

The Catholic Record.

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

1214

VOLUME XXIV.

LONDON, ONTARIO, SATURDAY, JANUARY 25, 1902

The Catholic Record.

London, Saturday, Jan. 25, 1902.

PROTESTANTS IN CATHOLIC CHOIRS.

Will some one kindly tell us why Protestant vocalists are invited to assist our choirs? Think of a non-Catholic singing the "O Salutaris"! It may please the fuss-and-feathers kind of a Catholic, but it is edifying in the extreme to the one who goes to church to pray and to adore the God on our altars.

THE LIBRARY FAD.

Mr. Carnegie has given \$10,000,000 to Washington for educational purposes. The libraries of this man of money are all over the country, and if we attach any credence to the reports of the good results produced by them, the millennium must be near at hand. The workingman, however, for whom most of them have been designed, may be inclined to doubt it. He may not have time to avail himself of the knowledge locked up in the tomes, and may think a little money given for other purposes would cause him to have a more abiding memory of the genial millionaire. Suppose Mr. Carnegie were to abandon the library fad and erect a college to be devoted to teaching capitalists that "A most strict account must be given to the Supreme Judge for all that they possess; that it is neither justice nor humanity to grind men down with excessive labor as to supply their minds and wear out their bodies; that the remuneration to those who help them to make their gold must be enough to support the wage-earner in reasonable and frugal comfort."

A WORD OF ADVICE.

Why do some parents devote nearly all their attention to their daughters' education? The girls are afforded every advantage—and precious little good it does some of them—while the boys are hurried through the common schools, and from thence into the world. This is a policy in vogue in some sections—and a blameworthy one. For it is hard to do much with the untrained—the men who have to fight the world with bare hands. Our colleges have battled against this policy, and with a certain measure of success. But for them should be to-day in a sorry plight. We are indebted to them for the men who fight our battles and give us standing. They are the backbone of any influence we have, and when we consider the obstacles to their advancement—the prejudice that they were not, and could not, in point of efficiency, be equal to other institutions—we must certainly compliment them on their courage and enthusiasm. Some day, perhaps, every Catholic will reward them by entrusting his children to their care. In the meantime the parent with a moderate income can drop the educational *fol de rols* from his girl's programme of studies and give the money saved towards his boy's education.

MENACE OF THE PRESS.

In an article in the Nineteenth Century and After, Mr. George Trevelyan deals at some length with what he calls the White Peril—that is, the inroads of ugliness, vulgarity and materialism through means of the press:

"Not only does the vulgar read nothing but vulgarity, so sacrificing the chances of gradual improvement which he used to enjoy, but the man with better capabilities reads so constantly below the true level of his taste and intellect that his ideals are gradually debased and he takes no pains to recommend good books and journals to his children. Until the reading of nonsense comes to be regarded by respectable families in the same light as dram drinking, the press will do more universal harm than the public house."

The writer goes on to say that the best fortress against evil of all kinds has been, and ever will be, the home:

"If boys and girls were brought up with the knowledge of the prime fact that most of what they see about them in the shops and stalls is nonsense, if nothing but was worth reading was put into their hands, if as they grew up they were taught to regard the choice of books and newspapers as one of the most important duties in life, future generations might yet preserve taste and understanding."

The views of the writer will, doubtless, be welcomed in many quarters. Certain it is that books which have no right, human or divine, to exist, in which religion is not even respected and doctrines received for centuries are spoken of as if they were conundrums proposed for solution, are scattered broadcast throughout the land. It is also a fact that the enormous circulation of poor

magazines and sensational novels do not warrant us in forming an optimistic opinion as to the taste of the public. And this stuff, debasing and unhealthy, is found everywhere. One sees it in Catholic households—and it is betimes the only pabulum for many who have been graduated from college and convent. The individuals who delight in wallowing in literary cesspools rather than themselves on their cultivated tastes. But it is all sham. They have cultivated themselves in the art of degeneracy to such an extent that serious reading is burdensome, and books that have soled, encouraged and inspired generations, are flat and insipid. With persons of this type we can do little. They are the unhappy people spoken of by Dante who have lost the good of the intellect. But we can hope to make the children understand that God never gave them immortal souls to be inundated by torrents of trash. If parents would but rise to a sense of their responsibility in the matter of procuring good reading for the family we might possibly have more intelligent men and women. Remember, Christian parents, said the Fathers of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, that the development of the youthful character is intimately connected with the development of taste for reading. To books as well as to associations may be applied the wise saying: "Show me your company and I will tell you what you are." See, then, that none but good books and newspapers be admitted to your home.

THE LATEST OUTBREAK OF THE A. P. A.

The A. P. A.'s in the United States are rather slow. They are out with a set of resolutions declaring that the murder of President McKinley was due to the General of the Jesuits; that "it is no murder to kill a Protestant," and "the doctrines of the Popish hierarchy are conducive to the murder and assassination of all rulers who are in any way obnoxious to said hierarchy."

There is nothing new in all this save the names. We have heard it all before, and we, therefore, claim for the Canadian A. P. A. the right to be regarded as the champion workers in the cess-pool of foul imaginings and contemptible slander. They are a native product, and though we are not proud of them, they are interesting as specimens of what blind hatred and crass ignorance can do with some people without the fold. Under favorable circumstances these human buzzards might possibly be decent citizens. If they were put on a farm and given time to recover their mental equilibrium they might learn to conform themselves to the usages of civilization. But it would be an experiment of doubtful success. For our experience leads us to believe that the emitters of unpleasant odors such as emanate from A. P. A. literature are perverted, mentally and morally, and, therefore, our friends who have visions of a day fast approaching when we shall all be dancing around the maypole of unity should lose no time in unearthing the A. P. A.'s from their holes and cellars—from higher places, if necessary—and confining them for life in an asylum. But this is beyond our most sanguine hopes. The A. P. A. will continue to infest our cities and to do harm to the weak and unbalanced of mind so long as they obtain the implicit or explicit approval of our separated brethren. Besides, they are useful at certain periods. The individual who preens himself on his respectability may, for business reasons or otherwise, shrink from smirching his skirts with filth, and yet be happy at seeing an A. P. A. in it up to his neck. He may dislike to draw his arguments from "poisoned wells" and still experience no uneasiness that others are not so sensitive or thin-skinned.

We remember how the campaign of calumny was conducted during the passage of the Jesuit Estates' Act of Quebec. Every liar in the country was at work producing copy for some Canadian journals. The Toronto Mail, for instance, that poses as a foe of "yellow journalism," published a letter to the effect that: "If the Pope directed the Roman Catholics of this country to overthrow the constitution, sell the nationality of the country . . . they would be bound to obey." This is but a sample of the mendacity of the period. No man of fair education believed it. But the many who, so far as Catholicism is concerned, are living in the land of dreams and hallucinations, accepted it as one more reason for

their hatred of the Church. Our reason for referring to this unpleasant episode is merely to show that the Canadian A. P. A. is a little swifter than the American articles.

THE WHIRLIGIG OF TIME.

Time brings its revenges, and the cloud is lifting from the memory of the Borgias. Historians, biased and unbiased, voracious and mendacious, of all degrees of knowledge and unknowledge, seem to have conspired to consign this name to infamy. Borgia, assassination, poisoning—these have been associated ideas. But this hard-headed age of ours takes nothing for granted, and the modern search light is nosing for authorities. The science which has proved Wm. Tell a myth has done to death a pretty tale, but serious people will welcome in such subtractions from the budget of nursery yarns, so many additions to the volume of truth.

A most interesting work has recently been published by E. P. Dutton & Co. entitled "The Chronicles of the House of Borgia." The author, Frederick Baron Corvo, undertakes to enquire just how much truth there is, in documentary evidence, in the current portraits of this family. What lends particular interest to the volume is that the author does not write in the Catholic interest, but solely as one who has acquired some knowledge of the subject which he purposes to disseminate. Readers may consult the volume, which is lengthy and exhaustive. What we wish to call attention to here is the splendid vindication of Pope Alexander VI. While it is not denied that prior to his elevation to the Papacy he was a very human man, it is shown that as Pope he was a faithful pastor, even remarkable among the long lists of Pontiffs, while as secular prince no contemporary deserves to be compared with him.

No one with any sense of justice can restrain enthusiasm at the way in which the author handles the cudgels in defence of this much maligned man. One heavy calumny after another goes down before the stern logic of documentary proof until Alexander VI. stands out a Pope and civil ruler who had few peers. The author examines in detail the murders and poisonings with which the Pontiff, in company with Caesar Borgia, has been charged; the Pope's innocence either as instigator, principal or accomplice, is proved almost to a demonstration. Indeed the very existence of the famous or infamous Borgia poison may well be doubted. It was Paolo Giorio who first described the venom, which he called *cantarella*. The author shows Giorio to have been "one of those double faced historians who wrote one set of memoirs for the highest bidder, and a second set for the enemies of the patrons of the first. Even during his life he was considered to be a flagrant liar."

It has been asserted that Alexander himself died by poisoning. The story has been told with much detail. It is interesting to note that this impudent falsehood has been indignantly repudiated, indeed laughed off the stage by no less a person than Voltaire, whom the author quotes at length.

After showing how many nameless infamies Alexander VI. did not perpetrate, the author proceeds to point out what a really great Pope he was. At the time of his accession anarchy and desolation reigned in the Papal States. For these he substituted peace and order and security of life. To this end he had need to be firm, as a turbulent baronage had ravaged the Papal States. But his reign broke their back. The sovereigns of Europe found him at all times rigorously just, amenable, neither to fear nor to flattery. When in 1492 the Jews were expelled from Spain, he, although a Spaniard by birth, gave them an asylum in Rome. How he restrained excesses of the Spanish Inquisition is a matter of history. He has been reviled by men of letters of his time, but their enmity is attributable to the fact that he ordained a rigid censorship of printed books, in the interest of public morals. It was he who instituted the "Imprimatur."

Under previous Pontiffs the papal government in certain departments had become somewhat lax. For instance, notaries of Pontifical Briefs had been habitually forging documents—nominating to benefices not only in Italy but in all Christian countries. In 1497 Alexander VI. found them out. How he got after them makes a thrilling bit of reading. Sufficient to say that the punishment was of a kind to discourage all future imitators.

Most noteworthy of all, perhaps, in this remarkable pontificate is the fol-

lowing fact: In the archives of the Vatican are preserved the Briefs and Bulls which this Pope uttered during his pontificate. They are bound in one hundred and thirteen large folio volumes, each tome containing about ten thousand documents. Thus we have over one million of documents to which Alexander VI. in a reign of eleven years must have given personal attention. And the days and nights were no longer then than they are now. When, asks the author, did Alexander VI. find time to accomplish the multifarious turpitudes with which he has been charged?

It is well known that the reigning Pontiff Leo XIII. has thrown open the Vatican archives to the scholars of the world. When asked by some timid Catholics what was to be done if they discovered things derogatory to the Papacy, he replied: "Publish everything. Some Catholics in their zeal for the Holy See would suppress the denial of St. Peter from the gospels."

Nearly two hundred years after the death of Alexander VI. one of his successors, Clement VI., was asked to give an opinion as to who had been the greatest Pope. He answered with a modesty, born, we suppose, of knowledge: "St. Peter, St. Sylvester, Alexander VI. and myself."

The appearance of this volume seems to give the maligners of Alexander VI. and the Borgias their quietus. They certainly now have the floor.

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE.

(Continued.)

McCrackan:—"The Divine Mind admits no 'clash' and no 'incompatible ideas.' All beliefs of discord, all evil in its multifarious forms, not only must lie outside of mind, but outside of the creation."

Comment: Christian Science teaches that there is but one mind or soul, and that is God. You, Mr. McCrackan, tell us that the material world, including our own bodies, are, like all physical and moral evils, delusions of the "mortal mind." In all your denials then you admit at least two things, namely, delusions exist. Now since your creed admits the existence of nothing outside the Divine Mind it follows that mortal minds and their delusions exist in the Divine Mind, as mental forms or ideas. Consequently, all the clashing beliefs known to mankind, all evils, real or imaginary, all errors—including those you claim it your mission to free the world of—are in the Divine Mind. Now it is precisely because of this inevitable and blasphemous conclusion from your Christian Science doctrines that they should be rejected. It is vain for you to deny that these clashes and incompatible ideas exist in the Divine Mind when your doctrines compel you to believe they are there. Since, according to Christian Science, nothing exists but The Mind (with a capital), all the delusions and evils whose existence you recognize and deplore, must exist as modes or ideas of that Mind.

McCrackan:—"There can be no 'divine idea of a grave,' for a grave supposes death, and God Himself is Eternal Life."

Comment: But your mortal mind has an idea or a delusion of a grave, and since your mortal mind is but a form or idea in the Divine Mind it follows that the mind must have an idea or a delusion of a grave. Since you yourself are nothing more than an idea in the Mind—with a capital—all your ideas and delusions must be in and of that Mind. Then there is a "divine idea of a grave," and of death also, for you have an idea of death else you could not deny its existence.

McCrackan:—"Evil and sin are unreal nightmares, which try to make themselves real."

Comment: As, according to C. S. doctrine, nothing exists but the Divine Mind, and as evil, sin and unreal nightmares have some sort of existence, as delusions if not otherwise, they must exist in the Divine Mind as delusive forms or false ideas. It is to avoid this conclusion that C. S. doctrines must be rejected. You do not avoid this conclusion by saying that these delusions are in the human mind, for your doctrine is that the human mind exists only as an idea in the Divine Mind, and, therefore, in the last analysis, these delusions are in the Mind that contains the human mind as an idea. Everything that is in an idea is in the mind that contains it. Consequently, every delusion in the Divine delusion. The best way to see the fallacy of a doctrine is to discover the absurdity of the conclusions that follow inevitably from it.

It requires a strong pull of the imagination to understand how a nightmare can try to do anything, and still a stronger pull when the nightmare is unreal.

McCrackan:—"Mrs. Eddy says on this question, in 'Science & Health,' page 468: 'Therefore, the only reality of sin, sickness or death is the awful fact that unrealities seem real to human belief until God strips of the disguise.'"

Comment: Mrs. Eddy's sayings are contradicted then as such. She has not proof, and we are surprised that she contradicted herself so frequently that it is hard, if not impossible, to know what her belief is, if she have any. She says herself, page 492: "We have no religious creed, if we accept the term as doctrinal beliefs." The statement,

then, which you have quoted cannot be accepted as her belief. Of her statement, considered in itself, we must say what we have said of several of yours. If man's ideas of sin, sickness and death be delusions and errors, these delusions and errors must, according to her doctrines, be traced to and lodged in the Divine Mind, and it, not man, is responsible for them; and her warring against these delusions is warring against the state or mode of the Divine Mind.

McCrackan:—"The sinner makes sin a reality, but when his understanding of God (good), as omnipotent, omniscient and omnipresent, becomes sufficiently real to him, then all the desire to sin, as well as all fear of sin, leaves him, and he sees this preposterous fraud called sin in its native nothingness. This is, indeed, the true destruction of sin."

Comment: The sinner makes sin a reality, not only in his imagination, but in fact. When a man, with a malice and forethought, sends a bullet through the heart of his fellow-man he commits a real murder, a real sin, and his understanding of God or good does not change the nature of that fact. The murderer with the noose around his neck would no doubt find great consolation in the C. S. belief that his crime was a delusion, a mere dream and not a reality, but he soon finds that his belief does not free him from the responsibility for the sin which his malice made a reality.

If our senses, consciousness and reason play us false in assuring us of the existence of sin, what assurance can we have of the existence of virtue, of goodness? Is it not the same authority that assures us of the existence of both? And if that authority must not be believed as to the existence of sin why should it be believed as to the existence of virtue? When you destroy the credit of the faculties by which we know anything with certainty, you take away all reason for belief in anything—even in the Divine Mind itself; and destroy the possibility of intelligence. If we cannot believe our intelligence when it affirms this material world about us, how can we believe that same intelligence when it affirms a spiritual world, or the Divine Mind? Thus you see your denial of sin goes further than you intend, and justifies the denial of virtue, goodness, and all things, and makes all real knowledge impossible. It needs not to be said that reason must reject such a principle. Aside from the evil results that flow from such a doctrine, we must reject it because it is self contradictory; for if we cannot credit the sole means we have of knowing anything we cannot know even the doctrine which discredits the sole means of knowing.

If the only faculties which God has given us to know things—that sin exists, for instance—cannot be believed, how can we believe that Christian Science exists? If you call sin a delusion have we not equal reason to put Christian Science in the same category, since the knowledge of both comes to us through the same means of knowing, namely, through the faculties which you discredit? Is not sin as potent a fact as Christian Science? Is it not more generally known and more widely prevalent? If you can destroy sin by denying its existence, can we not with equal validity destroy Christian Science by denying its existence and that of its propagandists and adherents. You cannot deny that sinners are as cognizable facts as Christian Scientists, as well as more prevalent, more notorious and of greater antiquity. So far as the means of knowing either goes, they are on the same boat, and if one is a delusion, so is the other; and all is delusion. Such is the absurd conclusion to which your denial of sin as a fact leads.

McCrackan:—"Christian Scientists do not differ from all other Christians in their determination to destroy evil."

Comment: But they differ radically in their method of doing so. The Christian is logical enough to know that to desire to destroy a thing is to admit its existence; he is not so fatuous as to attempt to destroy that which is not. The Christian believes that so far as he is personally concerned, the way to avoid sin is not to commit it; and the way to destroy it, if committed, is to repent, and by repenting re-establish that harmony between the Divine Will and the human will which sin—that is, disobedience to or revolt against the Divine Will—has marred.

The Christian Scientist's method is of another kind. He begins to destroy sin by denying its existence; by trying to convince the guilty sinner that he is not a sinner, not guilty, that he has the nightmare and is only dreaming; that if he only rouses himself up and makes himself believe he has done nothing wrong then he has done nothing wrong, for there is no such thing as sin; or there is only a very simple method if it only worked; it is as soothing as that benign syrup which another old lady, Mrs. Winslow, invented for young babies, and which has a sounder basis in reason than that invented by Mrs. Eddy for older ones. Mrs. Winslow went on the common sense principle that there is pain to be soothed, and soothed it. Mrs. Eddy goes on the principle that there is no pain to be soothed and then proceeds to tell you how to soothe it; no sin to be destroyed, and then tells you how it is to be destroyed. Here is the Eddy recipe: To destroy sin in the murderer with hands reeking with the blood of his victim let him believe that it is no sin at all, only a delusion of his "mortal mind" and forthwith he discovers that he is innocent. Or let him learn that he is only a divine idea

working out some mysterious purpose, and that if there is anything wrong in his wicked act it must be attributed to the sole cause of all things and events the Divine Mind; in which case he has been only an irresponsible instrument of that mind.

Such is the Christian Science soothing syrup, advertised as an panacea for all ills, physical and moral, that man is heir to. Of course, there is nothing in common between it and the Christian doctrine of sin and its remedy. The attempt to give Christian Science philosophy a Christian purpose, direction and end is futile. It is the antithesis of Christianity; as much so as Pantheism is, for in the last analysis it is Pantheism, Spinozian Pantheism, strenuously as its advocates may deny it. — New York Freeman's Journal.

THE CHURCH AND FREEMASONRY.

From the London Catholic Times.

All Catholics know now severely the Holy See has condemned Masonry, the world over. Not once only, but again and again, has Pope after Pope fulminated his excommunications against the sect. If there be at this hour any Catholics who doubt the wisdom of the Supreme Pontiff's policy, we commend to their attention a significant article in the current number of the Fortnightly Review, from the pen of Mr. Richard Davey. Under the title "A Few More French Facts" the writer has gathered together a fund of information of especial importance at the present moment, when Freemasonry is in so many lands carrying on a vigorous crusade against the Church and the religious orders now expropriated from France. Who has not wondered at the phenomenon of the resistance displayed to the exiled monks and nuns by populations professedly Catholic? Let him read Mr. Davey's article, and his wonder will cease. For he will see there what manner of men these Continental Masons are. We say Continental Masons; for, though other Masons come under the Papal ban, they are neither as anti-Catholic nor as God-hating as the members of the Continental lodges. Indeed, so disgruntled have English and American Masons been by the atheistic propaganda of their foreign brethren that, according to Mr. Davey, since 1888 no communication has been held between them and Continental, for which may be read all Latin, Lodges.

The propaganda of Masonry does not stop at merely pulling the wires which make political marionettes dance in time with the Central Council's wishes. That it effects a great deal of such harmonious dancing is undeniable, and Mr. Davey gives numerous instances. But it also invades the privacy of homes and hunts out people guilty of religious practices with all the zeal and fanaticism of a sixteenth century pursuivant.

Conversion of Remarkable Man.

The 1st issue of the London Monitor and New . . . says:

"We have the great pleasure of being able to announce that Dr. Frederic George Lee, till lately vicar of Lambeth, has been reconciled to the Church. Last week Dr. Lee gave to his friend, Father Digby Best, of the Oratory, the consolation of rendering to him this important service. The same Father had the happiness of receiving Dr. Lee's son some twenty years ago. That gentleman is now the well-known 'Blue Mantle' of the Herald's College. We understand that at present Dr. Lee is in poor health; but hopes are entertained that he will regain sufficient health and strength to add words and advice to the example he has just given—an example which must speak volumes to the many who know him and his learned writings. At present we respectfully refrain from further comment on this remarkable conversion of a remarkable man."

The Catholic in Matters of Faith.

But you may ask me, can a Catholic doubt any article of his faith without sin? Here is the one grain of truth in Mr. Lecky's assertion. A Catholic cannot voluntarily and deliberately doubt a single article of his faith without guilt. We Catholics do not hold our faith as a matter of private opinion. Ours is an objective certitude based upon the principles of authority. The rejection of a single point of faith is a repudiation of the authority through which it is held. But that authority is God speaking to us through His Church. Therefore, not to accept the vouchment of the Church is to question the veracity of God, and that we cannot do without guilt. All this is clear to him who has a clear conception of the Church.—Rev. John F. Mullany, L.L.D., in January Donahoe's.

Erected by Converted Masons.

In the Church of St. John the Evangelist, Philadelphia, is a statue of the Blessed Virgin, to the erection of which the principal contributors, Francis Cooper and Joseph Chandler, were converts and former pastmasters of the Grand Masonic Lodge of Pennsylvania. During a storm at sea, when the vessel on which he was a passenger was threatened with destruction, Mr. Cooper made a vow to see that such a statue should be erected if the storm abated. Mass was offered on shipboard at the same time by a Portuguese priest, and almost immediately the sea became calm. Miss Annie Cooper, daughter of Francis Cooper, drew the design, from which a plaster model was made. This was sent to Rome, where the marble statue was made.