

The Catholic Record.

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

VOLUME XXVI.

LONDON, ONTARIO, SATURDAY, MARCH 26, 1904

1327

The Catholic Record.

LONDON, SATURDAY, MAR. 26, 1904.

SCIENTIFIC NOBODIES.

In reply to a communication from Sandwich in regard to clairvoyants and "adepts" in kindred subjects, we beg to say that these people in our opinion trade on the gullibility of the public. They are fakirs as a rule who shrewdly upon a glib utterance and a shrewdness gained by much experience of all sorts and conditions of men, as valuable assets in the making of a livelihood. They are, also, oracular we know in pronouncements ament their knowledge of the hidden forces of nature. It savours of extravagant conceit this talk from individuals who are scientific nobodies; but it is pregnant with assurance to the individuals who wish to have their heads examined or their palms scratched or the future unsealed to them. Knowledge such as they boast of would bring quite a price in the scientific market, but with touching self-sacrifice they give the benefit of it all to the unscientific at so much per. The young and the impressionable and they who are ever in the quest for something new in the way of a remedy for jaded nerves are the victims or clients of these performers. Sometimes we are told the middle aged and they who desire to investigate the business steal in at nightfall and get a dollar's worth of enlightenment. In the majority of cases we repeat these "madames" and "professors" who hail from Thibet or India or Egypt are adepts at gulling the public and their "seances" based on imposture and trickery. In some instances they rely on contrivances of various kinds to gain the desired end; and on others in the assurance that any yarn however preposterous concocted in a darkened chamber will be listened to and credited.

Humbugging the public is as lucrative a business now as it was in the days of the great showman.

THE SPIRIT OF EVIL.

Sometimes there are facts connected with these performances which cannot be explained by stage machinery. It would be unwise to say that phenomena which cannot be accounted for at the first blush are other than the result of natural forces. But every effect must have a proportionate cause. When it happens that a table, for instance, raps out a sensible answer to some question or other it is manifestly the duty of common sense to attribute it to some intelligent cause. In other words it is deviltry pure and simple.

DIABOLIC INFLUENCE.

Without the fold many scout all stories of diabolic influence as childish and unworthy of the consideration of reasonable men. To them a personal devil is as much a myth or a bogey of the days of superstition as is hell. Phenomena which betray the existence of an invisible agent are ascribed to hidden forces, and thus the devil, the god of this world, as St. Paul calls him, conceals his sinister designs and settles them in disbelief. For the spirit of evil employs his tremendous power and intelligence to remove from the minds of men any idea that there is anything beyond this world and to induce them to view any effect as merely natural.

FLIMSY ARGUMENTS.

It is gratuitous the assertion that no diabolic manifestation takes place to-day. That such manifestations have happened is dogmatically and historically certain. We may doubt as to such and such a case coming under this head, but the doctrine that the devil does not play any part in the world is, so far as we have seen, supported by very flimsy arguments. The Church tells us that the devil does exist and that as a roaring lion he goeth about seeking whom he may devour.

AN INSTANCE.

We know that our Lord cast out devils and empowered His Apostles to do the same. We read in the Acts xvi. 16, that St. Paul encountered at Philippi "a certain girl having a pythonical spirit who brought to her masters much gain by divining. . . . But St. Paul being grieved, turned and said to the spirit: 'I command thee in the name Jesus Christ to go out from her.' And he went out the same hour."

OUR WAY IS CLEAR.

These facts should serve as a deterrent to any ridicule or incredulity on this matter. For us the way is clear. Against the most wicked one we are admonished "to take the shield of faith" and "the helmet of salvation" and "the sword of the spirit, which is the word of God."

Mediums, clairvoyants, etc., should be avoided. "Ouija" boards should not be tolerated in any Christian household. The excuse of whiling away an hour or so is valueless. For in themselves the "boards" afford no amusement; to use them for the purpose of finding out the unknown or the future is to invoke the spirits of darkness, who owing to their vast experience and knowledge are shrewd guessers. We may say that no notion of communing with the powers of darkness is entertained. This may be so; but he who wishes an end wishes also the means to that end. An intelligent answer requires an intelligent being. When we place ourselves before an Ouija board and expect it to answer our queries, no foolish delusion should blind us to the fact that we are invoking thereby the aid of invisible agents. But the path to all these "amusements" is barred. Back in the beginning God commanded: "Neither let there be found among us any one that consulteth soothsayers, or observeth dreams and omens, neither let there be any wizard or charmer, nor any one that consulteth pythonic spirits, or fortune tellers, or that seeketh the truth from the dead."

PRURIENT DRAMAS.

A correspondent writes us a long letter anent the stage as it is in Toronto. From his statement we learn that the drama presented there is of such character as to give a thrill to even the seasoned "rounder." We regret, of course, that our sister burg, "Toronto the good," is in a fair way of having its fame tarnished. There be critics, however, who, seeing pearls in every dung heap, tell us that the highly spiced drama teaches useful lessons. Still, as the average citizen is not in training to be either a cad or a blackguard, it is rather difficult to see eye to eye with the critic on the question of utility. But the amateur reformer may expend any amount of energy to the easing of his soul, doubtless, but to no appreciable amelioration of conditions. So long as the theatrical manager sees "our best citizens," and the others, flocking to boxes and stalls, he will turn a deaf ear to plaints, and can-it costs a trifle—get the dramatic critic to give him a "write up."

We suggest that the matter be placed before the Lodges. For, if, as our correspondent assures us, the opportunity to serve the public is a golden one, we may depend upon the Knights of the Apron keeping it in view.

THE GOSPEL OF HATE.

Just now many journalists are scratching the Russian and finding the Tartar. During the course of the operation they refer to him as barbaric and ruthless and scheming—in a word, the poor Muscovite is tormented daily by the big guns of the quill driver. But the Japanese suave and urbane, and considerate just now of the foreign devils they burn incense before them and bow down before them and salute them in a manner worthy of the poliest Tokioto who ever stepped the planet. The Japanese did put on a western mask in 1871, but this fact alone does not warrant undue laudation. It was merely a move in the international game and it may be that oriental diplomacy plus western resources may cause the tributes of admiration to grow beautifully less.

From what we learn of the state of his woman-folk we are of the opinion that the yellow man's ideas of morality must get a deal of furbishing before we can hymn praise of him, and vilifying the Russian is merely one way of preaching the Gospel of Hate.

JAPANESE RELATIONS WITH KOREA.

In the Nineteenth Century and After for Feb., Joseph H. Longford, late H. M. Consul at Nagasaki, writes on Japanese Relations with Korea. Russia has decided that the coast line of Korea is essential to the completion of her own Asiatic littoral. On the her own Asiatic littoral her harbors are eastern coast of Siberia her harbors are closed by ice and useless to her throughout the winter. The coast of Manchuria is ill provided with harbors; even that of Port Arthur is of insufficient depth and dimensions to afford adequate shelter to a fleet or even to

single battleships of the present day tonnage. That of Korea, on the other hand, has several harbors which fulfil every naval requirement. Japan regards the independence of Korea as essential to its national safety.

Korea is in the kindergarten department of the school of nations. Sometimes she has been thrashed by the Japanese, and so roundly on one occasion that the bitter memory of it still lasts among the Korean peasants, who to this day speak of the Japanese as the "accursed nation"; at others she has had to take, for her own health and incidentally for the good of trade, doses of diplomatic medicine. A bit of information is the following: "The Koreans," the writer says, "are, perhaps, the most expert stone-throwers in the world, and their skill in that respect would put even a Belfast Orangeman to shame."

A MONSTROUS CALUMNY.

A subscriber sends us as a paper published across the border, containing an article by a Rev. H. A. Schaeffler, of the Bohemians, etc., of Cleveland. This individual states that the late Bishop Gilmour demanded from the Bohemians of a certain parish in Cleveland \$5 each for pardon of their sins, and because they refused to pay it closed their church for a year and a half. Another proof of the saying, "that a fool can hold his tongue." Hence it is of no use to say anything about him. But it makes the judicious grieve to see such a one masquerading as an Ambassador of Truth.

The most of people like an antagonist that uses reputable tactics. The habits of the prize-ring cry down the pugilist who runs counter to its rules, but some good clerical gentlemen who talk unctuously of the "light," the "gospel," employ any kind of weapon against Rome. They listen to nothing save the voice of an unreasoning hatred, which, as in the present instance, lands them betimes in a quandary not coveted by self-respecting men. The brains attack of individuals of such calibre tend to make the sects ridiculous, and their friends should be the first to expose him. In connection with this matter the Ave Maria says:

The charges against the late Bishop Gilmour were made by the Rev. H. A. Schaeffler, of Cleveland, Ohio. They are monstrously false. The congregation in question was intimidated by the Bishop because it defied his authority. A more upright man than Bishop Gilmour we have never known. He hated injustice; and if he was not one to submit tamely to it from any source, on the other hand he was incapable of knowingly doing an injustice to another. Mr. Schaeffler was prudent to wait until the Bishop was dead before publishing such a calumny against him.

ARCHBISHOP QUIGLEY'S ADDRESS BEFORE THE CATHOLIC WOMAN'S LEAGUE.

A PLAIN STATEMENT OF THE FACTS AND PRINCIPLES UNDERLYING THE CATHOLIC POSITION ON THE EDUCATION OF THE CHILD.

Ladies: I learn from the constitution and by-laws of the Catholic Women's League that its members are to be guided in all their "educational, philanthropic and humanitarian" work by Catholic principles. As the ladies assembled here to-day are studying and working in the educational department of the League, it seems to me not out of place to review some of the fundamental principles that underlie the question of the education of the child. The question as to what the child should be taught and by whom it shall be taught is one of the great practical religious questions of the day. In France and England it seems to be the uppermost question just now in all men's minds. For years, as you know, it has been and remains to-day a very active question in our own country.

Most political and I might say all religious controversies, arise from conflict of opposing principles. The question of the education of the child has ever been one between Church and State, and almost in every case between the Catholic Church and the schismatical, Protestant or infidel state. The Protestant sects from the beginning surrendered themselves body and soul in this matter of the education of the child to the dominant principles of liberalism which came in with the so-called reformation and reached their flower and fruition in the French Revolution. Liberalism is still the fundamental error of the age. It is the denial of all authority and right outside of the individual and the State, and now generally proclaims the supremacy of the State in all human affairs, spiritual and secular. It began in rebellion against the divinely established authority of the Church and its visible head, and has long since ended in abject submission to the human authority of the State in all things. This is especially true of it, and more univer-

sally in its attitude towards education. In the original colonies the sects founded sectarian primary schools and held them subordinate to the predominating Church authorities. When the various states under new constitutions established state systems of primary schools, this sectarian school was rendered almost without a struggle to the control of the purely secular authority. So that in this country through the lack of firm religious principle on the part of the Protestant majority, the development of the primary school has been downward from the religious, sectarian and denominational school to the school without religion.

The same may be said of the institutions of higher learning established in the United States by the sects. They were a blessing in a way to the country, but the doctrine of private judgment in religion, the fundamental error and propagating principle of the sects, threatens by degrees and with pitiless logic to bring them under the control of anti-Christian and unbelieving influences, and make them propagators of every kind of religious error.

The Republic of France, acting on the principles proclaimed by liberalism of the supremacy of the state in education, is settling this question of the public instruction of the child by taking forcible possession of it, and educating it without any regard to the rights of God or the parent. In England the Government is more just to the parent, and whilst taking upon itself the direction and assuming the expense of education of the child, it leaves to the parent the right to say what the child shall be taught and by whom. This same spirit of justice and right principle pervades the legislation governing the education of the child throughout the British empire and its colonies from Ceylon to Canada. The same may be said of Germany, where the right of the parent is also respected, notwithstanding all the fierce battle of Bismarck's Kulturkampf of thirty years ago. This recognition of the parental right in the education of the child by governments results in these two empires in the denominational system of public education under state control, which the defenders of our state system decried as impractical.

In the United States there is no national system of education. The national government, however, in its decisions concerning the education of its Indian wards, manifests a preference for the so-called non-sectarian system adopted universally in the individual states of the Union within the last fifty years. This means a system of state aided primary and advanced education from which God and religion are professedly, though not actually excluded. This is the system which obtains in all the states of the Union. Neither the national government nor the state governments prohibit the establishment of schools under Church control, but they do deny to these schools all support from the public treasury. Our states have repudiated the beginning of the denominational school systems in the British empire and its colonies; in the German empire and also in Austria, and have gone over to a system of public education which its defenders call non-sectarian, but which in practice is either Godless or sectarian. Pushed to its last issue this principle of non-sectarianism would result in a state education to which the majority of our American people would clamorously object. It would result in the absolute exclusion of God and Christian morality from the education of the young. But the promoters and defender of this system of ours are not as logical as are the French government people, and do not push the principle of non-sectarianism upon which it rests at once to its last practical conclusion. Whilst defending non-sectarianism in the schools and proclaiming it as the great American and only principle upon which our school system shall rest, they will not admit that it results logically in Godless education. When, for instance, we Catholics protest against Bible reading, hymn singing and chapel exercises with Protestant prayers in these same schools, as inconsistent with non-sectarianism we are forthwith called enemies of our glorious system of public education. When the infidel insists upon the exclusion of God, and the Jew objects to the name of Christ in the schools on the ground of the non-sectarianism of the schools, at once the defenders of this non-sectarian school system proclaim that it shall not be made Godless and must remain Christian. The fact is that the American people are too busy to think; else they would recognize the fact that non-sectarianism in education means a purely secular education and the banishment of God and religion of every kind from the instruction of the child.

But to return to our subject. It certainly will not be out of place or out of time in the midst of all this confusion to review and determine the simple principles which underlie the Catholic position in every part of the globe on the subject of the education of the child. The Catholic position in this matter of the education of the child is founded on the eternal order of things, and therefore its perfect simplicity, consistency and sameness in all times and in all places where the Catholic Church exists. If we wish to settle this question according to Catholic principles, we must determine according to Catholic principles the ownership of the child. No one will deny that to the owner of the child belongs its education. To whom then does the child belong? Liberalism, which dominates pretty much the thought of this modern world of ours, proclaims, as we have seen, that the child be-

longs to the State, to the exclusion of both God and its parents. Therefore, it concludes that the state has an exclusive right to educate the child, to say what instruction shall be given it, and by whom it shall be given. In patriarchal times, under the theocratic government of the Jewish state and even among the nations of paganism, with few exceptions, the child was held to belong to the father. Except in the Jewish state, the authority of the parent over the child was absolute and exclusive of any interference on the part of the city or state.

When paganism came under the control of Christianity, the child was still held to belong to the parent, subject always to the rights of God. The Church came upon the scene as the guardian of the rights of God and the interpreter of His law, both for parent and state. The Church with this authority as representative of God on earth and as guardian and interpreter of His law and rights, has always taught, and most consistently, that the child first of all belongs to God; after God, and subject to Him, in the second place to the parents; and in the third place to the state. No one will deny that God, being the absolute Owner of all things, has also dominion over the child and its destiny. As secondary causes of the child, the parents are its society and of the child itself, the Church has always recognized in the state a claim upon the child subordinate to the divine and parental rights. As guardian of the temporal welfare of society, the state cannot stand idly by and suffer parents to neglect its life, education or general well-being. At all times that its rights over the child are subordinate to the rights of God and the parent and limited by them. This order which is founded on the very nature of things the State must not disturb, much less overthrow. The Church as the representative of God has always insisted upon the fulfillment by parents of the obligation resting upon them to bring up their children in the faith and practice which God makes known to men through her. Were she to neglect to do so, she would be recreant to her mission to teach all men to observe what the Saviour commanded them to observe. The State has the right to require the education of all children, but it belongs to the parents to determine what education shall be given them. Catholics must look to the Church for guidance in this most important matter and obey her regulations as to what the child shall learn and by whom it shall be taught, the voice of the Church being for them the voice of God—"Who hears you hears me." For non-Catholics this right to control the education of the child belongs to the parent, and this right of the non-Catholic parent the Church has ever respected and safeguarded. The Roman Empire, though it made war upon Christianity, never obliged Christians to send their children to state schools, nor deprived them of the right to have their own schools for their own children and to bring them up in the Christian religion. This is an oppression peculiar to modern liberalism, which denies all right and authority outside of and above the state. It has reached its practical climax in the legislation of infidel France of to-day against the right of Catholic parents to educate their children in the Catholic faith by Catholic teachers. This excludes all right of education from the Catholic parent, and all right of the Church, as representing God, to direct the education of the child. The modern spirit of liberalism would make the state supreme in morals and education to the end of getting rid of all religion and bringing up children in pure secularism. This is atheism; for what else is the assertion that the state is supreme in human affairs, than the denial of the authority of God and His Church. The American system of non-sectarianism will inevitably produce the same result. It also banishes God and religion from the education of the child. What is a matter of wonder to Catholics is that Protestants do not see it in this light, for if non-sectarian education means anything it means a purely secular education. That is an education without God and religion. But with all their cry for non-sectarian education in this country, Protestants know that in fact no such things exist. Catholics know from saddest experience that non-sectarian schools are for the most part Protestant schools, supported and protected by the state. If not actually Protestant, then they are, what logically they should be, Godless. They are not schools which Catholics can use. But it will be said, how can the state otherwise make provision for the education of all the children in the land, and at the same time respect the rights of parents to educate their children in their own religious belief? We simply point to the denominational system of Great Britain and its colonies, Germany and Austria, as an exemplification of how this difficulty may be solved and all rights of State and parents conserved. In these lands, government does not claim the right to tax the whole people to establish and maintain schools which only a part of the people can use with a safe conscience. Schools are provided for the minority as well as for the majority. In a system such as this the rights of all are respected, and the rights of God and the parents acknowledged without any injury to the rights of the State. A system such as this, though founded in simple justice and equity, would not satisfy the Protestant majority in this country. They prefer the present system because it is anti-Catholic. With the best inten-

tions possible they allow themselves to be persuaded that a system such as Catholics demand would contribute to the extension of Catholic influence in this country, and must be resisted. This is a hard saying, but it is nevertheless true of both the infidel and Protestant sections of the majority. They regard the Catholic Church as more to be dreaded than pure secularism and downright atheism, and they do not hesitate to say so. There are honest men, justice-loving men among them without number, who are neither bigots nor fanatics, who would not willingly wrong any class of their fellow-citizens; but the dominant influence that misrepresents the purpose of the Church leads them to believe that patriotism and devotion to religious liberty require them to oppose her. We do not flatter ourselves that infidels and Protestants will grant us the justice of giving us our proportion of the Public Schools, or relieve us of the tax now levied upon us to maintain schools from which religion is excluded or in which a false religion is taught. The time is past in this country, nevertheless, when the non-Catholic majority can interfere with our right to establish and maintain our own schools, colleges and universities, or oblige us directly to send our children to their State schools, as has been done in other countries and in other times. I say directly, because there is need of eternal vigilance on our part lest indirectly they may impose this obligation upon us. An instance of this indirect way of violating our right of conscience, you have here in the city of Chicago in the adoption of a Normal School by the School Board, which your sons and daughters who aspire to employment as teachers in the Public Schools must frequent for a time, or be denied admission to the positions of teachers. Against such a requirement we must protest. If a School Board can make attendance at a Normal School a condition to employment in the Public Schools, why may not some city charter of the future, or amendment to the constitution of the State make attendance at the Public Common schools a condition to employment in any branch of the public service. The liberalism of the age is not confined to France, but fortunately is not as bold elsewhere as it is in France. Our rights of conscience must be respected by force of the constitution, but what is the constitution to men who would sacrifice it to the hatred of anything Catholic if we were to stand by and permit the sacrifice. For this very reason I see in the Catholic strength the best defense of the rights of man is recognized and guaranteed by our constitution.

Yet we do not believe that Catholic schools will be suppressed, the freedom of education abridged or the members of religious orders and congregations banished or forbidden to exercise their vocation to teach as in France. Satan has succeeded in deceiving this unfortunate nation and is waging a fierce war against the Church, but shall not prevail.

This new world was discovered by Catholics and taken possession of in the name of the Cross, and we cannot get it out of our hopes that the Cross will yet come into possession of its own. We cannot believe that atheism will ever totally claim as its own this country of ours, and banish God from this fairest of the inheritances promised to His own dear Son. We are confident that the history of centuries yet to come will show this most favored of lands as one of the chief seats of the Church of Christ. God will bring this about in His own way and in His own good time, and by means that shall seem wonderful in the eyes of men. With all their tolerance of the destructive theories of this age, the American people are at bottom a God-fearing people, hating the anarchy and despotism which ever go hand in hand with a political order whence God and His holy law are banished.

No State can be lasting and safeguard liberty that is not based on the moral order, supported by the conscience of the people. By degrees, by the logic of events, and by the force of the moral order must have a divinely assisted interpreter and guardian, independent alike of the nation and the individual, to guide and strengthen in its support the conscience of the people.

Whatever our present difficulties may be, and they are many and great, we must ever continue to assert the rights of the Church as the representative of God. The time will come when we shall be listened to as were the Christians of old, for He in Whom we trust will not permit His Church to go down before onslaughts of men and theories whose triumph would mean the revival of paganism in the modern State.

Two Timely Questions.

Should a Catholic salute all priests that she may meet on the street, or only those whom she knows? If a new curate comes to her own parish, should she bow on meeting him or defer doing so until she has been formally introduced?

Generally speaking, a Catholic should salute all priests, as a mark of respect for their exalted office. In towns or small cities, where priests are few in number and usually known to Catholics by sight at least, this rule should be observed. But since clergyman of other denominations, notably the Episcopalian, dress so early like priests as to deceive sometimes even the elect, it is not always wise to attempt to follow the rule in large cities, where there is likelihood of mistakes.