

# The Catholic Record.

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

VOLUME XXIII.

LONDON, ONTARIO, SATURDAY, JULY 27, 1901.

NO. 1,188.

The Catholic Record.  
London, Saturday, July 27, 1901

## A CHURCH TRUST.

A short time ago the President of the Endeavorers said that one trust is needed, and that is a church trust. He must be gratified now to know that the sects have combined in order to pervert the Filipino. The Methodists, etc., have partitioned out the islands assigning to each denomination a Missionary district. The Episcopalians are arm in arm with the Methodists, cheek by jowl are Baptist and Presbyterians, and they are going to wipe out Rome root and branch. It is about time for the unconventional Dr. Rainford to say something. Well, at any rate we shall ere long have a good many fairy tales. But we must say that this Evangelical Church Trust is really in some particulars the greatest thing on earth. It has a bewildering assortment of opinions, and they are all true! This little policy of implying that denominations professing contradictory creeds are all teachers of truth is, of course, degrading to reason, an insult to God, and a breeder of disbelief; but all that does not dampen the enthusiasm of those zealots who are out for blood.

## STUDY OF THE FAITH.

It goes without saying that every Catholic should learn and know his faith. That, of course, has been always a duty, but in our age when so many theories and schemes are put forward and championed by individuals of some distinction, it demands even a greater fidelity that will not be withheld by the earnest Catholic. Some years ago the study of Christian doctrine was more in evidence than at present. We had controversies which whatsoever one may think of the good effected by them, were at least calculated to concentrate our attention on the points under discussion. The age of Controversy, however, has passed, and the arena is now occupied by the novelist and scientist who have each his own method of teaching for the new order of things. They are for the most part advocates of what they term honest discussion, manliness; they talk mightily about following one's conscience, and allude compassionately to the old-fashioned disputes of the past. They believe in a kind of God—a shadowy twentieth century God—and with a condescension truly touching commend the Sermon on the Mount, and other parts of the New Testament. Their method of attack—for it is nothing else—on the Church, is more difficult to follow than that of the controversialist armed with bits and ends of texts. One hardly likes to dub a dulcet-tongued novelist with a penchant for home-made dogma an enemy, and to place a scientist with a taste for giving mysterious names to things he cannot understand in the same category. But they are, unconsciously if you like, warring against the faith, and the one way to meet and to conquer them is to give a prominent place among our studies and readings to the science of our Christian inheritance. And the more time we devote to that study, the more shall we discover that the bland and unctuous novelist and scientist who compound up-to-date capsules are dangerous humbugs. They believe in following one's conscience. So do we, but it must be an educated conscience and not distorted through our own fault. "Conscience," said Cardinal Newman, "has rights because it has duties; but in this age with a large portion of the public, it is the very right and freedom of conscience to dispense with conscience, to ignore a law giver and judge, to be independent of unseem obligations. Conscience is a stern monitor, but in this century it has been superseded by a counterfeit, which the eighteenth centuries prior heard of, and could not have mistaken for it, if they had. It is the right of self-will."

But we must not take them too seriously. The conscience business plays an important role in the motive novel; but we are convinced that to those who use it, it has no meaning save that any pretext is good enough to justify blasphemy. They do not mean it, of course, but the pages of some much heralded publications bristle with state-

ments that show how well their authors despise St. Paul's "leading every understanding captive to the obedience of faith."

## CATHOLIC EDUCATION.

From a letter of Cardinal Vaughan on the Church and Catholic education we quote the following passages which may be of interest to many of our readers. Alluding to the excuses advanced by the parents in order to justify the confiding of their children to non-Catholic guidance he said:

"When parents send their children to non-Catholic schools they generally plead some excuse and try to justify their conduct. The poor say that the non-Catholic is a little nearer; a trifle cheaper; that the teaching is said to be better, etc. The rich say that the public schools of England have a national name; that they give a social prestige which Catholic schools do not; that wealth and fashion patronize them; that they hold out several advantages, social, political or economical; that parents must secure for their sons every possible advantage to enable them to compete successfully in the race of life, and to make a fortune; that in such a matter they must not take too seriously or too literally the Gospel or the Church."

Our Blessed Lord makes short work of all such excuses and calculations. Gentle, merciful and loving as He is, He hesitates not to pronounce a curse upon those who ruin the spiritual prospects of children, as He cursed the blind leaders of the blind, and the hypocritical Scribes and Pharisees. And as to the temporal advantages, sought at such cost to the children, rich or poor, He reminds them: "It is better for thee, having one eye, to enter into life, than having two to be cast into hell-fire."

The reasons mentioned by Cardinal Vaughan we have heard time and again. The one, perhaps, that is advanced oftener than others, is that Catholic institutions have, by some mysterious process, the power of giving the Catholics who frequent them a better chance of success in life than could be otherwise obtained from a Catholic college.

We do not know how this figment was evolved. It may date from the days when we were handicapped by poverty and prejudice, and it may have been invented by those who sought justification for their unflinching attitude towards ecclesiastical authority. But the fact is it exists, and exercises an influence upon the worldly minded fathers and mothers, who will not question themselves as to their paramount duty towards their children.

Again, our colleagues are sufficiently well-equipped to take care of the education of any Catholic body in Canada. They are progressive enough in all things that pertain to true education, and they are conservative enough to be wary of the blandishment of the strenuous technical education and to aim at, rather, the strengthening of mind and character.

Reminding his people of the dignity of children as outlined by Christ, and admonishing them that in spiritual and religious matters they are subject to the Church, the Cardinal asks: How do Catholic parents scandalize their little ones? and he answers:

"When they send them to non-Catholic schools without necessity; when they withdraw them from Catholic influences, and from Catholic training and discipline; when they expose them to the danger of growing up without a proper knowledge of their religion without love for the Mass, the sacraments, for the Mother of God and the saints; when they expose them to loss of faith and morality by companionship with those who are opposed to the doctrines and precepts of their religion."

## THE RULE OF THE PASSIONS.

We say of a man who has no will-mastery: "He is ruled by his passions." They govern him, not he them. Certainly an Arab wrote: "Passion is a tyrant, which slays those whom it governs." It is like fire, which, once thoroughly kindled, can scarcely be quenched; or like the torrent, which, when it is swollen, can no longer be restrained by its banks. Call him not a prisoner who has been put in fetters by his enemy, but rather him whose own passions overpowered him to destruction.

One wearies of all but God who never wearies of those Who love Him. —Mon. De. Maintenance.

## "HONEST BELIEF."

In his letter which we published in a late issue, and partly commented on, our Montreal Distast says, "Protestants are not willfully wrong in their beliefs."

The greatest Christian philosophers agree that error, false judgments and false beliefs, on all subjects, religious or otherwise, in the natural or supernatural order, have their origin in the will; and are therefore in a greater or less degree wilful. The charge of willfulness must therefore be made against all men who are error. How far this willfulness induces guilty responsibility we do not attempt to say. God alone, by reason of His infinite wisdom, has knowledge adequate to determine how far each rational being has sinned against the light he has, whether that light be of the natural or supernatural order.

The plea that one is not willfully wrong is a plea in mitigation, not in justification. No man intends by a conscious, direct and immediate act of volition to think error or believe the false for its own sake, as men desire to believe the true for its own sake. But, influenced by passion or interest, he may try to persuade himself that the false is the true and the true the false. In thus pandering to his passions and interests, he becomes the victim to invited delusion. Under such delusion it is possible for him to say that he is not willfully in the wrong, because he has bowed to the majesty of truth in trying to make himself believe he believes it.

"If God has spoken, who are not honest men convinced?" asks our correspondent. We will pair the question with the following: "If God has created the material world about us, our own bodies, the sun, moon and stars, why are not honest men convinced that they are?" The latter question is just as reasonable as the former. If there be honest men who deny revelation there are equally honest men who deny the creation of the external, material world about us. The former are called deists, the latter idealists, and Berkeley is their leading modern exponent.

Does the denial of the existence of the material world by this idealist philosopher and his followers make the world less real to our Montreal Distast and the rest of mankind? We venture to say that it affects his belief, and that of mankind in the reality of the material world, as little as a paper pellet shot from a toy pop-gun would affect a Harvardized steel clad man of war, or the rocks of Gibraltar; as little as it affected the every day life of the idealists themselves, whose non-belief in material things did not affect their appetites or prevent them from enjoying a juicy sirloin of roast beef. Their speculations did not dehumanize or derationalize them entirely and permanently, and as a consequence they came down from their altitudes still several times a day, and ate heartily, like honestly hungry men, of what they taught on their stilts had no existence.

Now, if the denial of matter by these idealists has and should have no effect on the belief of the Distast and the rest of mankind who believe in matter, why should the Distast's non-belief in revelation have any effect on the Christian and the rest of mankind who believe in the fact of revelation?

The Distast may say that the idealists, in their non-belief in matter, are exceptions to the belief of the human race, and that therefore their doctrine is contrary to nature, which never lies. To this the Christian replies: Your non-belief in revelation is contrary to the belief of the human race and the voice of the race is the voice of nature which never lies. The human race, as it pleads along, persists in its belief in the reality of the world as in the reality of revelation, heads the idealist and the Distast only momentarily, and as abnormalities.

Let us pair our Distast's question again with another. When he asked, "If God has spoken, why are not honest men convinced?" he implied two things. First, that honest men are not convinced that God has spoken, and that consequently those who are convinced that God has spoken are not honest. As we do not believe he intended this insult to the race, we suggest a slight change in the wording of his question. Instead of asking, "Why are honest men not convinced?" he should have asked, "Why are some honest men not convinced?" The second implication, thrown in, interrogatively, is that the fact that some honest men are not convinced that God has spoken, is proof that God has not spoken. With this explanation we now give the parallel question, which we may suppose to come from an atheist, who denies God, and is addressed to the Distast who believes in God and in creation: "If all nature proclaims and reveals the existence of God, why are not honest men convinced?"

What would our Distast say in reply? Would he yield the implied point in the question and admit that because some men are not convinced by the argument from creation therefore there is no God? Would he for a moment admit that the non conviction of these same men is a valid argument against the existence of God? We credit him with too much intelligence to think he would. For if he were to admit the validity of such an argument, drawn from some men's inability to see what he himself clearly sees, he would have to give up his Deism and become an atheist; because denying revelation as he does, he has no proof of God except creation, and if he admits that creation does not prove to him the existence of God because some men do not see its convincing ground, he robs himself of all proof or ground for his Deism.

To maintain his present belief, therefore, he must reply to the atheist, who denies God, in the same manner that the Christian replies to himself who denies revelation. He should say: "Sir, your non-vision cannot stand in my mind against my positive and clear vision. Your inability to see is no argument against my ability to see. The absence of capacity in you to see is no proof of absence of capacity in me. The blind man's failure to see the sun at midday can never convince me that I do not see it. The fact that he cannot see it is no evidence that it is not visible. It is, however, evidence satisfactory to my mind that there is something defective in him. In the same way, sir, the fact that you cannot see God through nature, as I can clearly see Him, proves to me that there is a defect in your intellectual vision, and not that I see what is not, but that you do not see what is. I have no objection, sir, to your comparing your capacity to see, with mine; that is legitimate and proper. But I cannot consent to your making your incapacity to see the measure of my capacity to see, and I will not close my eyes because you cannot or will not open yours."

That is the way to answer those who exploit their incapacity as something to be proud of in the way of argument. This eternally sticking their incapacity under our noses looks at first sight like a nosogay of the Ebers of humanity! But when we consider its real meaning its odor is anything but refreshing. It means, "What we cannot see cannot be," and then their mole eyes are made the criterion of all the possible and all the real. Everything that is must catch the eye of the speaker or remain in humble non-existence.

What we have made the Distast say to the atheist can be said with equal force to himself when he denies revelation. He cannot see that God has made a revelation. But the human race has always seen it and believed it. Which is the more probable, that the whole race sees what is not, or that a few Distasts see not what is? That the whole world's optic nerve is overstrung? or the Distast's just a little understrung? —N. Y. Freeman's Journal.

## OUR PRAYERS.

Reasons Why Some of Them Appear to Remain Unanswered.

"Unanswered Prayers" is made the subject of the following sensible discourse in the Angelus:

There are selfish prayers which go unanswered. Human lives are tied up together. It is not enough that any of us think only of himself and his own things. Thoughts of others must qualify all our requests for ourselves. Something which might be good for us, if we were the only person, it may not be wise to grant because it might not be for the comfort and good of others. It is possible to overlook this in our prayers and to press our interests and desires to the harm of our neighbor. God's eyes take in all His children, and He plans for the truest and best good of each one of them. Our selfish prayers which would work to the injury of others He will not answer. This limitation applies specially to prayers for earthly things.

There is yet another class of prayers which appear to be unanswered, but whose answer is only delayed for wise reasons. Perhaps we are not able at the time to receive the thing we ask for. A child in one of the lower grades of the school may go to a teacher of higher studies and ask to be taught this or that branch. The teacher may be willing to impart to the pupil this knowledge of higher studies, but the pupil cannot receive it until the rudiments have been mastered.

There are qualities for which we may pray, but which can be received only after certain discipline. A ripened character cannot be attained by a young person merely in answer to prayer. It can be reached only through long experience. There are blessings which we crave and which God would gladly give, but they come only through long and slow process. God delays to answer that in the end He may give better things than could have been given at the beginning. An immediate answering would have put green fruit into our hands. He waits until it is ripe.

## Fiat Voluntas Tua.

"Thy will be done" is the sum of all true worship and right prayer. The rest is aside from the divine purpose, and could it be realized would make the world a chaos or a desert. We should not love the flowers if it were always spring; and our purest pleasures would pall did not pain and loss come to teach us their worth. —Bishop Spalding.

## THE PRECIOUS BLOOD.

God in His infinite mercy and wisdom had decreed from all eternity that without the shedding of blood there shall be no redemption, no remission of sins. It is, therefore, from the Precious Blood of Jesus Christ alone that our salvation comes. There is no redemption, no washing away of iniquity, except in the Precious Blood of our most dear Redeemer. We can never praise and glorify too much the price of our redemption.

It is through His Blood that Jesus communicates to us every blessing; all the graces we receive are laid up for us in His Blood as in a storehouse. The devotion to the most Precious Blood of Jesus therefore brings us in a closer union with Him. Through this devotion we come nearer to Him, and the virtues of faith, hope and charity are strengthened and renewed in our souls.

This spiritual union is of great importance to Christians, especially in our days, because the knowledge of Christ and His love is the centre of a virtuous life, and is at the same time the pledge of eternal happiness, as Christ Himself assured us. The spiritual misery of so many Christians is caused by the fact that the knowledge of Christ and His love is becoming more and more lost to them.

We belong to Jesus; His divine Blood was the predetermined price of our redemption. He is the Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end of the whole creation. He should be the aim and object of our life. But indeed how many are there who lose sight of Him, their God and Redeemer, their last end? They may as yet call themselves Christians, but they have no more left of Christ than the more name. And why does it happen that there is so much in our times? It comes from the fact that the world tries to expel Jesus from the family, from the schools, and from public life and public affairs. And without Jesus there is no blessing and no salvation. Devotion to the Precious Blood of Jesus strengthens our faith in Him, the Son of the living God, and the Redeemer of the world. Who can doubt this when he sees Him bleeding on the Cross, and thus shedding His Precious Blood as the ransom of our sins?

Every doctrine in theology is a call to the Precious Blood. Every ceremony in the Church tells of it. Every sermon that is preached is an exhortation to the use of it. Every sacrament is a communication of it. Everything holy on earth is a fruit of the Blood of Jesus." (Faber).

The Blood of Jesus is our only hope. It is the hope of our redemption and of the forgiveness of our sins. What can excite in us a greater confidence in the mercy of God than the meditation of our redemption? To its fountain God calls the sinners; there they are washed and cleansed from their defilement; there the sinner is lightened of his burden, and a new life for God, and His Kingdom, is in stilled into his soul.

It is also the Blood of Jesus that kindles in us the self-sacrificing love. Man becomes a new nature, "renewed in Jesus Christ." By the Blood of Jesus the soul becomes more and more radiant and fit for any work or suffering that He may have destined for His loving follower.

Every drop of Jesus' Blood is an indisputable testimony that God does not want to condemn the sinner, but to save him for all eternity. Every drop of Our Lord's Blood is a voice that calls to man; God does not want the death of the sinner, but that he may return to life. Have you really any reason to fear and be troubled about the sins of your past life? Behold the devotion to the Precious Blood of Jesus, and the meditation on it, will fill you with hope and confidence. St. Mechtildis in a vision heard how our Lord Himself encouraged the most despairing sinners to the devout veneration of His most Precious Blood, so that they might have confidence in this ransom of their souls, and take their refuge to the price of their salvation. The devotion to the Precious Blood is also the inexhaustible fountain of all graces and blessings which we obtain from our Heavenly Father as often as we offer up to Him the most Precious Blood of His Only-begotten Son. Thereby we also restrain the power of the divine justice, so that God does not always punish us as we deserve for our sins. This Blood was the price and ransom paid to redeem us from the power of the devil and the slavery of Hell. — P. A. Gietl, in the Messenger of the Spiritual Benevolent Fraternity.

## ACCESSORIES IN SIN.

At times the actions of some Catholic business men prompts one to believe they seriously deficient in some of the very vital doctrines of their faith. Men who would lash themselves into a white heat at a question of their honesty are often the offenders. If by some smart business turn they manage to substitute inferior goods upon an unsuspecting patron they shake hands with themselves for having driven a good bargain.

It may be that they are only employees and resort to such deceptions upon the positive instructions of their employers. If they were to express

an honest conviction they would tell you he was a robber. Yet it never seems to strike them that they are equally as guilty. They do not seem to understand that they are accessories in the moral as well as the criminal law, and they they are violators of both.

Nevertheless he is on every occasion a thief when he so robs a patron by the command, consent, contrivance, permission of his employer. One is as guilty as the other. Being an accessory to his superior's theft, by virtue of that fact he becomes himself a thief.

Yet we have seen many such men quite regular in their religious duties. There is but one inference: That they do not make their practices a matter of confession. And this forces the query, have they received the Sacraments worthily?

The fact, however, remains that they are thieves, no less than if they had purloined the patron's purse. And restitution is required of them. As much a thief as the man who participates in the profits of stolen goods. These things they learned in their catechism, but it seems that the rivalry of business and the desire for wealth have made it convenient for them to forget. —Church Progress.

## THE VARIANCE BETWEEN THE LATIN AND GREEK CHURCHES.

During the first eight centuries there existed no variance between the Greek Church of the East and the Latin Church of the West. But differences and jealousies that gradually developed brought about a separation which finally became formal and fatal in the year 1054 when Pope Leo the Ninth excommunicated the patriarch Michael. The Church of Greece naturally did whatever the Church of the East did, being a part of it.

As a result of the crusades, various Western powers came into possession of Greece and held it for upwards of two hundred years, beginning at about the time of the fourth crusade, in 1204. But this sway of the Franks did not affect the religious belief of the inhabitants. They remained true to Constantinople.

During all these ages there had been growing amongst the theologians of the East a belief in the principle that the Church is a unit not in government, but merely in religious belief and practice, and that when other reasons demand it, the Church of each State or Nation may be entirely free from all jurisdiction coming from foreign authority. According to this principle, each national Church may be independent and autocephalous. Accordingly the Greek Church has gradually been subdivided. Russia and Greece and Roumania and Servia and other countries, whose religion is identical with that of the ancient Eastern Church, acknowledge no ecclesiastical authority of the patriarch of Constantinople. —Rev. Daniel Quinn, in Donahoe's for July.

## THREE IMPORTANT RULES.

By Which Uncharitable Conversation May Be Avoided.

The Right Rev. Francis Mostyn is Bishop of Merioneth and has jurisdiction over all Wales except the County of Glamorganshire. In a recent pastoral he has pointed out the obligation under which we are placed to practice the virtue of charity and to avoid the contrary vice. We quote the following from his letter:

"As there are many ways of practicing the holy virtue of charity, so there are many ways in which we can offend God by transgressing against His command. It is not our wish on this occasion to bring before your notice the various acts of charity which are incumbent upon us, but rather to warn you against the prevailing vice of uncharitable conversation—of speaking ill of our neighbor.

"If we would avoid speaking ill of our neighbor, if we would overcome the habit of publishing his faults, or of causing mischief by tale bearing, we shall do well to try and put in practice the three rules which are often given us by spiritual writers on this point. The first rule is: 'If you can not speak well of your neighbor do not speak of him at all.' This is a most excellent maxim, for if you talk ill of another, or if you are prejudiced against him, you may be sure that your conversation will be under the influence of this prejudice. The second rule is: 'Do not say in the absence of your neighbor what you would not say in his presence.' For it is certainly unfair to say hard things or to aim a blow at the good name of one who by his absence is unable to defend himself. The third rule is: 'Say not of another what you would not have another say of you.' Let us endeavor to act in conformity with these rules, and we shall find that they will often put a check on our speech and save us from many a sin against holy charity."

The rapidity with which the human mind levels itself to the standard around it gives us the most pertinent warning as to the company we keep. —James Russell Lowell.