

# The Catholic Record.

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

VOLUME XXIV.

LONDON, ONTARIO, SATURDAY, MAY 31, 1902

1232

## The Catholic Record.

LONDON, SATURDAY, MAY 31, 1902.

### BIBLE READING.

Writing in the Catholic Citizen on the reading of the Bible, and the services of the Church in protecting it from the present day Goths and Vandals, Prof. Egan says:

"The cultured person of to-day, the son or daughter of the orthodox Bible reader of the '50's, is, as a rule, found in the same camp with Voltaire. And, in the same camp with Voltaire, is another change!—it is discovered that the Scarlet Lady, whose delight it was to wallow in the ashes of burned Bibles and good heretics becomes the protector and conservator of the sacred books; for this, the advanced non-Catholic brands her as retrogressive and medieval. The false doctor, in Moliere, who put the man's heart on the right side and coolly said, 'we've changed all that' is a symbol of the new school of Protestants. Chillingworth's 'The Bible and Nothing but the Bible,' finds faint echoes now in the Protestant world.

### A WORD TO EDUCATORS.

Conventions of educators are entitled to respect. They are usually attended by men of acknowledged standing—grave and erudite signors who draft programmes and keep the school-machine running. If there be one thing more than another characteristic of these conventions it is the pleasant strain of jubilation running through the sessions. One hears it in the papers read in the addresses; it is in the air, charming like the men of learning and the individuals who pay them. But then one is apt to find small justification for the melody of self-congratulation when we hear an educator who has put God out of the schoolroom, talking about the formation of character. It is a good thing to do—it is the main purpose of the school, but it will never be done if the youth are trained and taught that money-getting is the principal business in life and led away from contemplation of the world beyond. This kind of education will form a character that will stand no strain because it rests on and is supported by nothing. Human life wants a stronger prop than sentiment.

### GIVE THE BOYS A CHANCE.

We have alluded to this before, but now that commencement days are approaching, it may not be inopportune to do so again. We refer to the inapplicable conduct of some parents in the matter of their children's education. They give the girls every opportunity and allow the boys to be contented with the most inadequate equipment for life's battle. It is this kind of a policy that will make us ciphers in the community. It is, when we have means enough, perfectly right to see that both sexes have every educational advantage; but when limited, they should not be devoted to the feminine section of the family. Let the boys have a share. The parents may miss a little piano playing, but later on they will hear the music of a noble manhood. We do not say that everyone graduated from our colleges is worthy of the sacrifice incurred for him by his sisters and parents, but there are hundreds who are worthy and who bless all their life the wise mother and father who saved them from toughdom or from hewing wood.

### SCIENTISTS.

Some scientists have the privilege of taking their ease with dignity, in a way not enjoyed by most mortals. They are surrounded by a crowd of adherents to whom their slightest behest is a command and who never dare to doubt any of the master's statements. His word is sufficient—and there are those who talk of the priest-ridden Catholic. His every theory is heralded to the world as an addition to science. He may have nothing to support it but the caprices of imagination, but nevertheless it will be regarded with awe by his following and described in magazines as the latest scientific find. He may deem the theory insufficient as Haeckel deemed Darwinism, and yet looked upon it with favor because it excluded the intervention of God. But just now there is a growing feeling that scientists who combat revelation, and who have no solution to the problems of origin and destiny but a "guess" or "I know not," have been reckoning on facts that have been made by themselves for a purpose. Perhaps they will admit later on that the God who wrote the Bible is the God who first wrote the illuminated manuscript of the skies. And our earnest prayer is

that they may rid themselves of the guides who are leading them over the wastes of infidelity and enjoy the happiness and mental freedom which can be found only in the Catholic Church. Said Dr. Brownson in reference to this: "I never in a single instance found a single article, dogma, proposition of faith which embarrassed me as a logician, or which I would, so far as my own reason was concerned, have changed, or modified, or in any respect altered from what I found it, even if I had been free to do so. I have, as a Catholic, felt and enjoyed a mental freedom which I never conceived possible while I was a non-Catholic."

### QUO VADIS.

In a recent issue of the Ave Maria Rev. Dr. Smith writes forcibly and entertainingly on critics. He is severe on Mr. Edmund Gisso for his mishandling of "Quo Vadis"—in fact he fastens on all professional critics the badges of incompetency and pretentiousness. This seems to us a very drastic method of eliminating the critic. The prominent reviewers may be biased at times and lend the resources of their art to the championing of comparatively worthless publications, but they are, as a rule, neither incompetent nor pretentious. That Andrew Lang does not wax eulogistic over Quo Vadis is certainly no proof of a lack of critical acumen. Even if his verdict in this case were found to be unworthy it would be a proof that a wise man blunders sometimes, and though it might make us cautious in accepting his pronouncements on literary wares, would give us no right to brand him as altogether incompetent. His adverse criticism of Quo Vadis is merely an indication that he does not agree with Dr. Smith in his appreciation of this work of the Polish writer and that he does not regard it as one of the greatest novels of the present day. And there are others of the same opinion. We commented upon it when it first appeared, and as our readers will remember we stood outside the circle of enthusiastic readers. This may have been due to our want of taste and our inability to discover its manifold beauties, but whatsoever the cause we failed to see how and why, viewed as a delineation of early Christian life it surpassed the Fabiola of Cardinal Wiseman.

### CATHOLIC ORGANIZATIONS.

In reply to a correspondent who is rather "sore" on fraternal organizations we beg to state that we cannot publish his letter. It would seem that he has an axe to grind, and besides the letter is too personal and bitterly unfair to make pleasant reading. Our fraternal organizations are subject to the imperfections of things mundane, but they are good enough for the ordinary citizen. They are of course open to criticism, but it is well to have it based on facts and not on susceptibilities wounded because one did not happen to secure a nomination to an office. When a man persuades himself into believing that he is the one for some petty dignity, and finds out after an election that his conferees do not agree with him, he, lacking in ballast, is likely to be fruitful in complaints of various kinds. We have heard it before. If, however, we cannot help being optimistic over our abilities, we should remember, just as an antidote to self-conceit, that no man is necessary. The organizations at which we cavil will be flourishing long after we have rounded off our little day. And one thing to bear in mind all the time is that the member who places self before the good of any association is not only a hindrance but a menace to its stability. He is the man to form cliques and to deter sensible men from joining it. A chairman, if firm, may gag him, but all chairmen are not firm, and this for a variety of reasons. The members might "freeze him" out, but we think that the only decent thing for our pessimistic brother to do is to resign. Then shall his eye be no longer tortured by dismal sights, and then also shall we have a big quiet and more business.

Whilst professing an admiration for the C. M. B. A. and kindred organizations, we imagine that more good would be effected if members were punctual in their attendance at meetings, and who then seem to forget that the C. M. B. A., for example, is on a higher plane than the mere insurance company. True it has this feature, but its life is charity and devotion to the Church. A C. M. B. A. member must be a lover of his fellow-man and his God. He must take an interest in

his brother or sail under false colours. If strong he will be quick to shield the weak, and if rich to succor the needy ones. He stands for the fraternity which springs not from whim, caprice or self-interest, but from the Gospel. And to do this effectually he should try to get at the heart of his organization by attending its meetings. If every member did his duty in this respect there would be a tightening of the bonds of sympathy and brotherly love, a more intelligent appreciation of the needs of one another and a concentration of effort.

### "QUESTION BOX."

Some of the Questions Answered at the Recent Mission by Paulists in Our Lady of Mercy Church.

Philadelphia Catholic Standard and Times. Question. I have heard you refer very frequently to "the Catholic Church." Do you mean the Roman Catholic Church? and if so, why do you claim for it that it is the old original and first Christian Church, while the facts are that the first Christian Church was established by the Apostles at Antioch, Asia Minor, and remained there for quite a time?

Answer. We call the Catholic Church the Roman Catholic because the head of the Catholic or Universal Church is at Rome. St. Peter, the head of the Catholic Church, died as Bishop of Rome. The one who was elected Bishop of Rome to take the place of St. Peter as Bishop of Rome, also, by the fact, was his election as Bishop, took St. Peter's place as head of the Church; so that, to this day, the Bishop of Rome is, by that fact, the head of the Catholic Church. Hence the name Roman Catholic Church. The name Catholic is not the same as Christian. Christian Church, as applied to those at Antioch, means a gathering of the followers of Christ. The Universal or Catholic Church means a society which was formed before there were any followers of Christ at Antioch. Christ said that He would found a Church on St. Peter: "Thou art Peter and on this rock I shall build My Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." Since Christ promised that the gates of hell should not prevail against His Church, it will last forever. You say that the first Christian Church was established at Antioch, and remained there for some time. Taken in your sense, this Church at Antioch only lasted for a time. Hence it could not be Christ's Church, which He promised would last forever. Taken in our sense, the Church at Antioch was not the first Church; it was only a part of a Universal or Catholic Church founded by Christ for all nations and for all time. The Church of Christ was formed on Pentecost Sunday, the day on which the Holy Ghost descended upon the Apostles. On that day the Church of Christ was formed by a union of the Holy Ghost with men, who are united together by means of a union with the head of the Church on earth, namely, the Pope, the successor of St. Peter. On that Sunday the Church that Christ promised to found on St. Peter was established, and received the name Catholic or Universal, because it was for all nations and for all times. The Church of Christ was not to be the Church of any one city or of any one nation. It was to be for all nations. So the Catholic does not say that his Church was the first Christian Church. He says his Church is the old original Church established by Christ, with members, during the time of the Apostles, at Jerusalem, Antioch, Athens, Rome and many other places. All these followers of Christ and members of Christ's Church, the Catholic or Universal Church, were united together in one society, with St. Peter as its head. So when the members of the Universal or Catholic Church at Antioch were called Christians, this did not separate them from the Universal Society of Catholics who did not make their Church at Antioch the first and original Church of Christ. The Church at Antioch was simply a part of the Universal or Catholic Church, founded by Christ, with St. Peter as its head. When St. Peter went from Antioch to Rome, Rome became the centre of the Universal or Catholic Church, founded by Christ, of which the Church at Antioch was simply a part. Because each of the great cities may have had a Bishop, and the Church in that city was called the Church at Antioch, the Church at Jerusalem, the Church at Alexandria, these different Bishops and these different appellations did not destroy the Universal Church, nor the bond of brotherhood between all the Churches. They were all united together into one great, universal society or Catholic Church by means of their union with the head, St. Peter, and his successor, the Bishop of Rome. Hence our Church is not called the first Christian Church, but is called the Catholic Church, or the Church established by Christ for all the nations. It is called Roman Catholic to emphasize its head, the Pope or St. Peter, the successor of St. Peter, in opposition to those who would deny that the Church had any head at Rome.

Question. Why does the Church use Latin at her Mass, and why does the priest stand between the worshipper and his God? The non-Catholic service is better than the Catholic Mass because it is in the language of the people; the worshipper goes directly to his God; no priest makes intercession for him.

Answer. The Latin language is used because it is necessary for a Universal Church to have a universal language. Just as the United States, a nation made up of many States, runs more smoothly on account of having one common language; so also the Church Universal, embracing all the nations of the world, with their different languages, seeks for the sake of order and uniformity, one language. The Latin language has been selected because it is a dead language. Every word has a fixed meaning. A living language changes constantly in the meaning of its words. This is why it is called living. A dead language, like the Latin, also preserves the meaning of the doctrinal terms so necessary for a teaching Church to use in the expression of her doctrines. Because of this Latin language the Catholic and the priest are everywhere at home in the wide world. There is the Mass, the same sacraments with the same words; the same doctrine, expressed in the same words, with the same meaning, etc., etc. You say the priest at Mass stands in the way of the worshipper and prevent him reaching to and speaking to his God. We think you are mistaken. Let us see. The priest, by the power given to him by Christ, through the Bishop who ordained him, brings down Christ upon the altar by the words, "My body," "This is My blood, which was shed for the forgiveness of sins." The worshipper pays no attention to the priest. His whole heart is lifted up to Christ on the altar, shedding His blood for his sins, supplicating the Father to spare the sinful one from the just punishment of his sins, and pleading with the Father to make him an adopted son of God, a brother to Jesus Christ. The worshipper can then speak face to face with Christ, just as St. John and the Virgin spoke to Him at the crucifixion. He thinks of no one, sees no one, hears no one but Christ and Him crucified. He worships Him, he cries for mercy to Him, he makes his acts of ardent love to Him, he thanks Him, he prays to Him. The priest is forgotten. God alone occupies and fills his heart, and he speaks to God freely, in his mind. He speaks to God freely, by vocal or mental prayer, or by short ejaculations from the heart. There is none to come between heaven and earth. The soul flies up to God and God descends to the soul. If any one is bound and limited, it is not the worshipper in the Catholic Church; it is the priest. The priest speaks to God by means of the prayers of the Mass book appointed by the Church. But his eyes are free; no words of the ritual can fetter them, and his Lord and God can feel his heart throbbing with love and gratitude to his Creator his Redeemer and his Mediator. The eyes of the priest can speak their own burning language, face to face with Christ and Him crucified, while his lips and mind use the Latin tongue to speak to Christ, because he has been placed apart by the Church to bring to the people and himself, and to supplicate the Saviour for the needs of the congregation and himself. Priest and people speak face to face with Christ and Him crucified. They speak to Him with eyes of faith and hearts of love. No saint, no angel, no Blessed Mother of God, no Pope, no Bishop, no priest, nothing stands between Christ and the worshippers as they cry, "My Lord and my God, have mercy upon me a sinner. Let me love you with my whole heart and above everything else." Thus they continue during the long service of the Mass. The lights and the incense help the mind to realize that the soul is before its God. The priest, with his Latin language, cannot distract them, for they know not what he says. The choir may sing, but they, too, use the Latin tongue. Their words cannot separate them from his God, while the music, with its accents of love, of praise, of adoration, of hunger for God lifts his soul closer and closer to its God; but in his own way.

How different it is in the Church of the non-Catholic! The choir sings, the sermon is preached, the minister prays; but the worshipper, what does he do? He prays, but with the minister, in the words of the minister's prayer. He listens to the sermon, but his mind is with the preacher's mind. He hears the choir singing its words of praise, and his mind is filled with the words he hears. But where is the free, untrammelled long intercourse between God and man, between Christ and the sinner, between the Creator and the creature that takes place at the Mass in the Catholic Church? Where is the act of worship, of adoration, when the soul exclaims my Lord and my God? Where is the cry of hunger that comes from the soul that it needs its God? Where are the acts of private love, of private contrition of private inspirations? They are not there; there is no individual service. There is but one road to God. Everything in the church comes between the individual and his God so he can only reach his God through his minister who selects the service. Non-Catholics wonder why the Catholic Church is filled with men and women at the many services on Sunday morning. The non-Catholic can see only the priest at the altar, and he hears only the sound of a foreign language. He sees the priest moving up and down the platform before the altar. The congregation is silent, and he thinks the priest is doing all the work and the Catholic worshipper does nothing. He calls such a service slavery to a priesthood. He looks upon his own service as free superior. He is free, he explains; free from the intercession of the priest, free from ceremonies, free from a foreign tongue, free to speak to God as a free man.

Is not the slavery in the non-Catholic Church, and in the Catholic?—slavery to the music, slavery to the sermon, slavery to the public prayer? Where is the free and long private intercourse between God and man that is

had in the non-Catholic service? Where is the opportunity given to Christ to act upon the soul of the worshipper and led him to further heights in religion? Where is the opportunity for private initiative which is necessary for all progress, even in religion? No two souls can be led by any minister in the same path to God; each must do his own work in his own way. The Scripture puts it thus: "Every man must work out his own salvation." The soul in its intercourse with God must not be fettered by music, by sermons or by any public prayer. You said well when you declared your opposition to a priest standing between the soul and God. Your condemnation can only apply to your own Church, and not to the Catholic. Is it any wonder that the non-Catholic says that "I can remain at home away from church and in my own way speak to God;" or "I can go out into the fields, face to face with the God of Nature, and tell Him how much I love and adore Him?" If non-Catholics but knew how sweet it is to speak in their own way, face to face with Christ crucified, as He is upon the Catholic altar, they would not say that we were slaves to the priests, that we could not go directly to Christ, but needed priests, saints, angels and a Virgin Mother to intercede for us. If the non-Catholics but knew how Christ crucified speaks back from the altar to the Catholic soul, they would leave the green fields and their communion with the God of Nature and go to the Catholic church on Sunday morning and share some of the joy that fills the Catholic heart that has spoken to his crucified God upon the altar of the Church and received divine tokens of love and forgiveness in return. They would see the difference between a communion with the God of Nature where their God is not a person, but a force and can tell them nothing of forgiveness for sin, and a communion with a crucified God Who comes to them as a person under the appearance of bread and wine to enter into union with their soul and fill the soul with a flood of tender love and divine forgiveness. This is religion, personal religion, free religion.

One of the greatest misfortunes of the Reformation in the sixteenth century was the overrunning of the Catholic altar, and the destruction of the Catholic priesthood in Germany and in England. God only knows how much from these alone the non-Catholic has lost from his spiritual life. You have asked, do not the priest and the Latin tongue stand in the way of intercourse between the worshipper and his God? The crowded houses of Catholic worship in every city in our land gives the denial more powerfully than any words of mine. You say that the service in the English tongue of the non-Catholic churches is better than the Latin Mass of the Catholic Church. The empty churches of the non-Catholics prove the contrary. You say that the Catholic worshipper is the slave of the priest. Not at all. The Catholic is as free as the birds of the air to sing his own song of praise and love and gratitude and adoration to his own dear Redeemer.

### JUSTIFYING MURDER AND RAPE.

For two hundred years and more the Jesuits have been falsely charged with holding to the doctrine that "the end justifies the means." It makes no difference that they repudiate this immoral teaching, and that the General of the Society of Jesus has offered a large reward to any one who will point in any book written by a Jesuit or in the teachings of any Jesuit professor anything which can be construed into meaning that the Society of Jesus believes that it is right to violate God's eternal laws to secure certain ends. No one has yet earned that reward for the reason that the Fathers of the Society of Jesus have never, by the spoken or by the written word, approved of such heinous immorality as is embodied in the maxim "the end justifies the means."

But if the Jesuits have never been advocates of this kind of immorality, some Protestant ministers have preached it, perhaps, openly, but in the States have defended the atrocities committed in South Africa and in the Philippines, on the grounds that these atrocities will prepare the way for the spread of "Anglo-Saxon civilization." It was only the other day that a Protestant minister told the readers of the Boston Transcript that the crimes against humanity committed in the Philippines by the American army would result in the extension of God's Kingdom, or, in other words, of Protestantism. "Nothing but the power of Almighty God," he writes in the Boston Transcript, "could use war and wicked armies to advance His purposes in this world. According to this view, Gen. Smith, when he issued his now famous, or, rather, infamous, order to slay, burn, devastate and 'kill all over ten' was a Christian missionary in disguise engaged in a good and holy work."

The writer in the Boston Transcript who advocates the doctrine that "the end justifies the means" is the Rev. C. W. Briggs, a Protestant missionary in Penang, in the Philippines. He cannot deny that innumerable atrocities have been perpetrated upon the natives. He, however, has no burning words of indignation for these atrocities. His comment upon them is that they might be worse. "In the meantime," he writes, "the Christian attitude of those at home should, in all fairness, be less of censure and more and more of faithful

prayer and Christian sympathy for the military powers in these islands." One cannot help thinking what sort of "Christian sympathy" a person who believes in the teachings of Christ could bestow upon the Smiths and the Wallers who have been doing their best to be the worst record ever made by the most savage Apaches or Sioux.

The Rev. Briggs believes that the Filipinos should be thankful that they have not fallen into worse hands. One hundred thousand of them have been killed off in one province, that of Batangas. That horrible fact does not affect the Protestant missionary who have been quoting, nor does it in any way shake his confidence in the "humanity of our soldiers who, he believes, are the most humane in the world. He tells us that the only soldiers in the world who are comparable with them are the Tommies in South Africa, who have been indulging in such innocent amusements as farm burnings and the shooting of unarmed prisoners and the killing of women and children through the slow process of starvation in the English murder camps.

But we shall let the Rev. Briggs speak for himself. Listen to his words: "No other nation, excepting possibly England, has an army that the Filipinos could afford to have supplant our army here." This enables us to catalogue with all exactitude the Rev. Briggs. He is an apologist for the worst crimes because they are committed by "Anglo-Saxons" who, in his opinion, can do no wrong either in the Philippines or in South Africa. He himself tells us of what he has heard of the "clean" and "moral" army he so praises: "I have heard of natives," he writes, "being shot down without quarter, prisoners being bayoneted without mercy." But what of all this, does not God's work, as the Rev. Briggs would put it, steadily go on in the spread of Protestantism in these distant Pacific Isles?

There are plain, old-fashioned people who still believe in the decalogue and who, therefore, cannot get rid of the conviction that murder, rapine and pillage are crimes against God and humanity. The Rev. Briggs has evidently succeeded in emancipating himself from these old-fashioned ideas. He lets us know that he is a firm believer in facts and that he has nothing but contempt for those who view facts from a moral point of view. After stating that he had heard of "natives being shot down without quarter, prisoners being bayoneted without mercy," he proceeds in this fashion to preach the doctrine that the end justifies the means:

"Oh! for the time to hurry up and come when the American people shall use their eyes and their reason, and be fair with the facts. We are living in an actual world of cold, hard facts, in many cases terrible facts. Our army, our Government has been meeting these facts, and meeting them as a Christian nation could best meet them. Some men and writers have tried to believe and tried to make others believe that we are living in the ideal world, and that this treatment which meets the facts so adequately is a bad policy because it does not accord well with the ideal world. We are in a world of cold, hard facts, and our army has been meeting such cold, hard facts, and we may well be proud of them for so doing."

Let us leave the Rev. Briggs to his cold, hard facts, including the savage and wanton murder of people to whom he is supposed to preach the gospel of righteousness and listen to the arraignment of him and his facts by Sixto Lopez, a native of the Philippines, who thus pillories the Rev. Briggs in the Boston Transcript:

"Yes, the Spanish soldiers were cruel too. But I am not aware that they ever sought to justify their cruelty, or tried to lay their atrocities to the account of Him who said, Blessed are the merciful. Under Mr. Briggs' theory of moral government? justification could be found for the foulest crime, even to the assassination of a king or the murder of a president."

"I admit that just now there is a 'hell' in the Philippines, but I do not ascribe it to the same source as Mr. Briggs. To my mind, God's work requires clean hands, and he who kills a king or bayonets a prisoner is a murderer."

"Enough. Let us have done with this mediæval cant and savagery of Mr. Briggs'. Let him learn to do justice and love mercy, and walk humbly before God, ere he seeks to teach others the way of righteousness."

In this way does Mr. Lopez draw aside the drapery of cant and let us see the moral hideousness of the doctrine preached by one who has gone seven thousand miles from our shores for the ostensible purpose of instructing Mr. Lopez's countrymen as to the best way of reaching heaven.—N. Y. Freeman's Journal.

The Reason for so Much Unbelief.

"It is probably true," says the Catholic Telegraph, "that, since the dawn of Christianity, there never were so many people doubting concerning the future life as there are now; and the reason is not far to seek. The leaders of Protestant thought, having no acknowledged, divinely-authorized guide and teacher, have proceeded on the principle of private interpretation until they have become hopelessly at variance with one another regarding religious belief. Each has his theory and his alleged reasons for supporting it, but these latter have not the power of convincing others. As a consequence, the ordinary people, who naturally look to the leaders for guidance, are bewildered by the dissension of their ministers, and fall into skepticism and irreligion."