

annate any man: and be content with your pay." Thus our Lord practically asserts that their occupation is a lawful one, inasmuch as He does not condemn it, but condemns only the faults into which men of that occupation are liable to fall.

An unjust war is, of course, to be condemned, but just as it is lawful to repel, and, if necessary, to kill the unjust aggressor who seeks to take away our life, so civil society may lawfully wage a just war, for instance, to repel the unjust attacks of another nation, to obtain reparation for a serious injury inflicted, when reparation can be obtained only by that means, or to restrain greedy nations from openly violating the rights of others.

It is true that war is a very great evil and misfortune, and entails much suffering upon humanity, but circumstances may arise in which it becomes necessary, and the military occupation is, therefore, not merely lawful, but meritorious, in proportion to the magnitude of the sacrifices made by the soldier for the sake of the general good of the people of his country. The Doukhobor peculiarity of refusing to serve in the army and to share in the common burdens of the people is therefore not a commendable one, though it may be endured for a time until in the natural course of events they become assimilated in manners to the people among whom they have taken up their abode.

REV. DR. BRIGGS AND THE RE-UNION OF CHRISTENDOM.

The Rev. Dr. Charles A. Briggs, formerly a Professor of the Presbyterian Union Theological Seminary of New York, but who some months ago renounced Presbyterianism and became a member of the Protestant Episcopal Church, is now before the public in a new character, namely, as the advocate of a wider Christian Unity than the majority of Protestant ministers have dreamed of in all their talk about the re-union of Christendom.

Most other Protestant clergymen speak of the re-union of Christendom without even a thought of including within it the Catholic Church, which of itself comprises within its fold many more members than all the sects together, even if we throw in with them all the Schismatical Oriental sects, which in doctrine and ritual closely resemble the Catholic Church. But Dr. Briggs sees the incongruity of such a union as would leave out the only Christian Church which has always existed since Christ established a Church, and which is still the religion of the world. Such a union would be like Shakespeare's play of Hamlet with Hamlet left out. But Dr. Briggs hopes that Catholics and Protestants alike will so modify or smooth down their respective beliefs that they will no longer clash with one another. Thus he says:

"I know three prominent Protestant theologians of different denominations, who have deliberately rejected the Protestant doctrine of justification by faith and adopted the Roman doctrine as set forth in the decrees of the Council of Trent. This movement has only to go on, and you will have unity."

Surely, if Protestants would adopt one by one the doctrines of the Catholic Church, as the Ritualists have done in the Church of England, they would soon be in close proximity to the Catholic Church, and unity might be the next step. But the Catholic Church cannot follow this course in order to become assimilated to Protestantism. The difference is that Protestants have a free path before them to choose what doctrines are suitable to their whims for the time being, and are not so solicitous about what has been revealed by God, whereas Catholics possess the truth and must adhere to it without compromise or modification. This has always been understood by Catholics, and the recent letter of Pope Leo XIII. on so-called Americanism sets forth this immutability of Catholic doctrine with the greatest clearness and emphasis possible. Dr. Briggs adds:

"If the Roman Catholic will only recognize the authority of the Bible as he ought to, and Protestants will recognize the authority of the Church as they should, they will not have so much objection to one another. Whatever differences there may have been will eventually disappear."

The doctor is quite mistaken in supposing that Catholics do not recognize the Holy Scripture as God's word. It is Protestantism which has belittled it, and which is every day more and more undermining its authority even to the denying of its truth and infallibility. We had an instance of this in the doctor's own case; for, was it not for his impugning the divine authority of Scripture that he was repudiated by the Presbyterian General Assembly of the United States, though he was upheld by his fellow professors of the Union Seminary? And were

there not hundreds of Presbyterian divines ready to sustain his opposition to the Assembly's decree, if he had only held on to Presbyterianism, instead of leaving his sect in disgust, as in the long run he made up his mind to do?

The Bible is the birthright of the Catholic Church, and it is the Church which preserved it through the eighteen centuries which have elapsed since the last of its books was written. The Catholic Church will continue to uphold the authority of the Bible even when all the sects will reject it, and she will preserve unchanged the doctrines of the Holy Scripture to the end of time. If Protestants seek the re-union of Christendom, they must effect it by accepting all the doctrines of the Bible as they are interpreted and understood by the Church, and not merely such as they may think they find therein according to their changeable fancies.

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE.

A lecture recently delivered in the Auditorium here by Mr. Carol Norton on "Christian Science and Common Sense" deserves some notice at our hands, not because there is either Christianity, science, or common sense in the teachings of the lecturer, but because a large audience was in attendance, and manifested considerable sympathy therewith, some of whom may be deceived by the lecturer's specious arguments.

The speaker possesses a good deal of fluency of speech, and with an audience easily susceptible to sophistical argument, is capable of making some impression. He was sent by the Boston Christian Science Society to propagate their so-called religion in the West. He made the assertion that this religion has now one million believers, and is growing in Canada at the rate of six new churches every year.

We believe that this is a greatly exaggerated statement, but, if it be correct, it proves only that there are many people who are ready to accept every new fad, however unreasonable it may be. We have had many instances of this in the past, and as long as human nature is subject to be misled by delusions, the same thing will occur again, and wherever there is a prospect of making gain out of the delusions of the people, there will be found persons ready to propagate the delusions.

Mormonism, Spiritualism, Theosophy, and other absurdisms have all easily found adherents, and it is no matter of surprise that the so-called Christian Science should obtain followers also. The natural desire of many people for novelty, and the persuasiveness of such lecturers as Mr. Norton, suffice to do the work of convincing those who are not accustomed to analyze sophistical reasoning, and to detect wherein its inconclusiveness lies.

Mr. Norton said:

"If Christians follow Christ's example in spiritual things and in His methods, for the reformation of the depraved, they should imitate His healing the sick without drugs."

This is most fallacious reasoning. Christ's moral example must, indeed, be imitated, but always with the humble consciousness on our part that He is infinitely above us, and that we cannot attain His divine perfection. We properly endeavor to reform the depraved by urging them to follow His footsteps, and to practice and imitate the virtues of which He has given us an example in His human life, but we know that we can only attain so much of perfection as is possible to human weakness, and thus our actions will be acceptable to Almighty God through Christ's merit, though they fall far short of our infinitely perfect model.

Christ's miraculous powers of healing are of another order. He certainly never ordained that we should do as He has done in healing all manner of diseases by His word only, or by an act of His omnipotent will, because this is beyond human power. He promised indeed that similar miracles should be performed by His disciples, and they are in fact frequently performed to benefit of those who have true faith. Thus there have been, undeniably, numerous miraculous cures through the divine bounty, at St. Anne's shrine at Beaupré, at Lourdes and Loretto in France and Italy respectively, and at other sacred shrines, but these are free acts of the mercy of God, and we cannot by any means demand such from Him. To make such a demand would be tempting God, according to our Blessed Lord's own saying when He rebuked Satan: "Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God."

The ordinary means appointed by God for the healing of diseases is by the use of such remedies or drugs as have healing qualities, and we have before this already pointed

out in our columns several passages of Holy Scripture which prove this to be the case. We need not repeat these here. It will suffice to say that Jesus Himself has said that "not they who are well have need of a physician, but they who are sick." It is therefore the ordinary disposition of God that recourse should be had to a physician for the healing of sickness of all kinds, and God's interposition by a miracle is an extraordinary case which occurs only when the Almighty has some special design in view, such as to reward extraordinary faith, or to manifest His power and glory. The Christian Scientists therefore tempt Almighty God and break His commandment by not making use of the healing remedies which God declares elsewhere in Holy Scripture that He has created for their purpose, and for man's use.

Such statements as the following made by Mr. Norton are not based upon either reason and science or divine revelation:

"If sickness is divinely sent as discipline, doctors and drugs interfere with God's plans."

It is true that sickness is often sent by God as a discipline, or as a penalty for sin. But it also frequently arises out of our own free acts.

If we carelessly expose ourselves to danger by standing under a tree during a thunderstorm we may be struck by lightning and seriously injured. If we expose ourselves to intense cold, our limbs may be frozen, or we may contract a pneumonia which can be cured only with great difficulty. According to the Christian Science theory, we must be cured of these troubles only by faith and prayer, rejecting all medicines, and not seeking aid from a physician, but reason and common sense teach us that we should employ all the means which God has left within our reach to recover health and strength; and as it was by our own act or want of care that the misfortune occurred, so by our own act we may endeavor to obtain the cure of the illness we have brought upon ourselves.

But even though the sickness be really intended by God as a discipline, how often during our lives has God revealed to us as a certainty that it was sent merely for such a purpose? This very rarely occurs, even if it occurs at all.

Surely if God had revealed to us in any particular instance that it was His will that we should suffer from some special malady, in order to atone for our sins, it would be a presumption and a sin for us to refuse to endure it, or to endeavor to escape from it; but it is very rarely that such a revelation is given to man, and it is, therefore, lawful for us to seek a remedy among the many means which God has given us for the purpose of alleviating our sufferings.

By neglecting these means, the so-called Christian Science has already, during the few years of its existence as a religion, or as a system of medical treatment, been responsible for many deaths which might have been prevented if reasonable medical treatment had been adopted. As a religion, Christian Science is, therefore, a superstition which all Christians should repudiate. But as a mode of medical treatment, it should be suppressed by suitable legislation, for it is evidently injurious to the best interests of society.

A TOUCHING INCIDENT.

The following incident is related by the Roman correspondent of the New York Herald, in a letter describing a visit to the Pope:

All persons are required to kneel when before the Pope. Catholics are expected to kiss the Papal ring, and is left optional with them whether or not to kiss the Pope's foot.

Protestants are of course required to do neither. Many of them, however, voluntarily kiss the ring, for the gentle bearing and simple dignity of the old man impress every one with respect. The occasions were rare indeed when Americans showed themselves lacking in the amenities of the place, and even these rare exceptions were of trivial importance.

One such episode occurred at a reception. When the Pope approached the American group several Catholic women prostrated themselves before him and kissed his slipper. When he had given his blessing he passed on to several others who were not Catholics and extended his hand. Two of the women kissed his ring, but a young girl who was with them, although kneeling, very plainly manifested her determination not to do as the others had done, and, ignoring the outstretched hand, contented herself with inclining her head as the aged man stood before her.

There was something very like a smothered murmur of consternation throughout the hall. The Pope could not have helped noticing the girl's attitude. An amused smile passed over his face, and he said to the young woman in Italian:—"You are one of

my children, just like the others, even if you do not like me." Then the gentleness and tenderness of his face increased as he looked down at the girl and gave her his blessing. When he had passed on to the next group somebody translated to the rebellious young woman what the Pope had said. She knelt there for a minute or so, looking at the aged man's face; then she rose hastily, and rushing over to where he was standing, threw herself impulsively on her knees before him and said: "I am ashamed, I am so sorry! Please let me kiss your hand."

The Pope, of course, could not understand the words, but the girl's meaning was clear from her manner, and the little, thin, trembling hand of the Pontiff was raised to bless her again, when the girl bent over and reverently kissed it. "Everything is well when the heart is right," said the Pope, tenderly, and there was a suspicion of a tear in his eyes as he moved on to the next kneeling figure.

TALK WITH A PARSON.

Parson: "How can ignorant and fallible men discover * * * infallible truth?"

As you and your brethren think you have discovered infallible truth, you must also think that there is some way for ignorant and fallible men to discover it. We say this not by way of a deserved retort to your insinuation that the Catholic hierarchy is ignorant, but because every man is ignorant of revealed truth until he acquires it. Then, even on the hypothesis that you and your brethren now possess some knowledge of revealed truth, there was a time when you were ignorant of it, and at all times you are fallible. In asking how ignorant and fallible men can discover revealed truth you simply ask Father Nugent how you yourselves discovered it. It is as if after crossing a river, or taking a long journey, you should ask some one how you got over it. If you really have got over it is to prevent Father Nugent getting over in the same way, providing he has no better, surer and safer way. He claims to have a better and safer way. But supposing for argument's sake, that he has no safer way; he is at worst as well off as you are at best.

But Father Nugent denies that the means or way which you use to come to a knowledge of revealed truth is the proper way, because experience proves that it does not lead to that knowledge. The way you follow—Bible alone and private judgment—is the way the Unitarian follows. It tells him that there is but one person in the Godhead, and at the same time teaches you that there are three. It tells the Seventh Day Baptist to keep Saturday holy, and tells you to keep Sunday holy; it tells the Episcopal Methodists one thing and the Protestant Methodists something different; and the Presbyterian something different still; and thus on through all the hundreds of wrangling Protestant sects. They all have their private, fallible judgment, and their Bible, and each finds something different in it. Now, there can be nothing more certain than that a way, means or rule that teaches so many contradictions cannot be the true way to find out anything, let alone revealed truth. And Father Nugent is right in holding that, as long as you follow this contradiction breeding way to discover revealed truth, you can never acquire it or never know whether you have it or not. The Rev. S. P. Cadman, Methodist pastor of Metropolitan Temple, New York City, is assumed to be as intelligent a man as you are, Parson. He has had the same advantages of a Methodist education that you have had. His standing in your Church is as good as yours, and more conspicuous. He has followed the same method of discovering revealed truth that you follow, and what is the result? In a recent lecture before several hundred Methodist preachers, he, your brother in the faith, Cadman, solemnly declared that "the absolute inferracy and infallibility of the Bible are no longer possible of belief among reasoning men." And his audience of reverend Methodist preachers applauded his declaration. Now, Parson, do you think the method of discovering revealed truth followed by your brother parson is a safe method for you to risk the salvation of your soul on? And is not a piece of brass egotism and self-worship on your part to set up your notions, resting on such a method as a theological yardstick to which Father Nugent or any other sensible man should conform his judgment? The true rule of faith, or means to acquire revealed truth, must necessarily lead to unity of belief, for it must lead all who follow it to believe the same thing. This same thing excludes diversity of belief from all who follow the rule. Diversity of belief in those who follow a rule is proof positive that the rule they follow is not the true rule.

Now, let us come back to your question: How can ignorant, fallible men discover revealed truth? Fallible men, learned or ignorant, can come to a knowledge of revealed truth only from God revealing it directly through some agency appointed by Him. There is no other conceivable way. Truths of the supernatural order are above the reach of man's unaided reason, and must be accepted if accepted at all, on faith based on the veracity of God. Revealed truths must be believed by man, not because he sees and understands their intrinsic nature, but simply and solely because they are revealed by God directly or indirectly through His appointed agent. Revealed truth is not something presented to man and submitted to his judgment for approval, but for his prompt

and unhesitating acceptance, whether he sees and comprehends fully its truth or not. Our belief, then, concerning things supernatural rests and must rest on authority, the authority of God in the first place, and, secondly, on the authority of the agency through which He has willed to speak to men. This agency in the New Dispensation is the Church founded by the Son of God while on earth. This agent and bearer of His word must be infallible, or men can have no guarantee that the word that comes to them is the word as it left the Divine mind. And as long as men are not certain of this unerring transmission of the Word, their faith is nothing more than unreasoning credulity. God, who deemed it necessary to give men a revelation, also deemed it necessary that it should be protected from change or error in the transmission. Nothing less than an infallible agent could thus protect it. That is why He said, "On this Rock I will build My Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it," and "If he will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as the heathen and publican." It is the reason why St. Paul called it "The Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of truth."

Then to the question, How can ignorant, fallible men discover revealed truth? We answer, by obeying the command of our Lord to hear the Church that He established to teach men revealed truth. They who seek revealed truth in any other way do not find it, and by divine injunction are to be looked upon as heathens and publicans.

Parson: "How can ignorant and fallible men authorize and proclaim infinite wisdom and infallible truth?"

They cannot authorize it or even know it except from the teaching of God's infallible agent, the Church of Christ. They cannot proclaim it, for the Church alone has authority from God to do that. It is this fact that bears heavily on you and your Protestant brethren.

Parson: "What possible advantage can truth have or gain at the hands of an organization?"

That depends on the character of the organization. If it be an infallible organization—such as the Church of Christ—it makes the truth known by promulgating it with infallible certainty. That is an advantage. It separates truth from its counterfeit, error, as wheat from chaff. That is also an advantage. You seem to be laboring under the delusion that all truth is self-evident. Get rid of that notion as soon as you can.

Parson: "It was but recently that the present Pope sought to proclaim some theological doctrine, and so he goes back into the Middle Ages and complacently quotes Thomas Aquinas!"

A truth that was a truth in the time of St. Thomas Aquinas, or even in the time of Pontius Pilate and Judas Iscariot, is a truth still is it not. It is a characteristic of truth that it changes not. The fact that a truth is old is no reason why the Pope should not quote it complacently, or why you should sneer at it.

Parson: "Have men's conceptions of truth—especially Papal conceptions—made no advance in 600 years?"

For the sake of truth, we hope the Papal conceptions of it have made no advance, for if they had the true conception of it six hundred years ago, any change must have been in the direction of a false conception; and as we believe the Popes had a true conception of truth, at that time, we prefer to believe they have the same conception still. Men know a greater number of truths now than they did six hundred years ago, but we do not think their conception of truth has changed. They may reject things that were believed then and believe things that would have been rejected then, but this does not imply a change in the conception of truth.

Parson: "You found the Church on a man."

Catholics have nothing to do with founding the Church. They know that Our Lord once and for all founded His Church on Peter, and said the gates of hell should not prevail against it. They are satisfied with the Church as He founded it. When it comes to founding churches, Catholics confess their utter inability. They leave that to your Protestant brethren, who seem to have a patent on it and a special genius for it. Yours, Parson, was founded about a hundred years ago by John Wesley. The last important performance in the way of Church founding was by Joe Smith. Mrs. Eddy has founded her Christian Science, faith cure shishow, but it is only an experiment as yet. Both these had the same right to found a Church as John Wesley had.—N. Y. Freeman's Journal.

HERESY TRIAL IN CHICAGO.

Chicago has had many sensations, but the heresy trial which is promised will be something new. New York has had heresy trials, and the Windy City will not be outdone. It is not enough glory for Chicago that she can boast of the biggest pork packing plant on the face of this earth. She yearns for a heresy trial, and Prof. George Holley Gilbert, of the Chicago Theological Seminary, is said to have strayed far from orthodox paths. It isn't easy to make out what article of the Congregational creed Dr. Gilbert has denied, but the prominent parsons of that city to learn their views; and, if one can believe the newspapers, there are others beside Brother Gilbert that ought to be hauled up for heresy. There is the Rev. Dr. A. J. Haynes, for instance, who is reported to have

said, among other things even more strange:

"The Church must recognize that its mission is not to save souls, but to save people. We have earned the right, by long struggle, to preach the fatherhood of God. . . . Old beliefs are passing away, and I think that every old theological dogma is doomed; as, for example, the story of the Creation, the personality of Adam and Eve, and of the devil, the story of the fall of man, and the doctrine of vicarious atonement. Religion and theology are two things, and they have long been confused."

Brother Haynes didn't say this for publication. On the contrary, he told the reporter not to put it in his paper. He declared that he didn't want to get into trouble. But the reporter wanted in his notes without a thought of the minister's prohibition. And now Mr. Haynes is suffering persecution for notoriety's sake. The conservative sheep of his Congregational flock are horrified, and say he is every bit as guilty as Prof. Gilbert, that he ought to be suspended from the ministry, etc.

We shall follow Chicago's heresy trial with lively interest. Good will result from it. The truth is sure to come out, and it will open the eyes of many pious Protestants to see that there are men posing as ministers of the Gospel who are simply—agnostics covered with the skins of dead Lutheran lions.—Ave Maria.

CARDINAL MORAN ON ETERNAL PUNISHMENT.

The following letter, addressed to the editor of the Age of Melbourne, Australia, appeared in that journal:

"Sir: A friend has forwarded to me from Melbourne your issue of the 10th inst., in which you devote a leading article to examine what you consider to be the Catholic teaching regarding the eternal punishment of the wicked in the next life. You impute to me the conviction that 'estimable citizens as Australians may be in this life, there is nothing short of damnation before them in the next'; and you give as a dictum of mine that 'the great bulk of us, as soon as this troubled existence is over, are bound directly for the everlasting punishment.'"

"I have no intention to intrude religious controversy into your columns, but you will permit me to repudiate these words and sentiments thus imputed to me, and to state that they are quite repugnant to the teaching of the Catholic Church."

"Divine mercy and divine love are the very warp and woof of the Catholic doctrine. You are at one with me when we teach that all those who through the mercy of God are faithful members of His Church here will be partakers of the heavenly inheritance hereafter. But you will say that I exclude from the eternal blessedness all Anglicans and all others who do not worship at our altars in the Catholic Church. I do nothing of the sort."

"There is but one true Church, and it is manifest that Anglicanism cannot represent that divine Church, for a house divided against itself cannot be the house of God. But there are innumerable souls who, though outwardly separated from the communion of the true Church, are nevertheless united with her in spirit, and hereafter, associated with her children, may be with them partakers of eternal blessings of redemption. By baptism they become members of the Church of Christ, and so long as their conscience is not seared with sin they remain in spirit united to her. But if they deliberately reject the gifts of God by closing their eyes against the light of divine truth and by sealing their hearts against the approaches of the divine mercy, they cannot expect to be partakers of the heritage of Christ. They who persistently quench the fire of divine love in their hearts may justly be said to kindle the avenging fires of their own punishment hereafter. Even Judas would not have been lost had he opened his heart to the infinite mercy of God that awaited him. They who associate themselves with Judas in his guilt and follow him in the paths of impenitence cannot but expect to be sharers in his condemnation."

"Yours, etc., Patrick F. Cardinal Moran, Archbishop of Sydney."

BROWNSON, THE GREAT CON- TROVERSIALIST.

Brownson's is one of the most unique figures in the history of the Catholic Church of the United States. As a master mind he rises above the most of his contemporaries, and in his grasp of Catholic truth as well as in his mastery of defending the teachings of the Church he has had few equals and no superior. As may be supposed of one who treats of the highest theological questions without having a thorough grounding in scholastic theology, he wavered at times in his flights, but as soon as he recognized the magnet of authority he steadied himself and yielded to its influence. The Catholic World Magazine for April gives a very vivid account of his conversion and what it was that led him to the Catholic Church.

Conversion.

Washington, D. C., March 27.—One of the notable conversions of the year, is that of Hon. George P. Fisher, who was received into the Church and died in the full communion of the faith on the 10th of February, at his home in Washington.

Judge Fisher was born in Milford, Del., October 13, 1817, and descended from a branch of the family that gave as a martyr to the Church the saintly Bishop Fisher, who was a victim of Henry VIII's persecution.—Correspondent Philadelphia Catholic Standard and Times.