

The Southern Cross  
Feb. 20th 1914.

## An Objectionable Text Book

The following is a copy of the correspondence which passed between His Grace the Archbishop and the Registrar of the University with reference to the Text Book, "Selections from Carlyle," which had been prescribed for the subject of English Literature in the Senior Public Examination.

February 13, 1914

Dear Sir—

I regret that I have to take exception to the book, "Selections from Carlyle," prescribed for the use of our Catholic children going up for University examinations. I object to the work with all the vehemence of my nature. It is utterly anti-Catholic. I have issued instructions to all my schools to refrain from using it. I make no charge whatever of religious prejudice against the University authorities. I think their action simply a thoughtless blunder; but still that blunder pains our people im-

mensely, and as I love peace I wish to avoid all complaint and quarrels in the future. Yours faithfully,

(Sgd.) JOHN O'REILY.

Archbishop of Adelaide.

The Registrar of the University,  
Adelaide.

February 17, 1914.

My Lord Archbishop—

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 13th inst., protesting against the inclusion of "Selections from Carlyle" amongst the books set for the Senior Public Examination. This matter had already been brought before the notice of the Chancellor by Mr. W. J. Denny, a member of the Council of the University.

In reply I am to convey the sincerest regrets of the Chancellor that this unfortunate oversight should be the means of giving so much pain to the Catholic members of the community. There are many difficulties, however, in the way of cancelling the book altogether, but in order to remove the objection I am authorized by the Chancellor to say that J. H. Fowler's English essays, prescribed as one of the books of the Higher Public Examination, and to which no objection has been taken, will be prescribed as an alternative for the Senior. The passages to be committed to memory will be selected at a later date. We have already communicated with Bro. Purton, the representative of the Catholic schools on the Public Examinations Committee, and he approves the substitute. It is all the more regrettable that this mistake should have occurred as it was thought that the precautions adopted would have prevented such unfortunate selections. The following customary procedure was adhered to last year in selecting the text books for the Public examinations:—The draft syllabus was prepared by the professorial staff, and submitted together with the text books for the Public examinations Committee for discussion and amendment. This body is composed of representatives of the various classes of schools in the community, and Bro. Turpin was at the time the representative of the Catholic schools. The syllabus as drafted was approved by the Committee for submission to the Council at a meeting held on June 20, 1913, at which meeting Bro. Turpin was present. To give teachers an additional opportunity for perusing the syllabus copies were distributed with the intimation that criticisms would be received up to Monday, July 21, 1913. During the month of July the syllabus lay on the table of the Council, and the text books were available for inspection by teachers in the office of the Secretary to the Public Examinations Board. No criticisms or suggestions were received, and the syllabus was finally approved by the Council without alteration.

Early in August copies were sent to members of the Committee, and further copies were distributed freely on application to the University, and from that till now no objection has been raised to any of the books selected.

While the unfortunate oversight is very greatly regretted it is thought that the method in selecting the books will show that the task is not undertaken lightly, and that such reasonable checks as can be devised have been adopted.

I shall be obliged if you will kindly instruct your Secretary to forward a list of the schools likely to be affected by the change of syllabus, and we shall notify them of the alteration without delay. I enclose, for your inspection, a copy of the work it is proposed to substitute. I have the honor to be, Your Grace's obedient servant,

ASSISTANT REGISTRAR.

To His Grace the Most Rev. the Archbishop of Adelaide,  
Archbishop's Home,  
Glen Osmond, S.A.

February 17, 1914.

Dear Sir—

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of to-day's date, together with a copy of Fowler's work, and thank you for your courtesy and promptness in replying. The thought of accusing your Chancellor (who is a dear friend of mine) or your board or yourself of any semblance of prejudice against the Catholic body never once crossed my mind. I know you all, as a body, to be above any weakness of the kind. Where an endless number of things have to be attended to mistakes will happen at times even when the best intentions prevail. I have not time to read Fowler's book through to-day, but from the names of the writers given in the index. I think I may take it for granted that the book is unobjectionable. I will give you my opinion to-morrow or the next day at furthest. Please do not trouble to give any formal notifica-

## THE LUTHER LEGEND.

### Demolition Acknowledged by Protestant Theologian.

It is interesting to note, in view of the prescription for the University senior examination of a text book containing Carlyle's "Glorification of Luther," the perplexity caused to thinking Protestants by Father Grisar's recent work on "Luther," "every sentence carefully documented," so that his own deductions need hardly be taken into account. Nowhere, perhaps, is this embarrassment more faithfully reflected than in an article written by the Protestant theologian, Lic. Braun, for the *vangelische Kirchenzeitung*, March 30, 1913, as follows:—"The reading of Grisar should afford food for reflection to us Evangelical theologians. With strips from our own skin the Catholic author has pieced together his 'Luther.' How small the Reformer has become according to the Luther studies of our own Protestant investigators! How his merits have shriveled up! We believed that we owed to him the spirit of toleration and liberty of conscience. Not in the least. We recognise in his translation of the Bible a masterpiece stamped with the impress of originality; we may be happy now if it is not plainly called a 'plagiarism.' We venerated in him the father of the popular school system—a purely 'fictitious greatness' which we have no right to claim for him. We imagined that we found in Luther's words splendid suggestions for a rational treatment of poverty, and that a return to him would bring us back to the true principles of charity, but the laurels do not belong to him: they must be conceded to the Catholic Church. We were delighted to be assured that this great man possessed an insight into national economics marvellous for his day, but 'unbiased' investigation forces

the confession that there were many indications of retrogressive tendencies in his economic views. Did we not conceive of Luther as the founder of the modern State? Yet in all that he said upon this subject there was nothing of any value which was at all new. As for the rest, by making the King an 'absolute patriarch' he did not in the least improve upon the coercive measures employed by the theocracy of the Middle Ages. Just think of it, then, all these conclusions come to us from the mouth of Protestant theologians! Grisar gives book and page for them. What is still more amazing, all these Protestant historians continue to speak of Luther in tones of admiration, in spite of the admissions which a 'love of truth' compels them to make. Looking upon the 'results' of their work thus gathered together, we cannot help asking the question: 'What, then, remains of Luther?' Verily the praises chanted to him sound hollow in our ears while at the same time we see jewel after jewel plucked from his crown."

It is a somewhat remarkable coincidence that the objectionable selection in one of the Adelaide University text-books is from Carlyle's "Heroes and Hero Worship," to which Archbishop Kelly took exception at the last Sydney Catholic Congress in 1909, as one of the text-books used in the Sydney Training College for Teachers. The passage which his Grace quoted was from a glorification of John Knox, similar in tone to that of Martin Luther, referred to in another column.

## SELECTIONS FROM CARLYLE.

### ARCHBISHOP'S CIRCULAR.

The following circular has been addressed by His Grace the Archbishop to the principals of the various Catholic schools:—

Archbishop's House,  
Glen Osmond.  
February 12, 1914.

I absolutely prohibit the use of the "Selections from Carlyle," by Elizabeth Lee. In no Catholic school in Archdiocese of Adelaide may the book be used. As a work it is as coarse as coarse can be, according to our Catholic notions. Not knowing it, our children may be handicapped at the University examinations; but better a thousand times the loss of a pass than the loss of one of our children's faith. The article on Luther is perfectly brutal. It is as anti-Catholic as ever article could be.

Yours truly in Christ,  
+ JOHN O'REILY,  
Archbishop of Adelaide.

## AN ALTERNATIVE TEXT BOOK SELECTED.

Referring to the above the following statement has since been made:—

One of the books selected for the University examinations was Elizabeth Lee's "Selections from Carlyle," to which representatives of the Catholic body objected. The matter was brought under the notice of Mr. W. J. Denny, M.P., a member of the University Council, who at once communicated with the Chancellor of the University (Sir Samuel Way), and the matter has been settled in a manner which is expected to prove satisfactory to Catholics. The Chancellor has arranged that J. H. Fowler's "English Essays" is to be selected as an alternative text book, and the necessary arrangements will be made accordingly without delay.

This is satisfactory so far as Catholic students are concerned, but it would have been better had the objectionable "selections" been struck out of the University course altogether. Why should the minds of non-Catholic students be poisoned by such bigoted, insulting, and untruthful perversions of history? However, it appears from the correspondence published elsewhere that there are difficulties in the way of withdrawing them at present.