

The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 104 and 406 Richmond street, London, Ontario.
Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.
EDITORS:

REV. GEORGE R. KORTGRAVES,
Author of "Mistakes of Modern Infidels."
THOMAS COFFEY.

Publisher and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.
Messrs. LUKY KING, JOHN NICH, P. J. NEVES and M. C. O'DONNELL are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for the CATHOLIC RECORD.
Rates of Advertising—Ten cents per line each insertion, adage measurement.
Approved and recommended by the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, and St. Boniface, and the Bishops of London, Hamilton and Peterboro, and the clergy throughout the Dominion.

Correspondence intended for publication, as well as that having reference to business, should be directed to the proprietor, and must reach London not later than Tuesday morning. Arrears must be paid in full before the paper can be stopped.

London, Saturday, January 7, 1893.

THE NEW-FANGLED THEOLOGY.

The Latitudinarian theological professors who are cropping out in such numbers from the Protestant seminaries throughout the United States seem not to be terrified by the heresy trials now in progress in which theological professors figure so largely. Professor Egbert Smith, of Andover, recently expressed his indignation against the Congregational Mission Board for refusing to send six young ministers to the mission field because of their laxity of belief on doctrines the most fundamental in Christianity. The six young ministers are claimed by the Professor as representing his own views, inasmuch as they got their theology from the Andover Seminary.

A statement of belief has been published by one of the ministers, in which he professes, indeed, to believe in "the divineness" of Christ, "not because of the stories of His birth or His miraculous deeds, or His ascension to heaven, but because in His life I see in deeper colors and truer proportions the divine humanity I have already recognized in my fellow-men."

In other words, this so-called Christian teacher acknowledges the divinity of Christ, only in the sense in which all pious persons are god-like or divine; and it would appear that this is the doctrine which is inculcated upon the generation of ministers who are being educated in Andover Theological Seminary. It is needless to say that all this cloud of words in which the divineness of Christ is set forth is but a poor imitation of the words in which the true doctrine of Christianity is conveyed. The meaning is, of course, that Christ is not God at all; and in fact further on in this statement of belief of the young minister he states what he means more plainly still:

"I regard the difference between Him and others as one of degree. The essential union of the divine and human belongs to the core of my faith."

In a word, according to this novel Christianity, Christ is to be called God only in the sense that every man is a God. And this teaching is to be looked upon as the newest phase of Congregational Christianity! We confess we consider the more open blasphemies of Ingersoll and Tom Paine as less objectionable than this pretence of using the language of Christian truth for the purpose of concealing the denial thereof.

On the inspiration of Holy Scripture the same teacher declares that

"All truth is from God. The scientist, the sage, and the poet are as truly inspired as the prophet or apostle."

We may judge from this of the kind of Christian teaching which is palatable to the congregation of Brooklyn tabernacle, as it has grown up with the doctrines instilled into it by the late Rev. Henry Ward Beecher. The minister whose views are set forth in the "statement of belief" above referred to is one of those whom the Brooklyn congregation was so desirous of seeing sent to convert the heathen to Christianity, that in consequence of the refusal of the Mission Board to send them on such an errand, the congregation has resolved not to contribute any more to the Board for missionary purposes.

This new fangled theology which is making such strides among the Protestant Churches of the day is now styled by its advocates "Advanced Criticism," or "Progressive Orthodoxy." The progressiveness simply consists in this, that its progress is towards atheism.

It is, of course, one of the doctrines of this new theological school that all men will finally be saved, whatsoever may be their creed; or perhaps we ought rather to state this doctrine in the form that there is no everlasting punishment for the sinner; for when the supernatural is entirely eliminated from a religion, we cannot conceive that there can be any belief in

an actual heaven. This denial of the existence of a hell is a very natural consequence of the denial of any obligation to believe in any special Christian doctrines. But we must say we cannot conceive of any valid reason why these ministers who were denied their request to be sent as missionaries to the heathen, should be so indignant at the refusal; for if all men are to be finally saved, the heathen cannot be in any much worse condition than Christians, and there is no great need of missionaries to convert them to Christianity. We presume that the Brooklyn Congregationalists took this view of the subject also, though their chief motive for the step they have taken seems to have been indignation against the Mission Board for passing by ministers whose views were like their own.

DYNAMITARDS AT WORK.

A dynamite outrage has been perpetrated at Dublin which has caused a sensation and created a general indignation which has not been equalled since the Phoenix Park atrocity when Mr. Burke was murdered. The outrage took place on Christmas eve at 11 o'clock p. m.

The explosion occurred beneath the window of the detective department of police. There were few persons on the street, but detective Synnot, who had just been discharged from hospital, was passing when the outrage took place, and he was killed on the spot. His face was mangled, his arm and leg shattered, and a severe wound was inflicted on his chest.

The walls of the detective office were cracked and the windows and window-frames badly broken.

There appears to be little doubt that the outrage was the work of some incendiary, and the verdict of the jury which sat on the case was to this effect.

It is said that recently the London police received a vague warning that preparations were being made for a series of new dynamite outrages, and that the subsequent vigilance of the police caused the dynamitards to change their plans and perpetrate the outrages in Dublin.

The funeral of detective Synnot took place on the 28th ult. and was attended by one of the largest crowds ever seen at a Dublin funeral, and it is announced that there is universal indignation felt in the city against the guilty parties. Among the condemnations which have been expressed against this outrage, there is one by the executive members of the Irish National League of Great Britain, who, at a meeting in London, adopted a resolution declaring that they view it with abhorrence, and that it emanated from the enemies of Home Rule. A meeting of the citizens of Cork was also held at which the Mayor presided, and on motion of Mr. Maurice Healy, M. P., a resolution was passed expressing "detestation and condemnation of the atrocious outrage, and the hope that in the interest of our common country the authors of so terrible an offence against the Irish cause may be speedily detected and brought to condign punishment."

We cannot conceive that any section of the Nationalists should sympathize with the perpetrators. It was a most dastardly and criminal act which must be condemned without reserve. The comments of the London Tory press upon it are by no means justified. Thus the *Standard* is reported as saying:

"This crime should serve to convince Mr. Morley of the futility of the hopes he has based upon the policy of conciliation. It has rather spoiled the effect of the pretty device of allowing the Gweedore murderers to return to their families before Christmas."

It is by no means certain that this outrage is the work of Irish Nationalists of any stripe. The efforts of the police to discover the author have so far been quite unsuccessful, and there does not appear to be much hope entertained that the guilty persons will be discovered. But, considering the kind of work in which the Anarchists of Great Britain have been discovered to be engaged, it is not at all unlikely that the outrage proceeded from them, and not from Irish Nationalists at all.

The language of the *Standard*, and similar language of the London *Times* is therefore both unjust and ungenerous.

There is a possibility that the outrage is an act of private revenge; but in any case the people of Ireland are not responsible for it; and we hope that under no circumstances will it be allowed to interfere with the generous intentions of Mr. Gladstone and the Liberal party to give Ireland that measure of justice which has been promised to her.

A FANATIC'S RAVINGS.

Glendower. I can call spirits from the vasty deep.
Hotspur. Why, so can I, or so can any man.
But will they come when you do call for them?
—Shakespeare.

It would appear that the Rev. Dr. Douglas, principal of the Wesleyan Theological College, imagines that the whole machinery of the Government of Canada depends, or ought to depend, upon his invocation of the spirits of the vasty deep, and so from time to time he calls them up after the mock-heroic manner of Owen Glendower. But the people of the Dominion seem quite as indisposed to be hypnotized by him as was Glendower's audience.

Our readers will remember the venomous attack made upon Sir John Thompson by the Montreal parson last summer towards the close of the Methodist Conference at Tilsonburg. He then invoked all the latent bigotry which he supposed to exist in the breasts of his co-religionists, and of Protestants generally, to prevent the possibility of the advancement of Sir John Thompson to the Premiership of the Dominion. He did not precisely say that his opposition was based upon the fact that the latter is a Catholic, but it was because he was supposed to be a tool in the hands of Jesuits, who were represented as being always on the watch to seize control of the Government of the country.

It is now apparent that the spirit of bigotry evoked by Dr. Douglas did not respond to his call; or if it was somewhat stirred up by the invocation, it was not sufficiently potent to work out the plot which the chief juggler intended.

The course of events has brought Sir John Thompson to the very position which Dr. Douglas said he must never fill. It is certainly not on account of his religion that Sir John Thompson is now Premier of the Dominion, but because his acknowledged ability and integrity marked him out as the statesman by all means the most suitable in his party for the responsible position. Dr. Douglas takes occasion once again to speak publicly in a similar strain to that by which he made himself the laughing-stock of the country last summer, the only difference observable being that he is now even more bitter than before.

It would not do for Dr. Douglas to say that a statesman must be ostracized when he is a Catholic. The A. P. A. of the United States takes this stand against the appointment of Catholics to any official position, but in Canada, where Catholics constitute so large a proportion of the population, such a contention could be only treated as contemptible, and this the doctor himself acknowledges in the following terms:

"It is insanity to suppose that the representatives of 41 per cent. of our population can be excluded from the highest political office in the gift of the crown when worthy and trusted men come to the front."

Hence the doctor is forced to put his objection against Sir John Thompson ostensibly on some other ground than the fact that he is a Catholic, and the grounds that he has taken are, 1st, That he is not an ordinary Catholic, brought up in his faith from infancy, but a convert; and, 2ndly, that he had his children educated by Jesuit teachers.

If Catholics were merely an inconsiderable minority in the land, we might indeed see the injustice if we were to be ostracized on any such grounds; but the injustice would have to be endured.

These are matters which every man has the right to judge according to his own conscience. Still, if Catholics were merely an inconsiderable minority in the land it might be possible for a fanatical party to carry out a policy of ostracism and persecution, and though the injustice would be glaring, it might be necessary to endure it, if inflicted; but as the case stands it certainly need not and shall not be endured. The sooner Mr. Douglas recognizes this the better will it be for his own influence.

We are glad to be able to state that the fanaticism of the Methodist Professor is not encouraged by his co-religionists generally. The Montreal *Witness* is almost alone in trying to give importance to his denunciations. Referring to them editorially that journal says:

"The thunder roll of Dr. Douglas' denunciations periods will again resound through all the provinces, and while it lasts the most thoughtless will grow serious. It is only a newspaper interview, but we think of Demosthenes against Philip, or Cicero against Cataline: 'How long O Cataline wilt

thou continue to abuse our patience,' etc.

The *Witness* is always ready to give its approbation to any proposal to persecute Catholics, and we are not surprised that it should approve of Dr. Douglas' absurd propositions, but we cannot repress our amusement when we find it comparing the Montreal parson to the vehement Demosthenes and the elegant Cicero. The only wonder is that the spread-eagle oratory of the doctor is not declared by his eulogist to leave those orators of old far behind in brilliancy and common-sense.

We will here produce two or three gems from the last effort of this modern Cicero to show the appropriateness of the *Witness*' comparison. Here is one:

"You say I was widely criticised by the public press for words spoken at Tilsonburg. Yes, we always welcome criticism, however severe, though in truth, like Disraeli, he seldom read it."

The press may now pass into obscurity when it is thus despised by the Montreal Cicero. But perhaps if he had read the press he would have learned sense enough to respect the almost universal condemnation of his bigotry, to which even Methodists, like Mr. Coatsworth, M. P., of Toronto, have already given expression. Perhaps Mr. Douglas has lost more than the press by his contempt for it.

Our next quotation will be of another kind. It is a literary jewel: "You say it is claimed that Protestants aided in bringing him out. Protestants! yes, verily. In the language of the old dramatist, I am prompted to say: 'Egad, Sir Yorick, them the chaps as dux our sloppy work when they gets summat for it.'"

We will here add a new sin against religion which Dr. Douglas has invented. It is a mortal sin, according to his code of ethics, for an Orangeman to have social or friendly intercourse with a Catholic, thus:

"We have seen it ostentatiously announced that an ex-Grand Master of the Orange Order was yachting with the disciple of Loyola, doubtless with the design of spectacularly influencing the sturdy Protestants of Ontario and elsewhere to ultimately accept as innocuous the man who has done more to strengthen Jesuitism in the land than any in his generation."

Thus speaks the Demosthenes or Cicero whom the Montreal *Witness* so much admires. We doubt whether Athens and Rome would have put much confidence in their orators if their utterances had no better foundation in common sense than have Dr. Douglas' fanatical outbreaks at Tilsonburg and his latest one in the form of a newspaper interview.

The *Empire* of the 26th ult. very aptly says that

"For a long time the age and infirmities of Rev. Dr. Douglas have been allowed to protect him from the punishment which his abusive and bitter references to Sir John Thompson undoubtedly deserved. There has been a disposition to pass over his un-Christian and intolerant remarks as the regrettable indiscretions of a broken man."

Further down it adds that,

"The time has come when it is well, perhaps, that Methodists who have too long had to bear the onus of even tolerating bigotry so cruel and obstinate, breathing as it does a vindictiveness utterly abhorrent to the broad-minded earnest Christians who form that religious community, should at last see the offence in its true light, and deplore it as they will undoubtedly do."

Dr. Douglas' wanton attack is all the less pardonable that it was made on Christmas eve, when the message was brought to earth by angels: "Peace on earth to men of good will."

THE BAPTIST MINISTRY.

We have received from a gentleman in Minot, North Dakota, Mr. W. J. Sparks, who is perhaps a Baptist minister, a communication complaining that we "infer that the Baptists are untrue to their principles by allowing Dr. Pierson, being unbaptized, to administer the communion."

Mr. Sparks corrects this as follows: "I believe you will find that Dr. Pierson does not administer any of the ordinances. Rev. James Spurgeon has been appointed to fulfil all the pastoral duties and to administer the communion. If you have been guilty of a misstatement I am sure you will correct it."

We certainly had no intention to misstate what the congregation of the late Rev. Mr. Spurgeon of the London, England, Tabernacle have done. We merely recorded the fact which has been published far and near that the Rev. Dr. Pierson, a Presbyterian minister who was never baptized in the Baptist fashion, was called to take pastoral charge of the Tabernacle. We cannot say whether or not full pastoral charge was given to him, but we took it for granted that the pastor of that flock was doing pastoral duty. We

cannot see that if a division of labor has been arranged between Rev. Messrs. Spurgeon and Pierson, the case is made any the less absurd, though it would seem that the idea of having the Rev. Mr. Spurgeon called in to take part of the duties was simply an afterthought.

The fact remains that the congregation called in a minister who neither believes nor practices the Baptist doctrine to teach them religious truth, and, we believe, also to administer the sacraments.

We still maintain that there is an incongruity in having a minister in a Baptist congregation, who glories in proclaiming his belief in the Westminster Confession, which declares that the doctrines of Presbyterianism, which Baptists reject, are alone the true religion of Christ.

We do not regard it as of much consequence whether Rev. Dr. Pierson or Rev. Dr. Spurgeon administers the Communion. Neither of the two gentlemen possesses the orders requisite in the Christian ministry, which must come by succession from the Apostles to be valid; for "no man taketh the honor to himself but he that is called by God as Aaron was." (Heb. v. 4.)

FURTHER RITUALISTIC DEVELOPMENTS.

Another case of Ritualism of a most decisive character is reported by the New York *Herald* of December 26. The service was the first thoroughly Ritualistic one which took place in the church concerning which it is reported, viz., the church of the Redeemer, in which Rev. Henry A. Adams is pastor.

This church has been noted, however, as having been attended by extreme Ritualists, and usages have been adopted from time to time which are held by Low-Churchmen to be objectionable; but on Christmas day the climax was reached by the open celebration of several Ritualistic so-called Masses. Incense was lavishly used, a crucifix was borne in procession, and candles were lighted on the table, which is now named the "altar." It is stated that with a very few exceptions the whole congregation were favorable to the innovation, and it is said that even these do not strongly object.

Thirty or forty persons left the church during the celebration. It is asserted, however, that these were strangers who wished to be absent during the Communion. They desired to be spectators, but not participants.

A so-called Low Mass was celebrated at 6:30 o'clock a. m., Matins at 10:30 o'clock and High Mass at 11 o'clock.

The chasuble used was a new one of cream color, beautifully embroidered with gold, and was the gift of a gentleman who takes great interest in the church.

In the procession, a banner of the Blessed Virgin Mary was a conspicuous object.

The preacher of the day, Rev. Mr. Johnson, declared that the reason for the change which had taken place was that "the forms of worship had become as devoid of life as the mummies in the Central Park Museum."

It is beyond doubt that the clergy of this Church believe in the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist, as the ceremonies introduced would otherwise have no meaning. Like many other clergymen of the Anglican Church they have discovered that the doctrine of the Real Presence was always the doctrine of the Church of Christ, from the time of the Apostles, and they have therefore adopted it as part of their belief.

But if they had examined the whole matter carefully they would have found that it is equally the ancient doctrine that to have the Real Presence a succession of priests is requisite coming down from the Apostles also. This they do not possess, and the supposed Real Presence which they imagine they have in Episcopalians so-called Masses is an illusion. Anglicanism itself has never claimed it; though recently a section or party in the Church have done so. This fact of itself is enough to show that Anglicanism has neither a priesthood, a sacrifice of the Mass, nor a Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist. To obtain these the gentlemen who are simply playing at Catholicity should become actual members of the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church in communion with and subject to the successor of St. Peter.

Every trial is sent to teach us something, and altogether they have a lesson which is beyond the power of any to teach alone. But if they came to teach we should break down and learn nothing.

MR. SATOLLI'S MISSION.

The mission of Archbishop Satolli to the United States has already been productive of many happy results, not only in the settlement of several controversies between Bishops and priests, but also in the official enunciation of the position taken by the Holy Father Pope Leo XIII. on the relations between Church and State in regard to the school question.

There are in the United States ninety dioceses, comprising within their limits about ten million Catholics. In so extensive a field it would be surprising if there were not differences of opinion regarding the application of even undisputed principles, and in fact though on the subject of the necessity of a Catholic education for the children of Catholics there is no debate, there has been a large amount of discussion as to the manner in which it is possible to reconcile Catholic convictions with the authority assumed by the State in establishing a purely secular system of Public schools.

In Fairbault and Stillwater, two towns in the diocese of Archbishop Ireland, a *modus vivendi* was established, which excited considerable discussion, on which we made some comments at the time, to the effect that Archbishop Ireland had properly approved of the plan there adopted as the most feasible under the peculiar situation in which Catholics were placed in the localities named. Owing to the opposition of fanatics, however, it was since found necessary to abandon the agreement arrived at between the Catholic and Public school authorities, and the Parochial schools have been again opened in both places. The experiment, however, has proved that it is possible to come to an arrangement with the State whereby Catholic schools can be conducted under State supervision, if the Catholic school authorities are left free to give such religious education as they deem necessary, and when the expediency of Archbishop Ireland's experiment was called into question by some writers, that eminent prelate had the satisfaction of having his experiment approved by the pronouncement of the Holy Father, that it could be tolerated—"posse tolerari." This is, of course, equivalent to saying that State aid and State supervision of schools are not to be condemned, provided that freedom for Catholic education be secured.

The pronouncement of Mgr. Satolli, which has been made public, confirms this view of the case. There are many localities both in Canada and the United States where it is impossible to establish Catholic schools, and Mgr. Satolli admonishes pastors, and especially the Bishops, to pay particular attention to provide means for instructing in their religion the children of Catholic parents who have not the opportunities which are afforded to those who are able to attend Catholic schools. The admonition is as applicable to Canada as to the United States; and though we know that most pastors are even now zealous in this matter, we are convinced that the admonitions of Mgr. Satolli will be followed by increased zeal on their part. They are admonished not to treat the children who are attending Public schools as if they were already irretrievably lost, but to use every effort to save them, paying special attention towards providing them with religious instruction.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

Our contemporary, the Hamilton *Times*, in dealing with the McGlynn case, takes what seems to us a very peculiar view, and indeed it is astonishing to note how frequently Protestant editorial writers get befogged when dealing with matters Catholic. Our Hamilton friend makes a mistake by claiming that Dr. McGlynn has been victorious. Concessions may have been made to him on minor matters, but on the main question in reference to the ownership of land, he must certainly have given heed to the teachings of the Church. Our contemporary will surely not claim that Catholic priests have a right to preach whatever they please, regardless of the voice of the Church, to which they have pledged obedience. When they get out of touch with its doctrines, why call them Savonarolas? If Professor Briggs is punished with excommunication from the Presbyterian fold, will he, too, become a Savonarola? Will all those other ministers who are now on trial for heresy before their Church courts blossom into Savonarolas when cut off from their folds? Were the editor of the *Times* to become a full-blown Protectionist, and were his services dispensed with by the