

# The Catholic Record.

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

VOLUME XXVI.

LONDON, ONTARIO, SATURDAY, MAY 21 1904

1335

## The Catholic Record.

LONDON, SATURDAY, MAY 21, 1904.

### MAN-MADE CHURCH UNITY.

Our ministerial friends are talking Church union. They are persuaded that dissension and diversion do not harmonize with the idea of the Church as set forth in the Bible and the number of sects is a reproach to the Christian name. But here as at Grindewald, and elsewhere, their efforts are doomed to failure, because they have no basis on which to rest the unity which they long for.

Suppose the different sects come together and agree to drop the points of disagreement between them. In this way they may have a semblance of unity, but far removed and very different from that unity as taught by the Lord and perpetuated by the means chosen by Him. A difficulty, however, which should present itself to the earnest believer is the possibility of making a mistake in this matter. The framers of the programme of common creed which is intended to be a barrier to discord are not fallible, and in questions pertaining to eternal destiny and above the reach of reason are in danger of leading their flocks astray, to say the least.

Again, what is to be the basis of the unity of the various sects? They answer the Bible. But if the Bible, reinforced by the learning of specialists and divines, has not effected unity, by what power shall the same Bible be able to do this at this juncture? And supposing they decided upon a creed, what authority could they show for it? They should also bear in mind that the unity of the Church must be of such a nature as to convince the world of the divine mission of Christ—"That the world may know that Thou hast sent Me." The scheme of unity which they elaborate is of man, subject to every caprice and whim of reason and without an element of permanence. The unity for which Christ prayed is of God, and it endures. That unity has been visible during the centuries in the Church that was, according to Dr. Schaff, the Alma Mater of the barbarians of Europe. She still stands like an immovable rock bearing witness to the fundamental facts and truths of our holy religion and to the catholicity, unity, unbroken continuity and independence of the Church.

### "THE DEMAND OF THE AGE."

Rev. Dr. Milligan in a sermon at old St. Andrew's church, Toronto, declared in favor of Church union. This was an age, he is reported to have said, for simplicity of creed. A decade or two ago a statement like the foregoing would have shocked the average Christian. He believed that God's word in its entirety should be hearkened to. He did not believe in the irrational and blasphemous method of presuming a revelation in order to sift it and to extract from it what pleased him. What the age demands in the opinion of some pulpiter counts as nothing. The only question is: Has God made known to us certain laws and truths? If so, we have to acknowledge Him as Master and to accept them. Because this age clamors for this or that, is no argument to show that man has the right to play the critic with Revelation and human reason has the privilege of passing judgment on the merits or demerits of the Word of God. A preacher may pay toll to the silly pretensions of the unthinking, but he is surely not of the opinion that he can fashion a better sort of Christianity than Christ gave us. Ingersoll said that he could beat the Ten Commandments, and give, we suppose, the age that is carried away by pride and encouraged in its headlong course by those who should restrain its self-sufficiency, a very simple creed. Once man puts himself against his God and dictates to Him as do the enunciators of new creeds there is no logical resting-place for him save in infidelity. There are some, says St. Paul, that trouble you, and would pervert the Gospel of Christ. But though we, or an angel from heaven preach a gospel to you besides that which we have preached to you let him be anathema.

### AN ANTIQUATED DOCTOR.

In the course of his sermon Rev. Dr. Milligan said: "The Romish priesthood—I say it almost under my breath—is a relic of paganism floating down to us from the Middle Ages."

Reading this gives us the suspicion that the rev. gentleman is not so up to date as he prides himself on being.

"Romish" is antiquated and not in consonance with the language used by gentlemen, nor is it in the vocabulary of any self-respecting Protestant scholar to-day. The gentleman believes, however, that severity and untruth are good mates. Still why should he say "almost under his breath" that "the Romish priesthood is a relic of paganism." We think that full lung power would be requisite to do justice to the statement, but perchance he essayed to do dramatic in his effort to make a "grand stand" play. We should like to hear his arguments in support of this contention. According to St. Paul we have an altar whereof they have no right to eat who serve the tabernacle. Sacrifice, priest altar occur again and again in the Scriptures, and are echoed by the writers of antiquity. We read, "Thou art a priest forever according to the order of Melchisedech." Christ was a priest according to Melchisedech when He instituted the Eucharist. But He was to be priest forever according to the same order. He was an everlasting priesthood. He Himself, therefore, must offer sacrifice daily, or through the instrumentality of others. Where is that sacrifice, that clean oblation if not in the Catholic Church? St. Augustine who lived some time before the Middle Ages, said: "We do not build temples to our martyrs as to gods: we erect altars in the churches and offer sacrifice on them."

### TALK ON SOCIALISM.

Subscription Book and Publishing Co., Jas. St. Arnold, General Agent, Louisville, Ky.  
Rev. L. A. Lambert, Editor Freeman's Journal:  
I have read with much interest Father Kress' letter and your editorials in the Freeman's Journal on the origin of the right of property. Have also noted your reply to Wm. J. Hurley of Shelton, Conn., in the issue of January 16, giving some reasons for opposing Socialism. Have also read with great pleasure your "Notes on Ingersoll" and "Tactics of Infidels," but your criticism of Socialism and Socialists is not so effective or convincing as your criticism of infidelity and infidels.

You say in your reply to Mr. Hurley that "Socialism demands the free use of all instruments and machinery that are used as adjuncts of labor and production. It denies the right of individual ownership of these instruments and lodges the ownership in the State. This is in direct antagonism to the principle you approve." In this statement you set up a man of straw to turn your arguments against—a thing you often in your "Notes" castigated Ingersoll for doing in his attacks on the Christian religion.

Comment: We have always had a strong antipathy to men of straw, and would regret giving evidence of decadence by manufacturing them. To put an opponent in a false position and then refute that false position is not to refute the opponent. But we fail to see the man of straw which our correspondent thinks he has in the above quotation from our article in reply to Mr. Hurley. We said Socialism lodges the ownership of the instruments of labor in the State. In thus attributing to Socialists a belief in "the State," or some form of Government, our correspondent thinks he sees a man of straw. It is in attributing to the Socialists a belief which they do not hold. If the Socialists believe in no form of government then we will have to commend to the man of straw, that is, that we misrepresent the Socialists. But if they believe in some form, any form, of government, it follows that the man of straw exists in our correspondent's imagination, and not in anything we said.

We need not go beyond the letter of Mr. Arnold, on which we are commenting, to prove that Socialists believe in "the State," that is, in some form of government. He says: "The State, the Socialist State, will not be an instrument of coercion, etc.; it will consist essentially of an organization of persons for primarily the administration of things."

Here, then, is "the State," the Socialist State. Hence, we built no man of straw when we attributed to the Socialists a belief in "the State," or the recognition of the necessity of its existence in some form as a condition of Society's existence here on earth.

Mr. Arnold: "Socialists do not favor lodging the ownership of the instruments of production in the hands of the State, as now constituted. They are decidedly opposed to increasing the powers of the existing State by transferring to it all or any considerable proportion, of the means of production and distribution."

Comment: All this we were well aware of when we said, "Socialism denies the right of individual ownership of the instruments of labor, and lodges the ownership in the State." Had we said, "The State as now constituted," there would have been reason for your charge of straw. But we did not say it, because we knew that the first object in the Socialist programme is the destruction of the State as now constituted.

Arnold: "Hence the strong opposition of Socialists to all proposals of so-called reformers for government ownership of railroads, coal mines, telegraphs, banks, etc., so long as the State is merely the coercive instrument in the hands of the exploiting class to keep the lower classes, those who produce the world's wealth, in subjection to their masters."

Comment: The so-called "lower class" that is, the manual laborers, are and always have been, in the majority. Under your ideal Socialist State this majority by their votes appoint the "organization of persons" or governing body. In the State as now constituted this same majority of laborers has the right under our Constitution, and the power to appoint the "organization of persons" or the governing body. As the laboring majority have now the same right and power to designate who shall be their public servants as they would have under your proposed Socialist State, why under your proposed Socialist State does the use of the State as the Socialist State offers that the State as now organized does not give?

If the laboring majority cannot now with the ballot protect themselves from the greed and coercive intrigues of capital, how can they protect themselves from the greed and intrigues under the Socialist State. In both cases the laboring majority has the ballot. If the use of that ballot cannot protect the people from the wrongdoings of their public servants now, how can it do then, since the means of protection is the same in both cases? Would the task not be still more difficult if the number of officials were increased tenfold, as it would have to be in your ideal Socialist State?

If the State as now constituted "is merely the coercive instrument of the exploiting class," whose fault is it? Is it not the fault of the majority, the working men, who by their votes could regulate and curb the exploiting class, and appoint faithful servants to keep an eye on them? If the majority, the working men, have not now the will, the unity and intelligence to do this under the present free State, what reason have you to think they would have those necessary qualities under the Socialist State?

Mr. Arnold: "The Socialist State is an entirely different conception from the State as it now exists. To-day the State is an instrument of coercion in the hands of the dominant property-holding class for the government primarily of persons. In the future the State, the Socialist State, will not be an instrument of coercion for the repression or keeping down of the struggles of a class to rise, but will consist essentially of an organization of persons for primarily the administration of things."

We do not see that the Socialist State is an entirely different conception from the State as it now exists. You say the Socialist State "consists essentially of an organization of persons for the government primarily of persons." This definition fits the State as it now exists as well as it fits your proposed new form of State. The difference is to be found in the number of things the State is to administer. The State as now existing recognizes the right of individual ownership of certain things and leaves these things to the control of the individual. Your State would take control of all those things and subject them to the administration of an organization of persons. But your State would still be a State, with an organized administrative body, just as the State is now. The conception, then, of the present State and of the Socialist State is not entirely or essentially different. The latter State extends its functions farther, over a larger number of things than the former, but this does not constitute a fundamental difference.

You say, "The Socialist State will not be an instrument of coercion for keeping down the struggles of a class to rise, etc." This is a fond hope, and nothing more. What reason have you to expect that the "organization of persons" elected to administer things will not be as greedy, ambitious and lawless as the organization of persons under our present State, or under any other form of government? If corruption and dishonesty prevail when the "organization of persons" has but few things to administer, will not corruption and dishonesty be still greater when said organization has many things to administer?

You may say that under the Socialist State the people could elect such unfaithful servants, and put honest citizens in their place. The people can do that just as well now, under the present State, if they want to. They have all the means of doing it now that they would have under the Socialist State. And if they cannot do it now—as you seem to think—why hope they could do it, then?

Your hope is based on no better ground than the supposition that in the new order of things men would become angels and voters Solons, and that fools and sinners would cease to be—a vain supposition.

Mr. Arnold: "As to the quotation from Pope Leo's Encyclical, 'As effects follow their cause so it is but just that the fruits of labor should belong to those who have labored,' I have cited this utterance of Pope Leo many a time when addressing working men, not because I deemed it necessary to justify or even strengthen the Socialist position, but because it would enable me to follow their cause so it is but just that the fruits of labor should belong to those who have labored." I have cited this utterance of Pope Leo many a time when addressing working men, not because I deemed it necessary to justify or even strengthen the Socialist position, but because it would enable me to follow their cause so it is but just that the fruits of labor should belong to those who have labored."

Comment: You say you are "opposed to" the utterance of Pope Leo, "I have read the Pope's Encyclical on the 'Condition of Labor' a good many times, and read it very carefully, but as a whole I cannot accept it as sound, socially or economically. I have consulted some priests in regard to it, and have been told that the Encyclical is not an utterance ex

ethedra, and is not therefore binding on the consciences of Catholics. As I understand Catholic teaching, the Pope, speaking as a theologian, may err, even in matters of morals or faith. How much more so, then, may he err when speaking on economics or politics? This being true, the mere fact that the Pope has decided against Socialism is not in itself a sufficient reason why Father Lambert, or any one else, should decide against it, especially when it appears that the decision of the Pope is wrong."

When you quote an isolated sentence from the Pope's Encyclical, for the purpose of reaching effectively a larger number of men, you mislead those men as to the real position of the Pope. If you use the Pope's influence with those men you owe it to them to let them know the Pope's position, that is, his opposition to Socialism, and his reasons for it.

Though the Encyclical is not in the form of an *ex cathedra* utterance of an authority, it settles the matter for the Catholic world. The fact that the Pope, in an official declaration to the Bishops of the world, has condemned Socialism is enough for the well instructed Catholic. The fact that you disagree with the Pope does not make it appear that the Pope is wrong, nor would argument with you demonstrate that he is right.

Mr. Arnold: "But you proceed to argue. You say: 'If your neighbor makes a plow or sewing machine, that plow or machine is his by right of production. I, because he has expended his labor upon it.' Correct. And conversely if your neighbor has not produced a plow or machine, that plow or machine is not his because he has not expended his labor upon it."

This is all correct, according to the principle you quoted from the Encyclical. The only way to acquire the right of ownership to a thing is to produce, make that thing, or to purchase it from the producer, or receive it as a gift from him.

Mr. Arnold: "But why do you say 'neighbor,' instead of neighbors? Why speak of the individual producer instead of the social producers?"

We use the singular instead of the plural because we are speaking of one person. Who produces a plow or a sewing machine? We speak of the individual producer because we refer to the individual who produced, made the plow, and not to several individuals or to Society in general, who did not make it.

Mr. Arnold: "The individual does not produce plows or sewing machines to-day. The day of individual production is past. Things are produced now socially, and Socialists declare that they should be owned socially."

It is nothing to the point what the individual may or may not do to day; but has the individual the right to the plow if he produces it—a right against all adverse claimants, individuals or Society? Your Socialist philosophy denies this. The day of individual production is not past, and never will be, as long as anything is produced. Things may be produced by the concurrent action of a number of men. A hundred or a thousand men may have worked, each his particular part, to the production of, say, a piano. But it does not follow that the piano was produced socially. Each man had a right to the part he produced. This right, by contract, cedes to his employer for a consideration called wages. The fact that he worked in conjunction with other workers does not give those others, either severally or collectively, any right to what he produces. It is produced. It is conjoint, corporate, contract or wage production; it is in no sense Social as Socialists understand that word. The present system of industry under the State is the wage system, not the Social.

Mr. Arnold: "But to return to your illustration of the plow and the sewing machine. If your neighbors make plows or sewing machines, your neighbor should own them. So asserts the Socialist, and if not, why not?"

Comment: If our neighbors make plows as a company or corporation; if each member has a right to his share of the income from their partnership work. If they work individually in pursuance of a contract with a common employer and receive the price of their labor as agreed upon the plows belong to the employer, just as if he made them with his own hands, because he bought from the workmen their title to the results of their labor—a title, which being in the owners, the employer had a right to transfer to the employer for a consideration. Having transferred their title to the plows they have no further right to them, whether we consider them individually, collectively or Socially. The ownership in the employer. If our neighbors make plows, each has a right to the plow he makes, just as each of the others has. The right of each is unquestionable as against all adverse claimants, including Society and the Socialist State. It is just here that Socialism comes in antagonism with the Encyclical in denying the right of the plow maker to the results of his labor, and claiming for all what has been made by one.

Mr. Arnold: "But who are the producers of the said plows and sewing machines? The true answer is, the whole army of workmen who have contributed to the production of these plows and sewing machines, viz., the workers who have provided the material, transported it to the factory where it is worked up into the finished product, and likewise other workers who erected the building in

which the plows and machines are made, and still other workers, who have made the machinery used in the making of plows and sewing machines. If not, why not?"

No one individual makes the completed machines. Every individual who worked on them or any part of them has a right to what his labor produced. This right he can and does transfer to his employer for a consideration called wages; and being thus transferred, the right inheres in the employer just as it inheres previously in the individual producer. It makes no difference how many may work in the production of the machines, each worker in the various stages from the raw material to the perfected machine, has, individually, the right to the result of his labor, and the right to transfer his title to his immediate employer. If he digs the iron out of the ground he has a just claim on it until he transfers that claim to some one else, say, his employer. Right then vests in that employer till he in turn transfers it to the manufacturer of machines. The manufacturer employs workmen to transform the iron, and in this transforming, the workmen, without any relation to the hands that worked on it before, have a claim on the iron for that which they did to it. This claim they have a right to sell for stipulated wages. The manufacturer then transfers his purchased claims to the purchaser of the machine, who pays for all claims from the miner to the manufacturer inclusively. Here we have a series of distinct events, of sales by and of purchases by those who have a right to purchase. The just claims of all participants in the production of the machine are cleared off by the latest purchaser. Having sold their claims and received payment the participants in the production have no further right in the machine. All their rights are lodged in the last purchaser, after all these transactions, after all these sales and payments, the State can step in and take the machine from the owner, the last purchaser, without any compensation. It is the custom of the civilized world to call men who do this kind of thing bandits, robbers, pirates; and the custom is founded on the eternal principle of justice.

Mr. Arnold: "Again you argue that: 'All men are moved to exertion by the thought and prospect of profit in some form. Without it labor would be paralyzed. The factories would be deserted, the plows would be out ships, the plow would rust in the furrow. This is a most extraordinary argument, coming as it does, from Father Lambert! Was John Milton moved to write his immortal epic, 'Paradise Lost,' by the hope or expectation of profit? Did Galileo pursue his studies in astronomy and give the world his great discoveries through the hope of gain? Did Elias Howe produce his sewing machine simply because he was looking for profit? Finally, did Father Lambert write his most excellent and famous 'Notes on Ingersoll' for profit for himself, or for the good of others?"

We said all men are moved to exertion by the thought and prospect of profit in some form. We used the qualifying phrase "in some form" to warn the reader that our use of the word "profit" was not to be limited to mere dollars and cents. Our warning has not attracted our friend's attention. Had it done so, he would not have thought of saying what he has just said. By our warning we meant to emphasize the dictionary definition, which defines profit as "Improvement, advancement, progress; any advantage, benefit, or accession of good from labor or exertion; valuable results, useful consequence, benefit, gain; comprehending the acquisition of anything valuable or advantageous, corporeal, or intellectual, temporal or spiritual."

All these meanings we emphasized by the phrase "profit in some form." But our friend did not catch on, and hence his limitation of the word profit to the mercantile or traffic idea.

Milton, Galileo and others profited immensely by their labors, even if they never received one penny from their writings. If anything we wrote did good to others, that good is itself a profit worth striving for.

Mr. Arnold: "And, as to the real wealth-producers—the working class,—would they refuse, for example, to raise wheat and go without bread unless they could exchange this wheat with other producers at a profit?"

Here you have the merchantry, or traffic, idea of profit again. The wheat they raise is the profit, the benefit to them, arising from their labor. And it belongs to the individual who raised it, and not to society in general, as your philosophy would have it.

Mr. Arnold: "To assert that a man, who performs no useful function in the work of production, who does not do his full share of the work, is entitled to a legitimate profit is a contradiction of the proposition, that to the producer belongs the product." Your two different propositions would read: "1. The producer is entitled to his product. 2. The producer is entitled to his product minus a legitimate profit for the employer, the non-producer."

Here the implication that the man, who has the ability, the initiative and the enterprise, and uses them to organize an industry, pays for the building of shops and purchases all the necessary tools for the industry, is a man who performs no useful function, is a false implication. If the Socialist State did all that this man does, would you say that it performed no useful

function. If this providing the means of labor be a useless function, why do you want your Socialist State to assume it? Is not the brain-worker, the organizer of an industry that gives employment to thousands of workmen, entitled to a legitimate profit. Is it fair to assume that he performs no useful function. All you say on this point rests on that false assumption, and is equally weak.

The producer is entitled to his product, but he is not entitled to the use of the tools and the shop which he did not produce. Justice requires that he should pay something for this use of tools and shop, etc., otherwise he would receive more than the product of his labor, and this more would be at the expense of others. This is why we said the producer is entitled to his product minus a legitimate profit for the employer. There is no contradiction here.

Mr. Arnold: "Once more you say: 'Legitimate profit of the employer is not a robbery of labor.' If the producer is entitled to his product, or, rather, if the producers are entitled to their product as I understand you to say in your reply to Father Kress, then there can be no such thing in morals as a legitimate profit for the non-producer."

A non-producer has no legitimate claim on any product. Your error, and it is a persistent one, is in your assumption that the brain-worker, the organizer and conductor of a manufacturing establishment is a non-producer. He is a producer and has the right to his legitimate profit.

Mr. Arnold: "Bishop Spalding, of Peoria, I understand, says a Catholic may be a Socialist and remain in the Church. What say you?"

We say with the Bishop, and in his words, "As set forth by Marx and his other able exponents, (Socialism) rests on a basis of materialism and atheism, and is the foe, not merely of the fundamental economic institutions, but of the Church and the family as well." These words are quoted from Bishop Spalding's lecture delivered in Chicago the 9th of last February. You will find it in full in the "Catholic Review of Reviews" for March, 1904, 637-8. Harding Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

Every ism must be judged by its principles. If these be false the ism is false. Socialism, according to its authoritative exponents, rests on a basis of materialism and atheism; it is therefore materialistic and atheistic, and is the foe of the Church and the family. Such being the case, need you ask "Can a Catholic be a Socialist and remain in the Church?"—N. Y. Freeman's Journal.

Right Rev. Dr. John Coffey, Bishop of Kerry, died at his home in Killarney last Thursday week. He was the founder of St. Brendan's seminary.

Amongst the converts to the Catholic Church in Korea were the present King's mother and also the Princess Mary, who died in 1898, in which year the number of baptisms reached 3904.

The costliest book in the world is said to be in the Vatican Library. It is a Hebrew Bible, for which the Jews of Venice offered—in vain, of course—\$100,000.

On Thursday last Archbishop Ryan completed the thirty-second year of his Episcopal rule. Both the clergy and laity of this, his former field of labor, fervently pray that God in His wisdom may preserve him for many years yet to come.

Official notification comes from Rome of the creation of the new Catholic diocese of Joliet, containing the counties of Bartholomew, Joliet and Montcalm in the Province of Quebec, and four parishes of L'Assomption. Everything points to Rev. Canon Archambault as the new Bishop.

Mrs. Enelle Donohoe, the wife of Joseph A. Donohoe, a San Francisco banker, has purchased five acres of land adjoining the Sacred Heart Convent at Menlo Park, and will provide sufficient funds with which to erect and equip a parochial school for the children of the community.

The Bishops of Switzerland have published a collective letter to their flocks, urging them to support Catholic newspapers. They say: "Whoever takes a journal hostile to the Church participates by so doing in its bad deeds. \* \* \* Subscribe to Catholic newspapers; when you have read them pass them on to others to read."

A committee of ladies has been formed in New Orleans with the object of preparing and presenting to Pope Pius X. a pair of sandals, richly adorned with precious stones, to be worn by His Holiness at the Pontifical Mass he is to celebrate on the Jubilee anniversary of the proclamation of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception. — N. Y. Freeman's Journal.

The Rev. Benjamin F. De Costa, the noted convert, who was ordained to the priesthood recently in Rome, arrived in New York on Tuesday, May 18. Father De Costa was for many years rector of the Protestant Episcopal Church of St. John the Evangelist in New York. After his conversion he went to Rome to prepare for the priesthood. While in Rome his health was very poor, and at times his condition was critical. On this account his ordination was hastened. His health improved recently and he decided to return to this country. The ocean trip was of great benefit to him, and on his arrival here his condition was very satisfactory, so much so that he immediately went into retreat, in thanksgiving for his return to health.

Mr. Arnold: "But you proceed to argue. You say: 'If your neighbor makes a plow or sewing machine, that plow or machine is his by right of production. I, because he has expended his labor upon it.' Correct. And conversely if your neighbor has not produced a plow or machine, that plow or machine is not his because he has not expended his labor upon it."

This is all correct, according to the principle you quoted from the Encyclical. The only way to acquire the right of ownership to a thing is to produce, make that thing, or to purchase it from the producer, or receive it as a gift from him.