

Catholic Courier
Published EVERY WEEK
For More Than 30 Years
1941
VOLUME XIII MAY 1, 1941 NUMBER 18
Official Newspaper of The Rochester Diocese
With the Approval of the
MOST REVEREND JAMES EDWARD KEARNEY, D. D.
Bishop of Rochester
Member Catholic Press Association of the United States
Member of N. C. W. C. News Service (Washington, D. C.)
BY REV. MACE W. M. HART, V. C., Editor-in-Chief
REV. LEO C. MOONEY, Managing Editor
HOWARD W. CLIFFORD, Editor
THOMAS H. O'CONNOR, News Editor
Member of The Rochester Chamber of Commerce
Member of The Rochester Better Business Bureau
Subscription, \$1.00 per year in advance (6 months \$0.50). Single Copies 10c. Please send address label to: Catholic Courier, 1120 N. Y. St., Rochester, N. Y.
Published by CATHOLIC COUNIER and JOURNAL, Inc., Rochester, N. Y.
Established 1908

Golden Anniversary of the issuance of Pope Leo's Encyclical "On the Condition of Labor" and of the tenth anniversary of Pope Pius XI's Encyclical "On Reconstructing the Social Order" is being observed throughout the Catholic World. The anniversary is on May 15.

Principles as set forth in these two profound documents were not set forth solely for Catholics. They were written for the betterment of all men. They should be made known to all men as they have been in later years by these zealous exponents of the Encyclicals.

Why success has crowned the efforts of industrial mediators, backed by their knowledge of these principles, is evident upon the reading and re-reading of those papal pronouncements. Another "must" for this month should be the procuring of the pamphlets available at the National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1812 Massachusetts Ave., Washington, D. C. and the deep perusal of them.



PAGE MY PASTOR
by
Right Rev. Mace W. M. Hart, V. C.
Editor-in-Chief, Catholic Courier of the South

The Indecent Dollar
"Fran, I wish you had come in about fifteen minutes ago."
"Why, Cedie, what goes on?"
"Just had the most beautiful argument on my hands, and you could have been a big help."
"Sorry to have missed it, darling. What was it?"
"Mostly about priests being rich and living on the fat of the land."
"My pastor told me a good joke about that. He said, 'What goes on?' and I said, 'What is it?' and he said, 'I think so. A big, snooty silver dollar passed a little ugly cent without saying hello.' The penny stopped and said, 'Say, listen, you big stiff, getting too elegant to notice me, eh? You're made of fine, shiny silver, and you're beautifully engraved; you go to swell places like night clubs and theaters, and you're too proud even to look at me. OK! I may be ugly, but I'm not stupid. I've got something you haven't got. I'm decent, I go to church every Sunday, where you never enter. Let that be a lesson to you!'"
"No, Cedie, I wish I'd known it a little earlier. As a matter of fact, I had a good bit of trouble upholding my end of the argument. Some priests do live on the fat of the land, but they shouldn't be associated with a weekly handout. That's what the collection box is considered to be, by help of people like you. The priest should be a beggar, if it makes not a particle of difference, as far as the pastor is personally concerned, what is put in the collection basket on Sunday."
"Why not?"
"He gets his regular monthly salary, stipulated by diocesan regulations, irrespective of whether the Sunday collection be heavy or light. Directly, he doesn't get a nickel of it."
"I never realized that, Fran. Oh, why weren't you here to bolster up my arguments?"
"You'd better bet the next time, darling. Oh, here's another point you could use. If Catholics think the priest should live like a pauper, they prove to have very little regard for the high station and position of their clergy."
"That's solid reasoning, Fran. After all, they don't believe in the standing of the mayor of the town, the doctor or the judge. All of them are supposed to be respectable men, and still they do not have a higher standing than the priest."
"Of course. You see, angel, if you'd only use that good head of yours you could argue with anyone."
"A two-edged compliment, I'm afraid, Fran."
"It wasn't meant to be—truly." "What these realize is that a priest must keep up a certain physical and material dignity becoming his exalted office as God's representative. He should be well-dressed, his home must be nice, and his living, although frugal, should impress everyone as being that of a man of distinction."
"These men examined the ceremonial and obligations to determine if the false oath was included. They stated: 'We find that neither the alleged oath nor any oath or pledge bearing the remotest resemblance thereto in matter, manner, spirit or purpose is used or forms a part of the ceremonies of any degree of the Knights of Columbus.'"

No 'Let-Up' Now

Catholicism has the right to speak his views on the war and its possibilities for America. He has the right to resign his commission in the army. But will resigning at a time when his experience is needed achieve for the nation what he could do by sticking to it, whatever the provocation?

This is no time to stop in persistent efforts for the achievement of peace for these United States and the world.

The Supreme Pontiff pleads with the faithful not to quit now in storming Heaven for that which all peace-loving men desire. It is "instant prayer" that he pleads for. To little children, His Holiness directs his appeal. It is to the Blessed Mother whose intercession have been effective on innumerable occasions that we are asked to turn during her month of May.

The "what's the use" attitude furnished by a resignation when the going is tough, will not suffice now for the seekers of a peace of justice and charity. The thing to do now is pray and work for the ideals set forth in the five-point program of the Holy Father. Therein lies the only successful achievement of men's desires.

Whatcha Know Joe?

It is not often that a dance band and its personnel furnish an example for youth that would draw commendation from parents. Most parents are concerned over the influence which the "fifties-bug, boogie-woogie" dance bands have on their children and are worried over the effects in future life.

Worthy of mentioning then, is a dance band which has demonstrated loyalty and co-operation, two essentials for youth as they swing into manhood.

The daily press recently told of Woody Herman and his orchestra and of the loyalty manifested by the band to Joe Bishop, one of their number who lies ill at Saranac. When the band was starting out, the musician, a co-operative, Bishop was the driving force of getting to the top of his health.

Now, every time the band can reasonably play a tune called "Whatcha Know Joe" they play it for him and when they play the song they call him long distances and as some one holds the receiver, they tell their fellow but incapacitated

Selected Insolent Guests

We hear much complaint about the insolent Americans repatriated by fear of the Nazis and about propagandizing foreigners lasciviously telling us to hop into the war to save their shame. There is little left materially to save abroad.

It will be well to bring case for our entry into the war for American reasons. If so, we would prefer to have the case stated by respectable Americans than by foreigners, no matter where they were born.

The war propaganda by foreigners in this country is dividing Americans and preventing American unity, such a unity as we shall need if we go to war.

The most offensive and ill-mannered, of course, are the French and British hybrids. They profess that most Americans feel were sympathetic for them than for the brave Finns, the betrayed Belgians, the escaped Poles and the deserted Danes.

An American, who has lived and associated with Englishmen and who is doing his thinking in a hospital bed, said only last Sunday:

"I feel very sorry that the English people have to suffer so much. They are as nice and kind a people as I have ever known, and their leaders have been stupid and arrogant. The leadership has brought on the decent people of England and on the Australians in the Near East this awful slaughter."

A feed expert claims sand may be eaten with impunity. Just Junior Hanks that's just some more glibly propaganda. Knoxville Journal.

Feast Days

Sunday, May 1—ST. MONICA, THE MOTHER OF AUGUSTINE.
Monday, May 2—ST. Pius V.
Tuesday, May 3—ST. JOHN BEFORE THE LATEIN GATE.
Wednesday, May 4—ST. STANISLAUS, BISHOP OF CRACOW.
Thursday, May 5—THE APPEARANCE OF ST. MICHAEL, THE ARCHANGEL.
Friday, May 6—ST. GREGORY NAZIANZEN.
Saturday, May 7—ST. ANTONY.

Five Years Ago--

From April 30, 1936, Edition
The nation-wide drive of Catholics of the United States to clean the motion picture screen of indecency and obscenity drew high praise from Pope Pius XI speaking at the Congress of the International Federation of Motion Pictures.

To Industry
A Catholic priest has taken part in a labor dispute has taken place. It once had been a laborer, trained in the ways of the industry, doing that very thing

Diocesan Recordings

FOURTH DEGREE OBLIGATION
Active Catholic laymen from various sections of the diocese will assemble in Rochester on Sunday for exemplification of the Knights of Columbus Fourth Degree. This is the patriotic section of the K. of C. and during its long existence throughout the country has a notable record of achievements.

There was a time, not too long ago, when attacks were made on the Fourth Degree and a bogus oath was circulated widely. The knights took immediate steps to fight the misunderstandings created by this conduct. They submitted the entire ritual of the Knights of Columbus to leading Protestant gentlemen to have them pronounce upon it.

At Seattle in October, 1912, this was done. A committee of prominent non-Catholic citizens declared the obligation taken in the Fourth Degree to be "one of the ally and patriotism to our flag and our nation."

In the Congressional Record, page 2817, Volume 52, Friday, January 10, 1913, it was stated by the Hon. William Keiser of California. He said in part:

"As a thirty-third degree Mason, and a working member of the Masonic order, I esteem it a privilege to present this report of these distinguished and fair-minded men on a subject which has been grossly misrepresented, and has caused religious bitterness and strife."

Four high Masonic officials at that time said: "We hereby certify that, by authority of the highest officer of the Knights of Columbus in the State of California, who acted under instruction from the supreme officer of the order in the United States, we were furnished a complete copy of all the work, ceremonies and pledges used by the order, and that we carefully read, discussed and examined the same. We found that, while the order is in a sense a secret association, it is not an oath-bound organization, and that its ceremonies are comprised in four degrees, which are intended to teach and inculcate principles that lie at the foundation of every great state."

These men examined the ceremonial and obligations to determine if the false oath was included. They stated: "We find that neither the alleged oath nor any oath or pledge bearing the remotest resemblance thereto in matter, manner, spirit or purpose is used or forms a part of the ceremonies of any degree of the Knights of Columbus."

Snickers

Dentist: Can you take a lot of
Terrible Patient: Naw, for Pete's sake, shut up!

How vile seems to me the earth when I contemplate the heavens.—St. Ignatius.

In Plain Words

By REV. JAMES M. GILLIS, C.S.P., Editor, The Catholic World

Last week this column was concerned largely with Mortimer Adler. I have no intention of "plugging" that excellent philosopher's stuff, but I hope readers will not object to a mention of him once again after so short an interval.

This time he shall be one of three corners of a controversy about the relationship of science and philosophy. In the other two corners are Max Otto, author of a volume entitled The Human Enterprise, and Lancelotti Hogben who reviews Dr. Otto's book in the New York Herald Tribune of March 2. Hogben you will remember as the author of Mathematics for the Millions, a literary phenomenon which achieved best-seller standing.

Dr. Otto is trying to discover a system of morals valid for an age of science, or, as his reviewer says, to examine moral attitudes in the light of current circumstances.

Now here is where Dr. Adler comes into the picture. It is Adler's contention—after St. Thomas and a host of others—that you cannot construct, and you should not judge a moral system on the basis of current circumstances alone. You must apply the touchstone of "universal moral truths" like Dr. Hogben. He rejects the notion that a philosophical or ethical principle can be universal. As for Dr. Max Otto, he "does not see the trouble to say that there are no universal moral formulas." In other words, a fundamental tenet held by Mortimer Adler—and before him by hundreds of philosophers from Socrates to Aquinas—is considered by Lancelotti Hogben and Max Otto as absurd as not to merit mention.

Now what does all this mean? The author of Mathematics for the Millions has the reputation of being able to explain deep truths in language the common people can understand. It is to be regretted that he didn't find space even in a book review for a line or two to say in very simple terms, such as the normal newspaper reader could understand, just what it means to have a universal moral formula. Since he doesn't do it, perhaps I may try.

It means that no moral principle is good for all times and all places. If no moral principle, then no moral code and indeed no single moral maxim is good for all men and all times.

For example: The Ten Commandments may have been all very well in their day. They were composed for an ancient oriental agricultural people. But that doesn't mean that they are good for a modern occidental industrial people. They served a purpose and became outmoded. Whether their author was Moses an Egyptian Jew or Hammurabi a Babylonian King, the Ten Commandments cannot last for ever. They cannot be applied to Europeans and Americans and Australians, to English, Irish, Germans, Slavs, Chinese in these our days and to the end of days.

We have to keep up with the times in morals as we do in styles. Everything changes. Philosophies and moralities are in a state of flux. Philosophical systems are no more permanent than political systems. And neither are ethical systems, codes of morals, or commandments. They change from year to year. Dr. Otto and with him Dr. Hogben, considers it a manifest absurdity that in 1941 we should be bound by the moral rules of 1274.

Einstein's theory of relativity applies, apparently, in politics and morals as in the natural sciences. But if it is relative and nothing absolute, if all is transient and nothing permanent, if all is local or temporal, and nothing universal, then how do we know where we are or whether we are going backward or forward? I wish Dr. Hogben had taken a couple of inches of his precious space to answer that question. I confess I am no scientist, as he is, and still less am I a relativist, as Dr. Einstein is, so I am bewildered in a world—physical or philosophical—still more a moral world—in which there is no point of departure, no goal of arrival and no landmark. Or should we say a world in which all the landmarks are moving all the time? If I am rowing a boat on a river, I can know whether I am making progress or losing, or holding my own, if there is a tree or a rock or a house or something on the bank by which I can gauge my movement. But the tree or the rock or the house must stand still! At least it must stand still relatively to the couple of inches of his precious space to answer that question. I confess I am no scientist, as he is, and still less am I a relativist, as Dr. Einstein is, so I am bewildered in a world—physical or philosophical—still more a moral world—in which there is no point of departure, no goal of arrival and no landmark. Or should we say a world in which all the landmarks are moving all the time? If I am rowing a boat on a river, I can know whether I am making progress or losing, or holding my own, if there is a tree or a rock or a house or something on the bank by which I can gauge my movement. But the tree or the rock or the house must stand still! At least it must stand still relatively to the couple of inches of his precious space to answer that question. I confess I am no scientist, as he is, and still less am I a relativist, as Dr. Einstein is, so I am bewildered in a world—physical or philosophical—still more a moral world—in which there is no point of departure, no goal of arrival and no landmark. Or should we say a world in which all the landmarks are moving all the time? If I am rowing a boat on a river, I can know whether I am making progress or losing, or holding my own, if there is a tree or a rock or a house or something on the bank by which I can gauge my movement. But the tree or the rock or the house must stand still! At least it must stand still relatively to the couple of inches of his precious space to answer that question. I confess I am no scientist, as he is, and still less am I a relativist, as Dr. Einstein is, so I am bewildered in a world—physical or philosophical—still more a moral world—in which there is no point of departure, no goal of arrival and no landmark. Or should we say a world in which all the landmarks are moving all the time? If I am rowing a boat on a river, I can know whether I am making progress or losing, or holding my own, if there is a tree or a rock or a house or something on the bank by which I can gauge my movement. But the tree or the rock or the house must stand still! At least it must stand still relatively to the couple of inches of his precious space to answer that question. I confess I am no scientist, as he is, and still less am I a relativist, as Dr. Einstein is, so I am bewildered in a world—physical or philosophical—still more a moral world—in which there is no point of departure, no goal of arrival and no landmark. Or should we say a world in which all the landmarks are moving all the time? If I am rowing a boat on a river, I can know whether I am making progress or losing, or holding my own, if there is a tree or a rock or a house or something on the bank by which I can gauge my movement. But the tree or the rock or the house must stand still! At least it must stand still relatively to the couple of inches of his precious space to answer that question. I confess I am no scientist, as he is, and still less am I a relativist, as Dr. Einstein is, so I am bewildered in a world—physical or philosophical—still more a moral world—in which there is no point of departure, no goal of arrival and no landmark. Or should we say a world in which all the landmarks are moving all the time? If I am rowing a boat on a river, I can know whether I am making progress or losing, or holding my own, if there is a tree or a rock or a house or something on the bank by which I can gauge my movement. But the tree or the rock or the house must stand still! At least it must stand still relatively to the couple of inches of his precious space to answer that question. I confess I am no scientist, as he is, and still less am I a relativist, as Dr. Einstein is, so I am bewildered in a world—physical or philosophical—still more a moral world—in which there is no point of departure, no goal of arrival and no landmark. Or should we say a world in which all the landmarks are moving all the time? If I am rowing a boat on a river, I can know whether I am making progress or losing, or holding my own, if there is a tree or a rock or a house or something on the bank by which I can gauge my movement. But the tree or the rock or the house must stand still! At least it must stand still relatively to the couple of inches of his precious space to answer that question. I confess I am no scientist, as he is, and still less am I a relativist, as Dr. Einstein is, so I am bewildered in a world—physical or philosophical—still more a moral world—in which there is no point of departure, no goal of arrival and no landmark. Or should we say a world in which all the landmarks are moving all the time? If I am rowing a boat on a river, I can know whether I am making progress or losing, or holding my own, if there is a tree or a rock or a house or something on the bank by which I can gauge my movement. But the tree or the rock or the house must stand still! At least it must stand still relatively to the couple of inches of his precious space to answer that question. I confess I am no scientist, as he is, and still less am I a relativist, as Dr. Einstein is, so I am bewildered in a world—physical or philosophical—still more a moral world—in which there is no point of departure, no goal of arrival and no landmark. Or should we say a world in which all the landmarks are moving all the time? If I am rowing a boat on a river, I can know whether I am making progress or losing, or holding my own, if there is a tree or a rock or a house or something on the bank by which I can gauge my movement. But the tree or the rock or the house must stand still! At least it must stand still relatively to the couple of inches of his precious space to answer that question. I confess I am no scientist, as he is, and still less am I a relativist, as Dr. Einstein is, so I am bewildered in a world—physical or philosophical—still more a moral world—in which there is no point of departure, no goal of arrival and no landmark. Or should we say a world in which all the landmarks are moving all the time? If I am rowing a boat on a river, I can know whether I am making progress or losing, or holding my own, if there is a tree or a rock or a house or something on the bank by which I can gauge my movement. But the tree or the rock or the house must stand still! At least it must stand still relatively to the couple of inches of his precious space to answer that question. I confess I am no scientist, as he is, and still less am I a relativist, as Dr. Einstein is, so I am bewildered in a world—physical or philosophical—still more a moral world—in which there is no point of departure, no goal of arrival and no landmark. Or should we say a world in which all the landmarks are moving all the time? If I am rowing a boat on a river, I can know whether I am making progress or losing, or holding my own, if there is a tree or a rock or a house or something on the bank by which I can gauge my movement. But the tree or the rock or the house must stand still! At least it must stand still relatively to the couple of inches of his precious space to answer that question. I confess I am no scientist, as he is, and still less am I a relativist, as Dr. Einstein is, so I am bewildered in a world—physical or philosophical—still more a moral world—in which there is no point of departure, no goal of arrival and no landmark. Or should we say a world in which all the landmarks are moving all the time? If I am rowing a boat on a river, I can know whether I am making progress or losing, or holding my own, if there is a tree or a rock or a house or something on the bank by which I can gauge my movement. But the tree or the rock or the house must stand still! At least it must stand still relatively to the couple of inches of his precious space to answer that question. I confess I am no scientist, as he is, and still less am I a relativist, as Dr. Einstein is, so I am bewildered in a world—physical or philosophical—still more a moral world—in which there is no point of departure, no goal of arrival and no landmark. Or should we say a world in which all the landmarks are moving all the time? If I am rowing a boat on a river, I can know whether I am making progress or losing, or holding my own, if there is a tree or a rock or a house or something on the bank by which I can gauge my movement. But the tree or the rock or the house must stand still! At least it must stand still relatively to the couple of inches of his precious space to answer that question. I confess I am no scientist, as he is, and still less am I a relativist, as Dr. Einstein is, so I am bewildered in a world—physical or philosophical—still more a moral world—in which there is no point of departure, no goal of arrival and no landmark. Or should we say a world in which all the landmarks are moving all the time? If I am rowing a boat on a river, I can know whether I am making progress or losing, or holding my own, if there is a tree or a rock or a house or something on the bank by which I can gauge my movement. But the tree or the rock or the house must stand still! At least it must stand still relatively to the couple of inches of his precious space to answer that question. I confess I am no scientist, as he is, and still less am I a relativist, as Dr. Einstein is, so I am bewildered in a world—physical or philosophical—still more a moral world—in which there is no point of departure, no goal of arrival and no landmark. Or should we say a world in which all the landmarks are moving all the time? If I am rowing a boat on a river, I can know whether I am making progress or losing, or holding my own, if there is a tree or a rock or a house or something on the bank by which I can gauge my movement. But the tree or the rock or the house must stand still! At least it must stand still relatively to the couple of inches of his precious space to answer that question. I confess I am no scientist, as he is, and still less am I a relativist, as Dr. Einstein is, so I am bewildered in a world—physical or philosophical—still more a moral world—in which there is no point of departure, no goal of arrival and no landmark. Or should we say a world in which all the landmarks are moving all the time? If I am rowing a boat on a river, I can know whether I am making progress or losing, or holding my own, if there is a tree or a rock or a house or something on the bank by which I can gauge my movement. But the tree or the rock or the house must stand still! At least it must stand still relatively to the couple of inches of his precious space to answer that question. I confess I am no scientist, as he is, and still less am I a relativist, as Dr. Einstein is, so I am bewildered in a world—physical or philosophical—still more a moral world—in which there is no point of departure, no goal of arrival and no landmark. Or should we say a world in which all the landmarks are moving all the time? If I am rowing a boat on a river, I can know whether I am making progress or losing, or holding my own, if there is a tree or a rock or a house or something on the bank by which I can gauge my movement. But the tree or the rock or the house must stand still! At least it must stand still relatively to the couple of inches of his precious space to answer that question. I confess I am no scientist, as he is, and still less am I a relativist, as Dr. Einstein is, so I am bewildered in a world—physical or philosophical—still more a moral world—in which there is no point of departure, no goal of arrival and no landmark. Or should we say a world in which all the landmarks are moving all the time? If I am rowing a boat on a river, I can know whether I am making progress or losing, or holding my own, if there is a tree or a rock or a house or something on the bank by which I can gauge my movement. But the tree or the rock or the house must stand still! At least it must stand still relatively to the couple of inches of his precious space to answer that question. I confess I am no scientist, as he is, and still less am I a relativist, as Dr. Einstein is, so I am bewildered in a world—physical or philosophical—still more a moral world—in which there is no point of departure, no goal of arrival and no landmark. Or should we say a world in which all the landmarks are moving all the time? If I am rowing a boat on a river, I can know whether I am making progress or losing, or holding my own, if there is a tree or a rock or a house or something on the bank by which I can gauge my movement. But the tree or the rock or the house must stand still! At least it must stand still relatively to the couple of inches of his precious space to answer that question. I confess I am no scientist, as he is, and still less am I a relativist, as Dr. Einstein is, so I am bewildered in a world—physical or philosophical—still more a moral world—in which there is no point of departure, no goal of arrival and no landmark. Or should we say a world in which all the landmarks are moving all the time? If I am rowing a boat on a river, I can know whether I am making progress or losing, or holding my own, if there is a tree or a rock or a house or something on the bank by which I can gauge my movement. But the tree or the rock or the house must stand still! At least it must stand still relatively to the couple of inches of his precious space to answer that question. I confess I am no scientist, as he is, and still less am I a relativist, as Dr. Einstein is, so I am bewildered in a world—physical or philosophical—still more a moral world—in which there is no point of departure, no goal of arrival and no landmark. Or should we say a world in which all the landmarks are moving all the time? If I am rowing a boat on a river, I can know whether I am making progress or losing, or holding my own, if there is a tree or a rock or a house or something on the bank by which I can gauge my movement. But the tree or the rock or the house must stand still! At least it must stand still relatively to the couple of inches of his precious space to answer that question. I confess I am no scientist, as he is, and still less am I a relativist, as Dr. Einstein is, so I am bewildered in a world—physical or philosophical—still more a moral world—in which there is no point of departure, no goal of arrival and no landmark. Or should we say a world in which all the landmarks are moving all the time? If I am rowing a boat on a river, I can know whether I am making progress or losing, or holding my own, if there is a tree or a rock or a house or something on the bank by which I can gauge my movement. But the tree or the rock or the house must stand still! At least it must stand still relatively to the couple of inches of his precious space to answer that question. I confess I am no scientist, as he is, and still less am I a relativist, as Dr. Einstein is, so I am bewildered in a world—physical or philosophical—still more a moral world—in which there is no point of departure, no goal of arrival and no landmark. Or should we say a world in which all the landmarks are moving all the time? If I am rowing a boat on a river, I can know whether I am making progress or losing, or holding my own, if there is a tree or a rock or a house or something on the bank by which I can gauge my movement. But the tree or the rock or the house must stand still! At least it must stand still relatively to the couple of inches of his precious space to answer that question. I confess I am no scientist, as he is, and still less am I a relativist, as Dr. Einstein is, so I am bewildered in a world—physical or philosophical—still more a moral world—in which there is no point of departure, no goal of arrival and no landmark. Or should we say a world in which all the landmarks are moving all the time? If I am rowing a boat on a river, I can know whether I am making progress or losing, or holding my own, if there is a tree or a rock or a house or something on the bank by which I can gauge my movement. But the tree or the rock or the house must stand still! At least it must stand still relatively to the couple of inches of his precious space to answer that question. I confess I am no scientist, as he is, and still less am I a relativist, as Dr. Einstein is, so I am bewildered in a world—physical or philosophical—still more a moral world—in which there is no point of departure, no goal of arrival and no landmark. Or should we say a world in which all the landmarks are moving all the time? If I am rowing a boat on a river, I can know whether I am making progress or losing, or holding my own, if there is a tree or a rock or a house or something on the bank by which I can gauge my movement. But the tree or the rock or the house must stand still! At least it must stand still relatively to the couple of inches of his precious space to answer that question. I confess I am no scientist, as he is, and still less am I a relativist, as Dr. Einstein is, so I am bewildered in a world—physical or philosophical—still more a moral world—in which there is no point of departure, no goal of arrival and no landmark. Or should we say a world in which all the landmarks are moving all the time? If I am rowing a boat on a river, I can know whether I am making progress or losing, or holding my own, if there is a tree or a rock or a house or something on the bank by which I can gauge my movement. But the tree or the rock or the house must stand still! At least it must stand still relatively to the couple of inches of his precious space to answer that question. I confess I am no scientist, as he is, and still less am I a relativist, as Dr. Einstein is, so I am bewildered in a world—physical or philosophical—still more a moral world—in which there is no point of departure, no goal of arrival and no landmark. Or should we say a world in which all the landmarks are moving all the time? If I am rowing a boat on a river, I can know whether I am making progress or losing, or holding my own, if there is a tree or a rock or a house or something on the bank by which I can gauge my movement. But the tree or the rock or the house must stand still! At least it must stand still relatively to the couple of inches of his precious space to answer that question. I confess I am no scientist, as he is, and still less am I a relativist, as Dr. Einstein is, so I am bewildered in a world—physical or philosophical—still more a moral world—in which there is no point of departure, no goal of arrival and no landmark. Or should we say a world in which all the landmarks are moving all the time? If I am rowing a boat on a river, I can know whether I am making progress or losing, or holding my own, if there is a tree or a rock or a house or something on the bank by which I can gauge my movement. But the tree or the rock or the house must stand still! At least it must stand still relatively to the couple of inches of his precious space to answer that question. I confess I am no scientist, as he is, and still less am I a relativist, as Dr. Einstein is, so I am bewildered in a world—physical or philosophical—still more a moral world—in which there is no point of departure, no goal of arrival and no landmark. Or should we say a world in which all the landmarks are moving all the time? If I am rowing a boat on a river, I can know whether I am making progress or losing, or holding my own, if there is a tree or a rock or a house or something on the bank by which I can gauge my movement. But the tree or the rock or the house must stand still! At least it must stand still relatively to the couple of inches of his precious space to answer that question. I confess I am no scientist, as he is, and still less am I a relativist, as Dr. Einstein is, so I am bewildered in a world—physical or philosophical—still more a moral world—in which there is no point of departure, no goal of arrival and no landmark. Or should we say a world in which all the landmarks are moving all the time? If I am rowing a boat on a river, I can know whether I am making progress or losing, or holding my own, if there is a tree or a rock or a house or something on the bank by which I can gauge my movement. But the tree or the rock or the house must stand still! At least it must stand still relatively to the couple of inches of his precious space to answer that question. I confess I am no scientist, as he is, and still less am I a relativist, as Dr. Einstein is, so I am bewildered in a world—physical or philosophical—still more a moral world—in which there is no point of departure, no goal of arrival and no landmark. Or should we say a world in which all the landmarks are moving all the time? If I am rowing a boat on a river, I can know whether I am making progress or losing, or holding my own, if there is a tree or a rock or a house or something on the bank by which I can gauge my movement. But the tree or the rock or the house must stand still! At least it must stand still relatively to the couple of inches of his precious space to answer that question. I confess I am no scientist, as he is, and still less am I a relativist, as Dr. Einstein is, so I am bewildered in a world—physical or philosophical—still more a moral world—in which there is no point of departure, no goal of arrival and no landmark. Or should we say a world in which all the landmarks are moving all the time? If I am rowing a boat on a river, I can know whether I am making progress or losing, or holding my own, if there is a tree or a rock or a house or something on the bank by which I can gauge my movement. But the tree or the rock or the house must stand still! At least it must stand still relatively to the couple of inches of his precious space to answer that question. I confess I am no scientist, as he is, and still less am I a relativist, as Dr. Einstein is, so I am bewildered in a world—physical or philosophical—still more a moral world—in which there is no point of departure, no goal of arrival and no landmark. Or should we say a world in which all the landmarks are moving all the time? If I am rowing a boat on a river, I can know whether I am making progress or losing, or holding my own, if there is a tree or a rock or a house or something on the bank by which I can gauge my movement. But the tree or the rock or the house must stand still! At least it must stand still relatively to the couple of inches of his precious space to answer that question. I confess I am no scientist, as he is, and still less am I a relativist, as Dr. Einstein is, so I am bewildered in a world—physical or philosophical—still more a moral world—in which there is no point of departure, no goal of arrival and no landmark. Or should we say a world in which all the landmarks are moving all the time? If I am rowing a boat on a river, I can know whether I am making progress or losing, or holding my own, if there is a tree or a rock or a house or something on the bank by which I can gauge my movement. But the tree or the rock or the house must stand still! At least it must stand still relatively to the couple of inches of his precious space to answer that question. I confess I am no scientist, as he is, and still less am I a relativist, as Dr. Einstein is, so I am bewildered in a world—physical or philosophical—still more a moral world—in which there is no point of departure, no goal of arrival and no landmark. Or should we say a world in which all the landmarks are moving all the time? If I am rowing a boat on a river, I can know whether I am making progress or losing, or holding my own, if there is a tree or a rock or a house or something on the bank by which I can gauge my movement. But the tree or the rock or the house must stand still! At least it must stand still relatively to the couple of inches of his precious space to answer that question. I confess I am no scientist, as he is, and still less am I a relativist, as Dr. Einstein is, so I am bewildered in a world—physical or philosophical—still more a moral world—in which there is no point of departure, no goal of arrival and no landmark. Or should we say a world in which all the landmarks are moving all the time? If I am rowing a boat on a river, I can know whether I am making progress or losing, or holding my own, if there is a tree or a rock or a house or something on the bank by which I can gauge my movement. But the tree or the rock or the house must stand still! At least it must stand still relatively to the couple of inches of his precious space to answer that question. I confess I am no scientist, as he is, and still less am I a relativist, as Dr. Einstein is, so I am bewildered in a world—physical or philosophical—still more a moral world—in which there is no point of departure, no goal of arrival and no landmark. Or should we say a world in which all the landmarks are moving all the time? If I am rowing a boat on a river, I can know whether I am making progress or losing, or holding my own, if there is a tree or a rock or a house or something on the bank by which I can gauge my movement. But the tree or the rock or the house must stand still! At least it must stand still relatively to the couple of inches of his precious space to answer that question. I confess I am no scientist, as he is, and still less am I a relativist, as Dr. Einstein is, so I am bewildered in a world—physical or philosophical—still more a moral world—in which there is no point of departure, no goal of arrival and no landmark. Or should we say a world in which all the landmarks are moving all the time? If I am rowing a boat on a river, I can know whether I am making progress or losing, or holding my own, if there is a tree or a rock or a house or something on the bank by which I can gauge my movement. But the tree or the rock or the house must stand still! At least it must stand still relatively to the couple of inches of his precious space to answer that question. I confess I am no scientist, as he is, and still less am I a relativist, as Dr. Einstein is, so I am bewildered in a world—physical or philosophical—still more a moral world—in which there is no point of departure, no goal of arrival and no landmark. Or should we say a world in which all the landmarks are moving all the time? If I am rowing a boat on a river, I can know whether I am making progress or losing, or holding my own, if there is a tree or a rock or a house or something on the bank by which I can gauge my movement. But the tree or the rock or the house must stand still! At least it must stand still relatively to the couple of inches of his precious space to answer that question. I confess I am no scientist, as he is, and still less am I a relativist, as Dr. Einstein is, so I am bewildered in a world—physical or philosophical—still more a moral world—in which there is no point of departure, no goal of arrival and no landmark. Or should we say a world in which all the landmarks are moving all the time? If I am rowing a boat on a river, I can know whether I am making progress or losing, or holding my own, if there is a tree or a rock or a house or something on the bank by which I can gauge my movement. But the tree or the rock or the house must stand still! At least it must stand still relatively to the couple of inches of his precious space to answer that question. I confess I am no scientist, as he is, and still less am I a relativist, as Dr. Einstein is, so I am bewildered in a world—physical or philosophical—still more a moral world—in which there is no point of departure, no goal of arrival and no landmark. Or should we say a world in which all the landmarks are moving all the time? If I am rowing a boat on a river, I can know whether I am making progress or losing, or holding my own, if there is a tree or a rock or a house or something on the bank by which I can gauge my movement. But the tree or the rock or the house must stand still! At least it must stand still relatively to the couple of inches of his precious space to answer that question. I confess I am no scientist, as he is, and still less am I a relativist, as Dr. Einstein is, so I am bewildered in a world—physical or philosophical—still more a moral world—in which there is no point of departure, no goal of arrival and no landmark. Or should we say a world in which all the landmarks are moving all the time? If I am rowing a boat on a river, I can know whether I am making progress or losing, or holding my own, if there is a tree or a rock or a house or something on the bank by which I can gauge my movement. But the tree or the rock or the house must stand still! At least it must stand still relatively to the couple of inches of his precious space to answer that question. I confess I am no scientist, as he is, and still less am I a relativist, as Dr. Einstein is, so I am bewildered in a world—physical or philosophical—still more a moral world—in which there is no point of departure, no goal of arrival and no landmark. Or should we say a world in which all the landmarks are moving all the time? If I am rowing a boat on a river, I can know whether I am making progress or losing, or holding my own, if there is a tree or a rock or a house or something on the bank by which I can gauge my movement. But the tree or the rock or the house must stand still! At least it must stand still relatively to the couple of inches of his precious space to answer that question. I confess I am no scientist, as he is, and still less am I a relativist, as Dr. Einstein is, so I am bewildered in a world—physical or philosophical—still more a moral world—in which there is no point of departure, no goal of arrival and no landmark. Or should we say a world in which all the landmarks are moving all the time? If I am rowing a boat on a river, I can