

# The Catholic Record.

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

VOLUME XXIV.

LONDON, ONTARIO, SATURDAY, JANUARY 4, 1902

No. 1211

## The Catholic Record.

London, Saturday, Jan. 4, 1902

### FREEMASONS.

The National Christian Association, in session at Brooklyn a few weeks ago, came down solid on Freemasonry. One of the speakers, a Presbyterian clergyman, asserted that it was worse than the lynching mobs of the South, and another described it as a breeder of lawlessness and anarchy. Some of course object to this denunciation, and just now the welkin is being disturbed by earnest protest.

Every Catholic knows why he is prohibited from joining the Freemasons. The Masons, as we are well aware, talk about the Supreme Architect of the Universe, whatever that may mean, of religion and of charity, but all this is merely to cajole the Catholics who are willing to sacrifice their faith for business or social interests into throwing in their lot with them.

Here in Canada the Mason is, from what we can discover, a hide-bound politician. Also he is a bit of a humbug. He styles himself a Mason, though he may be a boot-maker; and a venerable prelate or worshipful master may be arrayed in splendor whilst initiating some unscrupulous mortal, and the next day in humble disguise dishing out sugar at so much per pound. All this, however, is a matter of taste.

He prides himself on his freedom, though bound by an iron-clad oath or pledge, and takes infinite pleasure in learning the tomfoolery of grip and password. He is charitable, but to those only who belong to the lodge. He is liberal, though we have heard somewhat to the contrary. In matters of religion he is a model of tolerance, though most of us concede the privilege of admitting that contradictories can both be right to lunatics only. And first, last and all the time the Mason in our parts is out for the spoils. He has a Ritual, and one gets a glimpse on gala days of gorgeous regalia and oriental-looking symbols, but the shining and ever-visible sign of his existence is his insatiable appetite for governmental pap. The Grand Master, in apron and with wand of office, is a picture of benevolence, but on official business he is a terror to some politicians. His fiat is unquestioned. And the good brethren who cover up their tracks by blind and cowardly promises are his obedient and diligent henchmen.

### A POINTER.

The question of Freemasonry is a closed one to a Catholic. He cannot affiliate himself with it without depriving himself of the sacraments and the right to a Christian burial. With regard to other organizations not approved of by the Church we submit the following words of Bishop Chatelet: "If a Catholic be inclined or asked to join a society on which the Church has passed no sentence, then let him as a reasonable and a Christian man examine into it carefully and not join the society until he is satisfied as to its lawful character. There is one characteristic which is always a strong presumption against a society, and that is secrecy. Our Divine Lord Himself has laid down the rule: 'Every one that doth evil hateth the light, and cometh not to the light, that his works may not be reproved. But he that doth truth cometh to the light that his works may be made manifest because they are done in God.'" When, therefore, associations veil themselves in secrecy and darkness the presumption is against them, and it rests with them to prove that there is nothing evil in them.

But if any society's obligation be such as to bind its members to secrecy even when rightly questioned by competent authority, then such a society puts itself outside the limits of approval; and no one can be a member of it and at the same time be admitted to the sacraments of the Catholic Church. The same is true of any organization that binds its members to a promise of blind obedience, because such a promise is contrary both to reason and to conscience, and of a society plotting or working against the Church or against lawful authorities.

### CONGREGATIONAL SINGING.

Most of us who have heard congregational singing will admit that it is more soul-inspiring and devotional than that of the ordinary choir. It may be lacking in technique and artistic rendering and a good many more things which musical people lay great store by, but

it comes from the heart and to us seems like a veritable prayer. At all events it shuts out the gifted soprano and tenors and thereby an increase of vanity and distraction on the part of the worshippers. It must be remembered that congregational singing is not by any means anything new in the Church. But just as some of us, with an imperfect knowledge of history, acclaimed the admission of women into our universities and heard with joy and admiration the comments of Protestants at what they considered our new departure, so also a few are for the same reason inclined to look upon congregational singing as an innovation. However, this, as other practices, was an honor in the ages long past when many were accustomed to recite the breviary every day and to commit to memory the solemn proses and venerable hymns of the liturgy. This, by the way, is not common in our days. The most many pastors can do is to get their flocks to come to Mass, and then oftentimes we have what a contemporary calls a lot of key-hole Catholics, who take their religion at long range. Even they who aspire to be devout would not rank high, according to ancient standards. They are pious, surely hidden saints if you like, though one is tempted sometimes to think that their piety is somewhat like the garment described by Artemus Ward as much lace and little shirt.

But to return, according to Digby, St. Caesarius of Arles compelled the laity to join with the religious in singing in the church the divine office, the psalms and hymns, the proses and antiphons; and in the second Council of Vaison he entreated the people to assemble in the church at matutinal vigils, tierce, sext and none. The English Fathers of the Council of Cloveshoe, in the eighth century, required the faithful laity to assist at the divine psalmody in the church at the consecration of the church of St. Mary at Fereninum in 1191. The office began in the evening, at which assisted a great multitude of laics. The people remained without the church during the night, watching the relics, which were under illuminated tents, and singing "haec est vera fraternitas." By several councils in the time of Charlemagne it was decreed that a laic in the church should repeat the psalms and responses but not the alleluia. Kenelm Digby gives further information on this subject.

### NOTE AND COMMENT.

A short time ago we noticed in an editorial effusion in one of the daily prints the statement: "Louis XIV. once said that he was the State." According to competent historians Louis XIV. said nothing of the kind. It is merely a historical figment, one of the many that have done duty in school book recitations and essays and that linger yet in the minds of some quill drivers. But everything is grist to the political mill, and some Canadian journals scruple at nothing in order to score a point over a political opponent.

It is amusing to watch the loyalty antics of some of our editors. It is really too utter. Now and then when we happen upon an exquisite bit of bathos we would fain ask the writers, as Titania did Bottom: "I pray thee gentle mortal, sing again, Mine ear is enamored of thy note."

They are loyal of course, but judging from the quantity and vehemence of their patriotic declarations, they must imagine the Empire will go to smash if they desert for a moment. But the lady doth protest too much, methinks. And we cannot help thinking that, considering that their outbursts are usually coupled with denunciations of some other fellow, they rely on the proverb: "Give a dog a bad name and hang him."

The report of the Methodist Bishop McCabe concerning his last visit to Mexico is extremely moderate in tone for that gentleman. We surmise that he must have a high idea of the gallibility of his brethren, or otherwise some statements in this report would have undergone considerable modification. For we don't believe he is as absurd as he would have us imagine. So we presume it is a bit of literature for circulation among Methodists who have money to waste on Mexicans who are blighted only to those who rely on imaginary fairy tales for information. For instance, the Bishop tells us of a Mexican who, having heard the reading of the Bible, knew at once that it was the word of God. He grasped the fact of its inspiration, un-

derstood and believed it, instantaneously. A very intuitive individual, indeed, and rather in advance of the cunctious Quon Candae, who requested the deacon Phillip to show him the meaning of the words of Isaiah. Bishop McCabe's find should be patented and sent around to enlighten the higher critics and creed revisers.

### CHRISTIAN SCIENCE.

(Continued.)

McCracken—"The term 'expression,' as applied to the universe, including man, does not clash with the word 'pression.' God is mind. The term 'expression' is equivalent to idea, and does not attempt to describe, or specify, the manner in which God did His work. It sets forth an accomplished fact—that the whole creation, as it really is—spiritual and non-material—expresses God. The universe, including man, cannot express any other creator, for there is none other; nor is this statement in the least pantheistic, for pantheism implies that God is in matter, whereas Christian Science affirms that matter is a false concept of mortal mind, and that, therefore, God cannot possibly be in matter."

Comment—"We must consider this paragraph proposition by proposition. The term 'expression,' as applied to the universe, has a meaning that is perfectly consistent with Christian thought and teaching. As, for instance, when it is taken in the sense of a showing forth or manifestation of the creative power of God; that is, His power to bring forth—not from Himself, but from nothing—this universe. Or, to put it in another form, His power to externalize His eternal idea of the universe, and by His creative act cause that idea to exist in time and space as a real being, distinct from Himself, so that there is no longer only one Being, as before the creative act, but two beings—the Creator and the created; the latter expressing or manifesting the former as an effect or process or points to its cause. If by 'expression,' as applied to the universe, you mean such showing forth, or manifestation of God's infinite power, we agree with you, because in this sense it does not exclude, but implies, the creative act.

But we had reason, or thought we had, to believe that this was not the sense you intended to convey by the term 'expression' when you called the universe an expression of God. And from what you say in your present letter we still think we have reason for our belief. You say: "If Spirit is really infinite, it excludes any other spirit or spirits." By "Spirit," you mean with a capital, you mean—if we understand you correctly—that Infinite Spirit whom Christians call God, the Creator; and by spirits, spelled with a small letter, you mean any spirits other than the Infinite One. By "excludes" you mean the impossibility of co-existence; so that, the Infinite Spirit existing, other spirits do not and cannot exist. You also deny the existence of the material universe. Now, since you deny all spiritual existences or intelligences except the Infinite Spirit, or God, and deny the existence of the material universe, you deny creation in the Christian sense of that term. And, consequently, we believed, and still believe, that by the term "expression," you meant some sort of evolution of the Infinite Spirit, some sort of expression or manifestation of Himself to Himself, or in your philosophy there is no other being to manifest Himself to—the creative act, and remaining eternally only a form of the Divine Mind, as the ideas of a man's mind, uttered by itself, and only to itself, remain mere mental forms, having no real, external existence distinct from the mind possessing them.

As you deny the existence of all spirits except the Infinite Spirit, and deny the existence of the material world also, there remains nothing in existence but the Infinite Spirit; hence, you say, by the term "expression" you mean only some form, state or change of this Spirit Himself. The term "expression," then, in your sense, clashes with creation; it goes farther, and denies creation, leaving nothing but subjective change, development or evolution of the Infinite Being. This is pantheism pure and simple. You may not intend this, but it is the inevitable conclusion from your Christian Science principles.

You confirm this conclusion when you say in your Metropolitan Magazine article: "The only real universe is mental. Things are thoughts." That is thoughts in the mind of God. If things are nothing more than thoughts, existing only in the Divine Mind, then things—this universe—is eternal, for God's thoughts are eternal and unchangeable. Consequently, there never has been a creation; for, had there been, there would be something more than thoughts. There would be thoughts plus their realization in time and space by the creative act. You see, then, that when you deny the existence of everything but thought, you deny creation. It will not do to say that God created His thoughts for that would necessarily imply that He had to do something—create—before He could think—a supposition too absurd for a sane mind. To say, therefore, that only divine thoughts exist is to deny creation and fall into pantheism. While you hold such views you should eliminate the term "creation" from your Christian Science vocabulary; it has no place there whatever.

In contrast with this is Christian philosophy, which teaches that from all eternity the archetypes, patterns or exemplars of all things that have real, substantial existence, were in the divine mind, as the plan of a yet unborn palace is in the mind of the architect, and that by the creative act, of Divine Omnipotence copies or replicas of these eternal archetypes were brought from nothing into real being, separate and distinct from their Creator. Here it will be seen that the creative act is the mark of distinction between Christian teaching and pantheism in all its forms, including Christian Science as one of its forms.

McCracken—"God is Mind." Comment—"This proposition looks passable at first sight. But, measured carefully by the principles of logic, it denies the real existence of God. The word mind, used here without the article a or the, is universal, and is the exact equivalent of 'mentality.' Now, mentality, or mind without the article, being a universal, is an abstraction, having no real existence unless it is actualized, as an attribute or quality, in some real being. To say, then, that God is mind or mentality is to say that He is an abstraction, not a real being, but a universal attribute, without anything in which to exist. Had you said God is a mind, or one mind, or the Infinite Mind, you would have been correct, but unchristian scientific. This is laying your basis for the denial of the real, objective existence of all other minds—finite intelligences—you have denied the real existence of God; and, with Him, all other existences, and the universe is not even a thought or an idea.

McCracken—"The term 'expression' is equivalent to idea." Comment—"They are as different as chalk is from cheese; as different as the name Theodore Roosevelt is from the man who bears it, as different as the label on a medicine bottle is from the contents of the bottle. An expression may announce or advertise an idea, just as the label announces, correctly or incorrectly, the contents of the bottle. But this does not make the label and the medicine equivalents; nor does it make the label or expression of an idea the equivalent of the idea. Your proposition shows how impossible it is for you to make a simple statement without contradicting your principles. For, as you deny the existence of all else but thought, you deny the existence of expressions; and, as they can, in your philosophy, have no existence, they cannot be equivalent to thoughts or ideas which have existence.

You deny our charge of pantheism, and say: "Pantheism implies that God is in matter, whereas Christian Science affirms that matter is a false concept of mortal mind, and that, therefore, God cannot possibly be in matter."

Comment—"You err as to pantheism. The very essence of pantheism is the denial of the creative act; every denial of that act is pantheism. Those who hold to thatism may differ in their theories and explanations of the phenomena of the universe, of which we are all conscious, but they find their point of unity in the denial of the creative act—the essence of their creed. They do not say that God is in matter, but that all that is, is God; that all the phenomena of which we are conscious are but the visible unfolding or evolution of the divine nature, as the rose unfolds itself, all unconscious of what it does; and that universe, as seen by us, is but to the ocean, whose waves and bubbles rise and fall back into it, never ceasing in all their changes to be a part of it. Pantheism looks on the universe and all its changes—including thought—as phases or forms of the Divine Being, evolving and evolving or unfolding, by a fatal necessity. The only difference we can discover between this pantheistic philosophy and that of Christian Science is that the latter treats the universe as a delusion and confines the endless evolution to thoughts or ideas.

Some one has sent us a pamphlet containing a lecture by Frederick W. Peabody, a member of the Boston Bar. It is entitled, "A complete Exposé of the Pantheism or Christian Science and the Plain Truth in Plain Words Regarding Mary Baker G. Eddy, Founder of Christian Science." The lecturer does not deal to any extent with the doctrines of the new sect, but confines himself almost exclusively to a personal account of its founder, her life, character and methods, of business, the impression of which leaves on the mind is very unfavorable to the founder of Christian Science. The main thesis of the lecture is that Mrs. Eddy is a shrewd, cunning, unprincipled adventurer, who has used her profound knowledge of the credulity and gullibility of mankind to amass a large fortune; and that she is the ablest and most successful fraud of modern times.

We are dealing with the false principles of this new sect, and therefore confine ourselves to showing the fallacy and absurdity of those principles, and their contradictions one with another. Following this line, we have nothing to do with personalities; and, so far as our present purpose goes, we care not whether the founder is or has been a saint or a sinner. If, however, she is as bad as the member of the Boston Bar represents her to be, her followers have very little grounds on which to defend her claims to divine inspiration. —New York Freeman's Journal.

Persons who are virtuous inevitably tend through self-denial to positive suffering, just as the vicious tend through self-indulgence to the gratification of all the passions of the body.

### INQUIRY CLASS AT ASSUMPTION.

Non-athletic Misses Enter Upon the Really Critical Stage.

Philadelphia, Catholic Standard and Times. On Sunday evening last the mission to non-Catholics at the Church of the Assumption was brought to a close as far as the public lectures were concerned. The work, however, did not end then, but merely entered upon an equally important if less evident phase. During the present week Rev. Thomas F. Bruce, C. S. P., the lecturer, has been conducting a class of inquiry. He will probably leave the city on Saturday night, entrusting those who yet need and desire instruction to the parish clergy or to the priests in the neighborhood of the seeker after truth.

The class of inquiry began with an attendance of about forty members, and at least one-half of these already expressed a desire to unite with the one fold of the One Shepherd. One young man who attended the class was a fallen-away Catholic, who evidently came primed to puzzle the missionary, but who merely became an object lesson to the others of how little most people know of the Scriptures when pitted against the priesthood. The question-ers are, as a rule, ready to accept most of the doctrines of the Church which are disputed by the sects, but frequently desire an explanation of some particular point which gives them difficulty. The doctrine of indulgences has been so persistently misrepresented that it takes some time for them to see hold a view like unto it when they apply the merits of Christ to the souls of all, with this difference, however, that the Catholic has to do some good work in order to gain the indulgences, and must also be in the state of grace. Attrition and contrition seem to trouble others, even more so than confession. One man says he believes all the doctrines of the Church that he has heard expounded except transubstantiation, and is willing to become a Catholic if he can do so without assenting to this. The practice in one of the Protestant denominations makes this seem a reasonable request to him, no doubt, but the Church, like its Founder, will let those who will not accept this truth walk no longer with her (John vii).

During the week four hundred copies of "Plain Facts" were distributed to non-Catholics applying for them; also two thousand four hundred tracts, that of Sunday evening being "What Catholics Do Not Believe." One young man who heard only the last lecture came to Father Burke afterwards and thanked him, saying that he had given him food for thought.

A ROGUE'S "IRISH CATHOLIC." The minister who was there early in the week came again on Friday night a few minutes before the opening and handed the usher a set of fifteen questions he wanted answered that night. When Father Burke said he could not reply to them before Sunday night, when he did so. The minister has, it would seem, already been converted not only in religion, but in nationality, since he signed his list "An Irish Catholic."

Of course, no Catholic, Irish or otherwise, would ask the questions he asked, so that the "non de plume" would fool the minister of ordinary intelligence, even had the minister not handed it in himself instead of dropping it in the box and giving it some chance to lose its identity.

The masquerading questioner intimated that St. James was the prime minister of the Apostles, and not St. Peter. The Scriptural testimony, with at least seventy-two texts showing St. Peter to be first, gave a wide field for reply, and he was given nine of these points. It perhaps never occurred to the questioner that if St. James was the prime minister would prove the existence of the primacy and that his injunction of appointing the sick with oil was not carried out by those claiming that he is prime. In his efforts to prove an Anglican Church previous to St. Augustine's landing in England, this English "Irish Catholic" made Pope Leo send the apostle of the English instead of Pope Gregory, and asked if the saint did not find a perfect Catholic Church there.

Question number five in fifteen was, "Did not the Pope in freeing Napoleon from Josephine violate the law of marriage as given by our Lord Jesus Christ?" In replying to this question, as well as to many others which were mainly historical and not Scriptural and which began usually with false promises, the lecturer said he would in all kindness recommend the questioner to study history, both ancient and modern, though he answered them briefly as to the facts.

WHY I AM A CATHOLIC. The lecture of Sunday night was entitled, "Why I Am a Catholic."

He said in part that some of his hearers, perhaps most of them, considered the Catholic Church in regard to her exterior alone. What strikes you most forcibly is the outward appearance of this vast society or the influence exercised by her in social and civil life. Her sacred edifices, her significant ritual and devotional liturgy, the part the Church plays in the destinies of the civilized world, the great army of men and women spreading throughout the earth and yet linked together by a bond of faith which disregards language and clime, all professing the same doctrines, all united under one head; this body existing throughout the centuries despite the changes of the powers and the nations about it, the calamities of perverted history, the immoralities of some of its members, the intrigues of some of its high officials, the persecutions of the sword—the pen, of the tongue and of the sword—

all this makes you and all men wonder and admire. You see in her an immense and mighty institution of the world. But, viewed in all these lights, her true character is still hidden from you, still invisible, and will remain so until you consider carefully what is her most fundamental work.

Here the speaker said the object of the Church is the union of the human with the Divine, Christ in love appointed the Church the help and assistant of man in this direction. In reality this is the ultimate reason given by every Catholic for his faith. Whatever may be the initiatory movement which led him into the Church, or, if he has always been numbered with her children, whatever may be the most attractive feature for him within this vast society—her authority, her stability, her art, her music, her charity, her civilizing influence, her moral power, her opposition to tyranny, her defense of justice, her characteristic unity, in all and in each of which he sees reflected the Divine Exemplar; whether drawn by her painting, as Overbeck; by her architecture, as Pugin; by her philosophy, as Brownson, Ward or Hecker; by her conservatism, as the Spanish nobleman, Donoso Cortes; by her liberty, as Frederiek Ozanam; by the study of her history and the whatever motive of the immense variety that could be named, every Catholic, when asked the one foundation for his belief, will answer according to the dictates of conscience, "I am Catholic because the Church was instituted to bring my soul into union with God."

Reference was made to the sacramental life of the Church: the growth of unbelief in our land and the necessity of Christians uniting to check it. This can only be done by preaching certainty, not doubt. The light will be given to all who pray sincerely that they may know the will of Christ, and that knowing it, they may follow it. Your prayers will be answered and then also will be realized the petition of our Saviour, who, after praying for His disciples, added that "not for them only do I pray, but for them also who through their word shall believe in Me; that they may be one, as Thou, Father, in Me, and I in Thee; that they also may be one in Us."

### EFFECTS OF MALICIOUS MISREPRESENTATION.

From "Our True Position" by Rev. John F. Mooney, in December Donator's.

Not only have the affections and religious feelings been alienated and poisoned by misrepresentation as we have seen, but history, literature and science have been distorted for the same purpose. Since the so-called reformation of the sixteenth century, history has been a conspiracy against truth, and especially English history. No nation was ever as guilty as the English nation in its wholesale and systematic distortion of facts, for the purpose of creating prejudice against Catholics. For upwards of three hundred years the English nation has aided in this disreputable work, and during most of this time the maligned Catholic has not been afforded an opportunity of refuting the falsehoods uttered against himself and his Church. The English historians wrote their histories apparently for the sole object of creating prejudice in the minds of the non-Catholic world. Even to-day at the opening of the twentieth century, these shameful misrepresentations of historical facts, which have been handed down and perpetuated by a Burnet, a Robertson, a Gibbons, a Macaulay, a Hume, and a Frode, are received by the non-Catholic world as authentic statements, because no counter statements could be made by Catholics till within the past few years.

### THE SIN OF SPITE.

Many of us who call ourselves Christians are unworthy of the name. Against our own brothers and sisters of the faith we treasure up deadly hatreds or petty spite for the slightest offense. We gibberly rattle off in our morning prayers, "Forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us," utterly unmindful of the sublime meaning of these words which Christ Himself has taught us. These words have a meaning and a purpose. They are not a mere formula. They are distinct with the very essence of Christianity. They express the condition on which we hope for pardon from the Father who is in heaven, for our own innumerable offenses. If we could only see what lies beneath these words, would we be so unforgetting of our neighbors and friends for their trivial offenses against us?

### The Irishman and the Question Box.

From the Missionary. The question box is very often a seven days' wonder to many of the old folks in country parishes who have been accustomed to the routine ways. Their ideas of Church service never contemplated the presence of Protestants, and when the latter come in large numbers, as they do at non-Catholic missions, and are put into the most prominent seats, and are accorded the privilege of asking Catholic doctrine through the question box, verily the old folk think they have fallen on strange times. One good old Irishman, typical of the class of heroes who "had the faith," came in to the pastor one morning and wanted to know why he allowed the Protestants to come into the church and "to be trying to stick the church and 'to be meaning the missionary." "Never mind, Father," he continued in a contented way, "he is able for them."