

The Catholic Record.

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

VOLUME XXIII.

LONDON, ONTARIO, SATURDAY, DECEMBER 14, 1901

No. 1208

The Catholic Record.
London, Saturday, Dec 14 1901.

TO PUBLIC OFFICIALS.

We suggest that the following policy announced by Mayor-Elect Dennis Malvihill of Bridgeport, Conn., be adopted by officials in the pay of the citizen:

I'll serve all the people. No politicians about me. Public expenses must be reduced. No junkets. No secret sessions. No committee meetings behind closed doors. I know the value of money. I have had to work for it. The taxpayers' money shall be used as if it were mine own.

TREATMENT OF OTHERS.

We have heard that it is a good thing to learn early in life the necessity of being hard in our dealings with others. It is not a new opinion, and it is a pagan one. It lives to-day because true ideals have been madly perverted. The Catholic, however, must have always room in his heart for sympathy and pity and love. Even though it be abused to all seeming it is better far to give than to dig oneself a grave in the vulgarity of selfishness. To the generous heart "trust in all things high" comes easy, and though he trip and fall he shall not blind his soul with clay.

THE LOS VON ROME IN AUSTRIA.

The Los Von Rome agitation in Austria appears to be petering out. German agitators endeavor to keep it alive, and the agitation, despite the fact that it has for object the breaking up of the Empire and the revival of Paganism, is supported by Protestant ministers. The reports of its success that from time to time are seen in some of our exchanges are but echoes from fanatic foreign sheets which beguile our brethren into believing that the Catholics of Austria are flocking pell-mell into the various "isms." But so far as the mass of the people is concerned the movement is dead. Respectable papers, Catholic and anti-Catholic, have banned it. Regarding the fact that the government of Saxony have taken the agitation under their protection the Germania asks: Can the Chancellor stand by in silence while German governments officially countenance a revolutionary and treasonable movement in the neighboring empire which is bound to us by a close alliance.

TOO MUCH OF A GOOD THING.

If all the individuals who are honored by addresses possess the many qualities and excellencies credited to them by these precious bits of parchment there must be a great number of very distinguished men in this country. But we always pity those who are thus talked at. It must be a terrible ordeal, and to face and go through it unscathed requires a deal of good nature and courage. It is all very nice for the well-meaning persons who construct and read this kind of literature, but it is a severe tax on the auditors and the principal victim. Reticence in this as well as in other matters is much to be desired; and the knowledge that something may be left to the imagination may have a chastening effect.

A SENSIBLE LETTER.

Anent the founding of a Protestant Episcopate in the Philippines the Rev. A. S. Craspey writes to the newly-elected Bishop a letter which is too good and sensible to pass unquoted.

THE QUALITIES OF A FAITHFUL JOURNALIST.

Honesty of purpose, fidelity, self-control, industry, a sound morality, a strict sense of justice, should all be discerned in the faithful journalist. He is not a mere reporter, but a man of letters; and his duty is to report the truth, and to do so with a clear conscience. He is not to be swayed by the passions of the moment, nor to be influenced by the opinions of the public. He is to be a man of letters, and to write with a clear and concise style. He is to be a man of letters, and to write with a clear and concise style. He is to be a man of letters, and to write with a clear and concise style.

is in our own eye. Is our commercial religion so pure, so Christ-like that we can afford to look down upon and despise the religion of our Roman Catholic fellow-Christians?

"We Americans are in the Philippine islands by virtue of our military power. The people do not want us there; a very large number of our own people do not think we ought to be there, and the occupation and government of the islands present the gravest problems that our government has ever had to deal with. Now if we add to these complications religious rivalry and bitterness; if every Protestant denomination rushes in there not to build up the Kingdom of God but to secure denominational advantage and prestige, then we make a bad condition worse and the work of pacification much more difficult than it is at present. Surely the people of these islands have suffered enough without having forced upon them all the evils and discords of sectarian Protestantism!

"It is impossible that any new form of Christianity should take root in that soil. Experience teaches that the seed of the Reformation is sterile in lands long under the influence of the Latin race. Our missions have been barren in Mexico and in South America, and they will be barren in the Philippines, in Cuba and in Porto Rico."

A FAMILIAR CHARACTER.

Madame Mohl, as Kathleen O'Meara tells, never liked the chatterer. "Why don't they talk about interesting things," she used to say. "Why don't they use their brains? Everybody but a born idiot has brains enough not to be a fool."

We can imagine what the odd little woman would have said of the chatterers who harass professional men. A respected friend, having tried hints bordering on insult and everything in fact consistent with polite usage, intends putting up a barbed-wire fence around his residence. But this, we think, will be of little avail. They'll get under or over it somehow, and we see no hope for him unless he purchase a gatling gun or bull dog—one with a pedigree.

It is regrettable indeed to have a lot of empty-pated humans stealing one's time, and it is still more regrettable that they should be continually bandying about the names of professional men. Clergymen suffer a great deal in this way. They have no redress and little safety. A word or two from them is picked up and magnified into a discourse. Their names are, in praise or disparage, on the lips of frivolity, and we who have the Catholic veneration for the priesthood marvel at the levity and the good nature of the victims.

EDUCATIONAL REPORTS.

One reads so much about education nowadays that it is well to remember a few things which are not alluded to in current publications. Not that they wish to be offensive, for this policy, we believe, is fast disappearing, but they affect an ignorance as to what the Church has done and is doing towards the enlightenment of the human mind. One hears, for instance, reports bristling with eulogy of present day educational conditions. Their dominant note is one of arrogance that grates harshly on the ears of all who have learned how to form conceptions of proper range or grasp and proper dignity and worthiness. We hope we can give all deserved credit to our pedagogues, but we have no desire to waste any enthusiasm on educational fads that date from yesterday. We have our own system that has stood the test of centuries. It is the only one that can possibly turn out the right kind of a man. It is the surest defence of family and state, because it is based on religion and morality. As Father Parow said recently: "Education is not the mere pouring of facts and dates into the mind of a child, but the bringing out of all the latent powers of the soul. The world is beginning to realize the Catholic idea of education. The moral side must be developed with the mental. A boy may be kept at school so long as his father can pay for his books or his mother keep him in decent clothing, but if his heart is not educated with his head, and his con-

science with his memory, a knowledge of arithmetic is no guarantee that he will not use his acquired knowledge in putting the touches to us consummate a scoundrel as ever baffled a Pinkerton or crossed the threshold of our State prisons. We have all the educational facilities for making bright men, possibly more than any other nation, yet we provide more criminals to the percentage of population than history has ever put into its black book."

TEACHERS AND TEXT BOOKS.

Some years ago the old professors who had few books beside Aristotle and the Scriptures believed that the best teacher is not necessarily and often the one who knows the most, but he who has most power to determine the student to self-activity, for in the end the mind educates itself. Hence a strong character develops strength. A strong man who loves his work is a better educator than a half-hearted professor who carries whole libraries in his head. Thus we see they avoided a defect of some modern educational systems—a multiplicity of text books. The method of "exam and stuff" was not in honor, and when a student came from their hands he was able to think for himself. How often does it not happen nowadays that a raw lad from the country outstrips in life's race many a high school graduate! Want of industry, of perseverance, may sometimes account for it, but we believe that whereas the mind of the graduate is filled with undigested facts and scraps of information that warp his mental machinery, because knowledge is not education, the mind of the country boy, especially if of reflective cast, is in a normal state and can by its own native power do good work. We are not likely to be disabused of the idea that the text-book nuisance is responsible for a good many failures. It cannot be otherwise. The fact that the ever-increasing number of logies tends to weaken the intellectual grasp of the average school-boy should be apparent to everybody; and yet the tax-payer endures it and the educational grandee stamps his approval upon it. The system is so irrational that one wonders that it can exist for a moment. It must breed sham and pretence and irreverence and be a tyranny on both the teacher and his victim. There is work in this matter for some educators. We have been altogether too long at the mercy of school-dictators and their long-winded prophecies.

Dying Hard.

Many false charges die hard, and evidently one of the very toughest of them all is the accusation that the Catholic clergy endeavor to prevent the circulation of the Sacred Writ. Imagine a gentleman such as the Bishop of Manchester, who ought to be fairly well informed on the subject, saying the other day at a meeting of the "British and Foreign Bible Society," that he "found from this year's report that though many of the Roman priests on the Continent still opposed the circulation of Scriptures, yet here and there the priests were beginning according to the desire of the present Pope, to circulate the Scriptures among their people."

A correspondent of the Manchester Guardian not only informs the Bishop that the Gospels are published at a penny each by the Catholic Truth Society, and kept in book-cases of that society at the doors of many churches in England, Ireland, and Scotland, but also quotes a passage from a letter addressed by Pius VI to the Archbishop of Florence in 1778, congratulating him upon his Italian translation of the Bible. The clergy of Spain are described by Protestant collectors as especially hostile to the circulation of the Bible. We have before us as we write an edition of the four Gospels, with admirable notes from the Fathers, which was published at Madrid in 1895, and is sold for a mere trifle. But it is useless to cite facts for the "British and Foreign Bible Society," the imaginations of its agents rise superior to them.

THE QUALITIES OF A FAITHFUL JOURNALIST.

Honesty of purpose, fidelity, self-control, industry, a sound morality, a strict sense of justice, should all be discerned in the faithful journalist. He is not a mere reporter, but a man of letters; and his duty is to report the truth, and to do so with a clear conscience. He is not to be swayed by the passions of the moment, nor to be influenced by the opinions of the public. He is to be a man of letters, and to write with a clear and concise style. He is to be a man of letters, and to write with a clear and concise style. He is to be a man of letters, and to write with a clear and concise style.

THE QUALITIES OF A FAITHFUL JOURNALIST.

Honesty of purpose, fidelity, self-control, industry, a sound morality, a strict sense of justice, should all be discerned in the faithful journalist. He is not a mere reporter, but a man of letters; and his duty is to report the truth, and to do so with a clear conscience. He is not to be swayed by the passions of the moment, nor to be influenced by the opinions of the public. He is to be a man of letters, and to write with a clear and concise style. He is to be a man of letters, and to write with a clear and concise style. He is to be a man of letters, and to write with a clear and concise style.

THE QUALITIES OF A FAITHFUL JOURNALIST.

Honesty of purpose, fidelity, self-control, industry, a sound morality, a strict sense of justice, should all be discerned in the faithful journalist. He is not a mere reporter, but a man of letters; and his duty is to report the truth, and to do so with a clear conscience. He is not to be swayed by the passions of the moment, nor to be influenced by the opinions of the public. He is to be a man of letters, and to write with a clear and concise style. He is to be a man of letters, and to write with a clear and concise style. He is to be a man of letters, and to write with a clear and concise style.

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE.

N. Y. Freeman's Journal.

We received some weeks ago another communication from Mr. W. D. McCracken on Christian Science, but the discussion of it was unavoidably delayed till now.

McCracken—"It is pleasant to find and to be able to record a point of agreement, for such points are always more valuable than the points of difference between men."

Comment—"It is a source of pleasure to men—though just why is not entirely clear—when they find themselves giving intellectual assent and adhesion to the same proposition; providing—and this is essential—that they understand and adhere to the proposition in the same sense. To agree on a proposition or form of words that means one thing to one and something entirely different to another, is not to agree. Agreement to his pleasurable must be real, not merely apparent. Men in despair of agreeing sometimes resort to general propositions or formulas that leave their differences untouched, or hide them from view. General propositions that mean this to one mind and that to another, determine nothing; they are sources of discord rather than grounds of agreement."

McCracken—"Such a point of agreement is furnished by your statement, 'No one who believes in God as the Creator and Supreme Ruler doubts for a moment that all cures are effected by Him.'"

Comment—"This illustrates what we have been saying. The proposition here quoted is a simple thing, you and I essentially different thing to you, and you quoted our explanation of the meaning of the words you quote from us. The difference between us would have been so apparent as to leave no doubt. When we said that God effects all cures, we stated further that He did so directly or indirectly through the organized forces of nature which He originally created. The first case is outside the order of nature—a miracle. The second case is within and through the order of nature and as a consequence, the result of secondary causes. The sense then in which all cures are effected by God, is that He effects them always, and only by immediate and direct act. Our sense of the same proposition is that He, being omnipotent, can and does effect said cures sometimes by direct act, and sometimes indirectly or through the instrumentality of created forces or agencies. In our sense the proposition, 'God effects all cures,' is a secondary cause; in your sense it is a primary cause and is excluded. As therefore you do not assent to the proposition in our sense of it, and we do not assent to it in your sense, we cannot congratulate ourselves on having discovered a ground of agreement. The difference between us is radical and touches an essential principle of Christianity."

McCracken—"If God is omnipotent, omnipresent and omniscient, He must also heal the sick."

Comment—"Why do you say 'must'?" It is essential to omnipotence that it must do everything it can do, and render real all possible things? Do you not see that if omnipotence "must" heal the sick, there would be no sick; for the instant one is sick that same instant one "must" be well, for what omnipotence "must" do, it must do every instant of time and eternally. It is a fact that sickness—whether considered as a physical disorder or a mental error—exists, and has always existed since Adam's fall. From this fact it follows that omnipotence is not under the necessity, which you indicate by the word "must," to heal the sick. Either that or it cannot heal the sick. And then it is not omnipotent. All that God, being omnipotent, can heal the sick, if He so wills, and that He can do it by direct act or through His created forces, or what is called nature. Back of His omnipotence there is no fatal necessity in the case, as your statement implies. But, granting for the moment your statement that God must heal the sick, we have before us the *raison d'être* of Christian Science and the present or absent treatment by its adepts? Why should the sick appeal to those adepts to help them, if God, by His omnipotence, must bring about in any case? Thus your statement becomes the coffin of your science. It is worthy of note that in your enumeration of God's perfections you seemingly with care—avoid mention of His free will. In fact you deny His free will when you say He "must" heal the sick. If we are not very much mistaken this denial, expressed or implied, is Christian Science. Now a leper's "mortal mind" is, in the final analysis, Pantheism. McCracken—"When we come to consider how God heals the sick, the opinions of Jesus, His disciples, the Apostles and of first importance, should be accepted as of first importance."

held by Christians because of their belief in His divinity, His Messiahship, and His being the Second Person of the Eternal Trinity; and they try to utilize this veneration and the influence it carries with it, in behalf of Christian Science, while at the same time they deny everything on which this Christian veneration and worship is based. Christians to whom this thus appeal should take careful note of this fact. If they believe Him to be a mere man—then His authority with Christians is absolutely null and void. And if He is what Christians believe Him to be—true God and true man—then Christian Science is false because it denies His divinity.

McCracken—"From a study of those opinions it does not appear that God healed the sick by material means."

Comment—"St. John, the beloved disciple, certainly knew as much, if not more, about the 'opinions' of his Master and fellow disciples as the Christian Scientist of to-day does. In his Revelations, 3-18, he says: 'I declare Him to be a mere man—then His authority with Christians is absolutely null and void. And if He is what Christians believe Him to be—true God and true man—then Christian Science is false because it denies His divinity.'"

Comment—"This illustrates what we have been saying. The proposition here quoted is a simple thing, you and I essentially different thing to you, and you quoted our explanation of the meaning of the words you quote from us. The difference between us would have been so apparent as to leave no doubt. When we said that God effects all cures, we stated further that He did so directly or indirectly through the organized forces of nature which He originally created. The first case is outside the order of nature—a miracle. The second case is within and through the order of nature and as a consequence, the result of secondary causes. The sense then in which all cures are effected by God, is that He effects them always, and only by immediate and direct act. Our sense of the same proposition is that He, being omnipotent, can and does effect said cures sometimes by direct act, and sometimes indirectly or through the instrumentality of created forces or agencies. In our sense the proposition, 'God effects all cures,' is a secondary cause; in your sense it is a primary cause and is excluded. As therefore you do not assent to the proposition in our sense of it, and we do not assent to it in your sense, we cannot congratulate ourselves on having discovered a ground of agreement. The difference between us is radical and touches an essential principle of Christianity."

McCracken—"If God is omnipotent, omnipresent and omniscient, He must also heal the sick."

Comment—"Why do you say 'must'?" It is essential to omnipotence that it must do everything it can do, and render real all possible things? Do you not see that if omnipotence "must" heal the sick, there would be no sick; for the instant one is sick that same instant one "must" be well, for what omnipotence "must" do, it must do every instant of time and eternally. It is a fact that sickness—whether considered as a physical disorder or a mental error—exists, and has always existed since Adam's fall. From this fact it follows that omnipotence is not under the necessity, which you indicate by the word "must," to heal the sick. Either that or it cannot heal the sick. And then it is not omnipotent. All that God, being omnipotent, can heal the sick, if He so wills, and that He can do it by direct act or through His created forces, or what is called nature. Back of His omnipotence there is no fatal necessity in the case, as your statement implies. But, granting for the moment your statement that God must heal the sick, we have before us the *raison d'être* of Christian Science and the present or absent treatment by its adepts? Why should the sick appeal to those adepts to help them, if God, by His omnipotence, must bring about in any case? Thus your statement becomes the coffin of your science. It is worthy of note that in your enumeration of God's perfections you seemingly with care—avoid mention of His free will. In fact you deny His free will when you say He "must" heal the sick. If we are not very much mistaken this denial, expressed or implied, is Christian Science. Now a leper's "mortal mind" is, in the final analysis, Pantheism. McCracken—"When we come to consider how God heals the sick, the opinions of Jesus, His disciples, the Apostles and of first importance, should be accepted as of first importance."

Comment—"This illustrates what we have been saying. The proposition here quoted is a simple thing, you and I essentially different thing to you, and you quoted our explanation of the meaning of the words you quote from us. The difference between us would have been so apparent as to leave no doubt. When we said that God effects all cures, we stated further that He did so directly or indirectly through the organized forces of nature which He originally created. The first case is outside the order of nature—a miracle. The second case is within and through the order of nature and as a consequence, the result of secondary causes. The sense then in which all cures are effected by God, is that He effects them always, and only by immediate and direct act. Our sense of the same proposition is that He, being omnipotent, can and does effect said cures sometimes by direct act, and sometimes indirectly or through the instrumentality of created forces or agencies. In our sense the proposition, 'God effects all cures,' is a secondary cause; in your sense it is a primary cause and is excluded. As therefore you do not assent to the proposition in our sense of it, and we do not assent to it in your sense, we cannot congratulate ourselves on having discovered a ground of agreement. The difference between us is radical and touches an essential principle of Christianity."

ous notions about bodily diseases which they mistakenly thought they had. Why did He point to those miracles? To prove to John that He was the Messiah Whose coming was foretold by the prophets, and that no other was to be looked for. Thus we see over and above the consolation and help given to those afflicted there was still a higher ulterior motive in the miracles of Christ, namely, to afford supernatural proof of His Messiahship and divinity, and thus give belief-compelling and conscience-binding force to His teaching. The same is to be said of the miraculous cures wrought by the Apostles. These supernatural works were wrought, not to prove that there are no curative virtues in material nature, but to prove a supernatural mission and the supernatural character of the Christian religion. The fact that they were extraordinary proves the existence of the ordinary; the fact that they were supernatural proves the existence of the natural.

Thus far we have quoted Mr. McCracken's letter, sentence by sentence, and made such comments as each sentence suggested. We will continue this method till we get through with it. The best place for the curative ointment is in immediate touch with the sore place.

FESTIVALS OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN.

The ecclesiastical year contains many festivals set apart to the honor of Mary the Mother of God. For the most part these sacred anniversaries call up to the mind of the devout Catholic, recollections of the more important events in her life while here upon earth. On September 8th the Church celebrates her birth. The antiphon of the Magnificat chanted upon this day contains the words "O Virgin Mother of God, Thy birth has announced joy to the whole world, for from Thee has proceeded the Sun of Justice." On the 21st day of November we have the feast of the Presentation. When Mary was but three years of age she was offered by her parents Joachim and Anne, to the service of God. On the Friday before Palm Sunday her Seven Dolours or sorrows are commemorated, and on July second occurs the festival of the Visitation, when the Blessed Virgin visiting up went into the hill country to visit her cousin Elizabeth.

None of these feast days are made holidays by the Church. This dignity is reserved for the festivals which commemorate three still greater circumstances, viz., the Annunciation, the Assumption and the Immaculate Conception. The last mentioned festival occurs on the eighth day of December. On this day in the year 1854 Pope Pius IX. formally defined the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception from the Apostolic chair in St. Peter's Church at Rome. The feast of the Immaculate Conception, which is the date of the Annunciation. This refers to the declaration of the Lord unto Mary that she should become the Mother of the Saviour of men. The angelic salutation recited by Catholics every day should recall this great event and cause us to reflect on the mystery of the Incarnation.

On the fifteenth of August the entire Catholic world joins in remembering with joy her triumphant entry into heaven after her glorious victory over the temptations and trials of this life. St. Bernard, who among the saints was particularly fervent in his devotions to the Blessed Virgin, very vividly observes: "What mind can conceive the glory with which the arrival of the Queen of the world was celebrated by the brilliant heavenly hosts, their advance to greet her, their chanting as they led her to the magnificent throne. * * * If eye hath not seen nor ear heard the delights which God has prepared for those who love Him, who shall say what is prepared for her who bore Him and loved Him more than all.—Milwaukee Citizen."

"He Made no Pile."

From the Sacred Heart Review.

We take from the London Spectator's critique of Mr. Pontney Bigelow's "The Children of the Nations" a few sentences which are remarkable, inasmuch as the book under review seems to contain much that is unfavorable to the Church. Spain and her colonies are being discussed, and the conclusion is arrived at that the Church is responsible for the length of time during which Spain maintained her hold upon her colonial possessions. A very left-handed kind of a compliment the Spectator pays the priest, when it says he was responsible for the permanence of a system in its origin so corrupt, but his is to admit this of the Catholic missionaryary: "He does not come home when he has made his pile. He makes no pile, and as a rule, he dies at his post. Whatever good was done in Spanish America under Spanish rule was done by the Jesuits, and since this meant good for the natives rather than for the planters and the court, the Jesuits were expelled." We wonder if in years to come historians who write about American occupation of the Philippines can say as much for the Protestant missionaries who are flocking thither. Can the candid historian now say that "they made no pile" of the Protestant missionaries to Hawaii, for instance? Shun the world, for it will deceive thee; for happiness it will give thee disappointment; for honor it will give thee fraud for fidelity; misery for riches, and eternal death for everlasting life.—B. Henry Suso.