

# The Catholic Record.

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

VOLUME XXIV.

LONDON, ONTARIO, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1902

1218

## The Catholic Record.

London, Saturday, Feb. 22, 1902.

### JUST BETWEEN OURSELVES.

Bishop Billsborrow is a "plain blunt man." That he does not mince matters is evident from the following extract from an address given recently in England before a St. Vincent de Paul conference:

"You wealthy Catholics—at least a very large proportion of you—think you can save your souls while following out your epicurean ideas, said the Bishop. Your motto seems to be: 'Eat, drink and be merry, and reduce religious duties to a minimum.' You avoid contact with poverty, live in comfortable suburban houses, and seek pleasures not only on six days of the week, but often on seven. Do you know that in the big cities there is flowing a great tide of life, and that there your presence is needed? The waves of religious indifference are washing away the weak and the young. What are you doing to help them? Have you no practical sympathy for them? The miseries of the poor are torturing flesh and blood. Why are you not offering solace—why not tendering assistance? Youths who are surrounded by temptations. Why have you not held out to them the friendly hand which they require? You are afraid your respectability would suffer. Away with your respectability. What we want is genuine Christianity."

Montaigne said truly: "Men are most apt to believe what they least understand." Perhaps that accounts for the unlimited faith given by some persons to the oracular pronouncements of secular publications on questions pertaining to theology.

A very hard-worked phrase is "splendid executive ability." It sounds melodiously in addresses, and gives one the impression that the individual thus designated must be somewhat above mediocrity. Generally it means nothing at all, like many of the other phrases that find their way on the blessed bits of parchment figuring on Commencement days and other occasions. The man who does little, for example, in the building line because of a paucity of funds at his disposal must not sport the appellation; while the individual who has dollars galore, and ability enough to pay his bills and get proper receipts, is a very Napoleon of finance. If he have what is vulgarly termed a "pull," he will, so as to save precision, be credited always with "splendid executive ability." The phrase is on a par with the time-honored "eloquent and powerful discourse."

We have attended a few entertainments this winter simply because, for reasons good and otherwise, we deemed it our duty to do so. They were very good in their way—much warbling and piano playing and chronicled in a gorgeously adulatory article indited by the scribes who write patent medicine advertisements for the newspapers. What made the most impression on us was the appearance of little children on the stage. We might refer to "upper and lower register," and dally a little with counterpoint, but we know our limitations. Charming little artists, the reporters termed the children; but we should say they were charming little misfits, as much out of place as a bull in a china shop. Better far for them to have been in refreshing sleep, than to have been decked out in finery to do a turn for the delectation of their foolish parents, and incidentally to benefit some worthy object. The aforesaid object covers, like charity, a multitude of deformities.

Not for one moment do we entertain the idea that because of our poor words there will be any lessening of juvenile display at our entertainments. But what we should wish to call attention to is that, if we wish to have sound thought and action, it is surely unwise to expect it from heads addled by meaningless flattery and carried away by the glare and fascination of the stage. Not indeed for us the insinuation that all our children are allowed to make fools of themselves to make a parents' holiday, for, thank God! there are some who believe that the restraints and privations enjoined by Christian antiquity are eminently useful in the rearing and training of children. "The gardener," says St. Anselm, "gives space and freedom to young plants that they may grow and spread forth their sweet branches, and so should masters provide indulgence for the young, who by oblation are planted in the garden of the Church, that they may increase and bear fruit to God."

Our experience would justify us in stating that some school teachers are,

in dealing with their charges, lacking in judiciousness. For instance, they drill a little girl who happens to be good looking and well dressed in a recitation and forthwith trot her out on every occasion. A school magnate or a clergyman visits the room, and the little one is invited to speak her piece. She is potted and spoiled more or less, much to the amazement and repining we suppose of her gingham comrades in the back seats. There may be no harm in it, but how much better if the teacher kept her blundering hands off the little girl's soul. How much better to let the soul grow and not to force it to bud out into vanity and self-consciousness in a hot bed of pedagogical foolishness. This may not happen, but we have never seen the exception.

Were we a teacher we would pin our faith on combined effort. We would have no quavering solos from smirking little women, but a chorus from the class—from the children of the comfortable as well as from those who come from the tenements. We would have no distinction between the possessors of good and bad footwear. We do not say there is, though one, considering that in some school rooms the "show pupils" are invariably the children of the well-to-do, may be pardoned for thinking it.

This, we may remark, is always done in a business way. The parents who love to see their darlings shining as stars, and basking in the sunshine of compliment as worthless as it is insincere, may thereby be made more responsive to an appeal for a donation. The parents, however, who have not a substantial grip of things earthy do not count, as they are not on the donation category. Moreover, it is quite a privilege for an institution to be able to inform the public that Miss—, the daughter of our distinguished townsman (what he is distinguished for is immaterial so long as he has the ducats) played the bass drum or extracted several varieties of music out of the oboe. The children of parents in trade or destitute of a bank account might have done all this, mayhap more artistically, but any notice that that effect would lack an air of distinction, and would not be an advertisement.

We may be told that, like an opponent of Sheridan's, we are indebted to our imagination for our facts. However, we have noticed once in a while that the dollar has a fascination for those even who have a theoretical dislike for it. We do love to dilate on poverty in the abstract; but we imagine that if a Francis of Assisi made his appearance, we should think twice before extending the glad hand of fellowship. We might let him in the side door for God's sake; but unless attired in fashionable garments we might deny him access to the front entrance.

Now we do not want our readers to gather the unkempt and miserable round about them into their drawing rooms—not even for an "at home" which is usually attended by everybody who is not a somebody. We wish merely to say that we should not allow our principles to be obscured by the customs of the world. Wealth is a desirable thing, but a self-respecting mortal will not cringe before it, nor reserve his approval for those only who possess it. Let us speak and act so as to convince all men that the charity in which we set store is not something on which to string a few pious platitudes, but a reality.

There is, we understand, a scheme being evolved from the brains of altruistically inclined gentlemen for the purpose of benefitting the clergy. The details are simple—the soggarth pays so much cash for stock and will receive a respectable dividend sometime before his death, if not sooner. And, bear in mind, that it is merely for the purpose of enabling our reverent friends to amass a fortune. It is certainly consoling to know that such 18 karat unselfishness is lying around promiscuously. But we remember what Ruskin wrote to a promoter of railroads, who contended that he should be rewarded for having acted so benevolently towards the public. He said that if the British public were informed that they could make a railway to help them they instantly invest in the concern to any amount and stop church-building all over the country, for fear of diminishing the dividends. If we desire to go a journeying to the temple of Mammon let us avoid the short cuts which are dotted with swamps and pitfalls for the unwary and inexperienced.

Every now and then one hears some-

thing about the degeneracy of the stage. Fervid denunciations disturb the atmosphere, but the stage keeps right on and the manager fishes up objects (psychological studies, you know) from the cesspools of indecency and exploits them with the assistance of ladies who have pasts and clothes. He keeps a watchful eye on the public, and can, if accused of contributing towards the deterioration of the stage, point to the respectable people who applaud his productions. Should anyone, whosoever culled from the purities of past history, or from the divorce courts of the present, bid fair to be popular, he will stage it and get a dramatic critic to write it up for those who "think with the back of their necks."

There were, we are told, some pretty bad specimens of drama in the fourth century. To counteract their degrading influence St. Gregory of Nazianzen contrived to put on the boards dramas of a pleasing and instructive character, and succeeded to a great extent. If we cannot have that, we can at least, by declining to witness the performances now in vogue, touch the manager in the most vulnerable part of his make-up—his pocket. We should do it for higher reasons, but with many of us there is a wide divergence between theory and practice.

### A LENTEN SUGGESTION.

What are you going to do during Lent? You will, we know, receive all the advice you need from approved sources, but let us suggest a few things: First: "Let every man mind his own business." This is easy for sensible people, but contains no end of difficulty for those who, as a good friend says, are forever trolloping around the streets and keeping a jaundiced eye on their brethren. This will be quite a mortification to them. If they would go to some far distant island and stop there indefinitely or until Easter they might succeed in minding their own business—that is if each had an island to himself and no means of transportation. Even then one of Marconi's instruments might play havoc with this plan. But if they must stop with us let them strive, for a season at least, to keep their little heads interested in whatever they may have to attend. Let them cultivate a dignity and reserve which, like a soft voice, are excellent in anybody. If they must talk, let them do it from out the fullness of wisdom and charity. We are not, though it may seem, making a plea for a wilderness of silence; we merely advise less verbosity, and vacuous utterances which grate on the nerves and set us wondering why some people cumber the planet. Now if we do this, what a glorious Lent it will be for a suffering people!

We will ask no impertinent questions nor pry into what concerns us not. We will save shoe leather by keeping of the streets, and our soul's beauty by keeping aloof from the defilement of gossip. We will stand a chance of acquiring some knowledge of ourselves. We will strive to convince people that we are not unmitigated nuisances, so that when we meet them on Easter morn they will talk to us unafectedly and not guardedly as they do at present. We will try to be genuine Christians through and through, though we may not carry big prayer books and belong to all the societies in sight. We will give up all our sighs and tears and hard luck stories and just be glad. We do not expect they will pay the slightest attention to our advice; but if they did we would implore the editor for an increase in salary on the grounds that we were a potent factor in the moulding of public opinion.

### AN OBSTACLE TO ADVANCEMENT.

Bishop Spalding tells us that games and other amusements doubtless have their uses, especially for the young, and for all who are feeble in body and mind. The learned prelate lives on mountain peaks where the air is too rare for ordinary lunged mortals, but we can agree with him when he says that games are generally occasions for wasting time, and so a chief obstacle to human advancement.

### CARDS OR MARBLES?

We suppose that Lent will exercise a discouraging influence on the "enchre party." Any disposition to look askance at this popular mode of entertainment is, as we are well aware, regarded as a manifestation of eccentricity, but for the life of us we cannot understand why this should be the case.

We are willing to concede all that may be alleged in favor of it, and we respectfully submit that it is not the noblest way of killing time. Once in a while is quite enough, but to have them week after week—to invite people to shuffle cards for hours at a time—denotes a very poverty of invention on the part of their promoters. Suppose we try "marbles," for a change?

### IMMORTALITY.

From a mass of letters to the New York Sun on Immortality we select one which may prove of interest to our readers. It will be seen that the writer, a scholarly clergyman of the diocese of Halifax, N. S., uses, and with adroitness, the "learning of the Egyptians," in order to score his point:

To the Editor of The Sun:  
Sir—I ask the writer in a recent issue who referred to immortality as one of the "nickel-plated inventions" of ecclesiasticism, to follow me in a brief argument.

I first put it in syllogistic form, thus:  
No existing matter, substance, energy, is ever totally lost, destroyed.  
But man, besides physical, has intellectual, moral, spiritual energy.

Therefore the immortality of the soul is a necessary consequence of man's existence.

If the first two of these propositions be true, then the argument is conclusive for immortality. Let us examine. That no substance that exists is ever utterly annihilated is merely the enunciation of a scientific truth. The old axiom that "the corruption of one thing is the generation of another" always holds good in the physical world. The decay of the human body results in the massing of the atoms that now compose it under other forms. Its chemical elements and energies escaping to enter into other groupings, forces, combinations. There is no exaggeration in Hamlet's surmise as to the possible ignoble uses, in some future day, of the noble dust of Caesar. My first proposition, therefore, is an undisputed scientific fact.

The next proposition asserts that man possesses two kinds of energies, essentially distinct one from the other, and of absolutely different natures—the physical or material and the intellectual or spiritual energies. If this be true, then the argument need be carried no further, in view of our conclusion as to the perseverance of all existing energy. But it is precisely here where the adversaries of immortality bid us go slow. They object that both the intellectual and physical parts of man are one reality, and that the physical energy exercised in the making of man. Not to go outside the wording of the controversy as now carried on in your columns the objection as put by Mr. Ellis reads thus: "Embryology and heredity clearly prove that each individual—soul and body—consists of factors the result of the union of germs of both parents." The objection was obvious, and is worth considering.

It will immediately be seen that the difficulty centres round the question: Are the physical and intellectual powers of man of essentially different natures, or are they both the resultant of man's physical make-up? I contend that the latter position is by no means clearly proven.

It will be admitted, to begin with, that man does possess intellectual energy, as he is able to reason, calculate, argue on the immortality, which the brute cannot. It should not be necessary to adduce proof of this, any more than of one's existence. On the strength of his ability to think, Descartes was led to acknowledge that he existed: "I think, therefore I am."

It will likewise be admitted that this intelligence has power over certain of our physical energies, but not over all. I can control the movement of my fingers as I put the present argument on paper, but it cannot control the circulation of my blood, nor the neuralgia in my cheek. Such vital functions as pulsations, digestion and respiration are utterly beyond and independent of the control of the intelligence. On the other hand, not the most ardent opponent of immortality will ask me to state, argue on my hair, or the expansion and contraction of my pupil can have the slightest possible influence on the course of my thoughts.

If this radical and evident independence of the physical and the intellectual in man does not demonstrate an essential difference of nature of the two energies, then I may as sensibly conclude that neither mind nor matter exists, or that a man may reason with his heels.

Now, if it be admitted, as it must on scientific grounds, that not one atom of man's physical organism is lost, even after death, then, if there be virtue in logic, with equal certitude must it be admitted that man's intellectual energy lives on, which is only another way of saying the soul is immortal. Millions of years ago the sun's rays fell upon that portion of the earth from which I indite this letter. They remained locked up in the coal beds, geologists may tell you how long, I care not; but they are now being brought forth to furnish light and heat and power. Here is resurrection and immortality for the humble candleflower. And we are seriously asked to believe that man's spiritual energy is not immortal, that the idea of immortality is one of the "nickel-plated inventions" of the clergy, that the highest and noblest element of the universe is the only one to perish at once and utterly.

I borrow no argument from Christianity, from the propriety of immortality, or from any authority that ever proclaimed that the soul is or is not immortal. I have endeavored to reach a conclusion from scientific premises admittedly and demonstrably true; and I conclude that before going over to the "wicked New Yorker's" way of thinking, I will need to hear a deal more of argument, and a deal less of undignified and denunciatory phrasing. Belief in immortality is coeval and coextensive with the human race. A phenomenon of such magnitude is not to be laughed off the stage nor brushed aside by a catch word. Not only is this idea not one of the "nickel-plated inventions" of ecclesiasticism, but precisely the other way about: the fact of immortality is accountable for the presence, in this interesting world of ours, of ecclesiastics; some the pure article, others nickel plated, whose mission is to prevent wicked New Yorkers and others from shaking off this mortal coil in such a state of conscience as necessarily to persevere in wickedness.

J. D. CURRY,  
Joggins Mines, N. S., Jan. 4.

### CHRISTIAN SCIENCE.

(Continued.)

McCracken: "Much of the comment which deals with paragraph numbered 5 brings up the question of mortal Mind. The patient who asks questions about Christian Science would not be told that 'the angry gun-shot wound that eats the flesh away' is nothing but a 'creation of his imagination.' It is mortal mind in general, the father of lies, which tells the various lies that go to make up the discord called gun-shot wound."

Comment: If Christian Scientists are consistent with their own doctrines they must tell the wounded patient that his wound is a delusion or a creation of his own imagination. They deny the existence of material bodies and of the disorders of material bodies called sickness, disease, etc. The wounded man believes he has a material body and that it is disordered by the wound. Therefore, in applying your doctrines to his case you must eradicate his belief by telling him that his wound is imaginary, a delusion, that he falsely imagines or believes that he has a material body, and therefore, falsely believes that he suffers from a physical disorder; and that physical disorder is impossible.

This we say, you must teach or give your doctrine in regard to matter. You may know your doctrines better than the outsider; but once that you state them the outsider is as competent as you are to draw conclusions that necessarily flow from them. In the case of the wounded man, it is with his own personal belief that you must deal and not with "mortal mind in general," for it is his belief, whether true or false, that is immediately concerned. He cares nothing about what others may believe, he knows what he himself believes, and it is this belief of his that you must displace by persuading him that it is a delusion. If you tell him "mortal mind," by its lies, made up his wound, he will ask you, Whose mortal mind, yours, or his, or the man's who shot him? You will tell him that no one mortal mind did it, but mortal mind in general. He will reply that mortal mind in general is no particular mortal mind; that it is a mere abstraction, a universal, and as such cannot be the agent of any action whatsoever, much less the cause of his wound. He will tell you further that he never consulted mortal mind in general, and that it never expressed an opinion on his particular case. He would very properly conclude by telling you to dismiss mortal mind in general from your diagnosis.

McCracken: "Man is spiritual and immortal, and his real and only body is not material, nor subject to gun-shot wounds; nor are the objects in the universe material." They are very real and true objects, but we apprehend them falsely as matter, through our deceptive physical senses."

Comment: Here you prove conclusively that you cannot talk of your doctrines without contradicting them. You say man's "real and only body is not material." Now Webster defines "body" as "The material organized substance of an animal, whether living or dead, as distinguished from the spirit, or vital principle; the physical person. Any mass or portion of matter."

When you use the word "body" then, you affirm the existence of a material thing, an extended thing having length, breadth and thickness. Your statement, therefore, is equivalent to this: "Man's real and only material body is not material." That is to say, it is material and not material at the same time. Your next contradiction is when you say the objects of the universe are real but false; apprehended "through our deceptive physical senses." Here you attribute false apprehension to the physical senses whose existence you deny.

But passing that, we ask, if the physical senses be deceptive how do you know that you know the doctrines of Christian Science? All you know or suppose you know of them you have acquired through the teachings of Mrs. Eddy, through your "deceptive physical senses." You either heard them through your sense of hearing or read them by means of your sense of sight. How, then, do you know that you know them, since what you suppose you know through a medium which you declare to be deceptive and untrue? May not "mortal mind in general, the father of lies," have played on your deceptive physical senses and produced a delusion

in your mind as to what Christian Science really is? With such a defective medium of receiving knowledge how can you affirm with reasonable confidence that you know what Christian Science is, or teaches? How can you be assured that the defective physical senses have not given you a false apprehension of it, as you say it has given mankind a false apprehension of the created universe?

McCracken: "Mortal mind is not created by God, it is not an expression of God, and its lies cannot, therefore, be traced to God."

Comment: It is a Christian doctrine that the minds created by God are immortal. But what is that thing you call "mortal mind," which God did not create? It is, according to you a something that lies; it is even the father of lies. It is then an agent, a being that can do something, namely, lie. Now you tell us that this being was not created by God. As it could not create itself it is, therefore, eternal, because uncreated. You have then an eternal liar eternally lying and defying God; one the origin of good, the other the origin of evil. This dualism is the necessary result of what you say of mortal mind. It is Manicheism, that combination of Magic and Buddhism that was condemned by the Christian Church in the third century.

McCracken: "Christian Science does not teach, and, therefore, makes no provision for the absorption of the individual into the divine mind, such as Pantheism presupposes."

Comment: Mrs. Eddy says in "Science and Health," "Soul is Deity. There is but one soul. The term souls is as improper as the term gods." If this be not an absorption of individual souls into the Divine Mind, it is even more; it is annihilation of individual souls or minds. According to this doctrine of Christian Science, you, Mr. McCracken, must hold that the letter you wrote to us and which we are commenting on, was dictated not by your mind or intelligence, which has no existence, but by the Divine Mind, which is the All of intelligence that exists. As, according to Mrs. Eddy her mind and your mind and our mind have no existence, the supposed clash between us exists only in the Divine Mind; in which case the Divine Mind is at war with itself; contradicting and arguing with itself; it is the home alike of truth and error. A doctrine that leads logically to such a result has within itself the demonstration of its own fallacy.

McCracken: "Christian Science teaches the immortality and indestructibility of each individual expression, or idea, of the One Mind, but it also emphasizes the impossibility of man being separated from the author of his being."

### Trust.

Off in the Highlands of Scotland there is a mountain gorge twenty feet in width and two hundred feet in depth. Its perpendicular walls are bare of vegetation, save in crevices, in which grow numerous wild flowers of rare beauty. Desirous of obtaining specimens of these mountain beauties, some scientific tourists once offered a Highland boy a handsome gift if he would consent to be lowered down the cliff by a rope, and would gather a little basketful of them. The boys looked wistfully at the money, for his parents were poor; but when he gazed at the yawning chasm, he shuddered, shrunk back, and declined. But filial love was strong within him; and after another glance at the gift, he said "I will go if my father will hold the rope."

And then, with unshrinking nerves and heart firmly strong, he suffered his father to put the rope about him, lower him into the wild abyss, and to suspend him there while he filled his basket with the coveted flowers. It was a daring deed, but his faith in the strength of his father's arm and the love of his father's heart gave him courage and power to perform it.

And shall we, children of God, be less trustful of the protection of the Almighty Hand when we have difficult duties to undertake? No; rather let us say with the Apostle, "I can do all things in Him who strengtheneth me."

### Sleepy Catholics.

In some countries of Europe the Catholics are very sleepy. They are like the husbandman in the Gospel who was asleep while the enemy sowed cockle in his fields.

If we Americans wish to avoid falling into their unfortunate condition, we have merely to carry out the Pope's injunction—to organize and to establish a vigorous Catholic press. Wherever the Catholics are intelligent, wide-awake and organized no harm can befall the Church.—Holy Family Church Calendar, Chicago.