

The Catholic Record.

"Christianus nomen est Catholicus vero Cognomen"—(Christian is my Name but Catholic my Surname.)—St. Paclian 1st Century.

VOLUME XXVIII.

LONDON, ONTARIO SATURDAY, DECEMBER 22 1906

1470

The Catholic Record

LONDON, SATURDAY, DEC. 22, 1906.

A WORD WITH OUR FRIENDS.

Some of our friends wax querulous at our efforts to have religion in the school room. They cannot understand why we so insist upon this point, and they regret, more or less politely, that we cannot see eye to eye with them on this question. Our views are designated as those of the bigot, and, by those who are weary of controversy, are taken as proof that we are either unable to keep step with progress or unwilling to contribute our quota towards the unification of Canada. Hence we have useless words and outpourings, preconceived ideas, bent on maintaining their ground. With us this question is intensely practical, and one, so far as we are concerned, without the sphere of academic discussion. It is settled for all time, not by us, but by the Lord Who said:

"Seek ye first the Kingdom of God," and "what doth it profit a man if he gain the whole world and suffer the loss of his own soul?"

True, say our friends, but religion can be entrusted to the Sunday school. Without citing the testimonies of non-Catholics to the belief that adequate instruction in religion and morality cannot be given in the Sunday school, we content ourselves with the remark that their views as to what should be taught in the schools are entitled to respect. But they venture beyond the bounds of right when they seek to impose their views upon us. Instead of assuming that our course in regard to the position of religion in education is untenable, and, as such, to be assailed by any weapon, they should, as fair-minded men, weigh it in the balance of fair play. Whilst we are not opposed to education, and, as proof, can point to our halls of learning which dot Canada, we do not believe that any educational system should invade the claims of conscience. We believe—we do not ask if we be right, but our belief is entitled to respect—that we cannot approve a system of education for the young which is divorced from the Catholic faith and which entirely confines itself to secular matters, and to things affecting temporal and social life, and which is primarily concerned with these things. We believe that we are in possession of the faith once delivered to the saints. We believe that morality and religion are inseparable. We believe that our duties to God take precedence over all others, and hence should receive as much attention in the school-room as any secular branch, and that education, ennobled and consecrated by religion, is the source of good citizenship. Not only the intellect but the will must be cultivated. If we remember aught Herbert Spencer says "that the belief in the moralizing effect of intellectual culture, flatly contradicted by facts, is absurd a priori." We need not dwell on this point, for Canadians, theoretically at least, are agreed that purely secular instruction may develop clever men, but that it cannot contend against the passion and pride of man.

That parental rights are not created by the State, and that they have the right to determine the education for their children, are obvious truths. For our part, whilst we condemn education apart from religion, we have no desire to compass the slightest violation of the rights of others. One point, however, that escapes the notice of some of our friends, is that the children of Catholic parents are entitled to as much consideration as the children of non-Catholic or irreligious parents. That schools are called "non-sectarian" is no passport to our favor, and this for divers reasons. First, there is no such thing as unsectarianism. Secondly, the individuals who label their views "non-sectarian" and attempt to foist them upon schools, erected and supported by tax-payers, are not wanting in self assurance. They hanker, we are told, after un-dogmatic Christianity. What this may mean we do not know; but it is quite clear that un-dogmatic Christianity is a contradiction in terms and that Christianity, if of any value at all, must teach truth clearly and with authority, and, therefore, must be dogmatic. Science sets forth its teachings in precise terms, that is, it has dogmas. Our opponents have their opinions, and, in enunciating them, are not poor in dogmatism. And more, they seek to impose them upon others, forgetful that we have also a conscience, and that we believe neither in a un-

matic, nor a colorless, nor a Christian-ity based upon the fundamentals of religion. We believe that the whole child should be educated. With the Catholic, minor premise, says a non-Catholic, which concerns the means of securing such complete education, we may differ, but on the major premise Catholics and Protestants ought to be so far agreed as to recognize each other as a fellow-worker in a common cause.

MORE LIGHT.

They who assert that the Church has ever been the persistent enemy of science would do well to consult her history and to thereby find out that she has ever been the truest friend of all that can enlighten and elevate and ennoble the human mind. Nearly all the discoveries that have advanced scientific knowledge must be ascribed to her and to her devoted children. We must bear in mind that the Church teaches the truth of life eternal. Science teaches natural truths. The Church gives us the knowledge of the invisible; science treats of the material and transient. The truth of the Church is fixed and immutable; science is subject to experiment and progress. The truth of the Church is vouchered by God; the truth of science is estimated in accordance with the arguments of the scientist. But between the two there can be no opposition, for both lead us to God. The Church allows the greatest liberty to her children in the fields of science and speculation, but she is, and must be, ever opposed to any system that does not recognize God, and that tends directly or indirectly to sap the foundations of religion and morality.

We should also remember that theories are not science, and that hypothesis is not to be accepted as a demonstrated truth. But any theory against the Church is accepted as a self-evident truth by those who, while priding themselves on what they term the emancipation of the intellect, are bond-slaves to special pleading or to the sham sciences which make fables of their theories. In this connection, Dr. Virehow, in his address to German Naturalists in 1877, said:

"Every attempt to transform our problems into doctrines, to introduce our hypotheses as the bases of instruction—especially the attempt simply to dispossess the Church and to substitute its dogmas forthwith by a religion of evolution—be assured every such attempt will make shipwreck, and its wreck will also bring with it the greatest perils to the whole position of science."

In a word, the conflict between the Church and science is imaginary. Their aims are different but not contradictory. The God of reason is the God of revelation. The God of the heart is the God of the intellect, and out from Him comes all truth in heaven and on earth scientific and religious.

Well does Cardinal Newman say "that not a man in Europe now who talks bravely against the Church but owes it to the Church that he can talk at all."

NO LASTING CITY HERE.

Some without the fold dream of a Paradise here on earth. Ignorance, they say, is the chief cause of the wickedness of the world. The experience of past and present shows that knowledge does not necessarily connote goodness. Men may be lustful, and drunkards, etc., and be far from ignorant. To-day the advocates of education without religion are beginning to doubt the efficacy of mere enlightenment as a safeguard against vice.

But they go on to say that knowledge, as it gains more and more in honor among men, shall retrench the earth. Thus the drunkard will, by becoming acquainted with the laws of physiology, conquer himself, etc. Man, under the influence of culture and superior civilization, will contribute his share to the common good. Now, whatsoever we may think of this dream, it does not tally with the Gospel, which has no belief in the perfectibility of human life here on earth. We may devote ourselves to the assuaging of sorrow, but in this life of probation the rule is, that only in the Cross is life and salvation to be found. In what we are, and not in what we have is our happiness here.

Why should man who does not believe in a revelation sacrifice himself for others? We must, if we are to act in a reasonable manner, have a motive. Perhaps we can find this in the writings of those who bid us do our duty because it is our interest to do it. They, however, have nothing but contempt for

the masses of men. Go back into the history of the past and see how nations without supernatural religion have given indisputable evidences of belief that the common herd was not worth a thought. The poor, the old, children with physical defects, were regarded as things to be despised and to be destroyed. In our own days, despite all our enlightenment, it is not a fact that the old impede the march of business. We may dream, but we do not there-by muzzle selfishness. We may talk of the nobility of the intellect and of the heart, but words fail to guard us in this life when we know that it is difficult to see the true good, and that the heart is beset by sensuality. Are we taught by nature to sacrifice ourselves for others? If we have no belief in a God, why should we in our quest of an earthly paradise allow anything to keep us back? What sympathy can we have for him? Does nature teach us to be tender hearted? Is she not merciless towards the weak? Are the interests of the deformed and the unbecoming our interests? If men stand in our way does not self interest bid us to remove them by any means. We must look after ourselves, and away from God; he who sacrifices himself for others, acts without any adequate motive.

It is asserted that reason commands us to act in this manner. But a command demands a ruler and a subject. Reason dictates to the will and appetites, but they are all one nature. Hence the dictate of reason, emanating from oneself, is not a law, and consequently there is no strict obligation. To conclude, it is a fact of individual and universal experience that without God there is no law and no morality. By reason indeed we are able to find out the broad rules of right and wrong without supernatural revelation. But in his present state, man, unaided by grace, cannot keep the whole law of nature—he cannot of his powers draw up a religion capable of keeping him within the law of nature. Without God, therefore, man cannot reach his end. Without an authority to enforce the moral law there can be no valid obligation. It cannot have sufficient sanction unless we are convinced of its supreme claim and right. And this is alone found in its reference to God.

HOW THE PROTESTANT REFORMATION WAS BROUGHT ABOUT.

Written for the Free Voice by Rev. Charles Coppens, S. J.

XI. THE REFORMATION IN DENMARK, NORWAY, AND ICELAND.

Denmark—Christian, or Christiern II, ruled over Denmark from 1513-1547. Being exceedingly fond of autocratic power, he undertook to break down the influence of the nobility and the clergy in all portions of his dominions. We have seen how he attempted to do so in Sweden by the massacre of the Bloody Bath; and how utterly he was foiled by the insurrection of Gustaf Wassa, who achieved the independence of his native country.

In Denmark, Christiern chiefly attacked the clergy who were very powerful there. The means he chose for this purpose was the introduction into the country of Lutheranism, and its ordinary accompaniment the confiscation of all the Church property. It is the old story over, only diversified in its details. Christiern was not as wily as Wassa; he went straight to the point, not doubting but he could crush all opposition. He invited to Copenhagen a disciple of Luther, Martin by name, and he installed him as bishop in his capital city. The indignant nation protested with a common voice; but he heeded not. On the contrary, the deposed archbishop was put to death, and laws oppressive of the clergy were proclaimed. Then all parties combined to dethrone him; he fled, and, after various vicissitudes he was cast into a frightful prison, from which he did not come forth alive.

The throne of Denmark was next offered to his uncle, Frederik I, of Holstein. He too, unfortunately, believed in reformation and confiscation, which was the great temptation of the times. Yet when accepting the kingly crown he took a solemn oath to maintain the Catholic religion. He soon began a severe, and not an open prosecution of the clergy; and he defended his conduct in 1527 before the diet of Odessa on the plea that he had pledged himself to maintain the Catholic religion but not to tolerate its abuses. Among these alleged abuses he counted the piracy of the apostolic See. He arrogated to himself the confirmation of all elections to bishoprics. He granted to the Lutherans all the rights which had been enjoyed so far by Catholics alone, a measure which, as the result proved, practically means the protecting of heresy and the oppression of the ancient church.

At the death of Frederik I, in 1533 his son Christian III, though a Protestant, was made king, on the explicit condition that he would not be an enemy to Catholicity. How far he violated this promise, and how clearly understood from the following account

taken word for word from a Protestant writer in the Edinburgh Encyclopaedia: "As soon as Christian III was firmly seated on the throne, he turned his attention to the state of religion, and resolved to carry into execution a plan which had been communicated to him by Gustafus (Wassa) for reducing the power of the clergy. He accordingly assembled the senate with great secrecy, and they immediately came to the resolution to annex all the Church lands, towns, fortresses and villages to the crown, and to abolish forever the temporal power of the clergy. All the bishops in the different parts of the kingdom were arrested about the same time; and, that the nation might not be alarmed by this extraordinary measure, the king convoked the states of Copenhagen; the nobility were ordered to be there in person, the commoners by their deputies; but the clergy were not summoned to attend. After a strong speech from the king against the rapacity of the clergy, the senate confirmed the decree of the diet; and the power and privileges of the clergy were declared to be annihilated forever. The senate next settled the succession in the Duke Frederik, the king's eldest son. In return for these concessions, the king confirmed the nobility in all their rights, particularly in what they called the right of life and death over their vassals, and of punishing them in what manner they thought proper. Thus was the power of the clergy destroyed in Denmark; but the conclusion which the nobles drew from this, that their own authority and power would be so much the more augmented, was soon proved to be erroneous. For, as a great part of the crown lands had fallen into the hands of the clergy, these lands being again annexed to the crown, the royal authority was considerably increased. The oppression of the farmers still continued, and the nobles displayed a restless and increasing desire to prevent them from ever rising in the state; for the senate passed a law, for bidding any person, either ecclesiastical or secular, who was not noble, to buy any freehold lands in the kingdom, or to endeavor to acquire such lands by any other title."

The existence of the Catholic Church in Denmark and the liberty of the people thus fell together at one blow. It should here be remarked that in all other lands too in which the Reformation was established by main force, tyranny at the same time began to rule supreme and popular rights were greatly impaired. And yet, such has been the falsification of modern history, especially in English speaking countries, that the impression generally prevails that the Reformation meant the end of tyranny and the dawn of popular liberty. With the exception of the Netherlands, whose story is peculiar, the direct contrary is everywhere in evidence.

The diet of Copenhagen had taken place in 1536. The bishops cast into prison at the time could not regain their liberty except on condition of resigning their sees. All did so, except the heroic, Roennow, who remained in prison till death, eight years later, came to make him a glorious martyr for the faith. To complete the work of the Reformation in Denmark, a Lutheran preacher, Bugenhagen, was imported from Wittenberg. By his advice the king appointed seven "superintendents" to replace the deposed bishops.

In 1546 a new diet held at Copenhagen abolished all the civil and political rights of the Catholics who could themselves hold no civil office, or even inherit any possessions; while death was decreed against all priests and against those who should harbor them. Norway remained subject to Denmark after Sweden had thrown off the yoke. The Bishop of Drontheim was unfortunately a great friend of Christiern II., and promoted the introduction of the novel doctrines. But the Norwegians were attached to the ancient faith; nothing but violence could conquer them.

When Christiern II. was expelled from Denmark, the Bishop of Drontheim was forced to fly from Norway. Later on, in 1536, the Norwegians refused to accept Christiern III. as their king; they rebelled and slew or expelled his supporters. He sent an army into Norway and completely conquered it. Then he totally deprived it of its autonomy, and placed his own creatures in all the leading offices. As for religion, stringent laws were passed, by which all the idolaters and heretics were expelled either to embrace Lutheranism or to fly the country. Many, chiefly monks, preferred exile to apostasy. Here again, as in so many other lands, civil liberty and Catholicity perished together.

Iceland had been converted to Christianity about 1000 A. D. From the ninth to the thirteenth century it was the centre of Northern enterprise. Its government was a species of republic; its laws were wise; it was in the golden age of its civilization. But in 1380 it was annexed to the Danish crown; in 1482 it lost by a plague, one half of its population. Yet the land was beginning to regain something of its former prosperity when the Reformation came to inflict on its people a sadder and more permanent injury than the plague had done.

The history of this catastrophe is simple enough, and can be told in a few lines. Christiern III. of Denmark attempted to Protestantize Iceland. Clergy and people rose in rebellion against his tyranny. The king sent over a numerous and well equipped body of foreign troops, which ultimately overpowered the brave, but ill organized citizens. Their leading Bishop, John Areson, was seized and put to death. The same violent and arbitrary laws were imposed upon the conquered land which had destroyed the

Church in Denmark and Norway. Once more the Reformation was forced upon an unwilling nation by means of foreign bayonets.

FRENCH SITUATION NOT UNDERSTOOD.

CARDINAL GIBBONS SAYS REPORTS OF MATTER SENT OUT ARE BIASED.

Baltimore, Md., Dec. 12.—"The American public does not understand the present crisis in France," said Cardinal Gibbons, when asked this evening for his opinion on the French situation. He continued: "I think I know my countrymen. They love fair play, and yet France has treated her noblest citizens with injustice and inhumanity, and America, which has sympathy for the oppressed of all nations, has raised no protest nor uttered a word of sympathy. 'If I believed that my countrymen would knowingly see a majority in the Chamber of Deputies upon the rights of the minority; would knowingly see tens of thousands of men and women who happen to be priests and nuns, turned out of their homes for no crime, out that of serving God; if my countrymen could see and recognize all this injustice and refuse sympathy to those who suffer by them, then I will leave life without faith in American love of justice.'"

"The American people had not had these things put fairly before them. Our own press has been to a considerable extent the reflex of the Parisian anti-clerical press. Most people over here have little conception of the French and clerical. They look on the leaders of this party as enlightened statesmen seeking to preserve the republic from the attacks of an aggressive clergy. 'There have been sincere lovers of Republican Government among the anti-clericals, but the majority of them have far less love of the republic than they have hatred of religion. I saw with deliberate conviction that the leaders of the present French Government are actuated by nothing less than hatred of religion.'"

"They make no secret of their hatred of Christianity. They avow it in the press and in the chambers. Let me give you a few examples of the language of these men. In the course of a speech in the Chamber of Deputies, Jaures said: 'If God Himself appeared before the multitudes in palpable form the first duty of man would be to refuse Him obedience, and to consider Him not as a Master to Whom man should submit, but as an equal with Whom men may argue.'"

"In the same strain the present minister of public worship and the most strenuous advocate of the law of separation, M. Briand, said in an address to school teachers, 'The time has come to root up from the minds of French children from ancient faith which has served its purpose and replace it with the light of free thought; it is time to get rid of the Christian idea. We have hunted Jesus Christ out of the army, the navy, the schools, the hospitals, insane and orphan asylums and law courts, and now we must hunt Him out of the State altogether.'"

CHRISTMAS GREETING.

Once more it is "peace on earth to men of good will." The halo of a blessed time benignly settles over the house holds where Christian virtue rules. Millions of hearts will throb with glad exultation when from beirly and earnest peal out the joyous carillons that tell how a longing, sinful world heard from angel lips that the long promised Redeemer had at last been given to Judah. This is the one story of which mortals never tire. With repetition it gains in interest. More welcome than the sun's diurnal rising, its influence is felt as a source of perennial delight. It softens the most obdurate hearts into a glow of benevolence. The impulse to give, in the Christian realm, is at least almost universal. It becomes contagious and irresistible. This characteristic of the season proves, it might well be owned, the Divine element in it. As the Redeemer was a gift from God to man, so the spirit which impelled the giving of the gift is perpetuated, and will be perpetuated throughout all time.

There are many cynical people who see only the material side of this gift-giving. To such as these the excitement and eagerness that animate the crowds who rush around the great stores, intent on securing substantial things for Christmas celebration or Christmas gifts, are evidences only of our lower nature. The gratification of a selfish desire to get, as well as the indulgence of a taste for show and the sentiment of personal vanity, are to such eyes the main springs that inspire the daily surging of the great tide of humanity along our principal thoroughfares and up and down the innumerable aisles of the glittering department stores. This is mere pessimism. The general intention is to give something to somebody else; to show one's affection or esteem for dear relatives or friends. If there be vanity or selfishness mingled with this prevalent desire, it ought to be remembered that our human nature is imperfect, and it was because of this very fact that we have a Christmas to celebrate and rejoice in. The imperfection of our humanity made it necessary that God should send One Who should make amends for all.

It would seem as though there were no necessity to urge upon the average man or woman who is fairly well to do that this is the time to remember the needs of the poor. The bitter inclemency of the season, and the distress which accompanies it in too many places, are, unfortunately, too manifest.

Cold and hunger are imprinted on many a face which the spirit of pride will prevent from giving voice to the body's crying wants. There are associations whose special function it is to find out the places where self respecting poverty cowers hungry, shivering, and uncomplaining. One of the best of these is that of St. Vincent de Paul. We would earnestly recommend this as a medium for the best dispensation of charity; likewise the St. Joseph's House for Homeless Boys, the Little Sisters of the Poor and the St. Vincent's Orphan Asylum. There are several other noble institutions where the help that is given is always sure to reach those most in need of help, but those we have mentioned are in the forefront.

To another class of pessimists the Christmas season brings a message the most unmistakable and significant. These are the reformers who clamor for a radical readjustment of all human conditions. To such as these there appears no cure for the diseases of human society but a removal of all inequalities and a redistribution of all funds and chattels. The bells that will ring out the New Year salutation proclaim with the same voice that poverty is blessed more than wealth is, and that equality in human conditions is not the necessary preparation of earth for the advent of the Kingdom of God. That marvelous miracle of Nativity which we celebrate anew was wrought among the poor, and the dignity of virtuous toil was lifted above all earthly splendors by the fact of its effacement. It was to humble herdsmen and shepherds that the herald angels were sent to bear their glad message of salvation and redemption. We trust that not a word of that glorious message will fall unheeded in any home where beat Catholic hearts. To our own good circle of supporters we may be permitted to say that grateful feelings inspire the good old greeting which we once more tender. "A Merry Christmas."—Catholic Standard and Times.

THE MANGER THRONE.

In view of the stupendous mystery of Bethlehem's manger, which on next Tuesday shall be celebrated again over the world, all the children of men may well exclaim with St. Paul, "O the depth of the riches, of the wisdom and of the knowledge of God! How incomprehensible are His judgments and how unsearchable His ways!"

Two thousand years with their manifold vicissitudes—with their sin, their sorrow and their shame—had darkened this earth of ours during which the groaning generations of Adam had lifted their wailings to the skies beseeching the advent of the promised Messiah.

The promises of the divine sylogism of redemption were formulated to the poor mortal pair amid the ruins of Paradise; but O how long, how long before the conclusion was drawn in the utter desolation of the manger crib. Yes, verily, incomprehensible are the mysterious ways of the Lord!

Not in vain, then, did the holy ones of ancient days believe in a Redeemer. He had been promised, and when did Divine promise fail of fulfillment? They knew he was to be born by a prodigy new to earth; and that the "Blessed Among Women" was destined to crush the serpent's head. And, therefore, adown the centuries of the Jewish people, the advent of the Deliverer was implored with quivering lips and outstretched arms by king, patriarch and prophet. The clouds were impurpled to show down the Just One, and the very rocks to bud forth the Saviour.

At long last the promised Messiah vouchsafed to come—all the prophecies being fulfilled. The rejoicing angels were the first to announce His birth in strains of mingled peace and glory; while the miraculous star led the marvelling shepherds to the manger to adore the new-born King.

Then, as now, it required supernatural faith to behold in the poor manger child the Mighty God of earth and sea and sky; Who poised the globe in the tips of His tiny fingers; at Whose wrath the mountains melt in fear; Whose omnipotent ken pierces the measureless depths of the deep; before Whose majesty the stars pale in awe, and the reticent sun grows dim in the heavens.

For nigh twenty centuries that Child has ruled the world from the poverty of His manger throne. He hath shattered the shackles with which satan had bound in bondage the human race.

The proudest monarchs on earth have vied with each other in paying Him homage. The wealth of the Orient has been placed at His feet. Art has lavished its splendors in glorifying the manger Child. The valor of the world has hailed Him, the King of Conquerors. Thrones and dynasties have risen and faded from earth. Civilization and barbarism have succeeded each other—making the first last and the last first. But the Divine Child of Mary's heart and Bethlehem's manger endures and shall endure through all the eternities, for He is the Lord and Giver of life, of Whose kingdom there shall be no end. Praise and honor and power and glory to Mary's Child, Who reigneth from the manger crib evermore!

At Christmas, among the gifts we rejoice to give let us be sure to remember something special for our beloved dead—an extra rosary said, a visit to the Crib for them, a Communion received, a Mass offered. To those who once shared our Christmas joys, gathering with us round the home hearth, let us still wish Happy Christmas by the hallowed means of prayer. —Sacred Heart Review.