

The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 24 and 49 Richmond street, London, Ontario.
Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

EDITORS:
REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVES,
Author of "Mistakes of Modern Infidels."
REV. WILLIAM FLANNERY,
THOMAS COFFEY.

Publisher and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY,
Messrs. LUKS, KING, JOHN NICHOL,
J. SEVEN and M. C. O'DONNELL are fully
authorized to receive subscriptions and transact
all other business for the CATHOLIC RECORD.

Rates of Advertising—Ten cents per line each
insertion, grate measurement.
Approved and recommended by the Arch-
bishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, and St.
Boniface, and the Bishops of London, Hamilton
and Peterboro, and the clergy throughout the
Dominion.

Correspondence intended for publication, as
well as that having reference to business, should
be directed to the proprietor, and must reach
London not later than Tuesday morning.

Articles must be paid in full before the paper
can be stopped.

Persons writing for a change of address
should invariably send us the name of their
former post office.

London, Saturday, June 20, 1891.

THEOLOGICAL CONFUSION.

From the numerous heresy trials which have taken place recently in the various Protestant Churches, the anomalous condition of Protestantism may readily be seen. From the beginning, Protestantism proclaimed the right of private judgment, and without this claim it could have no justification for its revolt against the Catholic Church in the sixteenth century.

If the Church of Christ has really authority from God to settle controversies of faith, all who presume to set aside her authority must be condemned. There was certainly a Church in existence when Luther raised the standard of revolt; and there is no doubt that the Church then existing possessed a real and unbroken continuity with the Church which Christ established. Altogether independently of the divine right of the Pope to be considered as the successor of St. Peter, and head of Christ's Church on earth, there was only one organization which could claim to be the Church of Christ on earth, and that organization was the Catholic Church. If the Church had from Christ any judicial rights whatsoever it was certainly her right to try the teachers of new doctrines and to pronounce upon their agreement or disagreement with the "faith once delivered to the saints," and all who were condemned under this judgment fell under the anathema pronounced twice by St. Paul in his epistle to the Galatians (i. 8). "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."

That such an authority was instituted by Christ is evident. Christ Himself declares: (St. Matt. xviii.) "If he (an offending brother) shall hear thee, thou shalt gain thy brother; and if he will not hear thee, take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may stand. And if he will not hear them, tell the Church; and if he will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as the heathen and the publican."

The reason for this is then given, for "Whatsoever you shall bind upon earth shall be bound also in heaven; and whatsoever you shall loose upon earth shall be loosed also in heaven."

There is in this no setting up of private authority against the Church. Private correction is to be tried before complaint be made, but when the authority of the Church is invoked the decision is final.

We find the Apostles exercising the authority thus committed to them. (Acts xv.) They render their decisions in the name of the Holy Ghost: "For it hath seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us." Their decisions are, therefore, binding. St. Paul himself went to Jerusalem to confer with the other Apostles regarding the gospel he preached, and apart "with them who seemed to be something," that is with those highest in authority, "lest perhaps, I should run, or had run in vain;" and he relied on the decision he received. (Verse 3.)

It is clear, therefore, that Christ appointed a supreme legislative and doctrinal authority in the Church; but the first Protestants, and, professedly, the Protestants of to-day, found it convenient and necessary, so as to vindicate their own position, to reject such an authority, and to set up individual judgment in its stead. But with strange inconsistency, when among themselves a minister teaches some doctrine which is evidently contrary to the first principles of Christianity, they claim that their Churches, which have certainly no mission derived from Apostolic succession, have, nevertheless, authority to settle questions of doctrine. Such has been the case in the dealings of the Protestant Episcopalians with the Rev. Mr. MacQuary

and of the Presbyterians with Rev. Dr. Briggs. Dr. Heber Newton, of New York, is also threatened with an ecclesiastical overhauling; but he has said very truly concerning the situation, that "the Protestant Church is in a panic."

A recent issue of the New York *Sun* says, while describing the situation: "The Presbyterians are not able to determine what heresy is, because they have not yet determined what their own belief is." This perfectly describes the present position. Important changes are even now proposed to be made in the Westminster Confession of Faith, though the Assembly tries to make the world believe that the proposed changes are slight and unimportant; merely verbal changes indeed. But every one knows that the making of merely verbal changes would not have agitated that body to the extent to which the question of revision has moved them.

In fact, in dealing with Dr. Briggs, the General Assembly seemed to be actually dismayed to have the question of the Dr.'s orthodoxy touched on at all, and though his appointment to the position of teacher of Biblical Theology in the Union Seminary was vetoed his doctrinal teachings were left untouched by the decision. Most of the speakers on the subject were careful to explain that they objected to the appointment because Dr. Briggs contradicted himself, or because he did not make himself understood, which is a bad quality in a Seminary Professor, or because he was insulting and defiant in his tone towards those who differed from him, and thus excited the ire of his opponents.

But it matters little to these clergymen, even if their denominations expel them from their ranks. They can always find a phase of Protestantism to receive them, whatever may be their teaching. Thus Rev. Mr. MacQuary was received with open arms by the Unitarians; and, indeed, just as seven cities claimed the honor of being Homer's birthplace, as many Unitarian congregations offered their churches to the same gentleman when the Protestant Episcopal Church rejected him. Dr. Bridgman, too, a prominent Baptist clergyman, rejected the doctrine of everlasting punishment, to which Baptists adhere with great tenacity; yet, on his resigning his pastorate, many of his ministerial brethren openly or secretly avow their sympathy with him; and it is somewhat strange that he has been received into the Protestant Episcopal Church without any difficulty, and without being asked to change his views he is to become a clergyman in that denomination.

It is no wonder, indeed, that the New York *Sun* should say, "It is true, undoubtedly, that there is much confusion in the minds of theologians. Apparently, too, instead of approaching a solution of their difficulties, they are getting more inextricably entangled in them." "So complete is the confusion that, even now," the *Sun* says, "the American Missionary Board is embarrassed by the tendency of candidates for its commissions to accept the theory that the heathen will be saved without the Gospel."

THE ST. BARTHOLOMEW MASSACRE.

Our attention has been called to an article which appeared in the Montreal *Witness* of April 26, in reference to the massacre of St. Bartholomew's day which took place at Paris on the night of the 24th August, 1572, by order of King Charles IX.

Unfair Protestant writers have constantly made it their aim to connect the Catholic Church with this bloody occurrence, and to throw the responsibility of it upon Pope Gregory XIII., who was the reigning Pontiff at the time; and it is the aim of the article in question to do this.

The massacre of St. Bartholomew was purely a political action to which King Charles assented, being persuaded thereto by his unscrupulous mother, Catharine de Medici. During the decade preceding the massacre no fewer than four wars had broken out between the Catholics and Protestants of France, chiefly because the latter, though forming but a small proportion of the population of the country, desired, with the assistance of German allies, to seize upon the Government of the country, and to bring the Protestant house of Navarre to the throne. It was their hope also to establish the Protestant religion in the country. Encouraged by Calvin and Theodore de Beza, they sacked and pillaged the churches, demolished crosses and images wherever they were found, and plundered the houses of the Catholics, especially

in those provinces or localities where they were numerous. Calvin declared that these scenes of blood were "his consolation, joy and happiness."

M. Guizot in his history of France, Protestant as he was, acknowledges that Theodore de Beza advised and pleaded for the war of 1562, saying to the King of Navarre: "It is true that the Church of God should endure blows and not inflict them; but remember, I pray you, that it is an anvil which has used up a great many hammers."

We have no disposition to palliate the atrocities which were committed during that unhappy period by Catholics as well as Protestants; but it must be borne in mind that in a civil war raging on account of religion, between people of the same race, and dwelling side by side, such atrocities are sure to occur. Guizot tells us that "where they happened to be the stronger, and where they had either vengeance to satisfy or measures of security to take, the Protestants were not more patient or more humane than the Catholics." As a matter of fact they were by far more aggressive.

"At Nîmes, in 1567, they projected and carried out in the town and the neighboring country a massacre in which one hundred and ninety-two Catholics perished; and several churches and religious houses were damaged or completely destroyed. This massacre, perpetrated on St. Michael's day, was called the *Michaelade*. The barbarities committed against the Catholics in Dauphiny and in Provence by Francis de Beaumont, Baron of Adrets, have remained as historical as the Massacre of Vassy, and he justified them on the same grounds as Montaigne had given for his in Guienne. 'No body commits cruelty in repaying it,' said he, 'the first are called cruelties, the second justice. The only way to stop the enemies' barbarities is to meet them with retaliation.'"

It is to be remarked that the massacre of Vassy of which this historian speaks was an encounter between a Protestant congregation and the suite of the Duke of Guise, who was passing through the town; but M. Guizot himself acknowledges that it is difficult to arrive at the truth concerning the details of its origin. Forty-nine persons were killed and about two hundred severely wounded during this affray, the blame of which most Protestant polemicists throw upon the Catholics. We may suppose that there was culpability on both sides, but historians give very opposite accounts of how it originated. It is certain, however, that the Protestant party suffered more severely than the Catholics, but Conde, the brother of the King of Navarre, made it a pretext for offering to raise fifty thousand men towards conducting the war which broke out immediately afterwards for the establishment of Protestant ascendancy.

In the wars which followed during the decade the Protestants were invariably defeated; yet most favorable terms were always accorded them, with which, however, they were not satisfied, so that peace was always soon followed by another outbreak; and it is not surprising that the assassination of the Duke of Guise, the Catholic leader, and the traitorous negotiations with foreign powers which were carried on by the Protestant party for the overthrow of the Government, filled Catharine de Medici and the Guise family with anger and alarm; though certainly it was not through love of religion that Catharine persuaded the young king to consent to the murder of Admiral Coligny and his adherents. M. Guizot tells the reasons by which she prevailed. She told the king that "the Huguenots had sent despatches to Germany to procure a levy of 10,000 troops, and to Switzerland for 10,000 more," and that "it would be better to fight the battle in Paris, where we hold the chiefs in our clutches, than to hazard it in the field."

To these representations the king yielded, though he had all along been anxious to favor the Protestants, and even his mother had been favorable to them also, until she found that the dynasty of her family was in imminent danger. But it is certain that the outrage was perpetrated purely from worldly motives, and without even the knowledge, and of course without the consent, of the Catholic clergy. On the contrary, it is certain that in many places the clergy interfered to prevent the example set in Paris from being imitated, and thus aided in diminishing the number of victims.

The number killed has been very variously estimated. The Protestant historian de Thore says that all over France there were thirty thousand victims. Some fancifully put the number at 100,000; but the Calvinistic author of the Huguenot Martyrology,

after estimating the number at 30,000, afterwards, having examined the matter in detail, acknowledged that the whole number must have been 786 in all France. (See American Cyclopædia, Bartholomew, St.) Dr. Lingard computes the total at 1500.

But we are informed by the writer in the *Witness* that a medal was struck by Gregory XIII. to commemorate the massacre, and thus it is held that this Pope approved of it. For the purpose of sustaining this view a French historian is quoted who says: "Gregory seems by this medal to have approved and praised (the massacre), which can be explained by his ardent zeal for the Christian religion, the fact being that he entertained the hope that the leaders and promoters of that sect and plague which infested France . . . would disappear and be thoroughly eradicated."

The historian quoted does not pretend to assert positively that Gregory approved. It only "seems" so—to him. He was mistaken. But though the medal was struck, as, according to the custom of the time, it was usual to strike a medal in order to mark important events which occurred during the reign of each Pontiff, it by no means follows that these events were approved by the Popes in their details. In fact the designs of the medals were left to the officials, and the Pope seldom knew what the design was until he saw the medal itself. In the present case the design represented the destroying angel pursuing the Huguenots, by comparison with the destruction of Sennacherib's army, as recorded in Holy Writ. But Smile's History of the Huguenots admits that probably the Pope had nothing to do with the making of the medal. At all events, it is certain that Catharine and King Charles represented to the Pope that there was a conspiracy against them for their destruction and the destruction of their Councillors, and that there was an actual insurrection on the part of the Huguenots which was defeated by the energy and bravery of the king's officers and soldiers. It was represented that this was the whole transaction; and if such had been really the case it would have been quite right for the Pope or any good Christian to rejoice at the occurrence. There is no article of faith in the matter, and it is not surprising that with the deceitful account given of the occurrence by the king, the Pope should give thanks for his delivery from a supposed band of assassins and conspirators, even if it be supposed that the Pope knew the exact character of the medal which was struck.

The American Cyclopædia recognizes that this was the case, and completely exonerates the Pope from having approved of the atrocious deed; for atrocious it was, notwithstanding the great provocation under which it was perpetrated.

Another medal is mentioned by the writer in the *Witness*, which was intended by the same Pope to represent the true worship of God. The same French historian who refers to the previous medal states that Gregory XIII. aided Henry III. in repressing and crushing the attempts and efforts of the heretics. This needs no words of defence from us. The persistent treasonable attempts of the French heretics to establish in France a kingdom of their own deserved repression.

"CUMBERLAND PRESBYTERIANS."

The Rev. A. B. Milligan, one of the six ministers suspended and excommunicated by the Reformed Presbyterian Assembly of Pittsburgh, for exercising the rights of American citizenship by voting at an election, has declared that he will not submit to such a tyranny, but that he will continue to preach; and, as his congregation sustain him, he will draw his salary as before. As the majority in the Church firmly insist on abstention from all politics as a condition of membership there will in all probability be a schism, comprising at least the six excommunicated ministers and their congregations, together with twenty-one additional ministers who regard the oppressive course of the synod as most un-Christian. The final sentence of excommunication was carried last week by a vote of 95 to 37. Among the clergy present, Rev. J. F. Carson refused to vote, saying, "In view of the result of this vote just taken, and in view of the fact that as soon as the result of your libel is settled, I am going to leave the Covenanter Church, I refuse to vote. I will never again vote in this synod."

Mr. Carson was not one of the accused, but he openly sympathizes with

them. Rev. Mr. Logan, of Rochester, then declared that he would vote against everything which might come before the synod hereafter. Another minister, Rev. J. L. MacElninney, declared "I would rather stand with the Lord than the Reformed Presbyterian Church. I vote no." Several other ministers declared their intention to secede, and one of them, Rev. J. R. Thompson, said: "This sentence against the young men is too severe. The vote of this synod does not represent the sentiment of the people, and you will hear from the people later."

This strange conduct of the Reformed, otherwise called the Cumberland, Presbyterians, has caused great commotion among the people generally of the United States, who wonder how a Church which professes to have given the world liberty, civil and religious, and the free exercise of their private judgment, can presume to deprive its ministers and members of their liberty to act as free American citizens. A tyranny so gross has never been attempted in any civilized community, except perhaps Russia, if we can call the latter a civilized country.

As the suspended ministers left the Church in which the synod was held a number of ministers of the United Presbyterians greeted them sympathetically and expressed the public sentiment that the persecution to which they have been subjected will raise them in the public estimation. In the opinion of Rev. Dr. Thompson, of New York, there will be no positive split as a result of the trial, as that would cause a quarrel in regard to the division of Church property, but he acknowledges that numbers will slip away into other congregations, and the Church will lose a large proportion of the younger element and of those upon whom reliance is placed as the prop and support of the Church in future years.

AMERICAN ORANGEMEN.

The Grand Orange Lodge of the United States held its session last week in Detroit. The resolutions which were passed are a ludicrous effort to make the people of that country believe that Orangism is not at all an exotic plant, and that it is in full sympathy with the American Republic and American institutions. To carry out this deception, the Grand Master, in his address, explained that Orangism had not its origin in Ireland, as is generally supposed, but in Germany; from which he drew the inference that it is a cosmopolitan organization. To sustain this view he assured his hearers that it was initiated by William of Nassau, for the maintenance of Protestantism, before he took possession of the throne of England.

Even if it were true that William had instituted in Germany an association so vile in its purposes, and so un-American in its spirit and history, that would be no reason why the feuds of Europe should be transplanted to America; and of this the people of the United States are so thoroughly convinced that it is impossible to persuade them to countenance the vile concern. The Grand Master was careful to say that the organization in the United States has no connection or fraternity with that of the same name existing elsewhere; but the public generally are perfectly aware that it was established by Irish and Canadian Orangemen, chiefly Orange-Canadians who had no sympathy with the institutions of the United States. They have been sworn to sustain British Protestantism, the Protestant succession to the British throne, and Protestant ascendancy; consequently they find no recruits among a people who love free institutions. The weed of Orangism, therefore, finds itself in the United States in an uncongenial soil, though, for the sake of planting its roots there, its promoters are willing to abrogate their old profession of loyalty to England and to resuscitate, if possible, the withered plant of know-nothingism, and to restore the reign of persecution and intolerance.

There is a certain fraction of the people of the United States who have been educated in hatred of Catholicity; and acknowledge that Catholics in that country have contributed largely towards its prosperity, and have even shed their blood in defence of its institutions, in greater proportion than any other class. Know-Nothingism, therefore, makes no progress there now, though there is published in the city of Detroit a worthless sheet misnamed the *Patriotic American*, which is filled every week with the vilest calumnies against everything Catholic, under pretence of advocating the principles

of American patriotism. This sheet is the organ of the Orangemen of the United States, and it rivals the Toronto *Orange Sentinel* and *Mail* and the Montreal *Witness* in mendacity and intolerance. But it languishes for want of support from any considerable portion of the people.

The resolutions of the Orange delegates which met in Detroit are just what might be expected from the intolerant element from which the society is recruited, and they remind us of the resolutions which were passed by Canadian lodges when in 1889 the fanatical parsons were engaged in the fruitless occupation of endeavoring to ostracise the Catholic body in this country. Of course, a prominent plank in the Detroit programme is opposition to Catholic schools. It protests against "diverting public funds or public property to the furtherance of any Popish, Mormon or other religious-political designs, hostile to American liberty, whether through educational, reformatory, penal, or charitable institutions, under any pretext whatever."

The hypocrisy of this is readily seen, when it is understood that, under pretence of maintaining American liberty, they wish to deprive Catholic parents of all liberty of educating their children in religion, and they desire to oblige them to send their children to schools in which, theoretically, no religion is taught, while in reality proselytism to Protestantism will be practiced. And though they propose still to tax Catholics for the maintenance of Public schools of this proselytizing character, they coolly insert in their programme this proposition which they promise to advocate:

"The exclusion of Roman Catholics from the Public schools to which they are hostile, whether as officers or teachers."

It is almost needless to add that the resolutions of this Grand Lodge have been received by the American press with contempt and ridicule, all the more so as they have shown their want of ordinary common sense and judgment by coupling with their intolerant proposals the exploded proposition of a now defunct American party, to substitute an irredeemable paper currency for the present currency of the country, founded upon the principle of being redeemable in gold at its face value.

An amusing feature of the programme of these Orangemen is that one of the planks is

"Reservation of the public lands for American citizens; and that neither foreign nor domestic syndicates be permitted to usurp them."

It is well known that a number of British syndicates have bought up large tracts of territory in many localities in the West, so that unwittingly the Orangemen have proclaimed their purpose to weaken their own influence by making an attack upon the proprietary rights of those who may be supposed to be for the most part their own friends. Of course it was not their intention to do this, but their falling into so glaring a blunder shows the weakness of an association, which cannot muster brains enough to issue a programme which will tend to carry their own objects towards a successful issue.

It is evident that American Orangism is as weak in intellect as it is strong in iniquity of purpose.

What a remarkable difference is to be found in the characters of most of those who join and those who leave or are expelled from the Catholic communion. A most striking illustration may be found by a glance at the life of Sir John Thompson as a sample of the Catholic convert. It may be said that he occupies a foremost place in the councils of the country. He was at one time a Methodist. He is now a Catholic. He does not go roaming around the country saying unpleasant and uncharitable things about the Methodist belief. He attends to his own business, lives a good Christian life, and is honored for his honesty, his integrity and his sincerity of purpose. In contrast with such a man how does such characters as Chiniquy, Widdows, the escaped nun, etc., compare. It is indeed out of place to mention their names in the same paragraph. The lives of these unfortunate people are devoted to the horrible purpose of sowing discord by delivering villainous lectures from town to town, always taking up collections, and growing fat in pursuance of the crudity of simple and ignorant Protestants.

KIND WORDS.

That sterling Catholic paper, the CATHOLIC RECORD, of London, Ont., came to us last week in an entire new dress. The RECORD is one among our most valued exchanges, and we are pleased at this evidence of a prosperity which we feel assured has been well deserved.—*Pittsburg Catholic*.