besides, there are issues between employers and labourers which will not be submitted to arbitration; fundamental rights claimed by each party and held to be beyond the realms of dispute. For instance, the labour union will not submit the question of the right of the labourer to join a union, or the right of the union to represent its members. Leo XIII virtually concedes them these rights in approving of such unions. On the other hand, the employer would not submit to arbitration his right to manage his own business. There are, however, many minor questions arising between capital and labour which can and ought to be settled by peaceful methods.

VI.—The Strike

The strike is a method of enforcing the claims of a body of workers by ceasing to work for an employer. It is generally entered on by the advice of the union to which the particular class of workers belongs. It is seldom entered on by workers on their own initiative, but sometimes it is entered on and persisted in without the advice and in defiance of the efforts of the union leaders.

In the United States, the Labour' Unions

have generally discouraged strikes until every other method has been fully tested. In Ireland, some labour and trades unions are directed from England, or affiliated to English unions; and it has more than once happened that the emissaries of English labour unions have "called out" workers who were not inclined to "go out," and, having gone out, were obliged to return at the old wage. It would be much better for Irish workers to have their unions entirely independent of English unions, and worked on the basis of Catholic morality.

In regard to strikes, the worst kind is that known as the "lightning strike," by which workers suddenly quit their work without any warning to their employers or advice from their unions. They thus alienate public feeling and are left without any help or advice from any quarter. Such strikes generally end in disaster and sometimes with complete loss of employment. It is safe to say that that kind of strike is much more difficult to justify than the ordinary strike.

The strike is an extreme method, and should not be employed unless certain grave conditions are verified. To justify a strike, the following conditions are required :

The claims of the workers must be based on right and justice ;
A peaceful solution must have been tried and found ineffective ;
The grievance must outweigh the evil results which may follow from the strike; and
There must be good grounds for hoping that the strike will be successful.

To support a strike by violent methods, such as the destruction of the employer's property, is against justice and charity, and is indefensible.

Picketing is a common method of sustaining a strike. If it is free from physical violence or grave intimidation, and if the claims of the strikers are manifestly just, it need not be forbidden or condemned. To ascertain the conditions justifying it is a matter of considerable difficulty, and sometimes impossible. An impartial public opinion is the safest guide in such cases.

When a strike involves public services such as post-office work, railways and 'buses, or the supplying of necessaries to public institutions such as hospitals, colleges and the like, grave inconveniences are inflicted on various classes of people who are outside the parties to the dispute entailing the strike. In other words,

the *innocent* are punished *and* perhaps injured by the strike. Hence, strikes *involving* such consequences should be avoided, or provision made for *continuing such necessary services*.

Violence and disorder on the part of strikers is almost always unlawful, whether *directed against* employers or against those who take their places in work. It is *practically* certain that the evils resulting from *violent methods* are always greater than any benefits *accruing from them*. Such evils generally extend to the *entire community whose interests are above those of any particular class*.

The worker's claim to his job may *place an obligation on his* employer not to discharge him in cases in which grave inconvenience *would be entailed on the* worker. For example, a man *with a family and a house in the place where he works, if discharged, might not be able to get* employment at his trade from any other employer. It would require a *grave reason to justify an employer in discharging such a worker*.

On the other hand, labourers who quit their employment without a sufficient reason *would act unjustly towards their employer*. Employers often enter *into contracts and commitments, which must be fulfilled within specified time*

limits, and the cessation of work by employees might render such obligations impossible of fulfilment, and cause serious loss to the employers.

One of the most difficult features of strikes is the one arising from those who take the places *of the* strikers. Two things may be admitted, viz., that if the strike is unreasonable on the face of it, those who take the places of the strikers are justified in doing so; whilst, on the other hand, *if the strike is justifiable, those who take the places of the strikers act wrongly, unless their needs are very grave and pressing. If they are known to be professional strike-breakers the presumption is against them*.

The sympathetic strike takes place when workers who have no personal grievance quit work in order to aid their fellows. In railways, factories, and such like, one section of workers may go on strike whilst another section has no grievance of its own; but the second section also goes on strike to compel the employers to do justice to the others.

This is somewhat of an unusual and extreme form of strike. In principle, it is analogous to the case of a strong nation, or a strong man, coming to the aid of a weak nation or a weak man when assailed by a stronger nation or stronger man. In order to justify this kind of

strike, which is directed against an employer with whom *the sympathetic strikers* have no quarrel, the strike of the party to be assisted should be a justifiable one.

This *form of* strike may sometimes be directed against an employer not connected with either section of strikers. For instance, brickmakers might go on strike against their own employer with whom *they* have no quarrel because *he supplies* bricks to a builder or merchant whose workers are on strike. This *form of* sympathetic strike is rarely, if ever, justified. Strikes of *every kind* are dangerous weapons, and require to be very carefully handled and not used except in extreme and pressing cases of injustice and oppression, which no other methods can remedy.

The great and effective method of warding off strikes is for both workers and employers to co-operate cordially in furtherance of their mutual interests. The labourer should give an honest day's work, and the employer pay him an honest and just wage.

When disputes arise, by far the best mode of settlement is arbitration. Collective bargaining between the labour unions and the employers' associations is also an effective safeguard for the interests of both classes. *Hasty*

strikes and hasty lock-outs are both very dangerous actions, particularly while Socialistic and Communistic teachings are so insistent on warfare between Capital and Labour with the avowed object of destroying civil society.

VII.—The Boycott

Both the name and the practice of the boycott originated over half-a-century ago—in 1880. At that time, one Captain Boycott was land agent for Lord Erne, and resided near Ballinrobe, on the shores of Lough Mask, in County Mayo. This land agent refused the rent reductions asked for by the tenants, and issued processes of ejection. The tenants attacked the process-server and drove him to take shelter in the agent's house.

They then acted on a plan previously suggested by Parnell at a meeting in Ennis. It had the merit of avoiding murder and other violent methods. Partly by persuasion and partly by threats, they got Captain Boycott's servants and labourers to leave him. "No one would save his crops, no one would drive his car, the smith would not shoe his horses, the laundress would not wash for him, the grocer would not supply him with goods ; even

the post-boy was warned not to deliver his letters."

Fifty Ulster Orangemen then came to Lough Mask, escorted by police and military and with two held pieces. They saved the Captain's crops, valued at £350, but at an estimated cost to the State and to the Orange Society of £3,500; and, before they left, Lough Mask House was vacant, as Captain Boycott had fled to England.

The word boycott then became incorporated in the English language, and of all the weapons used in the Land League agitation none was more dreaded by the landlords and their friends.

The boycotting which was practised in connection with the " Plan of Campaign " was condemned in a decree of the Holy Office, dated April 20th, 1888.

It is not surprising that this weapon, having proved so effective in defeating the aims of rack-renting landlords, should, in course of time, be extended to industrial disputes between workers and employers. Its application to good and upright employers would be immoral and unjustifiable. On the other hand, where workers have a clear and strong

¹ *D'Alton's History of Ireland, Vol VI, p. 287.*

grievance against an employer the boycott is not necessarily wrong in every case, if due attention is paid to the claims of justice and charity. It is somewhat akin to what is known as the sympathetic strike.

The boycott extends beyond the limits of the ordinary¹ strike, for it seeks to deprive the boycotted person of all social intercourse in addition to stopping the works that may be in dispute. It is called a primary boycott when it is directed against the person with whom the boycotters have a dispute, and a secondary boycott when directed against a person who refuses to join in the boycott. The morality of the primary boycott depends on the nature of the grievance that the boycotters have against the boycotted person and the means by which it is prosecuted.

If the employer has treated the workers fairly and justly, so that they have no real grievance, they are guilty of injustice towards him when they organise and carry on a boycott against him. Every man has the right to seek and obtain material goods and opportunities on reasonable terms, and without unreasonable interference. This is the real basis of even property rights, and the justification of property titles. Hence it is a violation of justice to de-

prive a man of the benefits of social or business intercourse without a sufficient reason.

However, there may be a sufficient reason, as when the injustice inflicted on the employees is grave, and when no milder method will be effective. But the boycott must be kept within the limits of justice and charity in its process and extent. It must be free from violence and other immoral circumstances, and must not be carried so far as to deny its object the necessities of life or of those acts of social intercourse which are demanded by fundamental natural rights. A boycott refusing admission of a sick or wounded person to an hospital, and, still worse, the refusal to allow the necessary requisites for the burial of deceased boycotted persons—such extreme and unnatural methods would be shocking violations of both justice and charity and never justifiable as boycotts.

Besides the boycott against employers who treat their workers unfairly, there are lawful boycotts which have much wider application, and which are necessary and beneficial to whole communities. Such are the boycotts of bad newspapers, magazines, books, theatres, pictures, cinemas. The evils inflicted on multitudes of people by these agencies are far-

reaching as compared with unfair treatment of workers by employers. The owners of these agencies have no right to corrupt others for the purpose of money-making; and the loss of money inflicted on them by a lawful boycott is only a material loss which can bear no comparison with the moral and spiritual injury inflicted on many people by these agencies. Hence to persuade, exhort and induce people to avoid them is a lawful boycott, and fully justifiable in the public interest.

The secondary boycott is directed against "innocent third persons," that is, those who refuse to assist in the primary boycott. For instance, the labourers refuse to buy from a trader who will not cease from buying from a manufacturer against whom they have a grievance. In principle, it is the same as the sympathetic strike, and in practice is likewise immoral except in extreme cases. But the secondary boycott is not always and essentially wrong.

VIII.—P r o p e r t y

One of the most important subjects treated in modern times by sociologists and social reformers is Property]. Socialists and Com-

munists of *the extreme type put forward* most extravagant and impracticable views and theories on *the subject of property*. They advocate *the abolition of private ownership of property and its compulsory transference to the State or community, without any compensation*. Such a doctrine is in direct conflict with *Christian principles*. It is downright and unjustifiable robbery and an attempt to replace the *Seventh Commandment of God* by a new, man-made one, destructive of both the natural and the divine law.

Property, in its wide sense, may be taken to include every kind of goods of which a person has the full right of disposal as far as is not forbidden by law. This, strictly speaking, applies only to absolute ownership. There may be also qualified ownership—such as right to the use of a thing whilst the substance of it belongs to another. Lands, houses, trade-plants and tools, moneys, food-stuffs, investments—all these are properties, productive, distributive, consumable, and all admit of ownership.

Ownership may be private or public, and this distinction is most important, as the fight between Catholic moral teaching on this question and that of modern materialism now centres around the question of the lawfulness of private

or individual property. The true morality of private property is laid down by Pope Leo XIII as follows :

Private ownership of land and of other material goods is “ in accordance with the law of nature. To possess private property as one’s own is a right given to man by nature.” This right includes the power not only to use material goods but to keep them in one’s possession. It applies to the soil itself as well as to its fruits.

The Pope calls the socialisation of private possessions the main tenet of Socialism. “ Socialists,” he says, “ are striving to do away with private ownership of goods, and, in its place, to make the property of individuals common to all, to be administered by municipalities or the State.”

This would be highly injurious to the worker in preventing him from investing his savings in productive property and by confiscating his investments if already made ; it would involve the State in action outside its sphere ; it would introduce social disorder, and, above all, it is against justice as violating the right given to man by nature. The Pope does not deny to municipalities and States the right to own property when the public welfare requires such ownership, but he insists on the right of individuals

also to possess and own it themselves to the exclusion of the State and everyone else.

The Pope is insistent that the ownership of property entails certain duties and *rejects the idea of irresponsible ownership*. He rejects the Socialist denial of the right to own any private property whatever. Fred Henderson, a leading English Socialist, writes as follows :

Socialism is an attack upon the institution of private property in land and capital. We, Socialists, advocate the expropriation of the landed and capitalist class. This it is which our opponents describe as confiscation and robbery. . . . It is private ownership of land and capital that is confiscation and robbery, daily and continuous confiscation, enabling the proprietor class to quarter themselves in perpetuity upon the labour of the nation, to live by levying tribute, by stripping industry of wealth as fast as industry produces it." (*The Case for Socialism*, 1924.)

The Pope would reply that the ownership of land and capital is not unjust unless the rent or interest charged is excessive, but then it is not the ownership, but the rent or interest, that is unjust, and should be curtailed by legislation. The ownership of the instruments of production is necessary for supplying the owner's

needs, present and future, and he can supply these needs by using land and capital. Mere consumption goods will not be sufficient for all possible contingencies and risks of human life. Land and capital are not perishable by nature, and, therefore, endure for the production of necessities and utilities. The Pope argues that nature intends man to make provision for his present and future needs. If he is to do this satisfactorily, he must be able to acquire consumption goods and instruments of production as *his own property*.

Of all the instruments of production, land is the most enduring and affords the greatest security to its owner. He has, therefore, a natural right to acquire and possess land and other instruments of production (capital, etc.), as his own private property. Henry George argued against private property on the ground that the land is God's gift to the whole human family for the general welfare and that, therefore, individuals have no right to appropriate any part of it. The Pope answers briefly that God has, indeed, given the land to mankind so that all may draw substance from it, but that the institution of private property in land does not of itself interfere with this intention of the Creator.

No proof can be adduced that He forbade men to *divide the land amongst private owners, or to acquire land as private property by their own exertions. George and others admit that a man has a right to own what he himself has produced by his labour. If we suppose a man to cultivate a piece of land which belongs to no one, the improvements effected by his labour belong to him, and it follows that he has a right to own the land thus improved, and from which the improvements are inseparable. If the land belongs to another, all he can claim is compensation for his labour and the value of the improvements.*

Another argument in favour of the right to private property in productive goods, put forward by the Pope, arises from the nature of the family. A man is under the obligation of providing for his dependent children. The family is a natural society, closely bound together by the bonds of nature, with a natural end of its own. It has consequently a right to the natural means for securing that end. Productive property, giving some security against the risks of life, is one of those means, so that the father, representing the family, has the natural right to own it. The right to own property is unquestionable, but that right is by no means unlimited.

“ If wealthy capitalists were more conscious of their *moral duties* in regard to their property, and were more anxious to pay at least a *family living wage* to every adult workman in their employment than to increase their own bank balance, the tendency to great inequality in the distribution of property would be largely checked. . . . Capitalists may attack the intervention of the State as being ‘ Socialistic,’ but the fact remains that it is rendered necessary precisely because capitalism, heedless of the *moral obligations* attached to wealth and power, has failed to provide the workers as a class with the means of acquiring *private property of their own.*” †

* *Catholic Social Principles*, by Fr. Watt, S.J.

PART III

ORGANISED CATHOLIC ACTION

And How It Could Be Strengthened

If a country is invaded by the armed forces of a hostile country, the duty and the work of resisting these forces devolve upon the forces—actual and potential—of the invaded country'. These latter forces are recruited, trained and instructed in the knowledge necessary to make an efficient defensive fighting force; and they are composed of soldiers, officers and generals of various grades and ranks.

This foreign aggression is not always of a military character, but is sometimes directed against cherished principles, beliefs and practices, which are far above all purely material interests. Of the latter kind is the campaign, of which we see evidence in our own midst, by Communists, directed by Godless Soviet Russia. Communism is, therefore, the invading enemy to be attacked—repulsed and routed by us, before it has time to entrench itself. How is this to be done? It is to be done by Organised Catholic Action.

What is Organised Catholic Action?

Catholic Action has been defined by the Pope himself for all countries where Catholicism is found as: “the participation and the collaboration of the laity with the Apostolic Hierarchy.” Two things are here laid down—first, it must include the co-operation of the laity; and, secondly, the work of Catholic Action must be carried on under the authority of the Hierarchy in every country.

But, for *organised Catholic Action* something more is required, and, for us here in Ireland, it is necessary to discover how and where that additional something is to be obtained.

Fortunately, this necessary machinery seems to be at hand in the various Catholic societies at present operating in the country. How are these societies to collaborate in one grand phalanx to do battle in the noble cause of Catholicism? Must they form new societies or change their present names or rules? By no means: such a process would be inconvenient and cause undue delay, whereas prompt action is urgently needed. Each of them can simply add to their usual activities a new activity—namely, *Catholic Action* on approved lines and in conformity with ecclesiastical authority. We might call this the mobilisation of our forces. In warfare, active operations follow quickly on

mobilisation. And so with the forces of Catholic Action. Having first obtained the approval of the Apostolic Hierarchy, they should attack the enemy without avoidable delay.

For truly successful Catholic Action, the pulpit, the press and the platform are powerful auxiliaries, and it is earnestly to be hoped that our Irish newspapers, daily and weekly, will give a sincere and loyal co-operation. The press is for adults what schools and colleges are for children and youths. It is to be hoped also that our three University Colleges will furnish valuable help, and that political parties will not be found unmindful of the interests of the Catholic Faith in Ireland.

The A.B.C. of Communism gives the following as part of its programme :

The Church must be entirely separated from the State, and its property confiscated; religion must not be taught in the schools, and the Church must have no power over education ; and in order to prevent children being influenced by the religious teaching they might receive from their parents, Communists must see to it that the school assumes the offensive against religious propaganda in the home, so that from the very outset the children's minds

shall be rendered immune to all those religious fairy] tales which many grown-ups continue to regard as truth."

Here we have aims so horrible that Satan himself must have inspired them. They imperatively demand a chorus of condemnation and execration from all the Catholic societies of Ireland.

SOVIET PROPAGANDA

Soviet propaganda puts in the forefront of its programme the amelioration of the workers' conditions—better wages, better food, better houses, shorter hours—whilst keeping in the background its real objects, the destruction of Religion (especially of the Catholic Religion), of social order and lawful authority ; continual class-warfare, strikes and violent methods, including the seizure and expropriation of other people's property and goods without compensation or justification. These and their like are the real objects and aims of International Communism in every country, with its headquarters and directive organisation in Moscow.

Communism had a footing in many countries long before Sovietism came into existence. As such it always was, is, and always will be con-

demned by the Catholic Church as an erroneous system, entirely opposed to the natural and moral laws, and destructive of the natural rights and liberties of human beings.

The state of things revealed by the Soviet Press in Russia in connection with the Communistic "experiment" in that vast country" proves Communism to be specially calculated to reduce human life almost to the level of the brute creation. And this is the system some people would endeavour to set up in this country". Hence are we threatened with a Communistic campaign likely to grow in intensity if not crushed at the root. We see some of its fruits in Spain, where the bad seed has been allowed to grow and blossom unchecked.

Here, then, is work for the forces of Catholic Action—to expose, counteract, and, where necessary", fight this pernicious propaganda of International Communism wherever it may show its head here. In almost every country, Soviet propaganda aims at capturing workers, children, the unemployed: even the learned, educational, and cultured classes are embraced by" it. Its machinery is manifold and comprehensive, framed to attract all classes and nationalities: and designed with diabolical insidiousness to wean the youth from the Faith.*

In March, 1930, the Holy Father led the protest against the persecution of religion by the Soviets. His Holiness has also warned us against the educational attack on the children: "Under the appearance of friendship, it attracts little children and attaches them to itself." Finally, he has issued a trumpet-call to the Catholic world to inaugurate the work of Catholic Action to meet this Communism. It is time our forces were mobilised, marshalled and sent forth to attack, repulse and rout the forces of Satan.

AUTHORITY AND ALLEGIANCE

Source of Moral Power to Command in Human Society

Authority or the moral power to command is an inherent element of human society. It runs through the entire framework of human activities. It is their mainstay. It is to be reckoned among the chief agencies which give stability and cohesion to the various departments of life in which it is found. In the family, in commerce and industry", in the professions, in the various forms of employment, in education,

in the army, in the Catholic Church and in civil government—in all these, it plays an important and efficient part.

One of the most comprehensive and far-reaching kinds of authority is that which belongs to those who are placed at the head of the State, and on whom devolves its government. This is known as civil authority, and its correlative is civil allegiance. Each of these two is the complement and counterpart of the other, and together they constitute the integral entity known as the Government of the State.

Man's nature postulates civil society, and where civil society is, there also must be authority. Without authority you must have anarchy, which is the disruption of ordered society. Civil society is kept together by authority, and the latter should be esteemed and respected by every right-minded man and woman. It is both natural and beneficial to man to live in society, to submit to authority, and to obey the laws enacted for the welfare and protection of society as a whole, and of each of its individual members.

Whence, then, is civil authority? The source of civil authority and power is God. It is all-important to know this and to keep it in mind, so as to guard against certain erroneous

views which are sometimes put forward on this subject, and which lead to very disastrous consequences in many countries. Beyond any positive law or institution, nature requires civil authority to be set up and obeyed ; and, as God is the Author of Nature, what nature absolutely requires or absolutely forbids, God enjoins or forbids. Nature absolutely forbids anarchy, and requires civil authority ; so also, God forbids anarchy and enjoins civil authority and submission to it. In this sense, God is at the back of every State, binding men in conscience to obey the behests of the State within the sphere of its competence.

This duty of civil obedience is inculcated by St. Paul in the clearest language: “ Let every soul,” he says, “ be subject to the higher powers, for there is *no power but from God* ; and those that are, are ordained by God. . . . Wherefore be subject of necessity, not only for wrath, but also for conscience sake. . . for they are the ministers of God. (*Romans*, xiii, 1-6.)

That the source of civil authority is God is contravened by erroneous theories and by some modern philosophers. Two of the latter stand out above the others, viz., the English political philosopher, Hobbes, in the middle

of the seventeenth century; and the French rhetorician, J. J. Rousseau, at the end of the eighteenth century. Rousseau was an ardent disciple of Hobbes—he popularised Hobbes, and drew out of Hobbes's principles conclusions which Hobbes was afraid to formulate. Both Hobbes and Rousseau start by contradicting Aristotle. According to Aristotle, man is “by nature a State-making animal”; the State-making effort is “natural” to man, and, St. Thomas adds, “so is authority natural and, as such, of God.” There Hobbes and Rousseau are antagonistic to Aristotle and St. Thomas. Hobbes took “natural” as found in the original state of nature and as “desperately wicked” in the Calvinistic sense. On the other hand, Rousseau was enamoured of the “noble savage” and his natural goodness.

Hobbes held that man had good reason for getting out of this state of nature and for living in society. This was done by a pact or convention of every man with all the rest of mankind to live in society. This compact was called by Rousseau the “Social Contract,” and the body thus formed was named by Hobbes the “Leviathan.” The individual gave up his will when he made the “Social Contract.” Hence, with Hobbes and Rousseau the State

is omnipotent. The general will wields this tremendous power, and the individual will is non-existent. “No rights against the State,” is the motto of Hobbes and Rousseau; and that same motto seems to be the guiding star of many modern rulers and politicians, who are thus going back to pagan doctrine.

God as the source of civil power and authority is simply ignored. Herein we have, perhaps, the worst feature of Socialism and Communism. Even parental authority is swept away by these systems. Of this iniquitous feature, Pope Leo XIII, in his famous Encyclical, *Rerum Novarum* (15th May, 1891), speaks thus:

Parental authority can be neither abolished nor absorbed by the State, for it has the same source as human life itself. . . . The Socialists, therefore, in setting aside the parent and setting up a State supervision, act against natural justice and break into pieces the stability of all family life.”

This tendency to ignore God in public life and government has led to a very ambiguous and misleading theory on the origin and source of civil power and authority known as the “sovereignty of the people.” If God be the supreme source of public authority, it cannot

belong to any human agency. Rationalists and other freethinkers deify "Humanity" as their "supreme being," and find it easy enough to attribute public power and authority to their own deity. Christians and Theists cannot accept such a doctrine, as it robs God of what belongs to Him. They give to God what is God's; to Cæsar what is Cæsar's, and to the people what is theirs—viz., a voice in the setting up and changing of rulers in accordance with the provisions of existing laws and constitutions of States.

A very serious flaw in the theory' of Hobbes and Rousseau is to be noticed. What they call the "general" or predominant will of the people is, as experience shows, liable to be influenced by cupidity and avarice, and is sometimes unmindful of the Seventh Commandment. Not the predominant will, but rather the predominant intelligence, guided by justice and right, should be the determining factor in statesmanship and government. This intelligence is not necessarily inherent in majorities. The pagan poet Horace rightly says: "Force devoid of counsel, of its own bulk, comes to a crash"; whilst the modern poet Milton speaks in praise of government "broad-based on the people's will."

The people's will can be easily led astray by false reasoning clothed in glowing language. Hobbes and Rousseau start from a false supposition, viz., that the natural state of man is savage solitude and not civil society. Rousseau's theory of the "Social Contract" is devoid of any foundation and against the evidence of history', which shows that society is not a thing of convention and compact. It leads to tyranny and anarchy'; it tramples on the rights and consciences of individuals, and in some cases enslaves entire nations, as we see in the present state of Russia. It contains the germs of many erroneous views and theories in modern times.

The Holy See made a collection or syllabus of modern errors, which include a number of propositions on the subject of civil authority, and were condemned by Pope Pius IX in 1864. Three of these propositions ran as follows:

- I. (No. 39).—"The State is the source and origin of all rights."
- II. (No. 60).—"Authority is nothing else than numbers and a sum of material forces."
- III. (No. 63).—"It is allowable to refuse obedience to lawful princes and even to rebel against them."

Leo XIII not only condemns Rousseau's errors, but vividly presents the true doctrine on this subject. In his *Encyclical Immortale Dei* (November, 1885), he says :

“ Man's natural *instinct moves him to live in civil society, for he cannot, if dwelling apart, provide himself with the necessary requirements of life, nor procure the means of developing his faculties. Hence it is divinely ordained that he should be born into the society and company of men—as well domestic as civil. Only civil society can ensure perfect self-sufficiency of life. But since no society can hold together unless there be someone over all, impelling individuals, efficaciously and harmoniously, to one common purpose, a ruling authority becomes a necessity for every civil commonwealth of men ; and this authority, no less than society itself is natural and therefore has God for its Author. There is no power but from God.*”

Hence it follows that the phrases “ Sovereign People,” “ Sovereignty of the People,” the People's Will,” and the like, in the sense that the people of a State are the supreme source of public authority and power, involve a usurpation of Divine Rights. Civil authority is a natural means to a natural end. The

eminent theologian Suarez sets forth the primary obligations of civil authority as “the natural happiness of the perfect or self-sufficient human community, and the happiness of individuals as they are members of such a community that they may live therein peaceably and justly with a sufficiency of goods for the preservation and comfort of their bodily life, and with so much moral rectitude as is necessary' for this external peace and happiness. ’

Suarez here inculcates on rulers and law-makers the duty of promoting the welfare of the community as a whole, and thus indirectly promoting the happiness of the individuals composing it by securing to them that tranquillity, that free hand for helping themselves, and that peaceful enjoyment of their own just earnings and possessions.

The main point fixed by nature and by God is that *there must be authority in every State, and that the authority existent for the time being must be obeyed.* Authority rules by Divine right, under whatever form it is established.

To subvert or abolish public authority is against nature and the well-being of society. This does not mean that any particular kind of

public authority is inviolable and cannot be changed into another kind. The change may be a radical or fundamental one, as from a monarchical to a democratic form, or a change of persons at the helm of government. The latter change is usually made in accordance with the provisions of the constitution of each State. In the monarchical systems the changes are generally made on the hereditary principle, whilst in the democratic systems the elective method is the determining factor.

The theory known as the “ Divine Right of Kings ” prevailed largely in pagan countries and is still found in some of them, such as Japan. It meant the maintaining of the country’s religion and gods as part of the country’s government—in other words, the monarch, king or emperor, was the head of both Church and State. The coming of Christianity changed all that. Christ established a Church entirely distinct from, and independent of, the civil State and its government.

The “ Reformers ” returned to a large extent to the pagan system in recognising the temporal princes and rulers as heads of both Church and State. Their motto was “ *cujus regio ejus religio* ”—“ the ruler of a country

is the head of its religion.” It began in Germany and was adopted in England under Henry VIII, Elizabeth and James I. Another sense of the “ Divine Right of Kings ” was that a State once monarchical must always remain such, and that all power resided in the monarch. James’s son, Charles I, lost his throne and his head through this twofold claim of the divine right, viz., to be the head of both Church and State.

RULERS AND SUBJECTS

Catholic Church Not Wedded to Any Particular Form of Government

The Catholic Church is not, and never has been, wedded to any particular form of government. She recognises either monarchies or republics in which authority is justly and wisely exercised. Pope Leo XIII, in his Encyclical *Sapientiae Christiana* (January 10th, 1890), expounds the attitude of the Church as follows :

“ The Church, the guardian always of her own right, and most observant of that of others, holds that it is not her province to decide which is the best amongst many diverse forms of

government and the civil institutions of Christian States; and amid the various kinds of State rule she does not disapprove of any, provided the respect due to religion and the observance of good morals be upheld. . . . Therefore, they who are engaged in framing constitutions and enacting laws should bear in mind the moral and religious nature of man and take care to help him, but in a right and orderly way, to gain perfection, neither enjoining nor forbidding anything save what is reasonably consistent with civil as well as religious requirements."

On the subject of selecting rulers and law-givers, Pope Leo says: "Where the Church (does) not forbid taking part in public affairs, it is fit and proper to give support to men of acknowledged worth who pledge themselves to deserve well of the Catholic cause; and on no account may it be allowed to prefer to them any such individuals as are hostile to religion."

In the Encyclical A Catolici Muneris (December, 1878), Pope Leo says:

"As regards rulers and subjects, all, without exception, according to Catholic teaching and precept, are mutually bound by duties and rights, in such manner that, on the one hand, moderation is enjoined on the

appetite for power, and on the other, obedience is shown to be easily stable and wholly honourable. The Church teaches the obedience of subjects, and constantly urges upon each and all who are subject to her Apostolic precept the duties enjoined by St. Paul in his Canonical Epistles:

There is no power but from God; and those that are, are ordained by God. Therefore he that resisteth the *power* resisted! the ordinance of God; and they that resist purchase for themselves damnation.' And again: 'Be subject of necessity, not only for wrath but also for conscience' sake. And render to all men their dues; tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honour to whom honour.'

"And St. Peter: 'Be ye subject, therefore, to every human creature for God's sake, whether it be to the king as excelling, or to governors sent by Him for the punishment of evil doers. Honour all men, love the brotherhood, fear God, honour the King.'

"'But to the end that the rulers of the people shall employ the power bestowed, for the advancement and not the detriment of those under their rule, the Church of Christ very

fittingly warns the rulers themselves that the Sovereign Judge will call them to a strict account : Give ear you that rule the people, for power is given you by the Lord, and strength by the Most High, Who will examine your works and stretch and search out your thoughts . . . for a most severe judgment shall be for them that bear rule . . . for God will not accept any man's person ; neither will He stand in awe of any man's greatness, for He hath made the little and the great, and He hath equally care for all. But a greater punishment is ready for the more mighty ' (*Wisdom* vi, 3, and *foil*.)

Should it, however, happen at any time that in the public exercise of authority, rulers act rashly and arbitrarily, the teaching of the Catholic Church does not allow subjects to rise against them without further warranty, lest peace and order become more and more disturbed, and society run the risk of greater detriment ; and when things have come to such a pass as to hold out no further hope, she teaches that a remedy is to be sought in the virtue of Christian patience, and in urgent prayer to God. But should it please legislators and rulers to enjoin or sanction anything repugnant to the divine or natural law, the dignity and duty of the name of Christian,

and the Apostolic injunction proclaim that 'one ought to obey God rather than men' (Acts, v, 29)."

The foregoing is the teaching of a solemn Papal Encyclical addressed to the whole Church, and sets forth the Catholic doctrine on the subject of armed rebellion against constituted public authority. It is also the unanimous teaching of Catholic theologians, headed by St. Thomas Aquinas and St. Alphonsus Liguori. Armed rebellion or civil war is a terrible evil. It is a well-known axiom of Catholic morals that it is unlawful to employ evil means to accomplish even a good end. We must of two evils choose the lesser.

Civil war against constituted authority inside of a State is very different from a justifiable war between two independent nations. The former is war against the ruling authority of one's own country by the subjects of that authority whilst the latter is for the just defence of one's own country against an outside aggressor, and is the highest exercise of patriotism.

The existing evils of tyranny and oppression in a State are aggravated by armed rebellion and revolution. But here someone will ask : Is there any means of ending oppression and injustice besides armed rebellion? Yes, cer-

tainly there are other means, and these are mentioned in the Papal Encyclical and by St. Thomas Aquinas. These are: Christian patience and prayers, both *private and public*, that *God Who gave the power which is being abused may bring the oppression to an end*. St. Thomas adds that in order that this favour may be obtained from God, the people should cease from sinning, for it is often in punishment of sin that, by Divine permission, the wicked obtain power.

Tyranny and unjust laws can also be met successfully by various peaceful means, such as public agitation, exposure to the world, the influence of friendly States, public appeals, petitions, and most of all by the Vote in countries where the elective or franchise system puts down and sets up rulers and law-makers. These and other similar means are lawful and belong to the domain known as moral and constitutional methods. They often succeed where violent methods would only increase the tyranny and oppression of a people or certain classes of that people.

These were the methods followed by the great popular leader, Daniel O'Connell, a hundred years ago, and they met with a large measure of success in righting the wrongs of our

ancestors. Subsequently, armed rebellion and its ante-chamber, secret, oath-bound societies, condemned by the Church, not only failed, but cost some of the participants ven^l dearly. The subsequent agitation for Home Rule and land reform was conducted mainly on the basis of moral force, and effected some very substantial benefits for the Irish people.

In his Encyclical (November 1st, 1885),^l Leo XIII begins by calling the Church "the great promoter of civilisation": "The Catholic Church, that imperishable handwork of our all-merciful God, has for its immediate natural purpose the saving of souls and securing our happiness in heaven. Yet, in regard to things temporal, she is the source of benefits as manifold and great as if the chief end of her existence were to ensure the prospering of our earthly life. And, in truth, wherever the Church has set her foot, she has straightway changed the face of things, and has attempered the moral tone of the people with a new civilisation and with virtues before unknown. All nations which have yielded to her sway have become eminent for their culture, their sense of justice, and the glory of their high deeds."

^l *Christian Constitution of States.*

Duty of *Rulers and Subjects*

In the same Encyclical the Pope says : “ The right to rule is not necessarily bound up with any special make of government. It may take this or that form, provided only that it be of a nature to ensure the general welfare. But whatever be the nature of the government, rulers must ever bear in mind that God is the paramount ruler of the world, and must set Him before themselves as their exemplar and law in the administration of the State. For in things visible God has fashioned secondary causes in which His divine action can in some way be discerned, leading up to the end to which the course of the world is ever tending. In like manner, in civil society God has always willed that there should be a ruling authority, and that they who are invested with it should reflect the Divine Power and Providence, in some measure, over the human race.

They, therefore, who rule should rule with even-handed justice, not as masters but rather as fathers, for the rule of God over man is most just, and is always tempered with a father's kindness. Government should, moreover, be administered for the well-being of the citizens, because they who govern others possess

authority solely for the welfare of the State. Furthermore, the civil power must not be subservient to the advantage of any one individual, or of some few persons, inasmuch as it was established for the common good of all. But if those who are in authority rule unjustly, if they govern overbearingly or arrogantly, and if their measures prove hurtful to the people, they must remember that the Almighty will one day bring them to account—the more strictly in proportion to the sacredness of their office and the pre-eminence of their dignity. The mighty shall be mightily tormented.

Then truly will the majesty of the law meet with the dutiful and willing homage of the people, when they are convinced that their rulers hold authority from God and feel that it is a matter of justice and duty to obey them ; and to show them reverence and fealty united to a love not unlike that which children show their parents. ‘ Let every soul be subject to the higher power ’ (*Rom. xiii, 1*). To despise legitimate authority in whomsoever vested is unlawful and a rebellion against the Divine Will, and whosoever resisteth that rushes willfully to destruction. ‘ He that resisteth the power resisteth the ordinance of God, and they that resist purchase to themselves damnation

(*Rom. xiii*). To cast aside obedience, and by popular *violence to incite to revolt* is therefore treason, not against man only, but against God.”

THE CATHOLIC PRESS

American Cardinal's Appeal to the People

In 1931, Catholic Press Sunday was observed throughout the Archdiocese of Boston, in accordance with a proclamation of Cardinal O'Connell. The attention of the people at all the Masses was called to the importance of the Catholic Press and their duty to support it. In his official letter calling for the observance, Cardinal O'Connell said :

“ The influence exerted by the printed word upon the minds and hearts of men is tremendous. The Church, ever mindful of her Divine Mission to teach all nations, has adapted this mighty weapon to her holy purpose by developing what is known as the Catholic Press. This consists of books, periodicals and newspapers published under Catholic auspices and dedicated to the dissemination of Catholic truth.

CURRENT ERRORS

“ For a proper understanding of their Faith and a true appreciation of its blessings, it is necessary that Catholics should read Catholic literature. For there they will find in most accessible form the refutation of current errors, the solution of pressing problems, and the antidote to the false philosophy of the day.

“ It is a duty, therefore, incumbent upon all Catholics to read and support the Catholic Press.”