

Worked  
1/28/40 .5

# Catholic Paper Blames Coughlin for 'Front' Plot

**Pittsburgh Weekly Scoffs at His 'Denial'—Says Church Press Is Partly Guilty for Its Efforts to Shield Him—Takes Brooklyn 'Tablet' to Task**

(Special to the Sunday Worker)

PITTSBURGH, Pa., Jan. 27.—“The Pittsburgh Catholic,” official organ of the Pittsburgh Diocese, in a strongly worded article this week placed the responsibility for the “Christian Front” gun and bomb terror plot revealed in New York City squarely on Father Coughlin, Detroit radio priest.

The paper, which has the official endorsement of Bishop Hugh C. Boyle of Pittsburgh, and is edited by John B. Collins, prominent Catholic layman of this city, denounced Father Coughlin's early denial of having connections with the “Front” as misleading and states that the “Brooklyn Tablet” paper of Father Edward Lodge Curran, must be viewed with suspicion.

### EMBARRASS OTHERS

Pointing out that Father Coughlin first denied any connection with the Christian Front and then admitted it and extolled the organization, the “Pittsburgh Catholic” states: “. . . it seems proper to inquire why he (Coughlin) allowed the ‘garbled’ version of his views to stand for a week to the bewilderment of his followers and the amazement of the rest of the country.”

The article declares that Coughlin's statement to the newspapers puts many Catholic papers in the impossible position of “having attempted to ‘protect’ Father Coughlin” on grounds which he “could not maintain.”

The “Tablet,” the Pittsburgh paper points out, has long contained articles which the Christian Fronters found “anti-Semitic enough and otherwise so ‘satisfactory’ as to merit their endorsement and their promotion of its sale.” Now, the article continues, the Tablet suddenly prints a statement declaring that it knows nothing of the Christian Front. This “astonishing editorial statement . . . makes it obligatory

to discount heavily its (The Tablet's) other observations on the case.”

The article concludes by pointing out that neither the arrests nor the uncovering of the plot were needed “to show that the preachments of Father Coughlin on this Christian Front and other projects contained potential incitements to his listeners to do things which, in the light of Catholic teachings, they should not do.”

### HITS SHIELDING OF PRIEST

“The Pittsburgh Catholic” took issue with Catholic papers through the country for their attempts to “protect” Coughlin.

“Nearly all the Catholic press—or rather that part of it which made reference to the subject—seems to have accepted, with relief, perhaps, the notion that there was no connection between the arrested group and Father Coughlin,” the article said. “The ‘Denver Register’ chain, with its twenty-odd diocesan editions and its nearly half a million circulation, published last week, as its sole comment on the Christian Front incident, Father Coughlin's ‘coat tail’ disavowal. The Albany ‘Evangelist’ based its editorial comment on ‘the fact that the Radio Priest had vehemently disclaimed the outfit.’

“The Hartford ‘Catholic Transcript’ was led to say, incorrectly, that ‘Father Coughlin frequently disavowed any connection with this more stupid than sinister organization.’ Even the alert and well-balanced St. Paul ‘Wanderer’ and Buffalo ‘Union and Echo’ took a

similar stand. All of these papers now find themselves in the regrettable position of having attempted to ‘protect’ Father Coughlin on a basis which he himself did not, and of course could not, maintain.”

The article also chides the Jesuit weekly review “America,” which it says as “more often than not has agreed with Father Coughlin” for being “mislead” by Coughlin's “coat-tail disavowal.”