

### The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 484 and 486 Richmond street, London, Ontario.

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

EDITORS:  
REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVES,  
Author of "Mistakes of Modern Infidels."

THOMAS COFFEY,  
Publisher and Proprietor.

Subscribers are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for the CATHOLIC RECORD.

Rates of Advertising—Ten cents per line each insertion, agate measurement.

Approved and recommended by the Archbishops 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.

London, Saturday, April 7, 1894.

#### A BLOT UPON OUR CIVILIZATION.

The A. P. A. in the United States is every day making itself more and more ridiculous by the high-handed proceedings which it attempts, but which turn out to be disastrous failures just at the moment when it would seem that the object of the members is just within their grasp.

We already gave in our columns an account of the purchase of three-thousand Winchester rifles by the A. P. A. of Toledo, Ohio, at a cost of \$50,000, the object being to repel an attack which it was pretended the Catholics proposed to make upon the Protestants of the country in order to exterminate them.

But the Apapists, at all events, had the rifles for the money, and it might have been supposed that they would be content to pay the bill. A portion of the bill remained unsettled, however, and the firm which supplied the firearms was obliged to enter suit for \$250 for ten of the rifles of very superior quality which were furnished with the rest.

The society endeavored to shirk payment, but the court has just given judgment against Mr. Ostrander, the treasurer, for the full amount and the costs of the suit.

As the uprising is not likely to come off for some time, Winchester rifles will now be for sale cheap at the Toledo A. P. A. halls. As Mr. Ostrander contested payment rather for the purpose of forcing the other members of the Executive Committee to share the burden with him, lively times may be expected in the efforts he will now be obliged to make to have the responsibility divided equitably.

It is needless to say that by this transaction the Apapists have made themselves the laughing-stock of the nation, notwithstanding that there is a very serious side to it, inasmuch as their folly very nearly brought on a disaster the consequences of which might have been fearful. The citizens of Toledo generally express themselves as highly indignant at the whole shameful transaction, and the mayor of the city, who was the leading spirit in it, will probably never again be elected to his present position.

But not only in Toledo have the Apapists brought upon themselves the indignation of all right minded people, as the following still more recent occurrence will show:

The Democratic city convention of West Bay City, Michigan, has just taken a course somewhat unusual with political parties by giving the nomination for the mayoralty of the city to Dr. A. F. Hagadorn, a Republican, whom they had hitherto defeated for the office on two occasions on account of the party to which he belonged. Dr. Hagadorn is particularly obnoxious to the fanatics of the city because while he was a member of the Board of Education he refused to allow the A. P. A. to dictate the course he should pursue on educational matters. The Republicans have hitherto received the support of the A. P. A. because the Democrats would not countenance them, whereas some of the Republicans were disposed to yield to the pressure brought to bear upon them. Now, however, both political parties have agreed to lay aside their minor differences and run a citizens' ticket chosen from both political parties, in order to crush out bigotry and fanaticism. The Apapists are completely demoralized at the turn affairs have taken, for they feel conscious that they will be completely snuffed out. Dr. Hagadorn will head the citizens' ticket, the supporters of which are confident of a sweeping victory.

Michigan has hitherto been a very hotbed of Apapism, arising, not so much out of any great strength of the organization itself, but rather from the indifference with which it was regarded by Protestants generally, who, while not positively approving of it,

were inclined to let it have its own way, as they did not feel disposed to interfere with it while it confined itself to the injuring of Catholics. They felt it was not their concern. This new movement in West Bay City shows that respectable Protestants are waking from their apathy, and are now determined to put an end to the dominancy of bigotry.

In Denver, Colorado, also, there is evidence of a similar reaction against fanaticism. This has been made manifest by several recent events, among which may be mentioned the fact that the mayor of that city has openly renounced the association, of which he had thoughtlessly become a member before he was fully aware of its dark designs.

On entering upon the duties of his office, his first act was to appoint a Catholic chief of police, whereupon the A. P. A., with characteristic impudence, formally demanded that the appointment should be cancelled, and the chief removed. The mayor refused to yield to their demand, whereupon the association denounced him by resolution, and draped his photograph in black in their council chamber, with the words "Perjurer and Traitor" inscribed upon it. It was further resolved that "all communications with said traitor and his carcass repose in the arms of mother earth, in whatsoever land, an unknown committee, duly appointed, shall perform its last rite in the name of this council, by marking the place, that all may know, 'Here lies a traitor.'"

These proceedings, which so strikingly resemble those of the "Light-hearted revellers" which owned Simon Tappertit as their illustrious captain, have brought upon the association the contempt of the respectable Protestants of Denver, and the ridicule of the press of Colorado.

When a society thus makes itself the butt of general ridicule, it cannot long survive amid a population having so keen a sense of what is ridiculous as are the people of the United States. If the people of Canada were equally sensitive with our southern neighbors, neither would the sister society, the P. P. A., survive the humors of the recent convention of its Grand Council at Hamilton. But it is even more mischievous and wicked than ridiculous.

It may yet become advisable both in the United States and Canada to authorize a medical convention to inquire into the sanity of some of the leaders of the A. P. A. and the P. P. A. They would perhaps be found not actually insane, but no doubt they should be placed under the head of cranks, and should be taken care of by the authorities, so that they might not have it in their power to do harm to themselves or to others.

#### PROTESTANTISM IN EUROPE.

A Berlin paper, the *Gegenwart*, in an article entitled "The Condition of Protestantism," asserts that the religious enthusiasm of the German and other Protestant continental nations, by which men of the early part of the present century were moved is rapidly losing its influence, and that in consequence Protestantism is endangered by a coalition of enemies. These enemies, it says, are Catholicism, Greek Orthodoxy, Judaism, Liberal Deism and Atheism.

The Jews, Deists and Atheists are said to have regarded the cause of Protestantism as that of religious toleration and liberty of conscience; wherefore Protestants were looked upon by all these as brethren; while the Orthodox Greek Church looked upon them as allies against the arrogance of Rome. Why now is their opinion changed? The writer of the article gives for answer to this question that Protestantism has changed its character, and has become during the last few decades more arrogant than it accuses the Catholic Church to be.

The Franco-Prussian war was hardly concluded, the thunder of the artillery at Sedan had scarcely ceased, and the victor had scarcely placed upon his head the imperial crown, when he became head of the Church, and a Protestant Empire was proclaimed. This incensed the Russians, and to this is to be attributed in a great measure the persecution of German Protestants in Russia. The Kulturkampf was instituted against Catholics, and the Lutheran clergy began an anti-Semitic crusade, which forced the Jews into a hostile attitude in order to defend themselves. The Deists were also roused by the Protestantizing of the schools.

The writer thinks, however, that if the Protestants return to their old principles and sincerely carry out the religious liberty which they pro-

claimed in the beginning, they might regain what they have lost and become once more dominant.

As far as the recent doings of German Protestantism are concerned we have no hesitation in saying that the writer in the *Gegenwart* is right. The principle of individual liberty, which was so loudly proclaimed by Luther, Calvin and Zwingle, may have been cherished by some individuals, but it was certainly not put into practice by the dominant majority, and it was only because the Catholics took a determined stand in the assertion of their rights that the persecuting policy of Bismarck and Dr. Falk, known as the Kulturkampf, was reversed.

But it is a mistake to assert that at the beginning of this century continental Protestantism was really tolerant.

At so troublesome a period, when the German States were fighting for their very existence, it was not to be supposed that they would waste much time in enacting persecuting laws. Nevertheless enough was done to show the spirit which really animated most of the Protestant States. At this very period Hanover was confiscating Church property and Nassau was imitating its example. The revenues of the church at Mayence, Treves, Cologne, Constance, Basle, Strasbourg and Spire were seized, and William the Fifth, Stadtholder of Holland, was permitted to seize upon the property of the Abbey of Fulda, though the princely Abbot of that monastery alone upheld the liberties and independence of his subjects when their territory was invaded by the French under Napoleon. The princes of the neighboring States fled at Napoleon's approach.

In 1806 the religious sentiments of the Tyrolese were shocked when they beheld their churches, sacked and the crucifixes and images of the saints sold to the Jews by the soldiers of Maximilian Joseph of Bavaria. It was owing to such outrages that the Tyrolese revolted to a man on the 10th of April, 1809, proclaiming their independence.

In the beginning of this century Holland expelled the religious communities and all Catholic missionaries, and Catholics were treated as having no rights, civil or religious. It was on this account chiefly that the country was invaded by the French, who placed Louis Bonaparte on the throne to govern it as part of the French Empire.

Religious liberty flourished then till the fall of Napoleon I. changed the situation. A law was passed and placed in the constitution to the effect that the king must be a Protestant.

When the Congress of Vienna placed four million and eight hundred thousand Catholic Belgians under the Protestant king of Holland, this law was repealed, indeed, as a concession to the Catholics, but care was taken to deprive the Belgians of the influence in the Government to which their numbers entitled them.

The population of Belgium was three-fifths of that of the united countries, whereas its representation in Parliament was only four-elevenths, or a little more than one-third of the whole. Hence the minority was able to tyrannize over the majority, and they did not hesitate to do so, cramping their commerce, and imposing restrictions upon their exercise of the Catholic religion.

The patience of the Belgians was exhausted by these persecutions. The effigy of the Bishop of Gand was exposed in public between two thieves, after an unjust sentence had been pronounced against him, the Catholic seminaries were closed, Catholic children were openly taught Protestant doctrines in the schools, and Catholics were shut out from employment in the public offices.

The result of these annoyances was an uprising of the Belgians in 1830, and they soon established their independence, notwithstanding that the Prince of Orange led a powerful army against them in 1831.

The fact cannot be concealed that in every country where Protestantism established or endeavored to establish itself it attempted to do so by violence and persecution, and it is only during a very recent period that the spread of free thought, which is a result of the rejection of ecclesiastical authority, has caused more moderate counsels to prevail, owing perhaps partly to the laxity of religious convictions among free-thinkers. Yet it is not with Catholics that free-thinkers are disposed to cooperate as the *Gegenwart* states. Free-thinkers well know that the Catholic Church is the bulwark of Chris-

tianity, and we always find them working side by side with the most ultra-Protestants in attacking the Church. They are satisfied that Protestantism will finally end in Free-thought, and so they have little hesitation to make common cause with it, in their desire to overthrow religion altogether.

#### A PROTESTANT OPINION OF PROTESTANTISM.

Mr. de Pressense has in some public lectures delivered at Lausanne, in Switzerland, given utterance to opinions that have been productive of much comment and controversy. He happily spoke frankly, and we think but voiced the sentiments of the majority of his auditors. He called attention to the growth, ever increasing, of Catholicity, and to the manifest decadence of Protestantism in many countries. "Criticism and modern science," he said, "have shaken the historic foundations of Christian faith; one sees everywhere contradictions between faith and reason, and will no longer listen to the claims of the former. Only morality is henceforth needed, but on what base to establish it is the question. Protestantism once rested on two principles—the divine inspiration of the Bible and justification by faith in the Saviour Jesus. Every word of the sacred book was once the word of God and Christ the Saviour was thought to be indeed the Eternal Son of God made man. What has Protestantism done with these two principles? Who admits to-day the divine inspiration of the Scriptures? Who (among Protestants) would to-day refuse to sign with both hands the declaration of Edmund Schereu at Geneva in which he denied the inspiration of the Scriptures, a declaration that caused such a lively protest not many years ago? Is Christ yet believed in and preached as really God, inereate and consubstantial with the Father? He is to-day no more than a purely human being, and His divinity, if the expression be yet retained, only a certain sanctity or moral perfections.

What the consciences of Manning and Newman felt to be right, who will *a priori* declare wrong? When we see men of so much knowledge and piety take refuge in the bosom of the Roman Church, who will dare to utter a syllable of reproach?

#### CATHOLIC, ROMAN CATHOLIC, OR ROMISH?

Mr. Controller Wallace was very properly brought to task in the House of Commons by Mr. C. R. Devlin, M. P. for Ottawa county, for having used the term Romish as descriptive of the Catholic Church. Mr. Wallace disclaimed any intention of being offensive, nevertheless the term is an offensive one which ought not to have been used, especially by a member of the Government. The Catholic Church has a well-known name, and it is not becoming in one who ought to have the instincts of a gentleman or a Christian to use a nickname in speaking of the Church to which the vast majority of all the Christians of the world belong.

The title of the Church is "the Catholic Church." It is Roman in a peculiar but well-defined sense, inasmuch as the Pope or Bishop of Rome is its divinely appointed Head, and therefore we are quite satisfied to be called Roman Catholics, and to have the Church called Roman Catholic, by which name it is described in British legislation; but for the use of the term Romish there is no authority save that of enemies who are unwilling to give the Church any name but one of their own invention. Such words as Romanist, Romish, Popery, Papist and Papistry are the inventions of modern bigotry; whereas the true name of the Church has the sanction of nearly nineteen centuries, fifteen of which were before the birth of Protestantism, which came into the world too late, and is altogether too local an institution to stand sponsor for or give a distinctive name to the Church of all ages and all countries.

Mr. Wallace's apology for the use of the term Romish may be accepted on the principle that deficiency of knowledge excuses from the suspicion of malicious intent.

The Toronto *Mail* in referring to the event states that it does not matter much whether Mr. Wallace used the expression or not, and it attributes to Mr. Devlin's "smallness of mind, or largeness of yearning to be talked about," because he brought Mr. Wallace to task for his indecorous expression.

We have been hitherto under the impression that the amenities of decent society are of some importance, and

that they should be observed when the religion of two-fifths of the population of the Dominion is spoken of in Parliament. It is well that there are gentlemen in Parliament to bring to account those who violate these usages.

The *Mail* says: "No loyal subject objects to being described as British; but Roman Catholics do not like to be referred to as Romish." By this mode of reasoning it evidently means to suggest the propriety of the term Romish as applied to the Catholic Church. The propriety we deny.

It is well known that common usage may in particular cases modify the signification which strict etymology would give to a derivative word, and this seems to be the case with the word British, which is used by general consent of things relating to Great Britain or its inhabitants, because there is no other euphonious and simple word to express the idea. But out of these circumstances the termination *ish* has a diminutive and restrictive sense which, when it is attached to the names of countries or cities, localizes the meaning in a way not suited to the universal Church, which is alone Catholic. This is readily seen in the words greenish, whitish, Greekish, Frankish, etc.

The word Roman is understood to express the relation of the Catholic Church to its head in Rome, but the localizing diminutive "Romish" simply indicates the spitefulness of those who have invented the word as a nickname. It is not an appropriate word, because it localizes the Church which is universal, and Catholics can therefore never accept it as a title of the Church.

The *Mail* says, further:

"If you term a Church a 'Roman' Catholic Church you are practically declaring that there may be other sorts of Catholic Churches, and are thus denying by implication that the 'Roman' Catholic Church is the sole and only Church on this terrestrial sphere."

It is clear that the *Mail* fails to understand the application of the words it attempts to explain. The Church which is Catholic is no local thing. The name Roman is therefore applicable to it only in the sense that Rome is the centre of its universal unity. Hence the Church universal is neither the Church of Rome, which is the portion of the Church in the diocese of Rome, nor is it Romish. The Universal Church can be styled Roman in the sense that its head, divinely appointed, resides in Rome. But not even the most ultra Nationalist among churchmen pretends that Queen Victoria] or any of her predecessors, as Elizabeth or Henry VIII., has or ever had any authority to rule the Universal Church. Hence the expressions which we sometimes hear, "the Anglo-Catholic, Russo-Catholic, and Greek-Catholic Churches" are just as absurd as would be the "Luthero-Catholic, Prusso-Catholic, and Presbyterian-Catholic churches—absurdities which we believe have not yet been proposed. You may, indeed, call a sheep's tail a fifth leg; but the animal will still continue to have as before only four legs in reality.

We have said that the expression "Church of Rome" belongs to the portion of the Church which is in the diocese of Rome. It was thus that the name Church of England was applied to the portion of the Catholic Church which was in England before the Reformation. It is not by any inherent right that the modern Church of England assumed this designation, but by force of civil authority, which is purely local, and has no right to constitute a Church of Christ at all, much less a Catholic or universal Church. We must infer from this that even the assumption of this name is simply a usurpation; but the assumption of the name Anglo-Catholic is more preposterous still.

At Fremont, Ohio, a few days ago, the Rev. G. J. Shackelford, a muscular minister of the Protestant Episcopal church, was in attendance at an A. P. A. meeting which was held simultaneously with a democratic meeting at the other side of the street.

One of the democrats, Mr. Frank O'Farrell, a Catholic lawyer, made some remarks in denunciation of Apapism, which, however, were in no way personal. Mr. Shackelford overheard these remarks, and, determining to avenge them, rushed at Mr. O'Farrell to punish him for his audacity, but to his surprise Mr. O'Farrell was more than a match for his assailant, and in the melee the minister was undermined and might have been severely punished for his interference were it not that the bystanders rescued him from his perilous situation. Neither party was seriously injured, and it is supposed

that the Rev. Mr. Shackelford will be more cautious in future how he exhibits his pugilistic powers.

#### A NEW CHURCH UNION MOVEMENT.

A movement has begun among some of the Baptist ministers of the United States looking towards a union with the Campbellites, or, as they usually call themselves, "Disciples of Christ." Dr. Kerr B. Tupper, one of the most prominent of the Baptist clergy, of Denver, Col., is strongly in favor of the movement, and he even proposes to adopt the name "Christians" for the united sect, as an approach to the name claimed by the so-called disciples. He says the disciples "are in error in the emphasis they place upon baptism; yet he imagines there can be no great difficulty in arranging a union, as there is "not so great difference between Baptists and Disciples as is generally supposed."

The Boston *Watchman*, a Baptist organ, has stated that negotiations towards effecting the union have been secretly carried on between prominent men of both sects, to such an extent that the consummation is quite probable. It remarks, however, that the Baptist Churches are ecclesiastically independent, and that "no one is competent to act for the denomination to treat for its merger in another. Nor could the vote of a majority in any single Church bind a dissentient minority to agree to commit ecclesiastical *hari-kari*."

It considers that the assumption of the name "Christian" as the designation by this new combination would be a piece of unauthorized assumption exceeding even the assumption of Episcopalianism in calling themselves "the Church." It hopes, therefore, that should the union take place, and that a new name be adopted, the new sect will adopt some other distinctive title than the name "Christian."

The Canadian Baptists do not appear to take kindly to the proposal for a union. The *Northwest Baptist* seems to voice the general opinion of Canadian Baptists when it says: "We question the wisdom of spending time over Disciple doctrine. Disciples among themselves have a hard enough time in settling what they believe and what they do not believe."

After the avowal of the Boston *Watchman* above quoted to the effect that every Baptist congregation has its own peculiar belief, it is certainly a curiosity of logic for Baptists to put as a condition for the union of another sect with them, that the latter should first settle on some definite belief, the Baptists holding themselves free to leave faith an unsettled matter. Yet it is no more than the prevalent notion among different sects, that they are free to set aside truth at will, or what they have hitherto held to be the truth, if any ulterior end is to be gained by so doing. On this subject, the *Christian Evangelist* of St. Louis published recently a letter from a Baptist minister which very clearly gives us to understand that most Baptists are quite willing to give up the teaching of what has hitherto been regarded as the truth, if they can thereby secure the outward semblance of unity. He says:

"Some of our most prominent secular papers have very lately circulated the report that our two denominations were to unite. To that project I can say a hearty Amen! But as much as I desire it, I hardly dare expect it. I suspect that there are too many in each denomination who are too bigoted to be willing to yield anything of what they have held to be the truth—and one of the chief reasons why they think it must be true is because they have held it."

It adds that "Baptist Churches ask prospective members to subscribe to rather a lengthy creed;" but that there is latterly a change in this respect, so that "I should not be surprised to find out that there was as great a difference in the belief of different members of the Baptist Church as in the Church to which you belong. But this is a point in which Baptist theory does not quite agree with Baptist practice."

The idea these writers and teachers have of the Church of Christ is evidently very different from that of the Apostle St. Paul, who holds that the purpose for which Christ instituted a Church and ordained a hierarchy therein was "that henceforth we be no more children tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine." (Eph. iv., 14.)

St. Teresa used to say that if humility was to be considered the first grace for ordinary souls, we must consider that for souls aiming at perfection courage is of more account at starting even than humility.