

The Catholic Record.

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

VOLUME XXX.

LONDON, ONTARIO SATURDAY, JANUARY 25 1908

1527

The Catholic Record

LONDON, SATURDAY, JAN. 25, 1908.

HOW HE VIEWS IT.

Writing in the Illustrated London News, Mr. G. K. Chesterton says: "All reasonable men believe in symbol; but some reasonable men do not believe in ritualism: by which they mean, I imagine, a symbolism too complex, elaborate and mechanical. But whenever they talk of ritualism, they seem to mean the ritualism of the Church. Why should they not mean the ritual of the world? It is much more ritualistic. The ritual of the army, the ritual of the navy, the ritual of the law courts, the ritual of Parliament are much more ritualistic. The ritual of a dinner party is much more ritualistic. Priests may put gold and great jewels in the chalice, but at least there is only one chalice to put them on. When you go to a dinner party they put in front of you five different chalices, of five weird and heraldic shapes, to symbolize five different kinds of wines."

AN ANGLICAN VOICE.

Commenting on the statement of Rev. Arthur Lloyd, of Japan, that he has taken to the periodical payment of Peter's Pence as an outward and visible sign of the desires of his heart, The Lamp, an Anglo-Roman monthly, says that "already, under the blessings of God, results of far-reaching consequence have grown from that generous initiative. Who among our readers will follow his example and send a Christmas gift of Peter's Pence to the Pope in honor of his sacerdotal jubilee. It should contain a short personal message to the Holy Father, letting him know that the giver is an Anglican Churchman whose heart's desire is corporate reunion with the Holy See."

THE WITNESS ADMITS.

The Montreal Witness informs its readers that the Romans have given their reply to the Pope's fulminations against Modernism by electing as Mayor a Jew, Ernest Nathan. Now Nathan is not an Italian at all, and is half English and half Jew. He is a rabid anti-clerical, and Honorary Grand Master of Italian Freemasonry. Furthermore, out of 42,000 electors but 17,000, and these avowed enemies of the Vatican, appeared at the polls. Hence their victory was not an answer to anything but a manifestation of the spirit that is opposed to religion. The editor may attribute it to the Pope's utterances because the one came after the other, but people who are not editors have some regard for the most ordinary rules of logic. One of the members of the new Roman City Council is the editor of the Asino, "that notoriously blasphemous and obscene paper," says a correspondent of the Saturday Review, "which is simply a disgrace to journalism and to Italy." The editor, it seems to us, is at no pains to conceal his joy at the situation in Rome. Perchance the gentleman who writes passionately on other topics did not pen the article which has astonished us. One can dislike Rome without trampling on the canons of social amenity. And one can criticize the Holy Father without forgetting the rules of fair-play. But how any reasonable individual can view other than with abhorrence the anti-clerical whose weapons are calumny and obscenity passes our comprehension.

AN INSINUATION.

When the editor insinuates that the Holy Father is seeking to crush democracy we remember the dictum of knowing things that "aint so." Not being a mind reader we take the Holy Father's instructions as they come, and we confess that the eye of the editor has discerned far more in them than we have discovered. We know that the Holy See has declared that the Church is indifferent to all forms of government. She has seen them pass and re-pass on her journey down the ages. All this is accidental so far as she is concerned.

With regard to civil liberty let us glance at the thirteenth century, one of the most memorable most organic in the annals of mankind, and one in which the Church exercised vast influence in civil matters. "For Northern Europe the thirteenth century is the era of the definite establishment of rich free self governing municipalities. It is the flourishing era of town charters, of city leagues. And out of those rich cities arose that social power, the

middle class. The latter half of this same century saw the birth of the characteristic feature of modern society—the control of political power by representative assemblies." (Meaning of History, Frederic Harrison.) All that is best about Canada we have inherited from our forebears in the faith. But why should the Pope seek to crush democracy? The Witness seems to think that it bodes danger to the Church. While waiting for his reasons we may point out that some of the most brilliant minds are not so sure as is the editor on this point. M. de Tocqueville believes that among the different doctrines Catholicism is one of the most favorable to democracy. Proudhon has no doubt about it. Others declare that the Church alone can regulate democracy, that is, prevent it from becoming an unbridled despotism.

GOOD ADVICE.

In the course of an article on books, Mr. G. Chesterton says that everyone ought to know Newman's Apologia, not specially the subtle history of his early hesitations, but most emphatically the fine and firm conclusion of the book in which he sets out his fundamental reasons for being a Catholic. Nothing ever written on behalf of Christianity is stronger than that celebrated passage in which he contrasts the presence of God in the heart with His seeming absence in nature, saying that it appals him as if he had looked into a mirror and not seen his own face. The whole notion of a conflict between science and religion is futile; it can only arise out of an unsentient deduction of science or else an irreligious definition of religion.

Science, he says, is dangerous, not because it encourages doubt, but, on the contrary, because, when thus popularly presented, it encourages a universal credulity. Merely new books tend to narrow us. We require old books to broaden us; we require orthodox books to bewilder our aghs. He tells us that a man ought to know at least the Confessions of St. Augustine, some part (the theistic part) of St. Thomas Aquinas (this is harder to get, but there is a good English abridgment, published recently) and he ought to know the philosophy of Descartes. Many of us, however, prefer the popular magazine with its chit-chat about the stage, story-tales, and scraps of information. A good book, one that demands attention, would discipline the mind, but these articles about nothing in particular debauch it, and render it incapable of application and effort.

A VERY OLD STORY.

His Lordship, the Bishop of London, whose doings and sayings were recorded so minutely by the press, has given us his impressions of his visit to America. Whatsoever may be thought of them they are indicative of wide sympathy, and are, so far as gracious urbanity goes, beyond reproach. But to our mind he agrees with Mr. Froode that history is a "child's book of letters." For instance, he tells the readers of the Cosmopolitan that "I found in up-to-date America a little ignorance about ancient Church history. Some of them imagined that the Church of England began with Henry VIII." We are of the opinion that this question has been removed from the domain of imagination by historians. They agree that the infatuation of King Henry VIII for Anne Boleyn was the direct cause of his challenge to the supremacy of the Pope. "A king," says Macaulay, "whose character may be best described by saying that he was despotism itself personified, unprincipled ministers, a rapacious aristocracy, a servile Parliament—such were the instruments by which England was delivered from the yoke of Rome."

"It may be disagreeable," says Dr. James Gairdner, "to trace the Reformation to such a very ignominious origin; but facts, as the Scottish poet says, are fellows that you can't coax, and that won't bear to be disputed." This effort was to make the Church of England a national Church, recognizing as its head the English king. Aymer, Bishop of London in the time of Elizabeth, has no imagination on the question of the source of the Church of England. "Was not," he says, "Queen Anne the chief, first, and only cause of banishing the beast of Rome with all his boggly baggage." It seems to be certain that if Anne Boleyn had been as unattractive in the eyes of Henry VIII. as Anne of Cleves, the English Reformation might never have taken place.

In pre-Reformation days the Church in England was obedient to the Pope.

Is this the attitude of the Church of England to-day to the Holy Father? Before Henry VIII, the Church in England was one: to-day the Church of England is a camping ground for hopelessly irreconcilable opinions. Before Henry VIII, the Church in England held that bar authority to teach and to govern came from Christ and His Apostles: the Church of England is, to quote Lord Chief Justice Coleridge, "a political institution, established, created and protected by law, absolutely dependent on Parliament." The Bishop of London has just so much jurisdiction as a Prime Minister can give him. "The position of Bishops in the Church of England has been from the first anomalous. He says that no national object was secured by the transparent fiction of the election and consecration. The invocation of the Holy Spirit either meant nothing, and was a taking of sacred names in vain, or it implied that the Third Person of the Trinity was, as a matter of course, to register the already declared decision of the English sovereign. The wisest and best of its bishops have found their influence impaired by the element of unreality that adheres to them." (Frodes History of England, Vol. xii, p. 557-558.) And Dr. Elliot, Dean of Bristol, in his sermons on some of the subjects of the day, p. 11, avers that the clergy of the Church of England are but ministers and stewards, not lords and masters in a Church, which so far as it is the English Church because established by the English nation, is created by the law, upheld by the law, paid by the law, and may be changed by the law just as any other institution of the land.

A PRIMARY CIVIC DUTY.

The Irish Ecclesiastical Record. It is not a little surprising how sparingly our ordinary text-books of Moral Theology deal with the virtue of legal justice. They admit or at least clearly imply its importance, for they invariably raise the question whether every sin is a violation of legal justice, as well as of the particular virtue to which it is immediately opposed. Farther than this, however, they rarely go. The explanation of such a method of treatment seems to me to be found in the social conditions that prevailed when the classics of Theology were written. The practical obligations arising from legal justice could, at that time, be very easily described in general terms. The rulers were simply bound to enact equitable laws and the subjects to observe these laws in a proper spirit. These principles, specific enough for the age in which they were written, were merely repeated by later theologians, when social relations had lost much of their ancient simplicity. It is a long cry from the veritable monarchial governments of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries to the democratic spirit that obtains in European countries to-day. The voice of the people has now to be listened to; and it is no longer even the will, but the mandate of the people that is spoken of. Thus we have all come to share the responsibility for the laws and government of the country. To-day the masses play—or are supposed to play, and may actually play—an important part in the public administration. Still many appear not to realize their influence, or their obligation to use that influence to some purpose.

The lower classes of workmen have not yet come to exercise that power in public matters that their numbers might seem to entitle them to. As a rule, they are too ignorant to take an intelligent interest in public questions at all, or too poor to concern themselves about anything, beyond what will minister to the immediate wants of themselves and their families. But their season of power will come; and ready it is beginning to appear, according as one or other of the great political parties finds it to its advantage to remind them of it.

Not quite so intelligible nor excusable is the position of educated men, who profess to hold themselves aloof from public interests, and live practically, as if they were under a sixteenth century despotism, simply trying to make the best of what others—the government—will do for them, as if the government were something altogether removed from themselves—something which they could not hope to influence. Politics of all kinds—national and municipal—they ostentatiously hold in abhorrence. Politicians, they will tell you, are a venal and corrupt tribe, with which they could not mix without soiling their fair fame. They are fully satisfied that no one will have anything to do with politics that has not some axe to grind—some stroke of business to effect for himself or his friends. And so drawing their double mantle of probity and respectability tightly around them, they protect themselves from the contaminating influence of vulgar politics.

Others again are too indifferent to affairs of public interest to take active part in them. Without actually reviling politics or politicians, they are well content to let others see to them, and devote their entire attention to private business or domestic concerns. Now there is no excuse for the two latter classes. The plea that politics

are corrupt, sunk to low a level to claim the serious attention of honest, intelligent men, is simply an excuse for the arrogance that makes these people regard themselves as so much superior to their fellows, or for the laziness and cowardice that prevent so many from taking their proper place in the community—the place their talents and social standing require of them. There is no reason, surely in the nature of things, why politics should be corrupt, or politicians dishonest. Politicians will be precisely what politicians make them; and politicians, in turn, will be the class of men that obtain the confidence of the public with whom their words have weight. Of course, according as thoughtful and unselfish men hold aloof, political influence gets into the hands of worthless, self-seeking demagogues. Naturally we should expect trusted politicians to be the reflex of the people that trust them. It would appear impossible that immoral or atheistic politicians should flourish in moral, Christian communities; if they do, we may be sure it is because something has gone wrong, because some have failed to do their duty. On this point I shall have occasion to speak at greater length in another connection.

Man is by nature a social being. He may not, even if he could, live a solitary unit, not affected by nor affecting others. He might, indeed, if left to himself, manage to subsist; possibly, he might attain to the knowledge of a few elementary truths, and realize a few principles of morality; but he could not develop, as he ought, and perfect the faculties of mind and body that have been bestowed on him. It is only in community that he can lead the life his Creator intended him to lead even in this world. Hence society is necessary for us all. It is the element in which the seeds of human intelligence—so feeble and so little sufficient for themselves that some have really doubted whether they would exist at all in a state of complete solitude—develop and are perfected until they reach their consummation in the most perfect citizen of the most perfect state. As to how far that perfect citizen or perfect citizen will ever be realized, we may all very well have our own opinions. At least it is certain that community life makes for the realization of such an ideal, and will be successful to the extent to which the mutual relations of its members are wisely determined and conscientiously observed.

As members, then, of society—that, in some form, is absolutely necessary for us, and that, if perfectly constituted, might elevate our lives into an altogether different sphere—we are all bound to aim at that society's perfecting to foster whatever makes for its improvement as well as to prevent anything that should tend to injure it. And this is the object of legal justice; for legal justice is the virtue that inclines the individual of a community to promote the common good. Now the most important element in the constitution of community life is its authority; since community life, of any kind worthy of the name, is impossible without authority; and authority, moreover, it is by the nature of its authority, the manner in which that authority is exercised, and the respect shown to it, that a society's success or failure will ever be measured. And herein we find the justification of theologians, in determining the obligations arising from legal justice for the ruler to consist in the equitable enactment and administration of laws, and for the subjects to submit to legitimate authority and in obedience to just laws. With the subject's obligations we are not now concerned; the ruler's, strange as it may appear, have a practical bearing for us all, which it may be worth while considering at greater length.

If the entire government of a nation were vested simply in one individual; if, for instance, an absolute monarch had complete control of the laws, if he were free to make what laws he would, and able to determine the manner in which these laws should be administered, would it not be his obvious duty to provide that that nation should be equitably governed? Would he not be bound to study the needs of the people, to seek out abuses, and to provide remedies as far as he could? And if all this were to much for him, would he not be bound to associate with himself prudent advisers and able assistants? If, instead of being vested solely in one, the supreme sovereign power were shared by a dozen hereditary rulers, the only difference would be that the obligations, in the first instance confined to one, would now be extended to twelve. Each would be bound to do his own share to secure good equitable government.

Similarly, if instead of a definite number of hereditary rulers, a particular section of the community, e. g., landed proprietors, lawyers, or members of any other profession, were endowed with supreme ruling authority, every individual of that class would be responsible for the government. The ruling section of the community might be too large to admit of all taking an active part in the actual government, and an agreement might be entered into by virtue of which the authority would be exercised by a select few, in the name of the whole class. Even in such a case, the others would not be entirely freed from responsibility. The government would be still carried on in their name, and its enactments would be morally regarded as the acts of the entire body, i. e., unless they validly renounced all right both to participate in the government themselves and to have any voice in the selection of their representatives.

This responsibility does not imply that every individual of the ruling body should be condemned for every mistake or fault of government, as if he had entire control. It implies merely that each is guilty, as far as he has conducted positively towards the evil, by actually conducting, or negatively by remaining passive, when he might reasonably be expected to oppose it. Every individual of this governing class would be clearly bound to make some effort to understand public questions and everything that might have an important bearing on them. How much, in particular cases, this duty would embrace would depend on a variety of circumstances, principally on the intelligence, social position and opportunities of the individual concerned.

Finally, when the governing power is extended still farther, even so far as to be shared in by every member of the community, it still carries its concomitant obligations.

Taking it then, as certain, that citizens are morally bound to endeavour to promote a good government of the state, whenever, and so far as, the means of doing so are placed in their hands, I think there can be no doubt about the general principle of our practical obligations and responsibility in this respect. Every person entitled to a vote is, by that very fact, bound to use it for the benefit of the entire community. And even more, by it he becomes responsible for the official acts of the legislative and administrative bodies, that he and others like him have selected to act in their name. The practical government of the country at present is carried on by elective bodies. Without raising the question of the origin of the authority by which elected legislators act, there can be no doubt about the one pertinent fact, that, in its exercise, it is dependent on the people. All that Members of Parliament do officially, whether directly or indirectly, is done in the name of the people that select them. Local affairs, too, are administered by elected representatives of the people, by aldermen, councillors, guardians and similar bodies; the people, accordingly, are responsible for the manner in which these offices are discharged.

If, therefore, Members of Parliament are guilty of unjust legislation, or if they make unfair appointments to government boards, the whole thing is done in the name of the people whom they represent. It is the public, it is every one of us that have votes, that have placed them in that position, to act in our name. Their injustice, their corruption, is truly the injustice and corruption of the community. If a sovereign were to appoint a councillor to carry on the government of his state without inquiring into his qualifications for such a position, beyond noticing that he was able and high-spirited, should we not justly say that all the blunders such a deputy fell into, and all the crimes he committed in the exercise of his office, were to be attributed to the sovereign?

So, likewise, if people are content to be guided in their selection of parliamentary representatives, merely because a certain candidate is eloquent, popular, or because he makes fair promises, must not they be adjudged guilty of the crimes he commits in their representative capacity? And not only the public generally, but every individual of it in particular, is guilty of the crimes of its official representatives, according to the nature of the responsibility I have already explained, i. e., according as each has conducted positively to have unworthy or dishonest representatives selected, or failed to make a reasonable effort to prevent it. Viewed in this light, and I cannot see that is not the true light, many of us that have been accustomed to pride ourselves, on our indifference to political questions, and from our lofty pinnacle to look down with contempt on the vulgar squabbles of politicians, and with horror on their dishonesty, may begin to feel disquieting doubts about the nobility of the part we have been taking—may, in fact, see reasons for turning our condemnation of politicians back upon ourselves. For, surely, if anyone is ever guilty of culpable negligence in this matter, it is these revilers of politicians who, with nothing better than a word of loudly indignant, or hopeless criticism, look on passively when candidates whom they profess to believe unworthy of confidence seek election and win.

And if all this is true of our obligations in what may be called national politics, and of our responsibility for the laws passed by our parliamentary representatives, as well as for the working of all administrative boards subject to them, equally true, and much more evident, is it of our obligations in municipal politics, and of our responsibility for the acts of our representatives on local boards, boards of guardians, county councils, etc. We constantly hear complaints of the manner in which the affairs of these boards are administered. Members are often said to be more influenced by considerations of the interests of themselves and their friends than for those of the public whom they represent. And it is not infrequently do we hear suggestions of even grosser practices of corruption. I do not mean to imply that public boards in Ireland are worse, in this respect, than similar bodies in other countries. On the contrary, as far as it is possible to compare them at all, they appear better and purer.

But taking into account the method in which the members of these boards are selected, it would be too much to expect from human nature that abuses should not prevail here as elsewhere. It

is quite intelligible that there should be grounds for complaint from time to time. Even the most carefully selected representatives will sometimes prove unworthy of the trust reposed in them. But there is, in the nature of things, no reason for the prevalence of these chronic dissatisfactions of the people with their representatives. The record seems evident: It is the people themselves that select their representatives; if, therefore, they are unsatisfactory, why select them? Does it not sound almost paradoxical that the public freely, with their eyes open, depote men to act in their name, and if the complaints we hear be justifiable, to mismanage their affairs, sometimes even to cheat and rob them. In sober earnest, if there are robberies committed in these matters at all, the people are robbing themselves through their representatives. And a particularly sad feature of the case, as far as the people are concerned, and that which is most responsible for most of the complaints, is that, while they are robbed truly enough, they never receive the spoils, which are manipulated by the representatives in their private capacity.

TO BE CONTINUED.

SAINTE BLASIIUS.

The Festival of this saint is kept on February 3. He was Bishop of Sebaste, in Armenia, and suffered martyrdom for his faith in the year 316. Many wonderful cures were performed through his intercession, and on that account he is particularly honored and invoked by the sick.

Amongst the remarkable cures wrought by his prayers was that of a boy, who was nearly choked to death by a fish bone sticking in his throat, from which the saint freed him. Hence came the practice observed in many places, and approved by the Church, of the blessing of throats on this day.

At the end of Mass the priest first blesses two candles, using a form of prayer approved for this purpose, and found in the Roman ritual. Then the people come forward and kneel at the Communion rail, and the priest holds the candles crossed on their necks, praying at the same time in Latin: "Through the intercession of Saint Blasius, Bishop and martyr, may the Lord free thee from sore throat and from every other evil. In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen."

I know of some parishes in this country where this devotion to Saint Blasius has become very popular amongst persons that do not belong to the Catholic Church, as well as amongst Catholics. In one of these towns in particular, the priest has so many to bless that for some years past he tries on this day to get two or three priests to help him on Saint Blasius's day. Beginning immediately after Mass, he used to continue blessing throats till 12 o'clock and after eating his dinner, he returned again, and was kept busy at blessing throats till 2 or 3 o'clock in the afternoon.

And why do even Protestants and others continue to come on that day to the Catholic Church to have their throats blessed, and bring their children? Because for many years it had been noticed that when diphtheria, croup, or other maladies of the throat broke out, the children escaped whose throats had been blessed on the feast of Saint Blasius; and if any of them happened to have the disease, it was only in a light form.—Catholic Messenger.

CATHOLIC NOTES.

Official notice was received from Rome last Saturday by Bishop Hortsmann that Rev. Joseph M. Koudelka had been appointed to the position of Auxiliary Bishop of the Cleveland diocese.

Two young Levites, Rev. Ferdinand H. Angel and Rev. John C. Angel of Pittsburg, celebrated their first Masses on Christmas Day in St. Joseph's Church, Bloomfield. About eight hundred men, members of the Foresters, C. M. B. A., Knights of St. George and parish societies, attended both Masses in a body.

A dispatch from Washington, D. C., dated Jan. 6, says: As a mark of the high respect in which Dr. Stafford was held by others than Catholics, Rev. Frank M. Bristol, pastor of the Metropolitan Methodist Episcopal Church, has directed that the chimes be tolled during the funeral services on Tuesday. During the funeral march to Mount Olivet Cemetery the chimes will play "Nearer, My God, to Thee," and "Lead Kindly Light."

The staff physicians of St. Mary's Hospital, Milwaukee, acted as pallbearers at the funeral of Sister Theresa, who was shot by a discharged patient, supposed to be insane. The Most Rev. Archbishop Messner was present at the Solemn High Mass of Requiem, and addressed a few words of consolation to the Sisters on the untimely taking of their beloved companion.

"Belgium," says the Glasgow Observer "is a Catholic country—the only country in Christendom with an exclusively Catholic Ministry in power for the past twenty years, the only country where Catholics as a party have had and have the upper hand. Belgium is the most prosperous country in the world. The Belgian state pays the Catholic priests a state salary. The Belgian state goes further. Catholic ministers state attends, and it pays even Jewish rabbis the same."