University of Motre Dame Religious Bulletin February 20, 1933.

Good Ridance.

"The Sign of the Cross," the movie against which we took occasion to warn our readers, has come and gone; and, from the remarks overheard, it is probable that a good many Catholics saw it. Among that number there were without doubt some who were fully aware what they were going to see. It might seem, therefore, that such service as we sought to provide our readers was wasted effort. Which may well be true. But that does not destroy the intrinsic value of such service. Warnings are no more than means of calling attention to certain dangers; they are not in themselves capable of preventing anyone incurring the danger warned against. And while our object is, obviously, to arouse a sense of caution in those who might otherwise not know that any danger exists, it would be sheerest folly to presume that such objective can ever in the majority of instances be realized. Human nature is not quite so tractable as that. If it were, evil would long since have disappeared from the world."—Southern Messenger.

Common Sense Prevailed.

Locally, we won our bet. We felt certain that once you realized that what we placed before you was a test of faith, there would be but one answer. It might very properly have been made a matter of discipline, but that was not what we wanted. It was an opportunity to drive home a lesson in loyalty to the Catholic Church, and the procedure to be followed for the rest of your lives in matters affecting the Church. Your common sense and your home training settled the matter in a hurry.

Certain False Attitudes.

We have no further message for those who went to see the picture. We leave them to God, who alone can judge their dispositions. But for the benefit of others who have been muddled by some of the excuses these recalcitrants have offered for their action, we have to point out the fallacy of certain positions they have assumed:

- 1. These who quoted "America" as approving the picture either lied about the matter or quoted some liar. "America" praised the showmanship, but condemned unmistakably "several sequences in the film which, speaking morally, are the most objectionable things ever thrown upon a public screen." It also stated that the martyrs in the picture are "evermuch given to sad hymns and wringing of hands, and so are without that cagerness and joy which Christian tradition and legend attributes to them." In other words "wishy-washy Christianity."
- 2. These who went to see the picture after they discovered that discipline had not been invoked to keep them away, as well as those who have stated that they will see the picture elsewhere, have given the handle to management which offered to keep the back door open for sneaks.
- 3. Those who say their faith was strengthened by the picture don't knew what faith is. They may have wept for the weeping martyrs, but pity isn't faith and weeping martyrs aren't martyrs. Faith would have kept them from seeing the picture when it was put up to them as a test of faith. You never yet saw a man who sinned and didn't try to make some excuse for sinning.

Don't Let Up Now.

If you rush right back to the theatre which spent this weekend insulting your religion you will wipe out much of the good accomplished by your present action. If you kiss and make up too readily it takes all the dig out of your rightcons indignation.