

Mass Thurs. after Ash Wed., University of Notre Dame ..dead, p. 661. --No Benedic-
p. 166. 2nd col. of Saints, Religious Bulletin tion and no sermon tonight,
p. 660; 3rd of living and... February 26, 1936. Ash Wednesday.

Catholic vs. Secular Colleges--III.

In most of the Criminology text books used in secular colleges, according to Dan Gilbert (who has made a special study of the subject), the dogma is laid down that men are not free moral agents, that, consequently, criminals are not responsible for their acts.

Here are specific grounds for Mr. Gilbert's contention:

In DeQuiro's "Modern Theories of Criminality," translated by De Salvio of Northwestern University, the author contends "that crime and work, vice and genius derive their vitality from the same sources," and he goes on to state "that the affirmation of free will is in contradiction with science."

Maurice Parmelee's Criminology, a reference text found in college libraries, says, "the progress of science has destroyed for all practical purposes the theological and metaphysical doctrine of free will. The question may then be raised whether there can be such a thing as individual responsibility for conduct, or indeed human responsibility of any sort."

Edwin H. Sutherland, Associate Professor of Sociology at the University of Illinois, scoffs at a decision of the Supreme Court of North Carolina which states "to know the right and still the wrong pursue proceeds from a perverse will." Modern criminology, he says, denies the doctrine of freedom of the will.

John Lewis Gillin, Professor of Sociology at the University of Wisconsin, laughs at those who view "the criminal as a free and moral agent who chooses to commit an act injurious to society."

Robert H. Gault, Professor of Psychology in Northwestern University, treats as twin superstitions the doctrine "of demons to be cast out and of freedom of the will."

Philip A. Parsons, Professor of Applied Sociology at Oregon University, indorses the view that the explanation of crime as the outcome of individual free will has no scientific value.

Fred H. Hayes, Assistant Professor of Sociology at Iowa University, teaches that crime is a form of social maladjustment and is largely a phenomenon which civilization has produced.

If man lacks power to determine his acts, what is the meaning of moral "good" and "bad?" Why Heaven and Hell? Why redemption? Why a God-man? Why a Church? Why sacrifice or prayer?

"Crucifying Christ in Our Colleges" gives examples of sociology professors in secular colleges who indorse promiscuity, who advocate free love. Professors are cited who call parents sadists if they endeavor to keep their children chaste; still other professors, it is claimed, teach that sex abstinence is positively harmful, that it causes neurosis.

One sociology professor quoted Frederick Engels: "Marriage differs from prostitution in that one is purchase and the other hire. A married woman is distinguished from a courtesan only in that she does not offer her body for money, by the hour like a commodity, but sells it once and for all." The professor indorsed that view and called marriage legalized prostitution.

Are these theories the products of better equipment and of a more distinguished person? Would Professor Taylor submit Catholic boys and girls to that kind of rot?