

The Catholic Record

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

VOLUME XXXV.

LONDON, ONTARIO, SATURDAY, JANUARY 4, 1913

178 5

THE DEATH OF THE OLD YEAR

Fall knee-deep lies the winter snow,
And the winter winds are wearily sighing.
Toll ye the church bell sad and slow,
And tread softly and speak low,
For the Old Year lies a-dying.
Old Year, you must not die;
You came to us so readily;
You lived with us so steadily,
Old year, you shall not die.
He lieth still; he doth not move;
His eyes and his feet are waxing slow;
He hath no other light above;
He gave me a friend and a true, true
love.
And the New Year will take 'em away.
Old Year, you must not go;
Such joy have you been with us,
To long as you have seen with us—
Old Year, you shall not go.

He froth'd his bumper to the brim;
A jobber you shall not see;
But his eyes are waxing dim,
And his feet are waxing slow,
He was a friend to me.
Old Year, you must not die;
We did so laugh and cry with you:
I've had a mind to die with you.
Old Year, you must die.

He was full of joke and jest,
But all his merry quips are o'er.
To see him die across the waste
His eyes and his feet are waxing slow,
He'll be dead before he's
Everyone for his own.
The night is stary and cold, my
friend,
And the New Year, blithe and hold,
my friend,
Come up to take his own.

How hard he breathes! Over the snow
I heard his now the crowing cock.
The shadows flicker to and fro;
The cricket chirps; the light burns
low.
'Tis nearly twelve o'clock.
Shake heads before you die,
Old Year, we'll dearly rue for you;
What is it we can do for you?
Speak out before you die.

His face is growing sharp and thin.
Alack! our friend is gone.
Close up his eyes—up his chin—
Step from the corpse and let him
lie.
There's a new foot on the floor, my
friend,
And a new face at the door, my
friend,
And a new face at the door.

EDUCATIONAL PROGRESS

It seems as if London diocesan, under the administration of His Lordship Bishop Fallon, were to be blessed with a remarkable measure of success in material as well as in spiritual matters. Our readers are already aware of the good works which he has on hand much of which he has been enabled to undertake through the munificence of wealthy friends. It is our pleasing duty now to chronicle the fact that the princely sum of \$100,000 has been given him for the purpose of establishing in London a residential school for boys. The following statement appeared in the press:

London, Ont., Dec. 29.—"Fallon Hall," a residential school for boys up to the age of fourteen years, is the latest Roman Catholic educational project for London, and, in making the announcement to The Globe to-night, Right Rev. Bishop Fallon stated that the plans were so far advanced that the ground would be broken in the spring. The building will cost not less than \$100,000. This and another \$100,000 or the school's endowment came from an American benefactor of the Ursuline Sisters, who have a fine college at Chatham. The name of the generous donor would not be revealed by His Lordship. The stipulations accompanying the benefaction of over \$200,000 were that the donor's name should not be made known, that the school should be under the direction of the Ursuline Sisters, and that it should be called "Fallon Hall."

The school will be located on the west end of Sunshine Park, a block of forty-seven acres presented a few months ago to the Catholic Church for educational purposes. It is to be the site for St. Peter's Seminary, for which the people of the diocese have already contributed upwards of \$150,000. Evidently a year or so of this kind has been decided by His Lordship to the boys' school, and the latter will have an ideal site, with a frontage of 250 yards along the river.

The institution will be a residential school for boys, modelled after the academies for girls maintained at different convents. At present no such school exists in Canada under Catholic auspices. Such an institution was established at Birmingham, England, by Cardinal Newman, while another, with one hundred and twenty-five students, was built by Bishop Gilmore at Cleveland, Ohio. This latter school is also in charge of Ursuline Nuns, and will be the model for the local academy.

It will be an institution where parents, irrespective of creed, can place their boys up to the age of fourteen to be trained by the most accomplished professors for scientific callings, but under auspices that will assure them of the best moral care.

This announcement, following closely upon the coming of the Redeemers' Fathers, who will build a \$75,000 church and monastery at their own expense in East London, was welcomed for his indomitable zeal in the cause of God and His Church.

THE SOCIALIST MOVEMENT

A brochure bearing the above title is published among the booklets emanating from the Catholic Truth Society, its author being Mr. Arthur O'Connor. It is evident, he says, that for the grinding poverty of the poor to-day some remedy is urgently needed, and it is quite certain that when the Church arrogantly opposes certain suggested remedies (such as the Socialists claim to be in their panacea, for instance) its action is not due either to ignorance of the true state of affairs, or to an unwillingness to recognize the necessity of a change. The Church is honest, however, he would be reduced to a minimum. The Collectivists go to the other extreme, holding that the State should regulate all industrial relations and own the land in sole proprietorship, also all the capital and means of production.

Competition, according to them, should cease and private property be abolished. All, therefore, who are not individualists may, in some sense, be called Socialists—those, for example, who favor factory laws or free education, and it is in some such sense as this that many well known Catholics have called themselves Socialists. In recent years, says Mr. O'Connor, the word Socialism has become more identified with thorough-going Collectivism, and such Socialists who want an end to the "capitalist regime" assert that poverty will pursue the lower orders until the workers own all the means of production including the land. Extremists have gone so far as to declare that the idea of the family precludes all hope of an economic understanding that shall exclude competition, and that, therefore, the family must go.

How is it, asks Mr. O'Connor, that these Socialistic ideas spread so easily? The Protestant Reformation, he says, bringing with it the modern idea of wealth, was responsible in its selfishness for many of the current evils of society. The Catholic idea of the stewardship of each man in regard to his possessions is foreign to the Protestant notion, which holds that a man is justified in making whatever he can by any legal means. And in the days in which Catholic Christianity overspread the world there were (as the economist, Thorold Rogers, writes) "none of these extremes of poverty and wealth which have excited the astonishment of plain people and the indignation of workmen." "The essence of life in these days was that every one knew his neighbor and every one was his brother's keeper." The Reformation changed all by destroying that great support of the poor man, the Church, whose revenues were given to the poor. Even the "gentleman Socialist" (as he is called from the fact of his wealth), Mr. Hyndman, shows how the Church, the friend of the people as against the monarchy and the aristocracy, after the Reformation became a means of oppression in the hands of the landowners and the middle classes.

The idea of the regeneration of man by Socialism and its nostrums has, says Mr. O'Connor, been shown to be a dream as long ago as the day of Aristotle, who, speaking of proposals for a community of property, declared that "such an idea had a speciousness about it, but it was a dream." "Yet the evils that we denounce in the normal State arise from a very different cause, namely, the perversity of human nature." (Politics, chapter II). Everything that Socialism teaches is inconsistent with Christian principles since its doctrines trespass on the extra-industrial domain, for instance, when it holds that the State has nothing to do with religion, that private ownership of property is wrong, that children are primarily children of the State, and that the individual is to be entirely subordinated to the community.

Even Mr. Clifford Bax, an advanced thinker, will admit that the Socialist scheme is both "non-Christian and non-theistic," which means that it is wholly inhumanitarian and godless, if it means anything. It is certain, says Mr. O'Connor, that the leading Socialists of the present day are almost without exception, distinctly anti-religious. It is certainly so in Continental Europe, and G. B. Shaw, Hyndman, Quelch, Bax, Karl Pearson, and Blatchford agree with Marx and Babel in regarding Christianity as an absurd superstition, if not worse. Under a Socialist regime it is certain the Church would be brought almost entirely to an end.

In his "Religion of Socialism," Bax makes the following statement: "To the Socialist, labor is an evil to be minimized to the utmost. The man who works at his trade or vocation more than necessarily competes with, or who competes with, the man who can enjoy, is not a hero but a fool from the Socialist's standpoint." This, therefore, points the extent to which men's ethical notions will have to undergo revolution, in the suggested scheme.

Further than this, however, as Mr. O'Connor points out, even if marriage were to continue as it is, the children could not be brought up at home. Sexual equality would prevail, and the woman would work for the State; she would not, therefore, be allowed to care for her children. The State would care for them, and the children would thus become estranged from their parents. Even the personal choice and liberty

which men and women enjoy to-day in regard to the marriage-tie, would be no longer exercised. The inexorable State would interfere everywhere.—N. Y. Freeman's Journal.

Two Good Pledges

The following pledges are recommended for Catholics by the New Zealand Tablet: "I promise and pledge myself not to buy, receive, read or allow in my house any books, periodicals or newspapers that spread, foster or encourage false views on religion, or to an unwillingness to recognize the necessity of a change. The Church is honest, however, he would be reduced to a minimum. The Collectivists go to the other extreme, holding that the State should regulate all industrial relations and own the land in sole proprietorship, also all the capital and means of production.

MGR. BENSON ON THE FUTURE

Modern religious thought, writes Mgr. Benson in a Catholic Truth publication, dates from the religious upheavals of the sixteenth century. The establishment of the principle of Nationalism in religion struck the first blow at the idea of a final revelation guaranteed by an infallible authority. Congregationalism was the result of Nationalism, and then followed individualism and its "private judgment." Finally came the notion that Truth was not absolute, and that it varied according to the believer. At the present time the struggle is continued to what is taught by the "modern thinker" who has no final authority to guide him, and on the other side, to what is doctrine in the Catholic Church supported by an infallible authority.

In regard to the latter, the "modern thinker" assumes that the Catholic Church is the discredited Church of the uneducated, a common view (says Mgr. Benson) being that Catholics consist of a few Irish in America and a small percentage of peasant Latins in Europe. They seem to be unaware of a movement that is going forward among some of the shrewdest and most independent minds in all civilized countries, and H. G. Wells predicts that we are on the verge of one of the greatest revivals the world has seen.

When (says the distinguished convert who is a son of a late Archbishop of Canterbury) men in France, like Brunetiere, Coppée, Huysmans, Renée and Paul Bourget come forward from agnosticism or infidelity; when a Pasteur declares that his researches have left him with the faith of the Breton peasant; when in Great Britain a high Protestant Professor of Biology, a Professor of Greek at Glasgow, and perhaps the greatest judge on the Bench make their submission to Rome; when two of those who are called "the three cleverest men in London" (Chesberton and Bell) not only defend Catholicism, but in the ardor of preaching friars; when the Catholic Party in the English Parliament holds once more the balance of power; when the plain man in the street declares he would be a Catholic if he belonged to any religion; when the only successful missions in the East are the Catholic ones; surely it is a strange moment at which to assume that the religion of the future is to be a kind of ethical pantheism.

Another sign of the times, says Mgr. Benson, surely lies in the province of "Comparative Religion." Our most recent comparative religionists, however, namely, those that there are great elements of truth common to all religions. Your modern thinker, of course, jumps forward with his declaration that the Catholic faith is only one among many religions, and that, therefore, he has less "Comparative Religion" has argued the Church by revealing the fact that the creed which embodied Revelation contains correlated and organized into a whole all these points of faith of which each merely human system of belief can catch and reflect but one or two.

A final indication of the great future of Catholicism lies in its power of regeneration. Not only is it the sole religion which has arisen in the East and dominated the West, and now once more is reconquering the East; it is also the one religion that has been proclaimed as dead over and over again, and yet it has constantly reappeared. Once, says Mgr. Benson, the world groaned to find itself Ariau; now Ariau is enshrined in the text-books and the Creed of Athanasius is repeated by living men. Gaosticism trampled on the ancient faith everywhere; now not one man in a hundred could utter five lines on what it was that the Gaostics believed.

Once the Turks over-ran Africa and Spain and threatened Christendom itself; now the nations trained by Christianity are warring now they can best dispose of Christendom. Nero thought he had crucified Christianity in Peter; now Peter sits on Nero's seat. Once Elizabeth disembowelled every seminary priest she could lay hands upon and established Protestantism in Ireland. Now Westminster Cathedral draws immeasurably larger congregations than Westminster. Once Elizabeth disembowelled every seminary priest she could lay hands upon and established Protestantism in Ireland. Now Westminster Cathedral draws immeasurably larger congregations than Westminster. Once Elizabeth disembowelled every seminary priest she could lay hands upon and established Protestantism in Ireland. Now Westminster Cathedral draws immeasurably larger congregations than Westminster.

As every crisis in the history of Christendom—at the captivity of Avignon, the appearance of Luther and her capture of Rome in 1527—was a heresy, the appearance of the "modern thinkers" to be absolutely certain at last that Catholicism was discredited forever. Something or other, the Church is as much alive to-day as ever she was, and that in spite of the fact that "she is her faith, committed to the past and to doctrines formulated centuries before modern science was dreamed of. Yet who can doubt that she is more of a force to-day than all the most accommodating denominations around her? She has lived, too, in the tumultuous rush of Western life, not in the patient lethargy of the East. She has

struggled, not only with enemies inside her gates, but with her own children in her own house. On her secular side she has seen every kingdom of Europe rise and fall and rise again; she has seen every dynasty fall except her own; she has seen every "modern" sect (whose one claim to efficiency lies in its modernity) fall to keep pace with herself who has the centuries on her shoulders. "I called this characteristic of her Resurrection," concludes Mgr. Benson. "I call it now Resurrection."—N. Y. Freeman's Journal.

"BY ITS FRUITS"

Sixteen years old and a suicide—such is the record of Joseph Dobin of New York City. The newspaper announcing his suicide states that "he had been a brilliant scholar at the De Witt Clinton High School." The brilliant young scholar of the De Witt Clinton High school, before submitting his mortal coil, wrote a letter stating why he had grown tired of the world. In it he wrote preachers for denouncing those who assert the right of choosing the manner of their death. He then proceeds to state that it is cowardly to allow one's individuality to be crushed out in "the grind of conventionalism, to live a semi-animal existence." The boy who wrote these words was rated a brilliant scholar at the Public school he attended. There is no doubt that he was such, according to the standard of that school. He learned the assigned lessons and acquired the knowledge of the things, but unfortunately for him he never was taught in his school hours his duty towards God.

The tendency of that sort of education is to make those coming under its influence regard success in life as consisting of an accumulation of human comforts. In his advice "Put money in thy purse," sums up the ideal that is evolved in the youthful minds that are constantly concentrated upon material subjects to the exclusion of all spiritual considerations. Having no seeming prospect of obtaining what he believed to be the greatest good, young Dobin decided to end his life by the best thing he could do would be to make a speedy exit from this world "I believe," he wrote, "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world, as it has been made in the millions of tolling, dragging human beings condemned to a life of misery and degradation, and I am glad to be among the brave souls who have the courage to do away with themselves amidst a community controlled by the sentimental dread of death."

We put the question: did the boy who wrote these words ever learn in school the doctrine of the highest good, the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon him to obey them? If he had, he would not have taken the view that "a serious blunder has been made in bringing me into this world." His morbidness, and not physical suffering, is the greatest evil? Did he ever hear about God's laws and the obligation imposed upon