

456457
— Hunt, Duane G. (Duane Garrison)

1884 - 1960

Misunderstood Truths

ABZ0442

c2

MISUNDERSTOOD TRUTHS

by

Duane G. Hunt.



MISUNDERSTOOD TRUTHS

by

Rt. Rev. Msgr. Duane G. Hunt,
Vicar General of the Diocese of Salt Lake.

Seven addresses delivered in the Catholic Hour, produced
by the National Council of Catholic Men, through the
courtesy of the National Broadcasting
Company and its associated stations.

(On Sundays from June 30 to August 11, 1935)

- I. Religious Half Truths.
- II. Fanaticism or Indifference.
- III. A Search for Truth.
- IV. The Confessional.
- V. The Constitution and the Supreme Court of Christianity.
- VI. Religion For Children.
- VII. Christianity and the Depression.



National Council of Catholic Men,
Producer of the Catholic Hour,
1312 Massachusetts Avenue,
Washington, D. C.

Printed and distributed by Our Sunday Visitor
Huntington, Indiana



IMPRIMATUR:

✠JOHN FRANCIS NOLL, D. D.,

Bishop of Fort Wayne.

RELIGIOUS HALF-TRUTHS

Address delivered on June 30, 1935

My subject for this afternoon is "Religious Half-Truths". I choose the subject because it discloses a most unfortunate characteristic of modern thinking, one for which I believe the Catholic religion has the saving point of view. By a half-truth, I mean a proposition, true enough in and by itself, but which because it goes only part way obscures the whole truth.

I'll give you a few illustrations. Suppose that some one says that food is helpful to the growth of the human body. The statement is true, of course; but obviously it is only a part of the truth. The whole truth is that food is necessary to the growth of the body. And to say merely that it is helpful is to imply that it is not necessary; and that is false.

Giving too much attention to man as an animal, by way of another illustration, often interferes with giving sufficient attention to man as a rational being. It goes without saying that man is an animal. It is proper enough, therefore, to study and analyze his body, his nervous system and brain, his physical inclinations and needs. No doubt, it is useful to note how man's animal instincts influence his conduct. But if exclusive attention is given to this part of man, the reality and spirituality of his soul are likely to be forgotten. Acceptance of a mere half-truth thus leads to rejection of the whole truth.

When a father counsels his son that "honesty is the best policy", he is indulging in the same type of confused thinking. It is true, no doubt, that hon-

esty is the best policy. Over a period of years in any line of endeavor a man will attain the greatest success if he is consistently and scrupulously honest. Do you not see, however, that the proposition is only a half-truth, even a dangerous half-truth?

When you adopt a so-called policy, you imply that there are two or more courses of action open to you. You imply that your decision for the one is merely a matter of good judgment. You cannot regard honesty in that way. A business man may adopt the policy of discounting his bills. An employer may have the policy of conferring with his workmen. Now to designate honesty as a policy is to bring it to the level of such things. As you can see, once your attention is called to it, honesty is far more than a mere policy.

Honesty is a matter of morality. It is a virtue commanded by Almighty God. God has forbidden man to lie or to steal; He has commanded man to love his neighbor as himself. To disobey is to commit sin. No man is free in conscience, therefore, to choose between honesty and dishonesty.

Perhaps you ask: "What difference does it make what motive a man has for being honest, so long as he is honest?" I reply by pointing out that when honesty is built up on an incorrect basis, sooner or later it will be undermined and weakened. If a man is honest merely because it pays him to be so, some day he may face a problem in which he judges that honesty will not pay. If so, he is likely to become dishonest.

Furthermore, it is most harmful to close the mind to the fundamental truths of human existence; to the truth that God is the Creator of man, for instance, and to the truth that to disobey God is to

condemn man's soul. Honesty should start with God and His laws. Then, as a supplementary appeal, it is proper and useful to add that it pays to obey God.

The same confusion is prevalent in regard to the Holy Scriptures. You may hear it said that the Bible is a wonderful book, that it contains lofty sentiments, and that much of its literature is beautiful and sublime. You may be told that it has been translated into nearly every language, and that it is immortal. You may be urged to read the Bible for the reason that it will comfort you in time of trouble, and help you to live a better life. Such statements are true, without question. And yet they are but half-truths. In a description of the Bible they go only a part of the way, and a wholly unimportant part at that.

Every one of these statements can be made of purely human books, with only differences of degree. You can say of Milton's "Paradise Lost" that it is a wonderful book, that it contains lofty sentiments, and that it has been translated into many languages. You can be urged to read it because it will give you noble ideas. Similar things can be said about Dante's "Inferno", about "Pilgrim's Progress", some of Shakespeare's plays, the "Imitation of Christ", and many other books. All of such literature is immortal.

But to describe the Bible in such terms is to leave out the one thing that should be said. No matter how strong are the adjectives or how extravagant the praise, if the Bible is compared with other books, it is robbed of its one claim to distinction. And, what is more important, tragically so, it is robbed of its means of holding the human soul.

The one thing that identifies the Bible is that it is the "Holy Scriptures". Its authors were divinely inspired to write it. It is the word of God. When properly interpreted, it brings truth to man. Start with these facts, and the greatest of praise can be added. But start from the other direction, with words of human praise, and the fact of divine inspiration is usually never reached.

The same confusion is found in the current appreciation of Christ, our divine Lord. Praising Him in eloquent language seems to be a favorite diversion of certain writers and speakers. They declare that Christ was the greatest man who ever lived; that He taught a most uplifting philosophy of life; that He preached and practiced the most perfect morality; that He went about doing good; and that, by His example of self-sacrifice, He helped all who came in contact with Him.

No matter how much deserved such praise may be, there is something defective about it. There is something lacking. It is only a half-truth. The point is that it can be and has been said about other men, with only a slight difference in degree of superlatives. Other men are praised for their nobility of character, for their devotion to principle, their complete self-sacrifice, their strict morality, and their helpfulness to others. If such things only can be said about Christ, then, He remains a mere man, and a sadly mistaken man at that.

The whole truth is that Christ is the Son of God, the Second Person of the Trinity, that He possesses the divine nature, and that He is God. True enough, He is man; that's one half. Equally true, He is God; and that is the other half.

It is because Christ is God that He differs

radically, not merely in degree, from all other men. It is because of this fact that no man can be compared with Him. It is because of this fact that all praise of Him, in mere human terms, is idle and meaningless. For a correct estimate, let us start with Christ as God, then we safely add the description of Christ as man.

For my last illustration, I cite the modern estimate of the Church. Over and over again you may hear or read opinions like this: "The Church is a great institution. It is doing fine things in the world. It exerts a helpful influence. It has been and is a great agency for civilizing the human race." Now these statements are true; every one of them can be proved. But they are only half-truths.

Every one of these statements can be made and is made about institutions which are merely human, again with differences of degree only. And when the Church is praised in merely human terms, being described as other institutions are described, the impression is created almost inevitably that it is merely human. Once that impression is formed, it is only a matter of time until the Church loses the respect and reverence of her people.

After all, there is one and only one important thing to say about the Church: it is divine. It was placed in the world by God Himself; it is His agent among men; it acts with His authority. These facts make the Church so unique, so distinct from all mere human societies, that any comparison with them is impossible.

My appeal, therefore, is for clear and accurate thinking about religion. As strongly as I can, I wish to condemn all half-truths, because of the harm

which they do. As a matter of fact, they do more harm than clear-cut falsehoods.

Let someone say to you that you have no soul, and you will protest at once. But let the same person skillfully hold your attention to yourself as an animal, and you are unsuspecting. You may allow yourself to be led along until you become a pure materialist; and then you cease to care.

Let someone recommend dishonesty as a good policy, and instinctively you will recognize that he is wrong. But let him recommend honesty as a policy, and you are inclined to agree. From that start you may be led gradually to forget that honesty is a matter of conscience.

Let someone frankly attack the Bible in your presence, and very likely you will argue with him. But if he begins by praising it, you are disarmed. You may listen sympathetically while he gives you a new point of view toward the Bible, one that eventually will destroy your respect for it.

Let someone declare that Christ is not divine, and you will tell him that he is mistaken. But if he praises Christ as a man, you are drawn toward him. You may not foresee that you are being led to think of Christ as a man only, and that you thus lose all faith in Him as God.

If someone informs you that the Church is an institution of evil you are likely to protest. But if he praises the Church, comparing it favorably with all other institutions, you agree with him. You are caught off guard. You may fail to see that his words of praise are changing your estimate of the Church. You may not foresee that before long you will lose all respect for it, and your Christian faith as well.

It is the same with other half-truths. They are dangerous. Against them, the God-given safeguard is the Christian religion. Christianity is to be respected, therefore, not merely as a guide to the proper worship of God, but as a teacher of truth. To this teacher, everyone of us should be willing to come, in humility, in reverence, and with eagerness to learn truth.

FANATICISM OR INDIFFERENCE

Address Delivered on July 7, 1935

Perhaps nothing illustrates more clearly the inclination of human nature to go from one extreme to another than the pendulum of the old-fashioned clock. You know that if the pendulum is pulled sharply to one side and then released it will swing over to the other side, after which in proper time it will swing back again. Now, human nature in certain respects is like the pendulum. If, through certain incorrect influence it is pulled sharply to one side, it is sure to fly back and swing over to the other side.

It is to the present back swing of the pendulum away from religious fanaticism that I direct your thoughts this afternoon. Not so very long ago the religious life of the people of this country was affected by fanaticism. I do not mean the worship of God, or the cultivation of virtues of faith, hope, and charity. By fanaticism I mean a narrow, unreasonable, and mistaken expression of religious zeal.

In colonial days people were often driven away from their homes because of religious irregularity. The right to vote and other privileges of citizenship occasionally were limited to the member of the official church. In later days, when many of the laws had become obsolete, the narrowness survived in other forms. Many a time employment has been denied; many a time the door to social or political opportunity has been closed, because of religious fanaticism. Occasionally persons became so fanati-

cal as to think that the members of other churches were not and could not be good people.

The pendulum was sure to swing away from that extreme. At first the movement was a slow one. Of late years it has become more rapid. At the present time, throughout most sections of our country, certainly in the cities and educational centers, there remain but few evidences of fanaticism.

Very probably some Catholics and Jews listening to me will be inclined, at first thought, to question the accuracy of my statement. They would remind me that the Ku Klux Klan was in our midst as late as ten years ago. They would insist that the American people still have a long way to go before they reach perfect toleration.

True enough; but that is a different subject. I am not discussing persecution versus toleration; I am discussing fanaticism versus the reaction away from fanaticism. The attitude of the Klan, for instance, was not primarily one of religious fanaticism. The members of the Klan, for the most part, were not concerned about the eternal salvation of Catholics and Jews. They were not trying to persuade Catholics and Jews to join other churches. As a matter of fact, they were not thinking very much about churches and religion.

The Klan movement was negative; it was destructive. Now, the fanaticism of which I speak was positive and, in intention, though not in effect, it was constructive. When the members of one church discriminated against the members of another they did so out of love and zeal for their own church. Mistakenly thinking that they would promote the interests of their own church they were unfair with

their neighbors of other churches. It is this attitude that I call fanaticism.

As I said, for the most part the pendulum has swung away from that kind of thing. The trouble is that it did not stop in the middle. When it left one extreme it continued to move toward the other. Society is now moving toward complete indifference to religion. Let it be admitted that many of the colonists of the eighteenth century were entirely too intent on regulating their neighbor's conduct. Their descendants of today, at the other extreme, seem to be wholly unconcerned about not only their neighbor's conduct but about their own as well. They seem to be unconcerned as to whether conduct is right or wrong, moral or immoral. Whereas many of the colonists were unreasonably set against wholesome pleasures on Sunday, their descendants of today are so intent on Sunday pleasures as to forget to worship God. No doubt, many of the colonists used wrong means in trying to compel others to accept their creeds. Their modern descendants make a greater mistake; for the most part they care nothing about a creed, either for others or for themselves.

There are two hundred different churches and religious organizations in this country. Their doctrines are mutually contradictory. Each of them has at least one doctrine or practice which is considered wrong by the others. And yet, in the face of such clear differences, the so-called broad point of view, which is now being cultivated, assumes that these churches and religions are all equally good. It assumes that differences are of no importance.

The whole point of view is absurd. It presumes that there is no difference between truth and error.

It presumes that there is no difference, for instance, between believing in God and not believing in God, between accepting the divinity of Christ and denying the divinity of Christ, between believing in the inspiration of the Bible and denying its inspiration, between believing in the necessity of baptism and thinking it is unnecessary, between believing that God condemns divorce and thinking that divorce is permissible. I could go on indefinitely.

To disregard the difference between truth and error means to disregard truth. And to disregard truth means to lose religion. The very first step in religion is to make an act of faith; and that demands the truth of something to have faith in. It is inevitable, therefore, that with our so-called broad attitude there has come the loss of religion.

When a man says that he respects all churches alike, and wishes them all well, you can be sure that he has very little or no religion. He has spread himself out so wide that he has no depth. When a man says that his religion is the brotherhood of man, you can be sure that he has all but forgotten the fatherhood of God. When a man says that he has worked out his own religion for himself, and that it is broader than that of the churches, you can be sure that he is talking merely to impress you with his superiority.

Now, unfortunately, such things are being said by a large and ever-growing class of our people. Look about you; make your own observations. I ask you: What does God mean to the majority of your fellow citizens? How much do they worship Him? How much do they even think about Him? And, to pursue the questions further, if people think very little about God, how much do they think

about His commands? And if they don't think about His commands, how much are they likely to obey Him?

Here we come at last to the ultimate effects of indifference to religion. God is forgotten; His commands are ignored; more and more generally, people do as they please. Hence, the ever-increasing surrender to physical inclinations; the increasing criminality, robbery, kidnapping, and murders; the prevailing sex madness; the growing disregard for all law; the multiplying indication of communism; the alarming signs of social decadence.

If you have followed me thus far you expect me to offer some solution to the problem. You expect me to point out how we can avoid going to one or other of the two extremes. The solution is simple. It lies in making a fundamental distinction, the distinction between a doctrine and a man. It is the distinction between a false belief and the man who honestly holds the false belief. There can be no such thing as toleration of error, but there must be and is toleration of the man who is in error.

Truth demands, for instance, that we believe in the existence of God. Atheism is false and must be condemned. Very well. But does it follow that we should deny to the atheist his rights? I believe in the divinity of Christ; no doubt, many of you do, also. We must condemn, therefore, the belief that Christ is only human. It is false. But what about the many persons who hold to that false belief? Shall we discriminate against them?

I believe in every article of the Apostles' Creed. Perhaps you are with me. We must logically condemn every proposition and opinion contradictory to the Apostles' Creed. Very well. But what about

our neighbors who hold those contradictory beliefs? Shall we try to drive them out of the community? Shall we ignore their rights?

It goes without saying that we should preach our religion. We believe it to be true. Besides, we have the commands of God to preach it to all people. And we believe that the world will become better exactly in proportion to the acceptance of the true faith. So there are sufficient and excellent reasons for us to preach our faith openly to the world. By all means let us do so. Furthermore, let us live up to the precepts of our religion. By the perfection of our lives let us demonstrate that our religion is what it is, the one true religion.

Such an attitude is the truly Christian attitude. It is the one taught by the Catholic Church. I recommend it to you, because it gives us the basis for loving God and neighbor at the same time. It gives the basis for being truly religious and truly neighborly. It saves us from the dangerous swing of the pendulum from one unfortunate extreme to the other.

A SEARCH FOR TRUTH

Address Delivered on July 14, 1935

Today's discourse is going to be altogether personal; and I must begin by explaining why. Naturally I am not under any illusion that my listeners, save perhaps a few close friends, will be interested in my personal history. However, I am going to tell you about my quest for religious truth, because it will exhibit desires and motives which, I believe, are common to all men.

The convert to the Catholic religion is often misjudged. The sufficiency of his information about Catholicism is doubted, friends usually fearing that he is doomed later in life to be disappointed. It is thought at times that he is attracted by some appeal which is only superficial. It is thought, too, that in embracing the Catholic religion he makes a humiliating surrender of intellectual independence. That such is not true, I think that I can prove from my own case, which is fairly ordinary and typical.

I was born and raised in a good non-Catholic home, my parents being practical and devout Christians. From the very first I was taken to church, to Sunday school, and to various church services. At an early age I was introduced to the Bible and grew up with profound respect for it. In time, I was sent to a good Christian college, where at first I continued the religious habits of earlier days.

There came a time, however, when for reasons which would be hard to state, I found myself becoming critical about religion. I recall sitting back in prayer meetings, with a rather detached attitude, making uncomplimentary observations about the

extemporaneous prayers and the testimonies given by my associates. The emotionalism of revival meetings irritated me, as did also the personal work by which Christian students tried to win over their non-Christian fellows. In the scheme of things as it existed, I felt more and more uncomfortable and out of place.

Before long I was framing very definite questions about religion. What was I to believe? What was I to do? How was I to worship? From what source could I acquire truth? These became burning questions; they absorbed my thoughts and made me unhappy. By my own inquiries, I could learn the truths of science, of history, and of other natural subjects; but it seemed to me that for religious truths I must turn to God. And how could I do so?

Eventually I had to work out an analysis of my problem. Starting with my beliefs in the existence of God and that God is the Author of truth, I figured out that there were only three ways in which God might instruct me. First, God might in some mysterious way teach me directly. Second, He might inspire certain chosen men to write a book, through the pages of which He would speak to me. Third, He might appoint a group of men, teach truth to them, and then authorize them to teach me.

Concerning the first way, I could not find the slightest proof that God had revealed truth to me directly. And it seemed unreasonable to expect Him to do so. If God should reveal religious truth directly to me, He would do the same to others. And if He should reveal truth directly to individuals merely in response to their honest petitions, then, He must have done so to the millions of devout persons in the various religions throughout the world. But if

that were the case, then, God had revealed contradictory doctrines to different persons. This, of course, was wholly absurd.

The second possibility was a book. Instinctively I turned to the Bible, which I had been reared to respect. I had always assumed that it was the word of God. But when I critically examined the subject I became uncertain. First of all, I was aware that there were many different interpretations of Bible texts. Different Christian denominations drew conflicting doctrines from the same chapter, even from the same verse. Which interpretation and which doctrine were correct?

To make the matter worse, it wasn't long before I raised the question: How did I know that God had inspired the writers of the Bible? I was told that some of the early Christians decided that it was inspired. But how did they know? Did God tell them?

I was told that if I would only read the Bible devoutly, its inspiration would become evident to me. I followed that advice. There were certain passages of the Bible which I admired greatly, but I certainly could not be sure that they were inspired. How was I to know? What test should I apply? At the same time, there were other passages of the Bible which did not appeal to me at all. Was I to regard the former inspired and the latter not inspired? If so, I would be changing the Bible to suit myself.

The third possibility was that God had appointed certain men as agents to instruct me. Presumably, they would be the ministers of some church. But of what church? And how were they to be identified? Surely, if God had appointed

agents, they would be clearly marked so as to be recognized. I knew of no such men. Furthermore, if they were to teach as agents of God, they must be infallible. And where was I to find such men?

The more I pondered over such problems, the more confused I became. It seemed hopeless to try to find God's truth, infallibly taught. Problems had created doubts; doubts were destroying faith. I was slowly but surely drifting away from the religion of my youth.

It was in this frame of mind that I was given some books explaining the Catholic religion. I remember clearly the scorn and contempt with which I began to read them. I was so sure that the Catholic religion was wrong that I felt perfectly confident of finding a host of errors and contradictions. In reading the books, however, I discovered that the Catholic Church at least had answers to my questions. While I did not take them seriously at first, I noted and remembered them. I remember at one time saying this to myself: "It is a shame that the Catholic Church is so terribly bad, because its arguments are so logical."

You see, I had heard so many awful things about the Catholic Church that I was prejudiced. I had been taught to believe that, while the Catholic Church for a few centuries was holy and faithful, she later became corrupt, with bishops and popes falling into terrible scandals. The moment, therefore, that I thought seriously about the Catholic religion I had to weigh such accusations.

As well as I could, I did so. To my great surprise, I found that the accusations against the Church could not be proved. I mention one illustration, as typical of the others. A friend gave me a pamphlet

in which the author tried to prove that St. Peter was never in Rome. He asserted most confidently, in light of his argument, that the primary claims of the Catholic Church were false. I read the pamphlet, and then read some Catholic literature on the same subject. I found that the Catholic Church could support her claim by a mass of evidence, from the best of non-Catholic historians. The result was, of course, that I had more respect for the Catholic Church after the incident than I had before. It was precisely the same with every subject I looked into, whether it was criticism of the confessional, of indulgences, of the Knights of Columbus, of Catholic education, or of anything else.

At one stage in my floundering about I began to doubt the divinity of Christ. And I deliberately magnified that doubt because I wished to keep out of the Catholic Church. That may sound strange to you, but it is true. I assured myself that the Church must be wrong, and that it must have fallen into false doctrines and evil ways. Such being the case, evidently God had not protected the Church against failure. But it was only a matter of history that Christ had promised that His Church would not fail. If it had failed, then, Christ had not protected it. He had failed in His promise. If so, obviously, He was not divine, but was only a man, and a fanatical man at that.

In my desire to remain outside the Catholic Church, I was caught in the trap of my own prejudices. If I accepted the charge that the Church had failed, I was doomed to reject the divinity of Christ. If I did that, I was through with Christianity and every Christian church. If so, where could I look for truth? Yet if I accepted

the divinity of Christ, I was headed for the Catholic Church.

Sooner or later, I was compelled to study seriously the subject of Christ's divinity. As the result of that study, to make a long story short, I had to admit that the divinity of Christ was demonstrated, and that I could not honestly reject it. And then I was brought up squarely against the Catholic Church again. Christ was divine; He established His Church and guaranteed that it would not fail; from those facts there was no escape; therefore, He had protected His Church against failure. Therefore, His Church was still in the world, teaching truth infallibly. Try as much as I would, I could not close my mind to that conclusion.

To escape from the inevitable, I read the worst books I could find against the Catholic Church. I went most regularly to other churches, I taught in Sunday school, and identified myself with church societies; all with the hope that I could keep myself satisfied and happy outside the Catholic Church.

It was during a post-graduate course in law school that I finally made up my mind that I must be and would be honest with myself, and that since logic led me unmistakably to the Catholic Church, I would follow. I could not be a mental coward. I came into the Catholic Church, therefore, because I could not stay out.

The Catholic Church fitted in perfectly with my original analysis. Evidently God did not reveal truth to me directly. No doubt He had revealed truth to the writers of the Bible, but so that the reader would not be led into error He had appointed the officials of His Church to interpret the Bible correctly. The officials of the Church were closely

marked as the agents of God, because they were the successors of the Apostles, of those men whom Christ had personally appointed to teach infallibility. They were, as I discovered, the bishops of the Catholic Church.

THE CONFESSIONAL

Address Delivered on July 21, 1935

It is probably unnecessary for me to inform you that among non-Catholic people there is widespread misunderstanding of the Catholic religion. This misunderstanding is the cause of harm, both to non-Catholics and to Catholics. In my address of this afternoon, I propose to deal with that misunderstanding as it pertains to the Confessional. I do so because of all Catholic doctrines and practices those pertaining to the Confessional are perhaps the most generally misunderstood.

The usual criticism of the confessional is that it is superficial. Some non-Catholics seem to judge that the confessional makes the forgiveness of sin a mere formality, that it does not touch the soul or the conscience of the penitent, and that it does not compel a reform in morals. A favorite type of criticism is to allege that a Catholic, after committing any sin that he wishes to, may go to confession Saturday night, attend Mass the next morning, and then go back again to his sins. This criticism is accompanied usually by illustrations. The speaker, however he or she is, refers to certain individual Catholics who, it is claimed, are public sinners. It is pointed out that they drink intemperately, or that they cheat and rob in business, or that they indulge in sexual irregularities. "And yet", the speaker continues, "they go to confession, they go to Mass and they pose as good Catholics. Is it not evident that they are hypocrites and that the confessional not only does not check, but even encourages, their hypocrisy?"

Such an accusation is wholly unjust. Every Catholic knows that unless he is truly sorry for his sins he is not and cannot be forgiven. He may easily deceive the priest in his confession, but unless he is truly sorry, the words of the priest mean nothing. After all, the forgiveness of sin comes from Almighty God. The priest is only the agent, the channel if you please, through which God forgives. God cannot be deceived. And He does not forgive sins to any man unless the man is truly sorry. Now to be truly sorry the penitent must resolve never to sin again. It is not enough to express that resolution; the resolution itself must be in the very soul of the penitent.

All of this is simply a matter of fact. To prove it to you I shall not consult text books of theology. Neither shall I draw information from books intended for non-Catholic readers; you might readily think that they were written to give a good impression. For a similar reason I do not quote Catholic papers, or even sermons. I go to a source which you cannot help but respect. It is the Catechism, out of which Catholic children are taught their religion. It is the purest kind of application of Catholic doctrine. The Catechism, from which I quote, is the Baltimore Catechism used throughout this country. I shall read to you a few answers taken from the chapters on "Sorrow" and "Confession". To save time I do not read the questions, which precede in each particular case the answers.

"Sorrow for sin is a hatred of sin, and a true grief of the soul for having offended God, with a firm purpose of sinning no more."

"The sorrow we should have for our sins should be interior, supernatural, universal and sovereign."

“When I say that our sorrow should be interior I mean that it should come from the heart, and not merely from the lips.”

“By a firm purpose of sinning no more I mean a fixed resolve, not only to avoid all mortal sin, but also its near occasions.”

“By near occasions of sin I mean all the persons, places, and things that may easily lead us into sin.”

“The chief qualities of a good confession are three; it must be humble, sincere, and entire.”

“Our confession is humble when we accuse ourselves of our sins with a deep sense of shame and sorrow for having offended God.”

“Our confession is sincere, when we tell our sins honestly and truthfully, neither exaggerating nor excusing them.”

“Our confession is entire when we tell the number and kinds of our sins and the circumstances which change their nature.”

In light of these answers I ask you this: Suppose that you were to state the kind of sorrow requisite for the forgiveness of sin; do you think you could do any better than the Church has done in the catechism? Suppose you were to try to state what should be required in confession; do you think you could do any better than has been done in the catechism? In other words, when all the wrong impressions are brushed aside, and when you come in contact with the Catholic doctrine as it is really taught and believed, you find that it meets perfectly every demand of reason.

What is a man to gain, therefore, by pretending in confession to be sorry, if he intends to go back to his sins? Nothing at all. The only reason he goes to confession is to obtain peace of conscience. If he

lies, he defeats his own purpose. He only commits another sin, one which postpones still further the desired peace of conscience.

Many non-Catholics seem to think that there is some external benefit to be gained in the confessional. On this assumption, they judge that some Catholics go to confession, as if it were a ceremony or formality, without regard to the state of their souls. Please believe me when I tell you that such is not the case. There is no external purpose. No one goes to confession in order to impress someone else, to create respect among the members of his family, to raise his standing in the community, or to gain the esteem of the clergy. Nothing could be further from the mind of the penitent.

It is said, however, that some Catholics, after leaving the confessional, soon fall back again into the same old sins. Does not this fact prove that they were insincere in their confession? Does it not prove that they intended to sin again? Not at all. It proves merely that they were weak. Unfortunately, human nature is weak. And society, by its alluring temptations to sin, makes the weakness worse.

It is to be remembered that Christ came into the world to save those who are weak, just as truly as those who are strong. The weaklings cannot be expelled. We cannot say to them that until they reform their lives they must not come to Mass. Precisely the contrary; we urge them to come to Mass as the means of obtaining from God the spiritual help when they need. And we do so no matter how much the Church and her people may be criticized by those who do not understand.

You may ask, however: "Does not the confes-

sional play up to the weakness of human nature? Does it not increase it?" To the contrary, the confessional builds up strength. It makes the forgiveness of sin more difficult than it otherwise would be. It is not sufficient for the Catholic merely to be sorry for his sins and to promise in his own heart not to sin again. In addition to this sorrow, he must go to confession. He must humble himself in the presence of the priest. He must admit his weakness, something that no one likes to do. By doing what is a difficult task, he gains strength.

The confessional helps, moreover, because of the advice it brings to the penitent. The priest is bound to advise the penitent to avoid those persons who tempt him to sin and those places wherein he is tempted. And when a penitent, after repeated falls, goes back to these same persons and places, the priest will finally refuse him absolution and will forbid him to receive Communion. This very powerful check, in the long run, will stop anyone in his course of sin, if only he keeps his faith. And if it is not applied soon enough in many cases, it is because too much severity would be worse than too much kindness, and would cause far greater evils.

What about the charge of hypocrisy? Hypocrisy means that a man pretends to be what he is not. Now the Catholic sinner does not pretend to be anything but a sinner. If ever you have the opportunity to talk with such a Catholic ask him about himself and his religion. He will tell you frankly enough that he is a Catholic, but a very poor one. And if he is humble about himself in conversation, you can be sure that he is even more humble in the confessional. Weakling he may be, but hypocrite he is not.

The non-Catholic is likely to think that when such a person goes to Mass he is guilty of hypocrisy. Nothing could be further from the truth. In going to Mass, the Catholic does not pose as a saint. There is no pretense, no acting. He is what he is; a weak human being, admitting that he needs God's help.

Over a period of years, anyone who goes to confession regularly will be saved in his fight against sin. As exceptions to that rule you may think at once of particular persons. Concerning them, however, you may not be fully informed. You may know something about them for several years, but usually not for their whole lives. You can not foresee, therefore, what is likely to happen. Furthermore, you often take for granted that the man you criticize goes to confession, whereas, without your knowing about it, he may have kept himself away for years. Actually, there are very few exceptions to the rule which I stated. As the means of strengthening human nature, the confessional is ideal. It should be ideal because it was placed in the world by God, who Himself created human nature.

THE CONSTITUTION AND SUPREME COURT OF CHRISTIANITY

Address Delivered on July 28, 1935

On hearing the announcement of my subject, "The Constitution and the Supreme Court of Christianity", many of you perhaps are a bit surprised. Perhaps you haven't thought about Christianity in such a legal way as the subject implies. I hope to make clear to you that Christianity must have, and as a matter of fact does have, its constitution and its supreme court.

Every organized society has its constitution. It contains the purpose for which the society exists. To interpret the Constitution, some kind of a court is likewise necessary. The nature of the court differs, of course, with the nature of the organization.

For the purpose of comparison I call attention in particular to the method used by our own Supreme Court in arriving at its decisions. To learn what the Constitution means, the Court studies not only the Constitution but also, and most especially, its own previous decisions. These are carefully recorded and form an invaluable guide to the meaning of the Constitution.

With these preliminary ideas before you I wish now to tell you that Christianity has its constitution and its supreme court. The constitution was given by Christ Himself. It contains the purpose for which the Christian religion was organized. It contains its principles and ideals, its doctrines and its practices.

The constitution of Christianity was not written. Christ did not write it; He entrusted it to the mem-

ory of His Apostles. During a period of three years He instructed them orally in the principles of Christianity. Furthermore, He did not command them to write. There is not a single indication that He commanded His Apostles to put the constitution into a written form. On the other hand, He did command them to preach, to teach orally.

Now it so happens that many of the things that Christ said and did were later recorded by some of His Apostles and their disciples. "Do not these books", it may be asked, "together with the writings of the Hebrew prophets contain the constitution of Christianity?" Evidently not. So far as the Old Testament writings are concerned, they were not intended to outline the principles of the religion which Christ was to establish. They record some of God's revelations, to be sure. And they teach sound doctrines; but they do not contain the constitution of Christianity.

Neither does the New Testament. Christianity functioned according to its constitution long before the New Testament was written. The first book was written not earlier than eight or ten years after Christ. And during those years the life of the Church was complete.

As a matter of fact, Christianity began to function as an organized society immediately after Christ left the world; apparently within a few hours after His Ascension the Apostles met together to select a successor to Judas and to restore the organization to its original strength. The constitution of Christianity thus was known and in use for eight or ten years before the New Testament was begun, for over a half of a century before it was completed; incidentally, over three and a half cen-

turies before all of the parts of the Bible were put together and identified as the Bible.

The question may be asked: "When the books of the New Testament were finally written did they not then supplant the oral constitution?" They did not; and for the very excellent reason that they were not written for that purpose. Not one of the writers of the New Testament intended to record the constitution of Christianity. Each wrote for a particular purpose, to convert a friend, for instance, or to instruct the people of a certain community, or some similar purpose.

Furthermore, it is evident from the books themselves that they are not complete. They furnish clear proof that the complete teachings of Christ were in an oral, not written, form. As a matter of fact, it was by virtue of the oral constitution that the books of the Bible were recognized. Spurious and counterfeit books appeared, along with the inspired books. The Church had to decide which books belonged in the Bible and which did not belong. And in order to make that decision, the Church had to consult the oral Constitution.

Like that of other societies, the constitution of the Christian religion requires a court to preserve and interpret it. Not merely because it was originally oral and unwritten; it would be the same if it had been wholly written. For as you know, the part of the Gospel that is written is very difficult to interpret. So much so that it has given rise to all manner of conflicting interpretations.

Up to this point I have discussed the nature of the Christian constitution and the necessity of a supreme court. Let us now look for this court. Where is it? Who are its judges? Suppose we

speculate for a moment. If we tried to describe this ideal court, we should say, I believe, that it would be composed of those men who were closest to Christ, His Apostles, those who knew from their own hearing what He taught. Then we should have them choose new members of the court, one by one, to become their successors. We should have this process continued indefinitely.

Such a court is precisely what Christ has given us. He made the Apostles the first court of Christianity. He gave to them final authority in all matters. It was their duty to pass judgment on all questions of doctrine, of government, and of worship. As they died, one by one, those remaining chose new members, to whom they handed on the teachings of Christ. The new members in turn chose other successors. And this process has been going on for nineteen centuries. The ideal court which our judgment demands thus really exists and has existed all of these centuries.

Who are the officials? They are the bishops of the Church. Although no longer called Apostles, for that name is reserved for those whom Christ chose personally, they are united in a line of unbroken continuity with the Apostles themselves.

When a question comes up for decision their procedure is similar to that of the Supreme Court of the United States. That is to say, they consult their own previous decisions. Questions began to arise about the meaning of the constitution even in the first generation. Decisions were given by the Apostles and then handed on to their successors. Guided by these decisions, later bishops formulated new decisions. Before long most of the decisions were put into a written form. They are to be

found today, particularly in the decisions of Church councils, and in the pronouncements of the popes. They have been accumulating through the nineteen centuries of Church history.

When a question arises about the constitutionality of a law of the United States, what attitude do you and I take? Have you ever presumed to say that a law is or is not constitutional? You may express an opinion, but you know that it is only an opinion. In every case you look to the Supreme Court for final decision. The Constitution means what the Supreme Court says that it means. And why? Not merely because the judges of the court are well qualified to interpret the Constitution, but, and this is the one essential point, because they are officially appointed for that precise purpose. Even if they were not so well qualified as others, we should accept their judgment and theirs only.

Now should not our attitude toward the Gospel of Christ be similar? Questions arise: What are we to believe and do? Is baptism necessary? How is it to be administered? Is the Bible the word of God? Should we pray for the dead? Was Christ born of a virgin? Is it premissable to venerate the Saints? Is matrimony a Sacrament? Is divorce permissible? You can think of scores of such questions. How are we to find the correct answers? From our own opinion? Our opinion about the Constitution of the United States would not determine anything. Why, then, should it determine anything about the constitution of Christianity? No matter how honest we may be or how intellectual, we are not qualified to pronounce judgment. We are not appointed by Almighty God for that purpose. Shall we consult others? By all means; but whom shall

we consult? And the answer is simple: We should consult the supreme court of Christianity. The members of the court are not only well qualified but are divinely appointed for the express purpose of interpreting the constitution.

There is one final word to be said about this court. Its decisions are protected by the supernatural power of God, in which respect it differs from all other courts. The Supreme Court of the United States can make mistakes; even so, its decisions are law. The supreme court of Christianity, however, cannot make a mistake, not when interpreting officially the Gospel of Christ. It is so important that the Gospel be stated correctly that God Himself has guaranteed that His Church would never teach error. To this court and its decisions I invite your attention and your study.

RELIGION FOR CHILDREN

Address delivered on August 4, 1935

It seems to be difficult for the American people to understand that our civilization, with its culture, brilliance, and high standard of living, was built up over a period of centuries by a process of definite instruction. They seem to have forgotten that back of our advancement has been the teaching of religious truth, and that back of the teaching, was respect for it. We have come now to a stage in the civilization thus produced where enthusiasm for the teaching of religious truth is on the wane. Very definitely, therefore, we are turning back upon our own steps.

One phase of this retrogression, perhaps the most serious phase, is the neglect of religious training for children. To this subject, I invite your attention this evening.

To show you how unreasonable is this modern point of view, I ask you to consider a few parallel illustrations. Imagine a father talking to his son as follows: "Son, I want you to grow up free from any and all beliefs about your country. You may be told that you are an American citizen, that you have certain obligations to your country, such as voting for good officials, obeying its laws, and fighting for it, if necessary. Pay no attention to such ideas. When you grow up there will be plenty of time for you to decide whether you wish to be a citizen or not, and whether you have duties or not. For the present you must believe nothing."

Imagine a mother telling her daughter this: "You may hear some one say that sugar is good food and

that bichloride of mercury is poison. Do not believe such things. If you wish to think that sugar is food, use it, of course. But if you prefer bichloride of mercury, all right, again; use it. You are free to believe and do whatever you please."

Imagine a teacher in school saying this to your child: "I do not tell you that the sun rises in the east; perhaps some day you will prefer to believe that it rises in the west. I do not tell you that the earth exerts a physical attraction, known as the force of gravity, by which you would sink in water. No; some day you may wish to think that you can walk on water. You must be free to do so."

Such advice would be no worse than saying to a child: "Do not pay any attention to religion. You are too young. When you grow up you can decide for yourself whether you want a religion and, if so, which one you want. If, then, you decide that God exists and that He established a church, very well. Act accordingly. But if you decide to the contrary, very well, also. It makes no difference what you decide. The only important thing is that at present you must believe nothing." Precisely such advice, in one form or another, is now being given to the children of the country. It is being defended in the name of justice, as if the teaching of truth were unjust.

Where is the injustice? In teaching truth to the child, or in withholding truth from the child? Would it not be unjust if schools failed to teach the truths of mathematics, of history, of language, of science? Would it not be unjust if parents failed to teach their children the obligations of citizenship? Is it not the duty of parents to teach their children how to care for their bodies? Is it not their duty

to teach the precepts of morality, and all other essential truths?

The questions answer themselves, of course. Yet when we apply this same reasoning to religion, millions of our people, even educated folks, say: "No! Truth in all other lines should be taught to children: but not in religion. To teach religion is to handicap the child, for it destroys his freedom." Let me remind you: knowledge of his American citizenship doesn't destroy the child's freedom; knowledge of the multiplication table doesn't destroy freedom. Neither does knowledge of geography, or of history, or of languages, or of morality. As a matter of fact, all knowledge increases freedom.

Why, then, should any one think that religious knowledge destroys freedom? It cannot do so. Precisely to the contrary; it makes for freedom. The man who believes in God, not the atheist, is free; the latter is held down by error. In exploring the world of ideas about him, in reasoning about any subject, he is handicapped at every turn. Similarly, with every other religious truth.

Against religion for children, one error in particular must be noted. Apparently it is believed by many that "when they grow up" children will choose their religion. Can any notion be more foolish? Look about you; see for yourself. How many persons do you know who chose their religion as adults? Very few. Throughout the country you might find one in every ten thousand.

There must be noted, also, the peculiar assumption that it is possible for children, untrained in religion, to grow up with open minds. It seems to be thought that if left alone their minds will remain blank and unprejudiced. But is this true? When

parents fail to teach religion, are their children free? Free from positive beliefs in favor of religion, yes; but free from beliefs against religion, no. You may withhold positive teaching in favor of religion, but, if you do, your child will grow up positively inclined against religion. The world will see to that. The society in which you live will leave its mark. And when that imaginary moment comes, according to your expectations, for your child to choose a religion, he will be hopelessly prejudiced against it.

This is particularly true in our country at the present time. There exists a powerful anti-religious influence in every department of life. You meet it in current literature; you meet it in art; in social customs; in business; in politics; in recreation, and, also, most unfortunately, in education.

If I single out for special comment the anti-religious influence of our modern education, I do not mean to criticize the teachers, at least not the teachers in secondary schools. The fault is not with them, it is with the system. The fault lies in the movement started early last century by which education has been separated from religion.

Consider the average high school or college, for instance. Not only does it not teach religion or even the needs of religion, but, with its never-ending social affairs, athletics, plays, and other activities, to say nothing of the curriculum itself, it so fills the life of the student as to suggest that life is complete without religion. The system, divorced as it is from religion, does not warn the young people that something more important than all of the interests of school is lacking. Worse still, in certain higher institutions of learning it permits and even en-

courages the ridicule of religion as childish and out-of-date.

So it is that when our young people come to maturity today they do not turn to religion. With nearly unbroken unanimity they demonstrate the bad judgment of their parents, who neglected to teach them in youth. They demonstrate, moreover, the folly of all the talk about freedom. Educated according to the philosophy that they must be left free to think and believe as they please, they come on the stage of life with minds apparently incapable of thinking about religion. The philosophy which was to have given them open minds has most effectually closed their minds. Far from being free, they are mental slaves, slaves to habits of thought.

If, then, you wish your sons and daughters to practice religion when they become men and women, you yourself must teach it to them. You cannot depend upon the school. You cannot depend upon anything or anyone else. You must assume the responsibility. And you must begin when your children are children. There is no other way. And if you do not teach them, the only logical explanation is that you wish them to grow up without religion.

Concerning this sort of religious education of children there are three well defined stages. First, there is the stage in which children are taught positively the truths of religion. Second, there is the stage in which children are neglected, being left to the influence of non-religious schools and social customs. Third, there is the stage in which children are taught positively that religion is false.

The first stage is that idealized by the Catholic Church. It characterized the program by which the Church built up civilization wherever she carried

the Gospel. To this stage belong all progress and advancement.

The second stage is the beginning of the decline. Parents follow the path of least resistance, neglect the training of their children, and allow them to drift with the evil tendencies of the world. This is the stage of weakness, indifference, and laziness. It is the stage into which most of the people of our country have now come.

The third and last stage marks the collapse. It is illustrated by Russia of late years and even more recently by Mexico, where not only is religious instruction forbidden but atheism frankly and officially taught. In this country we have not as yet come to this last stage. But we are gradually preparing for it. Each year brings to adult life an increasing number of citizens who are mentally incapable of resisting the propaganda of atheism. Unless the tendency can be halted, the collapse of our society is certain. And when it comes, the blame must be placed squarely upon those of us who now neglect the religious training of their children.

CHRISTIANITY AND THE DEPRESSION

Address delivered on August 11, 1935

Listening to me tonight, no doubt, are many who five and six years ago enjoyed economic prosperity. You had good and comfortable homes; you had what you considered secure investments; you had steady work, for which you were well paid or, perhaps, were engaged in profitable business. With dependable incomes, you surrounded yourselves with material comforts. And then came, what we call for want of a better name, the economic depression, which has played havoc with the material prosperity of our country. Millions of persons, formerly prosperous, are now dependent upon others for help, or are struggling along with only the barest necessities of life. By the hundreds of thousands, our fellow citizens have had their material prosperity completely destroyed. Investments failed; business houses and factories closed; mortgages were foreclosed; homes were lost; the savings of years were exhausted. And for millions of persons no work has yet been found.

From the depression have come physical privation and suffering. From it have come cynicism, protests, bitterness, and despair. From it has come a feeling of helplessness. From it has come, and surely at last this is clear to everyone, a demonstration of human weakness. From it has come renewed evidence that man is dependent upon some Being greater than and above himself. Under the circumstances, then, is it not high time for us to think about our souls as well as our bodies? Is it

not time for us to think about God as well as about ourselves?

In times of adversity, in particular, we turn to God because we see more clearly than at other times how much we need Him. Today we need courage and hope; we need guidance; we need patience; we need consolation. For all of these blessings we should turn to God and to His holy religion.

Do I mean to suggest that a man is stronger and more courageous under adversity because he is devoutly religious? I do; most certainly. Such a man has something to turn to, something to hold on to, which otherwise he would not have. Of course, I do not pretend that all Christians are faithful in the practice of their religion; I know better. But I do not hesitate to point out that in the face of grief and defeat which break men, and which lead them to despair, the Christian religion is a tremendous force for unity, for calmness, for patience, and for genuine happiness.

As a matter of fact, the Christian religion, if given a reasonable hearing, will work out the solution to our present problems. In this solution, certain changes will be made by which the rights of the masses of mankind may be more adequately protected; I mean the right to work, the right to live from work, the right of each man to possess some property, and the right to save and hold what is earned. Concerning these and similar rights, God Himself has spoken. And so the Christian looks hopefully to God, and in particular to the Church through which God speaks, for help, for inspiration, and for guidance. He knows that the more faithfully he serves his Church, the stronger his Church

will be and the more effective it will become in carrying out its divine program.

There is something else, however, which Christianity does, and it is the necessary accompaniment of the other. There are times in the life of each individual when he can do nothing in a material way to remedy his condition. We have all been placed in such circumstances. It may be that something unfair is said about us. It may be that our property is damaged or taken. It may be that we are not adequately paid for work. It may be that our right of free speech is interfered with. It may be that through the selfishness and greed of others, with no fault of our own, economic disaster comes upon us. It may be that through wars and revolutions, whole nations are impoverished and that we, wholly innocent, are compelled to suffer. In a great many ways difficulties do come to us, which we are helpless to remove. At such a time the Christian, as I have pointed out, holds on more tightly than ever to his hope in the ultimate justice of Almighty God. Moreover, he holds on to his hope that the Christian religion, to the degree that it is respected, will gradually remake society so as to remove unfairness and injustice.

But what is he to do in the meantime? Doing everything he can to solve his own problems, hoping and expecting eventually a general improvement, what is he to do here and now? Today he needs work; today he needs food for his children. Today he suffers from privation. Today many of you are suffering; millions of your fellow men are suffering. What can the Christian religion do for you and for them at this moment?

The answer is to be sought in the Christian prin-

ciple and practice of penance. In and by itself, of course, penance is by no means confined to Christianity. As a matter of fact, in some of the oriental religions, which lack the perfect balance of Christianity, penance is practiced in unreasonable and even criminal ways.

Christian penance has its supreme demonstration in the death of Christ on the cross. To the world, the crucifix is not attractive; it is repulsive. It portrays suffering and death; precisely what the world seeks to avoid. And yet, the Christian religion holds on high at all times the sign of the cross. Why? In order to remind us that Christ suffered and died; to remind us, also, that He died to save us and all men. The fact of dying is bound up inseparably with the purpose of dying. Thus the Christian religion teaches us the tremendous value of suffering. The redemption of the human race, with which no other reform can be compared, was made possible by the sufferings and death of our Lord. Don't you see? Christianity teaches that suffering has its value, that it has a place in the divine scheme of things, an essential place.

That Christ suffered and died so that each of us may attain eternal salvation is a truth. But it would be misapplying this truth for us to sit back with folded hands and conclude that there is nothing left for us to do. God will not save us against our will. And so we, each of us, must cooperate with God. One way of cooperating is to imitate His example. We are not called upon to die upon the cross. Through the circumstances of life, however, we are compelled to suffer. And this suffering we can offer up to God as a penance.

In my daily work I am required to visit the sick.

I happen to be Chaplain of the Holy Cross Hospital in Salt Lake City and as Chaplain I go into sick rooms. Over and over again I am impressed and edified by the fortitude of those who suffer. It is particularly noticeable among the aged. Those who have seen many years of life, whose characters have been purified and tempered by harsh experiences, are the ones most likely to accept their suffering as a penance. Over and over again they assure me that they are offering up their pain to God as a penance for their own past sins. In this suffering they imitate, as best they can, the example of our Lord, who offered His suffering for all mankind. And they ask God for His help, His forgiveness of their sins, His grace for their relatives and friends, and His help for all sinners.

What can be more ideal? What can be more practicable? If such penance should mean the disregard of nurses and physicians, if it should mean the neglect of medicine and physical treatments, it would be false and even fanatical. But Christianity is a perfectly balanced religion. It commands the use of the very best means to relieve suffering, and at the same time it preaches resignation to the will of God and the acceptance of suffering as a penance.

To you listening to me tonight I recommend this Christian practice as not only practicable but as the *only* practicable way of putting up with your present difficulties. Do everything reasonably possible to remove these difficulties, and to that end adopt and follow the Christian program. In the meantime, however, offer up your trials and sufferings to God as a penance.

You may be conscious of past sins; you may recall that at times you have been guilty of selfish-

ness and of greed; you may have indulged in physical excesses; you may have been lazy; you may have been unkind and uncharitable to others. If so, in repentance for such sins, you can ask God to accept your present privations. Perhaps, however, you are not conscious of past sins. Then in complete unselfishness, you will find happiness in doing penance for others. You can offer up your suffering for the sake of others who are less fortunate.

Though perfect and free from all sin, our divine Lord suffered and died for others. He gave a perfect example of unselfishness. We can try, at least, to imitate Him. And from suffering, from penance, there does come to all mankind the special help from God. If all of us should offer up as a penance our present trials, God's grace is sure to come to the people of our country, increasing kindness, generosity, and charity, destroying greed, and leading us all back towards the attainment of perfect justice. And in the endeavor, with consciences free from guilt, we shall enjoy a happiness which we did not know before.

CARDINAL HAYES STATES AIMS OF THE CATHOLIC HOUR

(Extract from his address at the inaugural program in the studio of the National Broadcasting Company, New York City, March 2, 1930).

Our congratulations and our gratitude are extended to the National Council of Catholic Men and its officials, and to all who, by their financial support, have made it possible to use this offer of the National Broadcasting Company. The heavy expense of managing and financing a weekly program, its musical numbers, its speakers, the subsequent answering of inquiries, must be met. . . .

This radio hour is for all the people of the United States. To our fellow-citizens, in this word of dedication, we wish to express a cordial greeting and, indeed, congratulations. For this radio hour is one of service to America, which certainly will listen in interestedly, and even sympathetically, I am sure, to the voice of the ancient Church with its historic background of all the centuries of the Christian era, and with its own notable contribution to the discovery, exploration, foundation and growth of our glorious country. . . .

Thus to voice before a vast public the Catholic Church is no light task. Our prayers will be with those who have that task in hand. We feel certain that it will have both the good will and the good wishes of the great majority of our countrymen. Surely, there is no true lover of our Country who does not eagerly hope for a less worldly, a less material, and a more spiritual standard among our people.

With good will, with kindness and with Christ-like sympathy for all, this work is inaugurated. So may it continue. So may it be fulfilled. This word of dedication voices, therefore, the hope that this radio hour may serve to make known, to explain with the charity of Christ, our faith, which we love even as we love Christ Himself. May it serve to make better understood that faith as it really is—a light revealing the pathway to heaven: a strength, and a power divine through Christ: pardoning our sins, elevating, consecrating our common every-day duties and joys, bringing not only justice but gladness and peace to our searching and questioning hearts.

Hear and Help the Catholic Hour

Produced by the National Council of Catholic Men,
1312 Massachusetts Ave., Washington, D. C.

Presented by the National Broadcasting Company, and the
following associated stations:

Asheville, N. C.	WWNC	Los Angeles, Calif.	KECA
Atlanta, Ga.	WSB	Madison, Wis.	WIBA
Baltimore, Md.	WFBR	Memphis, Tenn.	WMC
Billings, Mont.	KGHL	Miami, Fla.	WIOD
Birmingham, Ala.	WAPI	Nashville, Tenn.	WSM
Bismarck, N. D.	KFYR	New York, N. Y.	WEAF
Boston, Mass.	WEEI	New Orleans, La.	WSMB
Buffalo, N. Y.	WBEN	Norfolk, Va.	WTAR
Butte, Mont.	KGIR	Oklahoma City, Okla.	WKY
Cincinnati, Ohio	WSAI	Omaha, Neb.	WOW
Charlotte, N. C.	WSOC	Philadelphia, Pa.	
Chicago, Ill.			WLIT or KYW
	WMAQ or WENR	Phoenix, Ariz.	KTAR
Clearwater Fla.	WFLA	Pittsburgh, Pa.	WCAE
Cleveland, Ohio	WTAM	Portland, Me.	WCSH
Columbia, S. C.	WIS	Portland, Ore.	KGW
Covington, Ky.	WCKY	Providence, R. I.	WJAR
Dallas, Texas	WFAA	Richmond, Va.	WRVA
Davenport, Iowa	WOC	St. Louis, Mo.	KSD
Dayton, Ohio	WHIO	St. Paul, Minn.	KSTP
Des Moines, Ia.	WOC-WHO	Salt Lake City, Utah	KDYL
Denver, Colo.	KOA	San Antonio, Tex.	WOAI
Detroit, Mich.	WWJ	San Francisco, Cal.	
Duluth-Superior	WEBC		KPO or KGO
Fargo, N. D.	WDAY	Schenectady, N. Y.	WGY
Fort Worth, Tex.	WBAP	Seattle, Wash.	KJR
Hartford, Conn.	WTIC	Shreveport, La.	KTBS
Hot Springs, Ark.	KTHS	Spokane, Wash.	
Houston, Tex.	KPRC		KGA or KHQ
Indianapolis, Ind.	WKBF	Tampa, Fla.	
Jackson, Miss.	WJDX		WSUN or WFLA
Jacksonville, Fla.	WJAX	Tulsa, Okla.	KVOO
Kansas City, Mo.	WDAF	Washington, D. C.	WRC
Louisville, Ky.	WAVE	Worcester, Mass.	WTAG

(Most of these stations present the Catholic Hour every Sunday at six o'clock, New York Time [D. S. T. during summer], though some of them suspend it periodically because of local commitments, etc.)

**YOUR CONTRIBUTION TO THE CONTINUANCE OF
THESE WEEKLY BROADCASTS OF CATHOLIC
TRUTH IS NEEDED AND SOLICITED.**

