

## The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 484 and 486 Richmond street, London, Ontario.

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

EDITOR: XXXV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVE.

Author of "Mistakes of Modern Infidels."

THOMAS COFFEY.

Publisher and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.

MESSRS. LUKE KING, JOHN RICH, P. J. NEVIN, and W. A. NEVIN, are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for the CATHOLIC RECORD.

Rates of Advertising—Ten cents per line each insertion, adage measurement.

Approved and recommended by the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, and St. Boniface, and the Bishops of Hamilton and Peterboro, and the clergy throughout the Dominion.

Correspondence intended for publication, as well as that having reference to business, should be directed to the proprietor, and must reach London not later than Tuesday morning.

Arrears must be paid in full before the paper can be stopped.

London, Saturday, July 24, 1897.

## CHRISTIAN MORALITY IN POLITICS.

The Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland held a general meeting at St. Patrick's College, Maynooth, on the 23rd ult., all being present except Dr. Nulty, the Right Rev. Bishop of Meath, who was unavoidably absent.

At this meeting some dangerous errors, utterly subversive of Catholic truth, which have been recently put forward by certain prominent politicians, were discussed and pointedly condemned as destroying the teaching authority of the Church.

An authoritative statement was unanimously adopted and issued with the signatures of all the prelates attached.

The errors referred to are specifically mentioned, namely "that political acts are outside the sphere of morals and not subject to the rules of morality nor to any control on moral grounds, so that it is an invasion of civil rights if the pastors of the people, in the exercise of their pastoral office, pronounce upon the unlawfulness of such acts in their moral aspect, or venture to condemn them if necessary as in conflict with the moral law. The public men now engaged in disseminating amongst our Catholic people these pernicious doctrines make formal claim to absolute freedom of thought and action in political matters in Ireland."

Regarding this doctrine the Bishops say that "such teaching and such conduct cannot be longer passed over in silence. These errors are in clear opposition to the teaching of the Catholic Church, and to the observance of Christian morality. As our Holy Father Pope Leo XIII. has declared in his Encyclical *Immortale Dei*, the true mistress of virtue and guardian of morals is the Church of Christ: to exclude her influence from the business of life, from legislation, from the teaching of youth, from domestic society, is a great and pernicious error. Real freedom, he adds, is exercised in the pursuit of what is true and just: absolute freedom of thought and action, untrammelled by the laws of morality, is not liberty, but license."

The doctrine which is thus condemned by the Irish Bishops is not confined to the Irish politicians to whom reference is here made, but it finds many supporters in this country and the United States, and it is well our readers should have clear ideas concerning it and should know precisely wherein it is erroneous.

The Bishops certainly do not claim to exercise control over purely political opinions, and the decrees of the Popes do not attribute to them any control over such matters. Hence, while maintaining that it is the right and duty of Bishops to point out what the obligations of a Christian are in regard to "mixed questions," so called in canon law, such purely political questions as the best form of local or national government, the extension of the franchise, the operation of commercial and industrial laws, belong to pure politics, over which the Catholic Church does not claim control. The Bishops say that regarding such matters as these "the wisest and best men may disagree, and the pastors of the Church, as such, have no desire to intervene, nor to restrain freedom of thought or action, except when the means and methods employed are such as cannot be deemed conformable to the principles of Christian morality."

But it cannot be maintained that politicians or even kings and princes are exempt from the laws of God, or that they have authority to interfere with the liberty of the Church to teach the laws of God and the principles of morality; neither can it be said that the pastors of the Church must keep silence when these principles are violated.

The Bishops enumerate among mixed questions, in regard to which it is their duty to give advice, certain questions which have arisen in the past, and the like of which may come

again to the front at any moment.

Thus in Ireland and throughout Great Britain such questions as the Emancipation of Catholics and the Disestablishment of the Protestant Church have been prominently before the public. Every one may see that on such matters the rights of conscience are affected, and the same thing is to be said of the questions of Education and Poor Law legislation. No State has the right to put obstacles in the way of parents who wish to educate their children in Christian doctrine and morals, and where there is legislation which raises such obstacles, it is perfectly within the province of the clergy to protest, and to endeavor to have these obstacles removed, and even if parents are negligent of their duties in this regard, it is incumbent on pastors of souls to instruct them regarding what they should do. These principles are as applicable to us in Canada, and to the people of every other country, as well as those of Ireland.

The pronouncement of the Irish Bishops says in regard to all such questions as these:

"To say that the clergy have no right to intervene in such questions where oftentimes the highest interests of religion are at stake; that they ought not to point out to their flocks the line of conscientious duty, and call upon them to follow it; that they cannot and ought not to advise their flocks in such political matters; to choose as their leaders men of high character and sound principles, is indeed a great and pernicious error involving a manifest denial of the teaching authority of the Church. The commission which the Apostles received from Christ Himself, and which their successors inherit, was to teach the nations—politicians as well as private persons—all the truth of the Christian revelation—dogmatic truth and moral truth—and to condemn everything which, judged by that code, is untrue, immoral, or unjust. All this the Bishops are authorized to do, and this they mean to do when the spiritual interests of their flocks require it, whether there be question of public or of private conduct of the rulers, the politicians, or the people."

This is noble language, defining precisely wherein it is within the province of the Bishops to pronounce upon the acts of legislators, or of others.

Though the recent declaration of Messrs. John Redmond and his party following in the British House of Commons is not specifically mentioned in the document, there is no doubt that their pronouncement is aimed at, as the erroneous principles here condemned are set forth in their political programme recently issued. We have to remark also that though the Bishops disclaim any intention to interfere officially with mere politics, this disclaimer is not to be understood as prohibiting priests from having private opinions as citizens on these questions, provided they do not set them forward as matters in which their flocks are bound to follow them.

It is to be remarked that the phrase "civil and political liberty" is sometimes used as if it were a certainty that in politics citizens are exempt from any obligation to observe the moral law. Those who so use it fall into the dangerous error condemned by the Irish Episcopate, who by their joint pastoral letter desire to show that God rules the whole world, and that none, whatever may be their position in life, or their dignity, may claim to be beyond the authority which God has vested in His Church, to preserve Christian dogma intact, and to maintain Christian morality in every path of life.

## THE PAN-ANGELIC CONFERENCE.

The Pan-Anglican Council, which is called officially the Lambeth Conference, opened with a devotional service in the chapel of Lambeth Episcopal palace on the 30th of June, this palace being the official residence of the Archbishop of Canterbury.

Two hundred Bishops are reported to be present, comprising, beside the Anglican Archbishops and Bishops of England, Ireland, and Scotland, many of the Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States, and those of the various British colonies including Canada.

The actual work of the conference or council did not begin till Monday, the 5th of July, as the Bishops desired to visit certain spots which have been memorable in the history of the Church in England, but curiously enough these localities are chiefly those which are memorable in the history of the Catholic Church, and not of the modern Church which was imposed by law and persecution on the people of England instead of the ancient Catholic Church established by the missionary zeal of

Fulgentius and Augustine, who were sent by Popes Eleutherius and Gregory the Great to evangelize the Britons and Saxons respectively.

Among the schemes which are likely to be brought before the Conference, one which will be very vigorously pushed is to make the Archbishops of Canterbury Primate of all the Anglican churches of the world, including the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States.

Whatever may be thought of this movement by the colonial Bishops, it is absolutely certain that the American Bishops will not consent to any arrangement of the kind. The Church in America deemed it necessary to assert its total independence of the English Church, as soon as possible after the country itself asserted its political independence, and since then even British colonies, having their own Parliaments, have declared their complete religious independence.

This is a natural consequence of the principle asserted by English Church divines, to the effect that National Churches ought to be independent. It is by virtue of this principle that the Anglican clergy swear that no foreign prince, prelate, or potentate has or ought to have jurisdiction within the British realm. If this principle be correct, it must work equally the other way, and no British prelate can have lawful jurisdiction in foreign countries. It was in fact on this pretext that the Church of England rejected the authority of the Pope. It was an appeal to British pride against the authority of the supreme head of the universal Church, and it shut out the idea of a universal Church.

But serious thought has shown the utter fallacy of such a principle. There is no national boundary which is strong enough to exclude an authority which Christ has made universal, and the Church of England itself is beginning to be conscious of this. The divines of that Church are beginning to see that a Church instituted by Christ to teach all nations, must have a central authority which extends over the whole world. Such an authority was certainly exercised by the Apostles when they went forth to preach in obedience to Christ's commands, and the Anglican theory would be a bar to all missionary efforts to convert the heathen.

The spirit of rebellion against the universal authority of the Church of Christ, and its supreme head is now understood to have been inconsistent with the essential unity of the Church of Christ, and Anglicans perceive the force of the reasoning of Catholics who show that without a central authority exercising universal jurisdiction, each national Church must gradually diverge from Christian truth, till at length there will be little if any resemblance between them. Some have therefore suggested that the Anglican Church should give the Archbishop of Canterbury some sort of primatial authority over all the churches which claim to be part of the Anglican Communion, or its offspring. It is not at all likely that any such powers will be given, as the so doing would make the Primate a sort of Pope on a small scale and would have no more effect than to emphasize the fact that in rejecting the authority of the Pope in the first instance, they had broken the unity with which Christ endowed his Church when He instituted it. In reference to this matter the London Daily News says: "The American Bishops will not be likely to acknowledge allegiance to a British primate, nor will the colonial Bishops give the Archbishop of Canterbury a power which they would resent if it were exercised by Parliament."

It is exceedingly unlikely that having rejected the authority of the divinely appointed Head of the whole Church, they will now agree to obey a Pope who would be appointed merely by human authority.

It is perfectly well understood that the Pan Anglican Council cannot exercise any authority over the churches which will be represented therein, and there will be no pretence at so doing. It does not appear, therefore, that there will be any further action than mutually to express a friendly feeling, and that the Bishops will give unauthoritative expression of their views on the various subjects to be discussed.

We observe that among the questions to be discussed there are mentioned these three: the possibility of union with the Greek Church, with the Latin Church, and with other Christian bodies. It is not at all probable that there will be any practical steps in any of these three directions, but the discussion of the matter may open the

eyes of many to the necessity of union with the only true centre of unity, the Pope and the Catholic Church, and numerous conversions to Catholicism may be the result.

During the sitting of the Conference, the Archbishop of Canterbury proposes to hold a celebration of the seventieth centenary of the baptism of King Lucius, the first Christian king of the Britons. This celebration is intended for the purpose of making the public believe that the modern Church of England is identical with the ancient British Church. This will deceive very few. It is too well known now that Lucius was baptized by missionaries from a Pope, and that the See of Canterbury and the other Episcopal Sees of Britain constantly recognized the Pope's authority. In this respect, and in regard to the doctrines held by the ancient Christian Britons, they were one with the universal Catholic Church which during their period recognized the Pope, and not with the modern Church of England. The celebration of the baptism of Lucius will have only the effect of impressing this fact more strongly on the public mind.

## REFORMED JUDAISM.

The eighth annual Conference of the Reformed Jews of America is now holding its sessions in Montreal under the name of the Central Conference of American Rabbis, and is composed of rabbinical and lay delegates.

The Orthodox Jews still remain faithfully to their old belief, which has been handed down through the ages from long before the time of Abraham and even of Noah, and to the laws established by Moses at the command of God. These laws, and the sacrifices, feast days and ceremonies then instituted are still exactly observed; but the Reformed Jews, though still retaining the Jewish name, have set aside these legal requirements and even the ancient faith of their nation, except in so much as the whims or fancies of each individual may dictate. They bear to Judaism, proper, about the same relation as Protestantism does to Christianity or Catholicism, and there is in reality very little difference between the Judaism they hold and the Christianity held by those who belong to what is called the new or advanced school of Christian theology, which is not Christianity at all.

A representative of the Montreal Daily Witness had an interview with Rabbi I. L. Leucht, of New Orleans, Louisiana, during which the latter explained the fundamental principles on which Reformed Judaism is based.

The Rabbi is the Vice-President of the Conference, and is said to be a man of learning and very tolerant, but "who will not believe a thing merely because some person, not half so well instructed as himself, has said so in a ruder or cruder day, but he believes in religious growth, and the constant inpouring of influences into the heart which are intimations from God."

This statement of the Rabbi's faith appears from the context in the *Witness* to have been made by himself, and the meaning is evidently that the authors of the books of the Bible, especially of the Old Testament, are unworthy of credit, and that their claim to inspiration is fallacious, the only true inspiration being the teaching of the reason of learned men. It is not our intention here to enter upon a full refutation of such a creed, as to do so would require too lengthy a treatise to suit our columns, but we quote this statement to show the similarity, and we may say the identity, of belief between the Rabbi and Col. Ingersoll, on one side, and the Rev. Dr. Briggs, the Biblical Professor of Union (Presbyterian) Theological Seminary of New York, and Rev. Professor Smith, of Lane Seminary, Ohio, on the other, who have been censured by the General Assembly of the United States for entertaining and teaching just such views as those expressed by the Rabbi. It requires no small amount of egotism for any one, however learned he may be, to speak thus of the ignorance of the inspired writers, or to claim superiority over those who were taught and directed by God Himself, as to what they should write. The Apostle St. Paul tells us that "faith is the substance of things hoped for, the conviction of things that appear not."

From this definition we may see that the matters which form the object of faith are for the most part things concerning which human reason alone can give us no satisfactory knowledge. If we are to know of these things at all, they must come to us through revelation, whereby God speaks, and reason must bow down in submissive homage to God's unerring word. The

teachings of faith are above and beyond reason—but they can never be against reason, that gift of God to man which is given to us to guide us to natural truth, and to enable us to understand revealed truth, so far as it is possible for finite understanding to grasp the infinite, but no further.

The Rabbi tells us that "Reformed Judaism is not a new departure. It is a continuation of Judaism, but it is not literal Judaism." Thus it rejects, on human authority, the sacrifices of the Old Law which were commanded by God Himself.

He adds:

"We are looking for a Messiah, but our Messiah is not a person. He is a principle. Call that principle education; call it development; call it increasing spirituality which shall understand the idea of God as universal Father."

It is scarcely necessary for us to say that this is merely a rhetorical mist to conceal the fact that this new form of Judaism destroys the sovereignty of God and all spirituality, instead of increasing it; for there can be no spirituality where the power of God to reveal Himself to man is denied, as it is in this religious system, which is a pure Deism. There can be no love between God and man, and therefore no spirituality in man, if divine intervention in the affairs of mankind is to be denied. Such a creed tends ultimately to the rejection of God Himself.

When asked whether Reformed Judaism teaches the immortality of the soul, the Rabbi answered, "Unquestionably." Yet when his interlocutor remarked: "It has been stated more than once that this principle has no place in Reformed Judaism," he answered: "There may be difference of opinion, but I can tell you for myself that I fully accept the principle of immortality." From this answer it is evident that Reformed Judaism, as such, has no fixed belief on this point whatsoever, nor indeed on any religious doctrine. It consists of an agglomeration of beliefs, or, we might say more accurately, of fanciful unbeliefs.

The continued existence of Judaism, which retains its belief in the inspiration of the books of the Old Testament, and in the coming of the Messiah, whom they still expect as the Saviour of their race, is one of the many evidences of Christianity, as it is a confirmatory testimony to the constant tradition by which the belief of Christians has been maintained. This new form of Judaism would weaken this confirmation if it became the prevalent religion of the Jews, but there is little likelihood that such will be the case with a nation which has kept its faith for at least thirty-four centuries, amid all the vicissitudes through which it has passed; and at the present moment it is said that the Reformed Jews form but a small proportion of the Jewish population of America.

Notwithstanding that, as a system of belief, we would prefer to see the Jews adhere faithfully to the teachings of Moses, rather than to these recent innovations, we are gratified to note that the representative citizens of Montreal, and the Province of Quebec, such as the Lieutenant-Governor, the mayor, etc., have expressed a readiness to accord an official welcome to the visiting Rabbis who constitute the convention. This is a matter of the manifestation of the religious toleration which exists in Canada, and a mark of the equality of all citizens before the laws of the Dominion, whatever may be their creed.

## ANGELIC LITURGY AND RITUAL.

At the recent meeting of the English Church Union in London, England, Canon Newbolt, a member of the Union, laid particular stress upon the utter disorder into which the Church of England has drifted in regard to matters of liturgy.

There is a kind of liturgy in the Book of Common Prayer, but in regard to details of ceremony and of the vestments which should be used in the Communion service of the morning, there is a reference to the ritual in vogue during the reign of Edward VI., which is interpreted according to each clergyman's fancy, and while some of the Evangelical clergy, so-called, are satisfied with the Genevan habits in use among Presbyterians, others have adopted all the chasubles, dalmatics and tunics of the Edwardine ritual, and have thus made up a communion service which has no remote resemblance to the Catholic Mass, as far as the shadow or outward ceremony, which is the chief thing noticed by the laity, is concerned, though the substance of the Mass, which consists in the sacrificial act of offering up the body and blood of Christ really present, is

conspicuously wanting in the ceremony.

The *Church Times* recently lamented these facts, that in the matter of ritual every man does "what is right in his own eyes," a state of affairs which it says "no society can view with equanimity." The *Times* complains that the present state of chaos arises from the fact that the decisions even of the Bishops in regard to the liturgical usages are founded not upon liturgical knowledge, theology, or archeology, but upon prejudice and ignorance, upon the baseless fear of Popery, and not upon any adequate knowledge of what ceremonies are appropriate to divine worship, as tending to excite respect therefor.

The *Times* asks: "How are we to steer clearly between the Scylla of despotism, and the Charybdis of chaos?" And the only answer it can give to this query is that there should be established in connection with the Church a body of experts who would be a permanent body of advisers to the Bishops on all questions relating to ritual or ecclesiastical ceremonies to be observed in divine service.

As matters stand there is much disputing, with little fruit, on the question of what constitutes Roman usage and what belongs to the old Sarum rite, and those who dispute on the question are usually not competent to tell exactly what is Roman and what is of the Sarum rite. The clergy, too, are subject to hostile demonstrations on the part of the laity who are very ready to detect a tendency to Popery when any ceremony is seen in the Church which they have not seen before, but the *Times* thinks that if there were an Anglican "Congregation of Rites," learned in liturgy and similar to that existing in the Catholic Church, both sides would be satisfied with the decisions of such a tribunal.

We believe that the only satisfactory solution of the difficulty would be in accepting at once, not only the Catholic ritual, but also the Catholic doctrine, on which the ritual is founded.

## TURKEY AND THE EUROPEAN CONCERT.

The "unspeakable Turk" has again taken a defiant position against the combined powers of Europe. Having succeeded during the recent war in occupying the whole of Thessaly, he is verily now to resign any portion of his conquest, and the Sheikh el-Islam, who is the supreme authority of the Mahometan religion, confirms the Sultan in his defiant attitude by making the official declaration that a territory which has once become occupied by Moslems through the shedding of Moslem blood, must remain in their possession in accordance with the rules of conduct laid down by the prophet in the Koran.

The Russian, English, French and Italian ambassadors, from the very beginning, warned the Turkish Government that their Governments would not allow a Christian population to become again part of the Turkish Empire, and now Austria and Germany have fallen into line with the other powers and have given a similar notice, notwithstanding that Germany has hitherto unmistakably encouraged Turkish arrogance, by allowing German officers to organize the Turkish army, and even to fight in its ranks and by support given to Turkey's cause in the council of diplomats.

For some time past the Sultan, while endeavoring to induce the powers to permit him to retain Thessaly as part of the war indemnity, has been making a show of a willingness to accommodate himself to the demands of the powers, but this was no more than a show. While making these professions he was arranging for the government of the conquered province, and was collecting a tax upon the people by taking possession of the crops. But he has not thrown off the mask, and his council of ministers has positively decided that the powers must make some concessions permitting the continued occupation of Thessaly, or enforce their decisions with their armies. This is regarded as a defiance of the powers, and in fact the Grand Vizier has declared to the Sultan that he will never sign an agreement based on the proposal of the council of ambassadors, that Turkey shall have merely some strategic points in Thessaly without bringing any Christian population under its rule.

The *Novoye Vremya*, the official newspaper of St. Petersburg, advises the Turkish Government to abandon further subterfuges in the negotiations for peace with Greece, as otherwise the powers will be obliged to adopt harsh measures to enforce their peace programme. This seems to indicate

that Russia will

hand, Lord Sal-

of Lords last w-

settlement of

tirely the fa-

powers, he sai-

against furthe-

this proble-

than it was at

sation of open

If we had no

of the threa-

favor of Arm-

inactivity whi-

is capable of

strong words

would infer

threatened du-

that Turkey

mands of the

grand fiasco

demonstratio-

fresh in our

prognosticate

now take a

tan evidently

jealous of ea-

snarl at him,

the course mo-

so he persists

defiances may

powers beyon-

hope this mi-

meantime we

hope that the

of the chival-

past animati-

than have b-

Turks during

a half.

## THE REFORMED

The learn-

Littledale, a

draw a corre-

of facts, can-

must say th-

against the

ences are ve-

is warped b-

he is of dec-

Ritualistic

Anglican ec-

party, he i-

unaccountab-

ity against

trained and

truths of rel-

ism is ende-

creed of the

Entertain-

be said tha-

against the

were really

men, he wo-

to take the

Protestants

zeal in God'

therefore,

Canon has f-

and fathers

In a letter

to Dr. Gat-

formers, cri-

Littledale's

"I grave

impossible

ligious men

of the time

such utterly

the most pa-

know for

speak of the

ance of I

Robespierre

trayed no

the particu-

crouched to

selves to ne-

on a higher

traitors wh-

executed b-

as that exe-

A candi-

especially

gar Luther

and the b-

scarcely ar-

tions he ha-

neverthele-

Protestant

praise the

terms of ev-

We may

from Canon