

The Catholic Record.

"Christianus mihi nomen est, Catholicus vero Cognomen."—(Christian is my Name, but Catholic my Surname.)—St. Pacian, 4th Century.

VOLUME XXII.

LONDON, ONTARIO, SATURDAY, JULY 7, 1900.

NO. 1,133.

The Catholic Record

London, Saturday, July 7, 1900.

AN ORANGE CELEBRATION.

The Free-Masons of Nova Scotia have cabled their congratulations to Right Worshipful Lord Roberts. Well, that is an improvement on the conduct of their brethren across the water and gives us a hope that in the distant future an Orangeman may be as good as any other citizen. In Belfast the celebrations were of a nature peculiarly Orange. Drunken ruffians paraded the streets, destroying the property of Catholics and insulting inoffensive women. Though time mellow most things, it cannot get the dirty strain out of the Belfast Orangemen.

A PRETTY LEGEND.

A Jewish legend tells us that when God created the universe He asked the angels what they thought of the works of His hands. And when the pure spirits looked upon the world and beheld it throbbing with life and resplendent with beauty they cried out in admiration that one thing alone was wanting—a voice which would chant forever the praises of the Creator and whose tones unmarred by discord would strike pure and deep into the hearts of men and turn their thoughts from gross and material things to those beyond the spheres. We think that such a voice rings out from the hearts of many Catholics who live their faith and have consequently a potent influence for good on non Catholics. They are not perturbed by the lucubrations of the so-called liberal Catholic and they are always proud of their faith and know their sole duty with respect to it is to guard and protect it.

"FREE CHURCHMEN" PROTEST.

In commenting on the fact that but one member in the Canadian Parliament questioned the course of Sir Wilfrid Laurier's proposition for a message of congratulation to Her Majesty, the London Advertiser calls attention to the fact that no such unanimity exists in public gatherings in the old land. For proof of its contention it refers to an incident chronicled by the Edinburgh Scotsman.

It appears that the Free Churchmen, or rather a good many of them, protested against an address which made mention of the present war as unhappy and unavoidable. Unhappy certainly: unavoidable, they demurred, and strongly, after the manner of Scotchmen.

The Advertiser's criticism is very suave, and is fragrant with a large-minded tolerance. True, his concluding remarks arent free speech, etc., are somewhat vague, but one must not be hypercritical. But is it not wonderful that in this enlightened age one should have any doubts as to the wisdom of the course pursued by the versatile Brummagem politician? Why do not those misguided Scotchmen read the newspapers? Surely in this age of free schools and free drinks, especially on patriotic occasions, they cannot be blind to the fact that the poor oppressed Anglo Saxon has at last been freed from the oppression of his beighted persecutors. If they had our advantages they would in all probability have an exhibition of fireworks whenever the cable flashed news of brilliant victories. Their ignorance, however, is truly deplorable, and the Advertiser is eminently wise in treating them with gentle commiseration.

But suppose some sixty Catholic divines had made the protest, or even insinuated that the statement that the Anglo Saxon holds a commission from Providence to paint all maps as red as possible, was at least open to discussion, why the atmosphere of this country would reek with the vapors of lurid language! A good many of our editorial friends would be dancing around, waving Union Jacks and singing "Soldiers of the Queen," and branding the divines as traitors to the Empire. Rather a big word "Empire," to say nothing of its cost.

This is, of course, a free-speech country—with limitations. One may vilify Catholicity, or hire an ex-nun or employ the Rev. Justin Fulton of unsavory fame, and be within the con-

stitution. But a thing not to be condoned is a word that is not an echo of Downing Street.

"IS THE CHURCH CHRISTIAN?"

Replying to the question addressed to Protestant ministers by the National Christian Citizenship League: Is the Church Christian? Rev. R. Heber Newton says: If by the question, however, is meant, Is the Church, as an organization, Christly—possessed of the spirit of Christ, and organized upon the principles of Christ?—then I am afraid the answer must be "No." The teachings of the Church are, as a rule, far from following the teachings of Jesus. The organization of the Church is planned and patterned upon a policy which is the very antithesis of a true society of Jesus. Commercialism dominates the organization and conventionalty tyrannizes the pulpit.

If Protestantism, as we have pointed out in a recent issue, were vivified by the spirit of truth, it would have today a paramount position in this country. For a long time it had a strong and a free hand: it was the darling of officialdom and the trusted guide and counsellor of thousands, and yet at the present time it is discredited as a truth-bearer, and adhered to only as a social and commercial force. In every great city there are hundreds who call themselves Protestants and who are nevertheless ignorant in religious matters as untutored pagans, and whilst these people are dying of spiritual starvation, their preachers are either misrepresenting Catholicity or disporting themselves in their pulpits as expounders of new creeds. Some of them have robbed their hearers of every particle of belief and cast them out on the highway that leads to infidelity. When they have a Bible they spell out its messages in fallible, human tones.

The one wonder to us is that a thinking man can be a preacher. Accepting as a fact that reputable divines have no taste for the controversial methods of former times, we think they should see that a church that resounds with the clamor of warring individuals, that has no definite creed and no guiding hand of authority, cannot possibly be the Church of Christ.

Said the late Dr. Martineau: "The answer of the Catholic Church to the question, Where is the holy ground of the world? Where is the real presence of God? Here within my precincts—here alone." It carries its supernatural character within it: it has brought its authority down with it through time: it is the living organism of the Holy Spirit, the Pentecostal dispensation among us still. And you ask about its evidence: It offers the spectacle of itself. Itself the sacred enclosure of whatever is divine and supernatural on earth, it has no problems to solve, no legitimacy to make out, no doctrine to prove; but simply to live on and witness of the grace it bears.

OUR DUTY.

Bishop McFaul of Trenton urges the Catholics of the United States to make a determined stand for their rights. We have read that nowhere on the face of the civilized globe do Catholics enjoy such freedom and privileges as in the fair land of America, but Trenton's Ordinary does not believe it. He says that Catholics themselves are to blame. We have been silent while our enemies were pushing us to the wall, and the impression has been gradually gaining ground that anything was good enough for us: and we ourselves were beginning to clasp the hand offering us the slightest recognition.

It will take, however, a dynamite charge to arouse some of our brethren, who are above all things prudent and think that a "don't wake the baby" air is the proper thing. Such lovers of peace they are and so convinced that things will right themselves that their lips are wedded to the dulcet utterances of diplomacy. That is what they term it, for they have a strange vocabulary. Sometimes they break loose about our prospects, etc., but this is vulgar parlance is a mere "bluff" on the public.

The Bishop goes on to say that all honor should be given to Protestants for the courage with which they stand in defence of their rights. They too, believe in tranquility, but they do not look upon it as an excuse for cowardly inaction when their claims are ignored.

Every reader of the CATHOLIC RECORD has observed how the individuals of any sect—no matter how divided by social or commercial interests—close up in united, aggressive lines when their rights are attacked. We have, of course, good men who are always ready to stand in the breach, but we have also too many critics who content themselves with censuring the method of warfare, and too many sweet-toned back-boneless individuals.

They are not respected by Protestants, but they are liked by them because they think of them as of themselves. This is the very reason, remarked Cardinal Newman, why they so often take our part, and assert and defended our political rights. But we have much cause to be ashamed and much cause to be anxious what God thinks of us, if we gain their support by giving them a false impression in our persons of what the Catholic Church is and what Catholics are bound to be, what bound to believe and to do: and is not this the case often that the world takes up our interest, because we share its sins.

One hears much talk betimes of new ideas and methods. Some of them are very beautiful, but they never seem to get beyond the abstract. But let us bear in mind that the best method in the world is, unless vivified by love, enthusiasm and humility, of no lasting value. Do you think that the great democrat, St. Francis of Assisi, found favor at first with the people of his age? What he said had been uttered time and again by professors and preachers and with more eloquence and beauty of diction. Still they made but little impression upon their hearers. But when St. Francis of Assisi took up the old doctrine and transfigured it with love and lived it, men saw that it was a reality. Take up the life of any man who has done anything for his kind and you will find that their success has emanated from the three things we have named.

Imagine the great laugh of the world when Dom Bosco began his work. "Visionary," said the timid: "impossible," said his brethren: "insane," said the worldlings. The gamins of Turin had been scampering around the streets years before Dom Bosco made his bow to the world and no friendly hand had been stretched out to them. They had been preached at, but at long range, and besides the gamins did not understand it. What they wanted was love and sympathy, and this gave Dom Bosco in goodly measure. And what was the result? He transformed the careless lads of Turin into respectable and respected members of society: he erected colleges for them and sent some of them to do priestly work in various centres and a few to be chiefs in the army of Christ. There were in Turin men who had more learning—more eloquence than he—who were willing to devote their talents to the reclamation of the rabble boyhood, but they did not want to give themselves. Dom Bosco, however, gave his all—a love that wrapped round the poor lads as with a garment, an enthusiasm that kept the spirit steadfast and hopeful amidst difficulties and reverses and a humility that sought success from above.

The price of good work is man's best blood. Give that and you will succeed; give your learning only and you will, no matter how wise your method, be a failure.

BILINGS ON "TITLES."

Someone has said that only a big man can wear a title gracefully. A little man is very apt when he becomes a notable to exhibit the worst side of his nature or to act and speak as to leave no doubt of his incompetency. He becomes bumptious and pompous and exacts that a respect and deference to which naturally he has no claim be accorded his title.

But he learns gradually that, as Josh Billings said "Titles ain't uv enny more real use or necessity than dog collars are." I have seen dog collars that cost \$3 on dogs that want worth, in enny market, over 87¢ cents. This is a grate waste of collar: and a grate damage tow the dog.

According to the laws that rule the spiritual world the attraction of one soul is needed to elevate another. This attraction we call love; in the language of philosophy it is called friendship, in that of Christianity it is called charity.—Frederic Ozanam.

A HINT TO THE GRADUATES.

Now that the season of commencement has come around again, the mind turns naturally to the young men and women who are leaving, this month, the shelter of Catholic educational institutions, to take up the struggle for existence. Their number is, doubtless, this year greater than ever. Students of Catholic colleges and academies grow every year more numerous. We are pleased to think that this is so, that Catholic parents are recognizing more and more the importance of a good, thorough education for their sons and daughters, and that they are anxious their children should receive it surrounded by all the lofty and ennobling influences of the Church.

But when these young men and women leave behind them their books and their school life: when they have read their graduation essays amid the applause of delighted relatives, and having stepped from the stage, take their places, with the rest of us, in the race of life, what will be their attitude towards those problems which puzzle the Catholic body at present? Will they be energetic in seeking a solution, or will they be afflicted with that apathy which renders useless the talents of so many of us now? This is a most important question.

It is not difficult to find in every part of this country many graduates of Catholic colleges whose utility, humanity speaking, to the Church which fostered them, and fed them with the bread of knowledge wherein lurked no rationalistic poison, might be expressed in figures by zero. They take no interest or part in the progress of the Church. They are sunk in lethargy from which it seems impossible to arouse them. Men and women, products of college and academy, both bear this odium, though the number of women who lose all interest in active works of religion is, of course, less than of men.

Who is the most active in the good works of the parish? Is it the graduate of a Catholic college? Well, it is, in many instances, but oftener it is the man who has won his way upward without the advantages of a college training, who has fought the good fight, and kept the faith amid the temptations from which the other was happily shielded. Particularly does this apply to the young men. Many of these think that in allowing themselves to be educated at a Catholic institution they have done all that could be expected of them, and in the work of church sodalities and societies, as well as in the charity of the St. Vincent de Paul conferences, they never think of lending a hand. These commonplaces of Catholic life are too vulgar altogether for some of these delicate-handed graduates.

It is painful to have to make these statements. But it is necessary to make them in the interests of the young men and women who are coming out year after year from Catholic schools, and who need to have their minds adjusted to the state of affairs that exists in every Catholic parish in the country. Because of their superior education and training, these graduates can become leaders in good works or they can become the laziest laggards. They can make their lives, by a little energy, beacons of hope to their brethren of lesser advantages, or they can be a reproach to the Catholic body, and a byword for those who want to point out the futility of Catholic education.

Young men and young women on the threshold of life, which of these alternatives are you going to choose?—The Sacred Heart Review.

"CONSCIENTIOUS BELIEF."

Editor Freeman: I again take the liberty of asking you a few questions: Can a non-Catholic have a conscientious belief that the Catholic Church is false? He may, of course, have a very strong opinion that it is false, in a somewhat similar way that he believes one particular political party is better than another, but can he have a firm, conscientious belief that it is false? This is my difficulty: God created the conscience. He also established the Church. Both are His work. Now, how can one of His works fail to recognize the other? Yours very respectfully, INQUIRER.

"Conscientious belief" is a somewhat loose phrase, and does not convey a clear and clean cut idea to the mind. Before we can answer your question, as it exists in your mind, we must find out what you mean by it.

By "conscientious belief" do you mean a real, actual belief, and no sham or pretended belief? If so, every belief is conscientious, for no man can believe and not believe or believe and doubt a thing at the same time. If he believes he knows, is conscious that he believes, and he can never make himself believe that he believes what he knows he does not believe. He may pretend to others, like a hypocrite, that he believes what he does not believe, and deceive them. But he can never make himself believe that he believes what he does not believe. Consequently every belief that one has is conscientious, that is, he is conscious of a real, actual belief for the time being, of a mental state. Whether it be a true or false belief is another question. It is still a belief, whether true or false. No man can believe as true what he knows to be false. Consc-

quently when he believes a thing he believes it to be true. His dishonesty is not in his belief, but in his pretending to others that he believes what he does not or that he does not believe what he believes.

Now, assuming that by conscientious belief you mean a real belief, an actual mental state, we are in a position to answer your question: Can a non-Catholic have a conscientious belief that the Catholic Church is false? We answer: He can. He can be in that mental state with regard to the Church. There are unfortunately many people in that condition. The Church has been misrepresented to them from their youth up. They have heard everything evil and nothing good of her. They know her not as she is, but as they have been led, without any fault on their part, to believe her to be. The Catholic Church as she exists in their minds is a hideous object, the enemy of truth and of all good. When they pass judgment and condemn, it is this hideous thing in their minds, this thing which their educators have built up in their imagination, that they condemn, and they are right in condemning it, for it is evil. But in condemning this hideous phantom, of which they are the unsuspecting victims, they are not condemning the Catholic Church as she actually exists in the world of realities, and of which they know practically nothing. If the Church were what, through ignorance and misrepresentation, they really believe her to be, they could not conscientiously do otherwise than condemn her as false.

Their mistake arises from an error of judgment as to fact, and from a failure to distinguish a creature of their imagination from a creature of God. Their judgment is based on false information whose fallacy they do not suspect. As long as they are in that mental state their ignorance is said by theologians to be invincible.

As to your second question. Conscience is not, as you seem to suppose, that faculty or act of the mind by which it seeks and apprehends truth. It is the indicator of the goodness or badness of particular acts which a man is called upon to do or avoid. Its objective is the morality of particular acts that are about to be done or avoided. Its judgments are based on truths supplied by reason and revelation. Its office is not to determine, but to bring those truths to each man and admonish him, when he is called upon to act, to make his act correspond to the particular truth that applies to it. To illustrate: A man knows the revealed command: Thou shalt not steal. He has an opportunity to take a sum of money belonging to some one else. The temptation is strong; it pulls him toward the forbidden act. It is just here that conscience comes in. Not to teach him the command not to steal—he knows that—but to arouse him to shake off the fascinating hypnotizer, to recall him to himself, to admonish him that now is the time to obey the law he knows. The law forbids theft. The act you are tempted to do is theft. Therefore don't do it. In every syllogism known to conscience the major premise is the law; the minor the act that comes under the law; and the conclusion, do it or do not. Conscience does not teach the law, but the law being known, it particularizes it and applies it to man's every act there and then.

As to why men gifted with reason may not recognize and identify the true Church we think we have given sufficient explanation in assigning it to ignorance arising from false education.—N. Y. Freeman's Journal.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE PAPACY.

Objection is made by our Protestant friends, especially our friends the Ritualists—who are "so near and yet so far,"—to the Catholic doctrine of the supremacy of the Pope, on the ground that there is so little evidence of it in the first ages of the Church. They overlook the important fact that there has been a natural development of Christianity in all its features in a regular, logical, progressive manner from its first beginnings—its infancy—until it attained its full stature of manhood in succeeding ages. Our friends seem to forget that it is entirely unreasonable to look for the full fledged doctrine of the Papacy at the very beginning. Our Lord instructed His apostles and gave them the deposit of the faith in its simple, fundamental principles, and left it to be developed by the Church, under the guidance of the Holy Ghost, as occasion required. The reason and necessity of development are thus very pertinently described by Cardinal Newman, in his "Essay on Development":

"The increase and expansion of the Christian creed and ritual, and the variations which have attended the process in the case of individual writers and churches, are the necessary attendants on any philosophy or polity which takes possession of the intellect and heart, and has had any wide and extended dominion. From the nature of the human mind, time is necessary for the full comprehension and perfection of great ideas; and that the highest and most wonderful truths, though communicated to the world once for all by inspired teachers, could not be comprehended all at once by the recipients, but, as being received and transmitted by minds not inspired, and through media which were human, have required only the longer time and deeper thought for their full elucidation."

Such has been the history of every doctrine of Christianity, and Newman well remarks:

"It is a less difficulty that Papal supremacy was not formally acknowledged in the second century, than that there was no formal acknowledgment on the part of the Church of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity till the fourth. No doctrine is defined till it is violated."

Language was used by some of the early Fathers on the subject of the Trinity which would have been considered heretical if used after the definition of the doctrine in succeeding ages. The same is true of other doctrines. The real question in regard to the Papacy is whether there were not indications of the existence in the minds of the earlier Fathers of the Church of a conviction or sentiment not fully defined that the successors of St. Peter were entitled to a prerogative above and beyond that of other Bishops—a conviction which, as time went on, was gradually and logically developed into the Catholic doctrine of the supremacy. Of this there can be no reasonable doubt in the mind of any one acquainted with the writings of the early Fathers. It would be impossible to give even a moiety of the evidence of this fact in the compass of an editorial article.

The fact is that from the very earliest period of the Church's history the Bishops of Rome have been recognized as the successors of St. Peter, and as, on that account, possessing special prerogatives which had been conferred upon Peter by our Lord Himself, when He made him the Rock of the Church; conferred upon him, especially, the power of the keys; prayed that his faith might not fail, and commissioned him to feed the sheep and lambs of His flock. These passages of Scripture are constantly quoted by them in confirmation of the superior claims of those who sat in the Chair of Peter. The *apostolicum unitatis* was universally recognized, and from the very first the Bishop of Rome was looked upon and treated as the head and centre of unity.

It is a very remarkable fact that in the very first age and the very first document belonging to Christian history we have an undoubted and striking instance of the exercise of the supreme authority of the Bishop of Rome. St. Clement, third in succession from St. Peter, by a very emphatic and authoritative letter (which the Protestant Lightfoot characterizes as "the first step towards Papal domination") quells a disturbance in the Church in Corinth, and restores peace and harmony. His authority was not disputed even by those whom he censured. The probability is that they had appealed to Rome for a decision. That, too, when St. John the Apostle was living at Ephesus, which was nearer to Corinth than to Rome.

Not to mention other and earlier Fathers, which our space will not permit, we do not hesitate to say that the case of St. Cyprian, in the early part of the third century, is sufficient in itself to settle the whole question. In more than a dozen letters, written at different times and under various circumstances, this eminent Father alludes to the fact that the Bishop of Rome is the centre of unity and source of authority because he sits in the Chair of Peter. And that remarkable essay of his on the "Unity of the Church," declares emphatically the necessity of being in union with the Chair of Peter. It is true that he quarrelled with Pope Stephen on the subject of the baptism of heretics and schismatics, but all the same he recognized the Pope's authority, though it had not been scientifically developed and defined as it was in succeeding ages. The present doctrine of the Pope's supremacy is the legitimate development of the very doctrine held in embryo by the early Fathers of the Church.—Sacred Heart Review.

EASY TOLERANCE OF EVIL.

It has been remarked that the easy tolerance of moral evil is one of the most alarming features of our own day: it is one of those tendencies which sap the very springs of civilization, which eat out the vigor and core of its life. We do not see its advance; it is in the air. It glids the dangers around us with nothing less than a deceptive beauty. It makes us easy and tolerant when it would be the vertiest mercy to condemn; it makes us in private life sensitive about being stiff and old fashioned, and wanting in sympathy for new and striking ideas about moral matters. It makes us delight in moral paradoxes which startle religious persons of the generation which is passing away. It makes men talk of God as if He were all benevolence and in no real sense justice. It blinds men to the moral necessities which drew the Eternal Son down into our vale of tears to die as a propitiation for human sin; it makes men turn away almost with fierce indignation from God's own revelations respecting the eternal world, because those revelations imply that He is, in virtue of His necessity, irreconcilable with self-chosen evil. Thus it debases society and public morals, and thus it debases sometimes that Heaven sent faith which alone can save them.—Sacred Heart, in American Herald.