Catholic Courier

VOL. VIII FEBRUARY 20, 1936 No. 8

Official Newspaper of the Diocese of Rochester
With the Approbation of the
Most Reverend Archbishop Edward Mooney,
Bishop of Rochester.

MEMBER CATHOLIC PRESS ASSOCIATION
SUBSCRIBER TO N.C.W.C. NEWS SERVICE

REV. LEO C. MOONEY..... Managing Editor
REV. JOHN E. MASSETH..... Editor
HOWARD W. KLIPPERT..... Manager
THOMAS H. O'CONNOR..... News Editor

MEMBER OF CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Subscription, $2.50 per year in advance, postpaid. Single copies, five cents. Foreign, $4.00 per year. In many instances subscribers prefer not to have their subscriptions interrupted in case they fail to remit before expiration. It is therefore assumed that continuance is desired unless discontinuance is ordered either by letter or personal calls.

National Advertising Representative
Callahan's List of Catholic Newspapers
(George J. Callahan)
41 Chambers Street, New York City

Entered as second-class matter in the Postoffice at Rochester, New York, as required under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879.

Published by
CATHOLIC COURIER and JOURNAL, Inc.
228 Chestnut St. Stone 1492. Rochester, N. Y.
Courier Established 1928—Journal Established 1889

I earnestly beseech for the CATHOLIC COURIER the united and generous support of our priests and people, and I fervently hope that it may carry into every home in the diocese the salutary influence of the Catholic Press. If Pope Pius XI could say for the whole church "anything that you do for the Good Press, I will consider as having been done for me personally", I feel that for this diocese I can and should say, "Anything that you do for the Catholic Courier, I will consider as having been done for me personally".

† Edward Mooney,
Archbishop-Bishop of Rochester.

Editorials

BALLYHOO AND BALONEY

Is agriculture a national problem? Everybody of prominence, whatever his political belief, seems to say so. Yet this particular problem, though affecting directly or indirectly the welfare of the whole nation, admittedly national, may not be dealt with on a national basis. Is that the way it goes? Must a national problem of this kind be left to the several states for solution?

You have heard of China and its weak central government and its consequent demoralized condition. And so you will understand the reference of Senator George W. Norris to China when he said in the Senate last Friday—

"If we leave it (agriculture) to the States, the time will come when we will be another China."

Monsignor John A. Ryan of the Catholic University, Washington, said in an address in New York City last Saturday—

"Congress should have the constitutional power to regulate industry, commerce, agriculture, labor and finance," he continued. "Adequate regulation by the States is impracticable because they can never agree on uniform economic legislation. In order to be fair to all industries and actions of the country, such legislation must apply in all parts of the country. Since our principal industries are national in scope, regulation of them must be likewise national in scope."

This country is so big and varied that sometimes it looks unwieldly. We are afflicted with sectionalism and its consequences. Because of their divergent and sometimes conflicting interests, sections, states find it impossible to see eye to eye with one another. Without the help of the central government, they stay as they are. Without such help, the states remain 48 separate nations.

Nobody is unaware of what could happen if our central government became too strong. Insistence on states' rights acts as a brake on autocracy or tyranny. But this insistence carried too far leaves us a weak central government and not one but 48 nations.

In TODAY of January 11, Charles A. Beard took up a statement made by James Truslow Adams. Mr. Adams had said that "unless I have never understood the America where my family has lived for 300 years, or its history and influence, the real American will be about the last person in the world to enjoy excessively centralized government," to which Mr. Beard made reply as follows—

"Nobody need quarrel with that. Probably no American, whether his family has been here 30 years or 300 years, wants an excessively centralized government. But how does anyone know just when a government becomes 'excessively' centralized? And what if it gets that way as a result of the efforts of some states to protect their conception of and practice of their rights against the conceptions and practices of other states?

"It is scarcely too much to say," said Mr. Beard, "that the real battle in domestic politics, as far as it involves the Constitution, is the battle to protect states against one another. The extension of Federal interference is a by-product. This protection [illegible] both public authorities and private enterprises.

"The issue was not in 1787 and is not now a conflict between the central government and state rights. It is a conflict [illegible] in underbidding, outbidding, throat-cutting, gouging, twisting, [illegible], all under the sacred name [illegible]. The question is not whether the central government is to prevail. It takes another form: [illegible] and what state actions [illegible] which states and what [illegible] it is to be fought out again, as in 1861-1865, it will have to be decided by the Federal government, which, after all, does not reside in the moon but represents the states and their peoples."

In any event, the good of the country will require of Americans in the next several months that they recognize ballyhoo as ballyhoo, baloney as baloney, when set before them.

JOHN E. MASSETH.

IN TOLEDO

In times like these labor interests and industrial interests get great prominence in the news. Not so much is heard of community interests. Yet when a fight occurs between industry and labor, community interests may be endangered greatly.

And when such extreme measures as strikes are taken, however necessary and justified, both business and employment suffer along with community interests. In other words, at such a time everybody suffers.

So why strike? Why not enforce arbitration?

In THE COMMONWEAL of January 31, Frank J. Oliver described the "Toledo Plan," which had its origin in the minds of three newspaper editors. It was recognized that, "through its power to mold public opinion, a newspaper is in an excellent position literally to force both sides to arbitrate rather than fight."

Beginning in 1934, a series of labor troubles visited Toledo. Unrest prevailed. Large corporations began to plan to move out of town. New industries sought other towns. Toledo's reputation as an industrial center was in jeopardy.

In stepped the three newspaper editors, Carlton K. Matson of the NEWS-BEE, Grove Patterson of the BLADE, Richard Patterson of the TIMES, who at once set about arousing a sense of community responsibility and rallying public support for a sensible plan of arbitration.

Mr. Oliver tells of the considerable success achieved. However, he has misgivings. "The question still to be answered," he says, "is whether the crusading newspapers will gain what they are striving for. They may attain some measure of industrial peace, but will industries want to move into a city where the press will force them to adopt broad social policies in dealing with labor? Some rugged individualists will not. They fear regimentation. In fact, one industrial relations counsellor in a nearby city has already advised a client not to locate his factory in Toledo under the present circumstances."

Whatever the results, Messrs. Patterson, Matson and Patterson deserve and get our approval. Let them be assured that not for long will stubborn reactionary industrialists be allowed to flout sound community interests anywhere.

J. E. M.

LESS HASTE

Worthy of support is the bill introduced in the Legislature at Albany last week by Assemblywoman Jane H. Todd, requiring that there be an interval of three days between the issuance of a marriage license and the performance of the ceremony.

As Miss Todd said, the bill "is in the public interest." She believes that "marriage should be something more than a hit-or-miss proposition, and should only be entered into after careful consideration. Gin weddings, hasty marriages entered into for the sake of headlines, 'adventure' or merely for the purpose of 'surprising friends' and adding to the conversational production of the world, should, as I view it, be discouraged. I think this bill will help do that.

"If we will consult the divorce records of the state, we will immediately become aware of the truth of the old adage, 'Marry in haste and repent at leisure.' After all, if merely the lives of two persons who unadvisedly lean into matrimony were involved in this hasty-marriage philosophy, it might not be so bad, but invariably families of both persons are dragged into subsequent divorce proceedings and, unfortunately, in many instances, children as well. Seventy-two hours, as provided in this bill, will give persons desiring to marry additional time to reflect. After all, marriage should be for a life-time, and not merely for a few months or a few years."

Provision is made in the bill for needed exceptions. Hurried marriage is allowed "when one of the parties is in danger of imminent death, or when by reason of other emergency public interest will be prompted thereby, or when such delay (seventy-two hours) will work irreparable injury or great hardship upon the contracting parties, or one of them."

However, according to press reports, in these emergencies "the order of a jurist" is necessary before the ceremony may be carried out. Any minister of religion can propose cases when time for such recourse would not be available. If properly reported, this feature of the bill needs reconsidering.

However, the general intent of the bill should be heartily approved by all. Of it the NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE of February 14 said in an editorial—

"The license of today is merely the civil counterpart of the ecclesiastical banns, which ordinarily must be published days or weeks before the marriage can take place, and the banns only reflect the care and solemnity with which practically all peoples have from time immemorial surrounded the serious business of getting married. Marriage may no longer be the irrevocable step which it once was, but that is all the more reason why the state should not encourage people to leap into it if they cannot retain through a period of seventy-two hours what ought to be a lifetime devotion."

J. E. M.

Current Comment

BROADMINDED BIGOTRY

By Victor Lubra

(In America, Jesuit Review)

Thanks to the Encyclicals of Leo XIII and Pius XI the Catholic Church can be said to have very definite social plans as regards the modern industrial world. Thanks to the present Pontiff's repeated prayers for peace the Church can be said to be definitely antagonistic to modern warfare. That the present Pontiff and the great majority of clergy and laity have from time to time proven themselves to be awake to definitely modern problems and have offered clear views thereon, cannot be denied.

Yet a Catholic may be pardoned for seeing red when liberal after liberal, advanced thinker after advanced thinker and broad observer after broad observer writes and speaks of the Catholic Church as though it were some sort of tactless guest who had been invited into the abode of the world to attend a medieval party and who insists on lingering on though the medieval party has long broken up and the smart set are now guests of honor.

Fortunately, modern decadent liberalism is so intolerant that too many see through it to let it have its own way. If it had its own way the Catholic wouldn't have a chance. However, decadent liberalism is not Stalin yet, and it must be highly embarrassing for the liberals to read that the German Catholic Bishops [illegible] bravely resisting Hitler in Germany, something the fearless liberals in Germany have not done since the Nazis assumed power in that country.

No doubt many liberals deplore the lack of tact shown by the Pope when he issued his famous labor Encyclical, the fairness of which is such that liberals are unable to ridicule it. Hence, they ignore it.

Indeed, if we are to take the word of the broadminded the Catholic Church is an amazing institution. It is at once democratic and plutocratic, and it is forever remaining silent while talking out of turn. If you don't believe that ask any self-styled liberal.

I per onally am tired of defending the Catholic Church against the dogmatic thrusts of free-minded liberals. Most of them do not want to consider the Catholic side of the question, and you only annoy them by offering it. They look at both sides of the question but they are blind in their conservative eye and see doubly well out of their left eye. They like to consider themselves as pinnacles of advanced thought and Catholics as superstitious medievalists to whom the liberal may condescend to offer sort of a patronizing tolerance. Hence any intelligence a Catholic may display will only torture them.

It is well nigh high time that advanced enlightened Catholics came to realize that we have to do our midst a backward and superstitious group who are slaves to dogma steeped in hypocrisy and who oppose or ignore every enlightened civilized measure, to say nothing of natural rights. They live in the twentieth century yet would thrust us back into the darkness of decadent Rome. They defend benighted governments such as Soviet Russia and National Revolutionary Mexico which like decadent Rome persecute Christianity. This fringe of [illegible] group goes under the false heading of liberalism.

The fact that they call themselves liberals shows how ignorant they are for liberalism means broadness which means universality which means Catholicity and the last thing most of them would want to call themselves would be Catholics.

They are fanatics of the worst kind. Their timid professors almost go into hysterics when they are expected to take an oath of loyalty to the constitution of the nation that pays their salaries. They are distinct threats to world peace. Another detestable characteristic of modern liberals is the tendency of liberal sophisticates to snoop into other people's morals and gossip. The blase sophisticate cannot mind his own moral business and must always feed gossip columns or tattle on the private lives of acquaintances.

We do not want Nazism in America. Therefore let us struggle intensively against this liberalism that upholds such Hitlerite measures as sterilization, [illegible] control of the family and anti-Christian paganism. Remember, too, that when religion is denied the same rights by vested liberal interests that are allowed Socialists and Communists, we are taking the first step toward dictatorship.

We have struggled for centuries to break the yoke of decadent paganism such as was personified by Nero; let us not return to it under the guise of modern liberalism.

Spiritual Thoughts

To him who remembers that he has deserved hell all suffering seems right.

* * *

Give fair language to all persons, and especially to the poor and needy. Blessed Adrian Forrescue.

* * *

We are too apt to receive as good what should be avoided as evil, and to deem that a curse which should be considered a blessing.—George H. Miles in "The Truce of God."

STRANGE BUT TRUE
Catholic Facts But Little Known

(c) 1932, by N. C. W. C. News Service

By M. J. MURRAY

THE LIBRARY SIGN POST

A man cannot do much more than harm himself when he loses his temper in private. He is a scandal to others when he loses his temper in public. Yet who shall gauge the scandal when hot blooded fury goes buzzing over the wires of the telegraph to be later picked up and quoted in the newspapers up and down the nation himself a Catholic and thus stoning to hell a priest down the length of Pennsylvania Avenue from the Capitol to the White House? It is hard to believe there is such an offensive ass whom the reserves and reticences of good taste do not prevent from saying nothing of religion are sent packing to find board and keep where they may.

Well let keep plodding along doing what we can. The great Pascal has said that [illegible] but to fight in its defense [illegible] of God for an engagement [illegible] after some scuffles [illegible] Drama's a-comin in the [illegible].

I think that if and when the Nazi regime finally [illegible] opposition to the Catholics of Germany, they will find a solid phalanx to keep [illegible] rough-shod to [illegible]. The Catholics of Germany [illegible] bodies and their souls has grown steadily more diverse [illegible]. Their power of strength has been reduced to almost nil by the tricky manoeuvering initiated by Bismarck but their spiritual strength is unshakable. The kingdom of God cometh not with observation [illegible] not even the [illegible].

It is well to say that the vast majority of persecutors [illegible] means today, outside of the heresy of Rommel Gruber [illegible] spite [illegible] than a mere thousand German citizens and Karl Adam both of them very well known high rank and file in the very forefront of modern Catholic Thought and Action. Translations of their works are the C. F. Lehrer is follows: By Karl Adam: THE SPIRIT OF CATHOLICISM, THE SON OF GOD, CHRIST OUR BROTHER and CHRIST AND THE WEST. FREE MIND, by Romano Guardini. THE SPIRIT OF THE LITURGY and SACRED SIGNS. A recent translation of Father Lippert's work THE CHURCH AND THE CATHOLIC has not yet been put into the Library.

THE CHRISTIAN FRONT [illegible] market's battle with a weak [illegible] and cross drive to right for the gate. I see its track but [illegible] spirit of [illegible] these. For example, THE CHRISTIAN FRONT is [illegible] truth as an overwhelming force [illegible] does not [illegible] in the case of truth [illegible] of history [illegible] Palestine has been smitten so

THE CATHOLIC EVIDENCE LIBRARY RECOMMENDS

[illegible]

[illegible] Who shall read a volume [illegible] most [illegible] a number [illegible] and [illegible] and [illegible] and