

Archbishop Elder On Catholic Education.

To the Clergy and Laity of the Archdiocese of Cincinnati:

Dearly Beloved:

As the Catholic schools are about to open, we consider it opportune to address you on the important obligation of parents to provide for the Catholic education of their children. There are, we regret to be obliged to say, some fathers and mothers, who, either for the sake of fancied advantages, or through indifference, or on account of feelings against priest or teacher, send their children to non-Catholic schools.

It is undeniable that as a rule, all Catholic teaching is excluded from non-Catholic schools, and that in them there is usually present some kind of false religious influence. Now a system of education for the young, in which Catholic faith and the direction of the Church are excluded, cannot be approved by any Catholic. The Church considers it vital to a child's faith, that the spirit of religion should animate every part of the scholar's task, and influence every hour of his time in school. The teachers should be good Catholics, well instructed in their faith, and be capable to thoroughly drill the children in religion. The Church recognizing this necessity has always opposed the separation of education and religion, and hence has condemned those who advocate it. Pius IX. proscribed the forty-eighth proposition of the Syllabus, which reads as follows: "A Catholic may approve a system of education for the young which is divided from the Catholic faith and from the power of the Church which entirely confines itself to secular matters and to things affecting temporal and social life, or which is primarily concerned with these things."

The same Pontiff in a letter of July 15, 1864, to the Archbishop of Freiburg, strongly inculcates that religion and secular learning should go hand in hand, and points out the pernicious effects resulting from the opposite course. We are told by him that divorce of education and religion is a system which is a source of grievous harm to society; that it is the most pernicious system, especially if adopted in elementary schools; that the young are thereby exposed to the greatest danger; that in the face of such a system the Church should and will spare no pains to provide Christian education, and will find herself compelled to warn the faithful that such schools cannot in conscience be attended. These words from the letter to the Archbishop of Freiburg are repeated with slight variations in numerous instructions of the Holy See.

Leo XIII., in 1885, in a letter addressed to the Bishops of England, teaches that there is hardly anything more essential at the present time than that education in literature should be accompanied by the inculcation of true doctrine in faith and morals. He reminds heads of families of the solicitude with which they should avoid sending their children to these schools in which they cannot be taught the precepts of religion. In the Encyclical of Leo XIII. "Nobilissima" of the 8th of February, 1884, occur the following words: "The Church has over and over again loudly condemned those schools which are called mixed or neutral, warning parents to be careful in a thing so momentous."

These pronouncements of the Holy See are the law for all. The legislation of the III. Plenary Council of Baltimore is based upon them. It is evident, then, that the doctrine of the Church, which it would be erroneous, scandalous and even saving of heresy to contradict, is that to attend a non-Catholic school constitutes usually a grave and permanent danger to faith, and that, therefore, it is a mortal sin for any parents to send their children to such a school, except where there is no other suitable school, and unless such precautions are taken as to make this danger remote.

In applying this teaching to practical life, there are difficulties. We often meet with parents who object to sending their children to Catholic schools on account of certain features which they dislike, or who prefer non-Catholic schools on account of certain advantages. They claim that, if they take due precautions to have their children properly instructed and brought up in piety, they cannot justly be interfered with. But such a claim can not be admitted. This is a religious question, and is, therefore, within the sphere of the Church authority. In such questions it belongs to the Church not only to pronounce on the principle involved,

but also on its application to particular cases and individual Catholics. It is the office of the Bishops, as the III. Plenary Council of Baltimore teaches, to judge both of the alleged necessity, and of the sufficiency of the precaution. This is a matter, then, which lies within the jurisdiction of the spiritual power, and it is far from the true Catholic spirit to decide such a grave question for oneself.

Moreover, there is another aspect of the subject which shows still more clearly how necessary it is to abide by the judgment of the Church. It is almost impossible for a Catholic parent to send his child to a non-Catholic school anywhere in the country where there is a Catholic one without causing scandal. That is to say, such action suggests to other Catholic parents to do the same; it has the appearance of religious indifference; and it tends to break down the strictness and firmness of the Catholic faith. It is, therefore, nearly always a very grievous scandal, especially when the parent in question is a person of some standing and influence. Now an action which involves scandal of this kind can only be justified by a very grave necessity. It is the duty of the parent, therefore, to take the judgment of the Church both upon the possible extent of the scandal and the reason for risking it. The foregoing principles justify us in laying down the following rules:

1. In places where there is a Catholic school parents are obliged under the pain of mortal sin to send their children to it. This rule holds good, not only in case of children who have not yet made their first Communion, but also in case of those who have received it. Parents should send their children to the Catholic school as long as its standards and grades are as good as those of the non-Catholic school. And even if there is no school attached to the congregation of which parents are members, they would still be obliged to send their children to a parochial school, college, or academy if they can do so without great hardships either to themselves or to their children.

2. It is the province of the Bishop to decide whether a parish should be exempted from having a parish school and whether, in case there be a Catholic school in the place, parents may send their children to a non-Catholic school. Each case must be submitted to us, except where there is a question of children living three or more miles distant from a Catholic school. Such children can hardly be compelled to attend the Catholic school.

3. As the obligation of sending a child to a Catholic school binds under the pain of mortal sin, it follows that the neglect to comply with it is a matter of accusation, when going to confession. We fail to see how fathers and mothers who omit to accuse themselves of this fault can believe that they are making an entire confession of their sins.

4. Confessors are hereby forbidden to give absolution to parents who, without permission of the Archbishop send their children to non-Catholic schools, unless such parents promise either to send them to the Catholic school, at the time to be fixed by the Confessor, or, at least agree, within two weeks from the day of confession, to refer the case to the Archbishop and abide by his decision. If they refuse to do either one or the other, the Confessor cannot give them absolution; and should he attempt to do so, such absolution would be null and void. Cases of this kind are hereby numbered among the reserved cases from September 1, 1904.

5. The loss of Catholic training which the children suffer by being sent to non-Catholic schools must as far as possible be counteracted. Wherefore we strictly enjoin on the Diocesan Statute No. 64 be adhered to: "We decree that those who are to be admitted to first Holy Communion shall have spent at least two years in Catholic schools. This rule is to be observed also by superiors of colleges and academies." This statute was enacted by our Synod in 1898, and we regret that it has not always been observed. The necessity of complying with it is evident. It is difficult to properly prepare for first Communion even the children who have always attended Catholic schools; and it is simply impossible to do so when the children are allowed to go to non-Catholic schools up to a few months before they are to make their first Holy Communion. Pastors, superiors, of academies and colleges, are admonished to observe this regulation. No exception is to be made to it without our permission. In places where there is no Catholic school, pastors will confer with us as to the provision, which should be made for the instruction for first Communion.

6. Pastors seeking to prevent parents from taking their children too soon out of school have made regulations regarding the age of first Communion. As there has been some discrepancy in regard to this matter, some fixing one age, some a different one, and in consequence causing dissatisfaction among parents and children, we hereby direct that no child shall be admitted to first Communion, made publicly and solemnly, unless it has completed its thirteenth year on or before they day fixed for first Communion.

7. It is the pastor's duty to decide whether the children of his parish have sufficient knowledge for making their first Communion. Hence children attending a Catholic school other than the parish school, as well as those going to colleges and academies, must not be admitted to first Communion unless their pastor has testified that they are sufficiently instructed for approaching the Holy Table.

8. In connection with the matter under consideration we desire to draw the attention of the faithful to the following provision of the III Plenary Council of Baltimore: "Let pastors, moreover, take great pains that the boys and girls be better instructed in Catholic doctrine and in their Christian duties for two years following their first Communion." This regulation supposes on the part of the parents the obligation of using their parental authority to compel their children to attend these catechetical instructions. The pastor, to insure the attendance of the children, should fix such a time for the instructions as will best suit their convenience. Usually, the most suitable time is on Sundays before Vespers or before Benediction with the Blessed Sacrament. We exhort parents and adults to be also present at these instructions. We may have known the truths of our religion very well when we made our first Communion, but unless we recall them to mind from time to time we will forget them. It is especially desirable that parents should attend in order to see whether their children are present and whether they diligently studied the Catechism.

Dearly beloved Brethren, we have written at length on this matter of Catholic education. The importance of the subject is our only excuse for this long pastoral letter. We feel that it is a subject which cannot be too often nor too emphatically dwelt upon. Love for the dear little ones, whom God has entrusted to your care and whom you hope to be your crown and glory in heaven, we believe, will urge you to comply with the directions given in this letter. See to it that your children are well instructed in their religion, so that they may not be influenced by the errors and false doctrines which are sown broadcast by the enemy, and, that they may be able to give out-answers a reason for the faith within them by their knowledge, instead of being to them a stumbling block by their ignorance. Pastors will read this letter to their congregations on the last Sunday in August.

May God bless all, and especially bless parents, their children and all engaged in the work of Catholic education.

Sincerely yours in Christ,
WILLIAM HENRY ELDER,
Archbishop of Cincinnati.

Given at Cincinnati this 18th day of August.

PRECISION.

The habit of being accurate and thus averting annoyances arising from error.

I always find all the wisdom I need in St. Teresa's book-mark. It is a volume in itself. My great comfort in distressing circumstances is that "all things are passing."—Rev. Jos. Farrell.

If a man does not exercise his arm he develops no biceps muscle; and if a man does not exercise his soul, he acquires no muscle in his soul—no strength of character, no vigor of moral fibre, nor beauty of spiritual growth.

The end which at present calls forth our efforts will be found when it is once gained to be only one of the means to some remoter end. The natural fights of the human mind are not from pleasure to pleasure, but from hope to hope.

Strange Career of An Irish Admiral.

The theory that Ireland, second mother of military genius as she is, has never produced a great admiral, can only be accepted by those unacquainted with the history of Admiral Brown, erstwhile of Foxford, County Sligo, Ireland, and latterly head of the Buenos Ayrian navy during the war of independence and the subsequent war with Brazil. . . "whose exploits," says Mulhall, in a fine work misnamed, "The English in South America," may be ranked, like those of Nelson, above all Greek, above all Roman fame." Such language sounds hyperbolic, but those who care to study the well-authenticated records will cease to smile long before they get to the end. The Brown family emigrated to Pennsylvania in the year 1785. Poor as they were when they set out, they were reduced to absolute indigence when the father died immediately after their arrival at their destination. But the captain of the ship had been struck by the intelligent, self-reliant look of one of the boys, and offered to take him as his cabin-boy—and thus William Brown, instead of becoming a renowned Indian fighter on the prairies, whither, no doubt, his spirit would eventually have led him, became at the age of nine one of those "who go down to the sea in ships."

For twenty years he sailed the seas, storm smitten on the weather-bow, but at peace with mankind, till at last, as captain of a British merchantman, he was captured by one of Napoleon's privateers and imprisoned in Metz. He escaped—in the guise of a French officer—but was captured and brought back. Next he cut a hole in the floor of his cell to communicate with Colonel Clutchwell who was beneath, and then made a hole in the roof, through which they both escaped. They wandered about in Ardennes for several days, living on chocolate, and Clutchwell grew so exhausted that Brown had to carry him on his back until they came to the banks of the Rhine, which they crossed in safety—the Duchess of Wurtemberg lending them money to return to England.

Captain Brown established the first regular packet between Buenos Ayres and Monte Video, and having married an English lady, with whom he lived very happily, he built a handsome cottage on the Buenos Ayres shore, which became his home for upwards of forty years. The rebellion against Spain having broken out, the patriot government called on him to command, with the title of commodore, its first fleet. And such a fleet! There were the Hercules, an old Russian trader of 350 tons; the Zephyr, a brig of 200 tons; the Nancy, a schooner; the Julietta, smaller still; and three small tubs of too nondescript a kind to be set down in any class.

Not one of these vessels but was a peaceful trader or tramp, fit enough to fly before the gale, but hardly the sort of thing for a fleet of warships, bigger than a decent-sized blunderbuss and the powder supplied was often so weak that the commodore complained that it would hardly carry to the enemy's ships. As for the crew, it matched the rest of it. There were milkmen, butchers, deadbeats, and some convicts; the raking of a disreputable coast, and some men from the interior who could lasso the near hind leg of a bull at a gallop, but whose knowledge of the sea probably stopped at the certainty that it was salt. But the spirit and genius of the commodore rose above all, and though some of his men always failed him at a critical juncture, and one or two of his vessels often stole off to a safe distance and looked on when the flagship was getting it hottest, there always seemed enough with which to achieve heroic success. With his pitiful flotilla Commodore Brown bore down on the Islands of Martin Garcia, sometimes called the Gibraltar of the La Plata. A Spanish fleet of nine war vessels was fastened together in line under the shore batteries. There was a fierce fight, and the Buenos Ayrian fleet having suffered heavy loss, drew off—save Brown's own ship, the Hercules, which had run aground. All through the night she fought single-handed, till the next morning the tide floated her off. Half the crew, including two Irish officers, were lost, and the Hercules was holed in 82 places. The Commodore ran to Cañon to repair, took forty-five new men on board, and then, again, ho! for Martin Garcia. He landed with 150 men, and attacked the batteries with such fury that the Spaniards fled to the ships, leaving all their guns and ammunition in his hands. He returned to Buenos Ayres with his spoil, and set out for Monte Video, where, with seven of his vessels, he attacked nineteen Spanish ships. He feinted, drew the Spaniards out of the harbor, and got between them and the shore. He then split their fleet in halves, and captured six ships, drove the rest pell-mell back into the harbor. The Spaniards on shore rang their bells when they saw the Hercules coming in behind, thinking it had been captured, but Brown, who seems to have had a proper eye for the picturesque, draped his ship with the Republican bunting, and giving them a salute of twenty-one guns, sailed out again. In this action his leg was fractured by a cannon ball, but he remained on deck, and contrived to give directions as if nothing had happened.

This action decided the fate of Monte Video, which shortly afterwards surrendered. The Governor became the Commodore's own prisoner, and was treated with the most chivalrous courtesy, his generous captor giving him out of his own pocket a handsome sum for his expenses home. Brown, who had been on crutches for some time, now went home to have his wounds healed. His appearance was universally acclaimed. He was promoted by the Government to the rank of Admiral; and, as a special and unprecedented mark of honor, was presented by the nation with the now famous Hercules for his own property.

The fall of Monte Video had destroyed the last hopes of Spain on the Atlantic side, but there was further work to do in succoring the new republic on the west. With the Hercules and two other small vessels, one of which was commanded by his brother Michael, Admiral Brown set out for the Pacific, rounding Cape Horn amid fearful storms. Sailing up the west coast he daringly attempted to cut out some Spanish vessels under the batteries at Callao. He seized a gunboat, but it was chained to a frigate. But he sank a Spanish corvette before the batteries drove him off. Passing on the Guayaquil, he stormed a battery, spiked twelve heavy guns, and demolished the works. Next day he seized another battery, but his ship ran aground, his men got drunk at the liquor shops and the Spaniards recovered their courage and boarded the Hercules, which was now completely at their mercy. They were for refusing quarter, but the Admiral rushed with a brand to the magazine, whereupon the terrified Spaniards fell back and agreed to terms. The conquerors stripped the prisoners of their clothes and even the Admiral himself had to go about in ship's bunting till the Governor of the town, hearing of his condition, sent him some clothes and a polite invitation to dinner.

Michael Brown now appeared, and, under threats of shelling the town, obtained the release of the prisoners. At sea again, but without arms for his own crew, who were, besides, in a starving condition the bold Admiral felt that it was time to turn back. He ran to the Galapagos, caught seventy turtles, and with this unique larder on board set back for Buenos Ayres, ten thousand miles off. It was a terrible voyage, pumps going daily, and semi-starvation all the time. Ten years later Buenos Ayres was at war with Brazil. The Brazilians had eighty war vessels, including several big men-of-war: the Buenos Ayrians had no fleet at all. But it was the time of wooden ships, and courage and seamanship could do much against mere numbers and metal. The Government asked Brown to do what he could, and he sailed forth at day-break next morning with one vessel, the old Hercules, cut out and captured two vessels from the blockading squadron, and brought them in amid the cheering of thousands watching from the flat roofs of the houses. He got together six ships and made a bold effort to break the blockade; but three of his captains steered out of range, and left the Admiral's ship surrounded by half the enemy. The hopeless-looking fight was kept up for several hours, till Brown, showing incomparable coolness and skill, got his ship away. The enemy's fleet, badly mauled, drew off, but appeared later. Brown went out to meet them with only three vessels, when they turned tail and disappeared. Subsequently, with four ships, he went into the open and fought a drawn battle with sixteen Brazilian war vessels.

The Emperor of Brazil now sent twenty large ships, with express orders to seek out the terrible Irishman and sweep him off the seas. Brown sailed out. The house-tops

were crowded—it was the national anniversary of Buenos Ayres. The combat raged with incredible fury, but in the end the Brazilians were beaten and had to retire. This was only the prelude to the more glorious affair a fortnight later. The Brazilian fleet numbered thirty-one. Brown had only four small ships with six passenger launches carrying a gun each. With a skill rarely if ever surpassed in naval warfare, he manoeuvred the enemy's fleet into hopeless confusion, and put them to flight. The hero was rapturously received on his return, and the ladies presented him with an embroidered banner, suitably inscribed. A third time the enemy reappeared and Brown set out with his usual alacrity. But all his captains deserted him, and he was left for three hours to fight the whole Brazilian fleet. So raked was the Hercules from every quarter that the Admiral ordered his men under the hatches, remaining on deck himself alone. The enemy meditated boarding, but the universal belief that Brown would blow him ship up if hard pressed kept them off. At last the Republican came up and the Admiral got on her and towed his battered but unconquered old Hercules into port.

The Brazilian navy was now so weakened that the Buenos Ayrian commander assumed the offensive. He appeared off Rio and seized four vessels there, returning to Buenos Ayres after having destroyed fifteen vessels during his cruise. The following day the Brazilian fleet, which had been looking for him, arrived. Brown did not go ashore to see his family, but went out with seven ships and eight launches to meet seventeen large ships. He captured twelve, burned three and only two escaped.

The wildest rejoicing took place in the city when the prizes were brought in; the Admiral was drawn by the citizens in triumph to his home, and Congress voted him the thanks of the nation. This was by no means Brown's last glorious action; but enough, surely, has been related. When the three years' war with Brazil was ended, he represented the republic and arranged terms of peace. The portraits extant of Admiral Brown show a typically Milesian face. He remembered Ireland well, though he had left the country so young, and he experienced all the tender yearnings and regrets which are the lot of the exiles of Erin. In old age he revisited his native land, and spent several happy months in the haunts of his boyhood. He was a great "character," and many good stories are related of him. One is that, having run short of cannon balls on one occasion, he remembered that he had some hard Dutch cheese on board, and these proving an exact fit, he resumed firing. This story is apocryphal, but it is certain that he once attacked and captured a Brazilian warship with cavalry. The ship, it should be added, was aground at the time. His spirit and energy were such that the Brazilians reckoned that if they could land a party at night and capture him in his home—which was some distance from the city—they would put an end to the war. He died in 1857, in his eighty-first year, plausibly, and surrounded by his family and friends. The day of his funeral was a day of national mourning; and the government granted a site on which his widow erected a beautiful monument, with reliefs of his victories, and an epitaph wreathed in shamrocks.

POISE.

The power of self-control, which often makes one master of the situation.

If the perfection of good manners is simplicity, the perfection of literary culture is sincerity.

PENETRATION.

The ability to foresee events and consequently to provide for them.

PERSEVERANCE.

The characteristic which impels one steadfastly to pursue the object in view with an invincible determination to triumph over all opposition.

A REDEMPTORIST DEAD.

The death of Rev. John Cook, C.S.S.R., is reported from Porto Rico. Father Cook was a convert to Catholicity. He was born in West Newton forty years ago, and attended the Second Congregational church, of which he was for a time an instructor in the Sunday school. On becoming a Catholic he entered the Redemptorist Order. He has been in Porto Rico the past six years.