

with such earnestness and fervor the sermons on faith and morals, he had so quickly fallen away again. 'Ah, father,' said he, 'I could manage the faith all right, but the morals bate me.' University students, like other people, may sometimes find the 'morals' of their religion stick them, and make them seek for excuses for throwing off its restraints; but no Catholic who has read and digested either Newman or Brownson can ever have any intellectual pretext for abandoning his faith.

## EDUCATION SYSTEM

### CATHOLICS' POSITION.

The following letter from the Right Rev. Dr. Cleary, Bishop of Auckland, appeared in the *Wellington Evening Post* of April 5:—

Sir,—The present discussion is concerned with the most radical and revolutionary change made in educational principles in all Christian history—namely, the banishment of religion, by Act of Parliament, from the school-training of children. We call this 'for short,' 'the secular system,' or 'the purely secular system.' The burden of justifying this comparatively recent and localised system naturally falls upon its promoters and supporters. It is an evil legacy of the anti-Christian phase of the French Revolution. The Continental and other enemies of revealed religion have ever since then supported the exclusion of religion from the school because of their view of life—because they do not believe in God, or in religion, or in duties connected with or arising out of religion, or in an immortal human soul and a life beyond the grave. Now, a view of life, of its origin, of its duties and destiny, constitutes what is, for convenience, termed a 'philosophy of life.' This term is one of the commonplaces of educationists all the world over. It is known to every tyro in pedagogy, or the art of teaching. And I naturally (though, as now appears, mistakenly) gave you the credit of supposing that the term was quite familiar to you as a journalistic authority on education and educational systems, and as a creator or moulder of public opinion thereupon.

The atheists and other unbelievers' plea for the banishment of religion from the school, though wrong-headed, is perfectly consistent and intelligible. But we have yet to learn on what principles professing and believing Christians join with unbelievers in demanding and defending this revolutionary departure from immemorial Christian ideals and sentiments. In this discussion you stand forth as their champion and expert. On you, therefore, devolves the duty of defending our secular system, and all that it necessarily involves, by an appeal to Christian truths and principles. Thus far, you have not even made a serious pretence of doing so. You have thus compelled me to state and restate, over and over again, and keep full square before the public eye, the true issues of the discussion, and all that is involved in your duty of justifying our secular system.

You complain, in your issue of March 29, that I 'ignore' your arguments. This supposes that there are arguments of your which (a) I was bound to notice, but which (b) I wrongfully ignored—that is, passed over or disregarded. Either they were, or they were not, arguments which you advanced for the radical justification, on Christian principles, of the legalised expulsion of religion from the school—which is the whole and sole issue between us. If you advanced arguments along this line, I have quite failed to discover any trace of them. If they were not, I was, by the rules of right discussion, quite entitled to ignore them. Now, the justification of the secular system, on Christian principles, plainly involves the following and other points, which I propose to keep full and clear in the public view:—

1. We all know the views and ideals of life on which atheists, and unbelievers generally, uphold the legalised proscription of religion from the child's school-preparation for life. But on what particular Christian truths and principles, on what view of life, of its origin, of its duties, of its destiny—briefly, on what philosophy of life—do you support the divorce of religion, by law, from its olden place in the schools? You have declined to argue this grand fundamental issue. I, therefore, fail to see, how I can have ignored your arguments in this connection. You have not even tried to show just how you can put up a defence of the secular system, on Christian lines, without dealing with this fundamental issue.

2. I invite you once more to show—if you can—just where and how any groundwork principles, on which you can logically defend our secular system differ (if at all) from the groundwork principles on which unbelievers base their demand for the banishment of religion by law, from the schools. I have not ignored your arguments in this connection, for the simple reason that you have not advanced any.

3. Once again: By what particular moral right, recognised by believing Christians, did our legislators expel religion, by Act of Parliament, from the place which it occupied in the training of children for the duties of life? Either such a moral right is claimed by you, or it is not

claimed. If it is not claimed, your case for the secular system, on Christian lines, collapses. If such a moral right is claimed, it is surely high time to state it clearly and establish it fully. I cannot find that you have done this. I fail, therefore, to see how I can have ignored your arguments in this vital connection.

4. Yet again: On what Christian or educational principle do you demand the exclusion of religion from the school-training of children for the duties of life, and at the same time retain religion in the home-training of children for the duties of life? I can find, in your writings, no argument in this connection either to deal with or to ignore. Nor have you shown how you can justify the secular system without solving this clamorous riddle.

5. Can you show how a body of legislators can kick religion out of the place it occupied in the schools, without at least implicitly professing the following (among other) sectarian religious dogmas: (a) that religion has no necessary or rightful place in school-training; (b) that all Christian history, teaching and tradition, demanding the essential union of religion and education, are a vast blunder, a scholastic heresy; (c) that a majority of law-makers has a moral right to banish religion from the schools by Act of Parliament? Or can you show by what particular moral right, acknowledged by believing Christians, a professedly 'neutral' State can impose the above-mentioned implied sectarian dogmas with enforced taxation of dissidents, on the public schools? Till I find that you have argued out this matter, I must deny the soft impeachment of having ignored your arguments in this connection.

6. It is your duty to prove, not to assume, that our secular system—or indeed, any school system—can possibly be 'neutral' in regard to religion. I deny it, and refer you to my letter of March 16. And when you have advanced facts or arguments in this or any other fundamental connection, you may be quite sure that I will gladly deal with them. I have been waiting for them all along.

The burden of proof is upon you. And these are only a few of the riddles which you have to read, if you are to justify, on Christian truths and principles, the banishment of religion from the schools. I have already (in your issue of March 22) dealt with a preliminary bundle of the unsupported assertions and undue assumptions which, I greatly fear, you have been mistaking for 'arguments.' The same remark applies to your expressions, 'the same old catechism,' 'logic-chopping,' 'logical subtlety,' and so on. These are known as 'question-begging epithets,' and, in works on logic, are mostly associated with lack of argument and an indefensible case.—Yours, etc.,

\* HENRY W. CLEARY, D.D.,

Bishop of Auckland.

March 31, 1911.

## TYRANNY AND ANARCHY IN PORTUGAL

### THE PRESS MUZZLED

### LAWLESS MOBS RAMPANT

In his last weekly conference with foreign correspondents, the Minister for Foreign Affairs in Portugal (writes the special correspondent of the *Catholic Times*) gravely informed his expectant audience that all was for the best in the best of all possible republics, that the financial situation was as flourishing as could be expected—this being true enough when one considers the circumstances of the case—and that the campaign of defamation against Portugal in the foreign papers had almost ceased. This campaign of defamation, it may be explained for those who do not understand the special signification attached by our republicans to such words as calumny, honor, generosity, honesty, toleration, and above all liberty, means the natural indignation expressed at long last by foreign journalists over the petty despotism of the set of

Little Tin Gods on Wheels

with which this unfortunate country has burdened itself. When foreign journalists in search of information in the days of the monarchy persistently interviewed only its enemies and spread in the whole world their modest opinion of their own value, and when later they sang the praises of the nascent republic to an extent which caused many Portuguese to hold in grave doubt their incorruptibility, the opinion of the press was constantly invoked here as the most conclusive argument in favor of a republican régime. Now that the glorification of assassins and other 'heroes' of much the same calibre, and the utter weakness of authority in defending property and many lawful interests besides draw forth a few mild protests or only the recital of facts as they were and not as the official notes represent them, it is a 'campaign of defamation.'

Of course in the country itself all expression of opinion is carefully muzzled. A new law renders one liable to prosecution if one dares to express an unfavorable opinion with regard to the duration of the present anarchy, or even to criticise the Ministers. Several papers have been suspended by the new press law, and to this Government

"Drunken at e'en, drouthy in the mornin'."—the best substitute for Glenlivet is Hondai-Lanka Tea.

"If ye brew weel, ye'll drink the better." Hondai-Lanka Tea well brewed is fit drink for princes.