

The Catholic Record.

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

VOLUME XXI.

LONDON, ONTARIO, SATURDAY, APRIL 22, 1899.

NO. 1,070.

The Catholic Record.

London, Saturday, April 22, 1899.

"ANGLO SAXON SUPERIORITY."

The Christian Guardian of Toronto has in a recent issue a very flattering notice of a book bearing the title "Anglo Saxon Superiority: To What it is due." We read it carefully, and came to the conclusion that it must have been written by a very young reporter, for we charitably suppose that any respectable editor would scorn to spoil paper with such nonsense.

When we read that "Anglo Saxon" superiority is due to the open Bible we were at a loss for adjectives to qualify our surprise.

Does the author of that article imagine it is a book of recipes for the fashioning of machine guns which have been of invaluable assistance to Englishmen in their task of demonstrating their world superiority? Does he think it is a book written by the Almighty for His spoiled children of the mysterious race cleft Anglo-Saxon, and that to it is due that they have their fingers on nearly every part of the globe? If the Bible can be made to stand as sponsor to all the bloody deeds that mark the conquering path of England, and to all the trusts and syndicates that bear her commercial banner, then God help the poor and weak. If the buccanniers of Queen Elizabeth and the political and commercial pirates of our day can point to the Bible as the source of their success; if wealth, and all that is earthy is a sign of orthodoxy, let us gather the dollars, make materialism its goal, and we may receive a certificate of character from the Christian Guardian.

But the connection between the Bible and national prosperity is beyond our ken. It is strange, too, that the gentlemen who are forever boasting of their spiritual form of worship should have such a regard for the temporal view!

What would the editor say to the stuttering Moses, when confronted by the magnificent Egyptian civilization; or to the first Christians, who were materially and intellectually inferior to the Romans? If commercial and military conquests are signs of orthodoxy the religion of Christ must have undergone a curious transformation. He who had not whereon to lay his head denounced riches, and transmitted to those who were to be His standard-bearers the heritage of woe and persecution.

We are unable to discover any commendation of money or any word to warrant us in saying that the prosperity of a nation is an indubitable test of religious fidelity.

The assertion of the Guardian is not only un-Christian but absolutely false. "If," says Bishop Spalding, "England's wealth to-day comes from the Reformation, how shall we account for that of Spain in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries? And if the decline of Spain has been brought about by the Catholic faith, to what cause shall we assign that of Holland, who, in the seventeenth century, ruled the seas and did the carrying trade of Europe?"

If Englishmen are enterprising and progressive it is due not to the Bible but to their fearlessness and resourcefulness and to the magnificent natural endowments of their country. "We may truly say," remarks Monsignor Vaughan, "that all that is best and grandest [about England, even at the present time, has come down to her from] Catholic days, when she was known throughout the world as 'Merrie England.' Thus: 1. Her glorious constitution. 2. Her representative form of government. 3. Her two Houses of Parliament. 4. Her trial by jury. 5. The charter of her liberties, the Magna Charta. 6. Her noble universities. 7. Her splendid cathedrals and churches. All these, and much more, she has inherited from her Catholic progenitors."

And we still remember that any nation that can point to impartial administration of law, to the virtue of its men and to the purity of its women, has, however destitute of material resources [and] barren of commercial triumphs, reached a high plane of civilization. God does not use a stick

to measure the worth of a people.

But they have an open Bible. Yes! they have a Bible open to the unhallowed hands of every stripling who has a mind to go into the mission field and who will distribute it by the millions to crowds who can hardly read, much less understand its pages. It is this senseless scattering of God's word that has bred fanatics and illusionists, and that has shorn it, in the eyes of many, of its dignity and sacredness. It is kicked around to-day in every rationalistic highway. It is mutilated by ministerial critics and by others who accept as supernatural revelations the vagaries of over-heated imaginations.

The open-bible theory is no new thing in the world. "Heresies," says St. Augustine, "have not sprung up save where Scripture, which is good, is ill understood."

"Historically," says Spalding, "the Bible grows out of the Church: and to overthrow the Church as the work of Satan, and to hold the Bible as the word of God is an absurdity so monstrous that it cannot be committed with impunity. If organic Christianity is not a divine work human reason must refuse to look upon its documents as inspired; and this, as is now manifest to all, is the result to which the historic evolution of the Protestant principle has led."

The Guardian seems to infer that before the time of the "sainted Wesley" the Bible was practically unknown to the people. It is an historical fact, however, that no book was held in such reverence during the Middle Ages as the Bible.

Dr. Maitland says: "To say nothing of parts of the Bible, or of books whose place is uncertain, we know of at least twenty different editions of the whole Latin Bible printed in Germany only before Luther was born. Before Luther was born the Bible had been printed in Rome, Naples, Florence and Placenza, and Venice alone had furnished eleven editions."

And Sir Thomas More tells us that the "Holy Byble was translated into the English tongue and by good and godly people, with devotion and soberness, well and reverently red."

If the Bible is such a panacea for all human ills, how comes it that England, which, to use a phrase much quoted on Evangelical platforms, in the full light of Gospel truth, presents a picture of misery, filth and brutal degradation which is a disgrace to a civilized country. The above assertion will be found on the minutes of the Statistical Society of London. How is it that there are thousands "homeless, breadless, without raiment or shelter, to whom," says the Bishop of Rochester, "God is unknown except as the substance of an oath, and to whom Jesus Christ is as distant as a fixed star. In 1883 Mr. Chamberlain declared that England had a million paupers, and millions more were on the verge of pauperism. Never before was the misery of the people more intense or their condition more hopeless or more degraded." In the days of the "shut Bible" there was indeed poverty in England, but not the biting, pinching kind that makes criminals of men and that prompts women to sell themselves for raiment and nourishment. Then there were dispensers of the good which Providence had bestowed on them. It remained for other days to beget the soulless principle of individualism with its selfishness, rapacity, greed and contempt for the poor. "The connection," says the London Tablet, "between the Protestantism of England and her workhouse is far more easily established than is any connection between her many creeds and industrial importance."

How comes it that the "open Bible" has unchurched fifty millions of people in this country? If so, why are there so many civilized pagans—without creed or God, living only for pleasure, and caring nought for what lies on the other side of the grave?

Surely it is nauseating to the normal mind, this prating about "Anglo-Saxon superiority!" Wealth and military genius are not the guarantees of permanent nationality: they are powerless against immorality, egotism and scepticism, which alone can pluck the crown of nationhood from the brows of the people.

ANOTHER SAMPLE.

The aforesaid flattering notice was followed by rhetorical fireworks anent the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes and the Massacre of St. Bartholomew. These two articles are usually kept on the top-shelf of theological museums, and exhibited only as weapons of controversy of the olden time. England, we are told, has nothing of the kind in her annals, especially since the days of the "open Bible." But he may come across a few pages of history that will teach him to be sparing of statements of that nature. Hallam's assertion that persecution is the deadly original sin of the reformed Churches is particularly applicable to England. Time has brought us a larger measure of liberty, and has taught us to repress the instincts of the savage, and to live in harmony, and agree to differ; but this does not prevent us from seeing that on the pages of the history of England, the land of the open Bible, is written the tale of merciless cruelty dealt out to Quaker, Puritan and Catholic. When one considers the innocent devices, such as the scavenger's daughter, the iron boot, the chamber of little ease, not to mention the hangings and quarterings, we have but to admire the sublime ignorance of the individual who chants the praises of the toleration of England.

Has he ever heard of the penal code, "the most prolific machine," said Edmund Burke, "ever invented by the wit of man to disgrace a realm and degrade a people." And this code was promulgated by Christian Englishmen, for the avowed purpose of making Irishmen apostates or the veriest serfs that ever cringed under the hand of a master! It deprived them of education and of the franchise; it strangled their industries and made the trade of priest-baiting as honorable legally as it was lucrative.

And how did the Irish, who had not the open Bible, retaliate upon their oppressors? Let Cooke Taylor, the historian of the Civil War in Ireland, speak: "It is but justice to this maligned body, the Irish Catholics, to add that on the three occasions of their obtaining the upper hand they never injured a single person in life or limb for professing a religion different from their own."

NOW ONE WORD MORE.

We should like to ask the Christian Guardian if the friends of the open Bible who bewail the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, etc., showed when they landed in the New World that they were free from the deadly sin referred to by Hallam? We speak of historical facts. Did they forget the lessons they learned in the Old World? Did they not hurray and burn, and all for conscience' sake? And where did the proscribed Quaker and Puritan find shelter from their mild-mannered brethren? He found it in the settlement of Maryland, founded by Catholic hands and presided over by the Catholic Lord Baltimore. They who had cast in their fortunes with the colony had done so to avoid a short shrift and high gibbet from the defenders of religious liberty. Lord Baltimore himself had chosen fidelity to the faith of his fathers in preference to apostasy and political position, and yet, despite all this, they hesitated not to throw open their gates to those who were persecuted on religious grounds. Bancroft pays a just tribute to these pioneers of religious freedom when he says that "that asylum of Papists was the spot where in a remote corner of the world, on the banks of rivers which as yet had hardly been explored, the mild forbearance of a proprietary adopted religious freedom as the basis of the State. The Roman Catholics who were oppressed by the laws of England were sure to find a peaceful asylum in the quiet harbors of the Chesapeake: and there, too, Protestants were sheltered against Protestant intolerance."

Cardinal Simon Langham was the first to establish schools in England for painting, architecture, and the cultivation of orchards, gardens and fishponds. William of Wykeham, the great bishop of Winchester, was the first to introduce the system of making good roads. The daily date so familiar to us on the top of every newspaper is due to the labors of the Jesuit Father Clavius, in revising the calendar, performed at the order of Pope Gregory XIII.

TALK WITH A PARSON.

Parson: "It (the Catholic Church) has never enacted a law nor adopted a policy that looked toward life, growth and spiritual evolution since it came into the world."

Now, Parson, we propose to prove that you are exceedingly ignorant of the history of European civilization and of the Catholic Church as the controlling factor in it. We will do this not from Catholic, but from exclusively Protestant authorities. Not because they are better than Catholic authorities, but being Protestants, their testimony will not be suspected of bias in favor of the Church, but will be considered as an honest and frank effort to be true to the facts of history. Unlike you, Parson, the authors we shall quote are well known to the world in the field of literature and learning.

The first we quote is the historian Lecky. In his "History of Rationalism," he says:

"The Catholic Church was the very heart of Christendom. The result of the ascendancy it gained brought about a stage of civilization that was one of the most important in the evolutions of society. By consolidating the heterogeneous and anarchical elements that succeeded the downfall of the Roman Empire, by infusing into Christendom the conception of a bond of unity that is superior to the divisions of nationhood, and of a moral tie that is superior to force, by softening slavery into serfdom, and preparing the way for the ultimate emancipation of labor, CATHOLICISM LAID THE VERY FOUNDATIONS OF MODERN CIVILIZATION. In the transition from slavery to serfdom, and in the transition from serfdom to liberty, she was the most zealous, the most unwearied and the most efficient agent. (Vol. 2, page 36, 37, 209.)

The great statesman and scholar, William E. Gladstone, said:

"Since the first three hundred years of persecution the Roman Catholic Church has marched for fifteen hundred years at the head of human civilization, and has driven, harnessed to its chariot as horses to a triumphant car, the chief intellectual and material forces of the world; its art, the art of the world; its genius, the genius of the world; its greatness, glory, grandeur and majesty have been almost, though not absolutely, all that, in these respects, the world has had to boast of." (Quoted from Dr. Zahm's "Catholic Science and Catholic Scientists," page 116.)

Dr. Samuel K. Maitland was librarian to the Protestant Archbishop of Canterbury, editor for several years of the British Magazine, author of Essays on the Dark Ages, and many other works. In his essays, he says: "At the darkest periods the Christian Church was the source and spring of civilization, the dispenser of what little comfort and security there was in the things of this world, and the quiet scriptural asserter of the rights of man." (Page 393.)

M. Guizot, the Protestant French historian, says:

"There can be no doubt that the Catholic Church struggled against the great vices of the social state—against slavery, for instance. These facts are so well known that it needless for me to enter into details." ("History of Civilization," lect. vi.)

The Rev. E. Cutts, author of "Turning Points in English Church History"—a work which was published by the English Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge—says:

"In the Middle Ages the Church was a great popular institution. * * * One reason, no doubt, of the popularity of the Mediaeval Church was that it had always been the champion of the people and the friend of the poor. In politics the Church was always on the side of the liberties of the people against the tyranny of the feudal lords. In the eye of the nobles the laboring population were beings of an inferior caste; in the eye of the law they were chattels; in the eye of the Church they were brethren in Christ, souls to be won and trained and fitted for heaven. * * * On the whole, with many drawbacks, the Mediaeval Church did its duty—according to its light—to the people. It was the great cultivator of learning and art, and it did its best to educate the people, and used it on the side of the liberties of the people. * * * By means of its painting and sculpture in the churches, its mystery plays, its religious festivals, its mystic plays, and its preaching, it is probable that the chief facts of the creeds were more universally known and more vividly realized than among the masses of our present population." ("Turning Points of English Church History," 1874, pp. 16, 165.)

James Anthony Froude, the Protestant English historian, says:

"Never in all their history, in ancient times or modern, never that we know of, have mankind thrown out of themselves anything so grand, so useful, so beautiful as the Catholic Church once was. In these times of ours well-regulated selfishness is the recognized rule of action; every one of us is expected to look out for himself first, and take care of his own interests. At the time I speak of the Church ruled the

State with the authority of a conscience and self interest, as a motive of action, was only named to be abhorred. The Bishops and clergy were regarded freely and simply as the immediate ministers of the Almighty; and they seem to have really deserved that high estimate of their character. It was not for the doctrine which they taught, only or chiefly, that they were held in honor. Brave men do not fall down before their fellow-mortals for the words which they speak or for the rites which they perform. Wisdom, justice, self-denial, nobleness, purity, high-mindedness—these are the qualities before which the free-born races of Europe have been contented to bow; and in no order of men were such qualities to be found as they were found six hundred years ago in the clergy of the Catholic Church. They called themselves the successors of the Apostles; they claimed, in their Master's name, universal spiritual authority, but they made good their pretensions by the holiness of their own lives. They were allowed to rule because they deserved to rule, and in the fullness of reverence kings and nobles bent before a power which was nearer to God than their own. Over prince and subject, chieftain and serf, a body of unarmed, defenseless men reigned supreme by the magic of sanctity. They tamed the fiery Northern warriors who had broken in pieces the Roman Empire. They taught them—they brought them really and truly to believe—that they had immortal souls, and that they would one day stand at the awful judgment bar and give account for their lives there. With the brave, the honest, and the good, with those who had not oppressed the poor nor removed their neighbor's land mark; with those who had been just in all their dealings; with those who had fought against evil and had tried valiantly to do their Master's will, at that great day it will be well. For cowards, for profligates, for those who lived for luxury and pleasure and self-indulgence, there was the blackness of eternal death.

"An awful conviction of this tremendous kind the clergy had effectually instilled into the mind of Europe. It was not perhaps; it was a certainty. It was not a form of words repeated once a week at church; it was an assurance entertained on all parties of doubt. And the effect of such a belief on life and conscience is simply immeasurable. * * * In the eyes of the clergy the serf and his lord stood on the common level of sinful humanity. Into their ranks high birth was no passport. They were themselves, for the most part, children of the peasant and the son of the artisan or peasant rose to the mitre or the triple crown, just as now a days the rail-splitter and the tailor become Presidents of the Republic of the West. The Church was essentially democratic, while at the same time it had the monopoly of learning." ("Short Studies on Great Subjects," Vol. I., pp. 33, 37.)

The learned Canon Farrar, in his "Saintry Workers," says:

"What was it that had preserved the best elements of Christianity in the fourth century? The self-sacrifice of the hermits. What was it which saved the principles of law and order and civilization? What rescued the wreck of ancient literature from universal conflagration? What restrained, what converted the intrusive Teutonic races? What kept alive the dying embers of science? What fanned into a flame the white ashes of art? What reclaimed waste lands, cleared forests, drained fens, protected miserably populations, encouraged free labor, equalized widely separated ranks? What was the sole witness for the cause of charity, the sole preservative of even partial education, the sole rampart against intolerable oppression? What weak and unarmed power alone retained the strength and the determination to dash down the mailed hand of the baron when it was uplifted against his serf, to proclaim a truce of God between warring violence and to make insolent wickedness tremble by asserting the inherent supremacy of goodness over transgression, of knowledge over ignorance, of quiet righteousness over brute force? You will say the Church, you will say Christianity. Yes, but for many a long century the very bulwarks and ramparts of the Church were the monasteries, and the one invincible force of the Church lay in the self-sacrifice, the holiness, the courage of the monks." (Saintry Workers, pp. 82, 83.)

In his Hulsean lectures before the University of Cambridge this same Canon Farrar, Chaplain to Queen Victoria, said:

"From the fifth to the thirteenth century the Church was engaged in elaborating the most splendid organization which the world has ever seen. Starting with the separation of the spiritual from the temporal power, and the mutual independence of each in its own sphere, Catholicism worked hand in hand with feudalism for the amelioration of mankind. Under the influence of feudalism slavery became serfdom, and aggressive was modified into defensive war. Under the influence of Catholicism the monasteries preserved learning, and maintained the sense of the unity of Christendom. Under the

combined influence of both grew up the lovely idea of chivalry, moulding generous instincts into gallant institutions, making the body vigorous and the soul pure, and wedding the Christian virtues of humility and tenderness to the natural graces of courtesy and strength. During this period the Church was the one mighty witness for light in an age of darkness, for order in an age of lawlessness, for personal holiness in an epoch of licentious rage. Amid the despotism of kings and the turbulence of aristocrats it was an estimable blessing that there should be a power which, by the unarmed majesty of simple goodness, made the haughtiest and boldest respect the interests of justice and tremble at the thought of temperance, righteousness and judgment to come." (Hulsean lectures for 1870, page 115.)

An American writer in the North American Review, 1840, says:

"It would then, perhaps, be expedient to refer the history of Europe in the Middle Ages to Italy, as the history of the ancient world has always been referred to Rome. The great ascendancy of the Papal, and the influence of Italian genius on literature and fine arts of all countries, made Italy essentially the centre of light, the sovereign of thought, the capital of civilization."

Another Protestant writer in the North American Review, 1845, writes:

"Though seemingly enslaved, the Church was in reality the life of Europe. She was the refuge of the distressed, the friend of the slave, the helper of the injured, the only hope of learning. To her chivalry owed its noble aspirations; to her art and agriculture looked for every improvement. The ruler from her learned some rude justice; the ruled learned faith and obedience. Let us not cling to the superstition which teaches that the Church has always upheld the cause of tyrants. Through the Middle Ages she was the only friend and advocate of the people, and of the rights of man. To her influence was it owing that, through all that strange era, the slaves of Europe were better protected by law than are now the free blacks of the United States by national statutes."

Samuel Laing, a Scotchman and a Presbyterian, in his "Observations on Europe," page 395, says:

"Law, learning, education, science, all that we term civilization in the present social condition of the European people, spring from the supremacy of the Roman Pontiff and of the Catholic priesthood over the kings and nobles of the Middle Ages. All that men have of civil, political and religious freedom in the present age may be clearly traced, in the history of every country, to the working and effects of the independent power of the Church of Rome over the property, social economy, movement, mind and intelligence of all connected with her in the social body."

We will close our quotations from Protestant authorities by giving another from Rev. Canon Farrar:

"Consider what the Church did for education. Her ten thousand monasteries kept alive and transmitted that torch of learning which otherwise would have been extinguished long before. A religious education, incomparably superior to the mere athleticisms of the noble's hall, was extended to the meanest serf who wished for it. This fact alone, by which the dignity of the individual, elevated the entire hopes and destinies of the race, the humanizing machinery of schools and universities, the civilizing propaganda of missionary zeal, were they not due to her? And, more than this, her very existence was a living education: it showed that the successive ages were not sporadic and accidental scenes, but were continuous and inherent acts in one great drama. In Christendom the yearnings of the past were fulfilled, the direction of the future determined. In dim but magnificent procession 'the giant forms of empires on their way to ruin' had each ceded to her their sceptres, bequeathed to her their gifts. * * * Life became one broad, rejoicing river, whose tributaries, once severed, were now united, and whose majestic stream, without one break in its continuity, flowed on, under the common sunlight, from its sources beneath the throne of God." (Christianity and the Race, page 186.)

Such, Parson, is our reply to your statement. In the light of these Protestant scholars and historians you will be able to see that you have made a sorry exhibition of yourself, and shown how ignorant a preacher may be and yet think himself competent to talk at a scholarly Catholic priest like Father Nugent.

We make acknowledgements to Father Alfred Young, in whose book, "Catholic and Protestant Countries Compared," we found conveniently arranged all but one of the quotations we have given. Father Young's book is invaluable to the Catholic layman who is often bothered by such anti-Catholic trash as is to be found in the Parson's letter to Father Nugent, and in cheap Protestant literature generally. There are two other works that cannot be too highly recommended: we refer to Archbishop Spalding's "Miscellanea" and "History of the Protestant Reformation."—N. Y. Freeman's Journal.