

VII. Interactions with the World

E. The Secular Press

469.

Editorial, *The Catholic Telegraph and Advocate*, July 30, 1853 (2)

[A False Report.]

A little paper, called the "*Hillsboro Gazette*," says that "the Archbishop warned the people, while preaching at the Dedication of St. Mary's Church in that place, against entering Protestant places of worship." The statement is false, unless the advice to the railroaders, never to enter a *grocery*, be construed into that meaning. We heard the entire sermon. What is the use of printing falsehoods?

A news paragraph in the same issue describes the dedication ceremony and names the clergy present, noting that "Rev. Dr. Rosecrans assisted in the Choir."

470.

Editorial, *The Catholic Telegraph and Advocate*, October 1, 1853 (2)

Found Out at Last.

The "*Cincinnati Gazette*" of September 23, informs us that the cross "is an especial object of dislike to the devotion of this land, as being the instrument of the cruelty of our Saviour's murderers." The "*Gazette*" will soon have a Protestant theological library, fruit of his own brain. This "reason" of Protestant dislike to the cross, the "Compass that St. Paul fetched," and the evening edition's "Dissertation on Christmas," would form a small pamphlet, commendable to the tract societies for distribution among Catholics.

In the same article he says:

"Everybody remembers the pother that was made over Mr. Cass' success in extorting from the Papal power, permission to hold a sneaking conventicle somewhere in the suburbs of Rome."

We confess we were astonished when we read this. Having been in Rome during most of Mr. Cass' residence there, and knowing that he *never asked for*, and *never* "extorted from the Papal power, permission to hold any sneaking conventicle in the suburbs of Rome," we were startled at the cool impudence with which it was asserted. The "sneaking conventicle," just out of the most frequented gate of Rome, and on Sunday afternoon, surrounded by the finest (Livery) carriages of the city, existed before Mr. Cass came to Rome. The Protestant Cemetery, between the city and St. Paul's Church, was adorned with shrubbery and filled with beautiful monuments long ere Mr. Cass took his first drive out of the "*Porta San Paolo*" to visit the "Three Fountains." Mr.

Cass *did*, in 1850, have a chapel in his private house. We have seen Italians scanning its bare walls and bleak reading desk, and asking where the preacher "said his Mass." And after holding it for some time without *any* permission, he asked to have it legalized, alleging that he, as an ambassador, had the same right to a Protestant chapel in his house, as the Prussian ambassador. After settling that the concession of the chapel was not admitting him, a *charge* to the rank of *ambassador*, (an affair of court *etiquette*) his request was readily granted. Those who made the "pother" about "extorting from the Papal power," &c. &c., were, we suppose, preachers, who wished to transmit news of success in the letters asking for more "help," and their ignorant echoes like the "*Cincinnati Gazette*."

471.

Editorial, *The Catholic Telegraph and Advocate*, January 28, 1854 (1)

The Cincinnati Commercial on the Disturbances.

The *Commercial* on Monday morning contained an editorial of remarkable malignity. It is the *forte* of this paper to address itself, with an appearance of moderation to the most violent passions of its readers, and with an air of candor, to deepen the most unjust prejudices. We do not intend to reply at large to this article, and we take pleasure in subscribing to the views the writer of it expresses with regard to the terror of mob rule; but there are three points in it particularly objectionable.

First, he insinuates--and this is not the first time that he has made the reckless insinuation--that the police, in suppressing the *Freemen's* riot acted under "hidden influences of the most malignant and dangerous character." He had said some two weeks ago that "a secret key to the action of the police might be found in the influence of the Bishop," or words to that effect. Now, the writer of this article, knew that his assertion would have the effect of alarming persons not Catholics, to the highest degree, with the idea that Catholic influence governed the city--of entirely taking away their confidence from the public authorities. He knew also that he had not the slightest shadow of proof for his assertion. In all the trials that have occurred, not a particle of evidence has been elicited to show that the police has acted under "the dangerous and malignant influence" of which the incendiary of the "*Commercial*" speaks, as though it were a notorious fact. The charge is most maliciously false.

Second, he makes a contrast between the liberality of anti-Catholics, and "the sensitiveness of certain of our religionists about demonstrations of any kind by persons not of their creed," most unjust and calumnious. Here are his illustrations: "In our view a Kirkland has as perfect a right to harangue in a market-place as a reverend bishop has to lead a procession through the streets on a Sunday. The right to preach against Popery, is as well established as the right to preach in its favor, and Gavazzi is as much

entitled to immunity from insult, as Brownson or D'Arcy McGee."

As every one sees, the injustice and calumny of this comparison, consists in assuming that a religious procession is the same kind of a demonstration as Kirkland's street preaching, that one is objectionable on the same ground as the other; and that the reason for censuring Gavazzi, bears with equal force on Brownson and McGee. Now, no Catholic ever found fault with Kirkland for showing respect to God according to the dictates of his conscience, or for proclaiming his religious tenets and advancing arguments to support them. What they thought hard was that he abused them, personally--applying foul epithets, and attributing filthy actions to their wives, sisters, daughters, and to all they loved and respected. This was not an attack on their system of belief, but insult to their persons.

So of Gavazzi. Though his right to immunity from insult, was never practically questioned in Cincinnati, still his tenure of it was not on the same principle as that of Mr. McGee, or Dr. Brownson. Mr. McGee has lectured in this city four times, and has never been accused, even by the hottest of the enemies of catholicity, of offering a personal insult to men of any class. Dr. Brownson, certainly speaks with all the frankness and boldness of an American citizen; but Dr. Brownson never said a word against the honor or chastity of persons holding the opinions he refutes.

It is very unfair of anti-Catholics to pretend that Catholics irritated by abuse and calumny, are complaining against the abstract right of freedom of speech. If a rowdy should meet the editor of the *Commercial* and claim the right to call him a liar, a scoundrel, a thief, a burglar and what other opprobrious names he might know, the editor of the *Commercial* would, perhaps, begin to appreciate the difference between the right to annoy your neighbor and the right to advocate your own opinions.

Third, the *Commercial* quotes from the *Enquirer* an assertion to the effect that there is "a spirit abroad in this city which nothing short of the murder of Catholics and the burning of their Churches, seems able to satiate," and pronounces it a "base slander on the city of Cincinnati." Now we have no desire to go over the exciting "evidences of the credibility" of this assertion. We will not repeat the threats that have been uttered publicly, the exhortations to destroy that have been received with enthusiastic cheers by the crowds, the intentions that have been declared in places of public resort;--we pass by the fact of a distinguished gentleman from another state, coming here to leave his two daughters at school, and taking them away immediately, from accounts of the insecurity of life in the city received at one our public hotels; we say nothing of our many property-holders who have been determined by the late disturbances to sell out and remove the country; but one "evidence" of the truth of what the "Enquirer's" correspondent says, we will press home upon the "Commercial." It is this: the "Commercial" and some of the other journals have exhibited a most persevering determination to misrepresent the Catholics in this affair. It has begun by

misrepresenting Mons. Bedini, and obstinately refusing to admit into its columns any refutation of the odious slander against him, though such refutation appeared in the *N.Y. Courier & Enquirer*, *N. Y. Herald*, *National Intelligencer*, and again and again in the *Catholic Telegraph*. It next misrepresented the design of the *Freemen*, and fabricated a Catholic influence producing the action of the police with regard to them. It now misrepresents Catholics as being aggressors, and as being unwilling to concede to others what they claim for themselves. Now a spirit of persevering malignity that prompts a man to slander his neighbor, and to exert every means lest his neighbor's denial of the slander should be heard--to array public sentiment against the authorities by expressing malignant suspicions of Catholic influence over them--to conceal with sedulity the avowed intentions and threats of the anti-Catholic rabble-rousers--is not easily to be satisfied. Will a man who is never content with destroying the reputation of Catholics and persuading his readers that they are worthy of infamy and death, be satisfied with anything short of that to which he is urging on the people? The course of the "Commercial" itself, and the very censure it volunteers on the "Enquirer" for admitting the matter of fact statement of his correspondent, is an ample proof of the assertion that there is a spirit in this city which seems insatiable except by the "murder of Catholics and the burning of Catholic Churches." Men who will not only calumniate but will quarrel with people for denying their calumnies, wish something more than calumny.

The article ends by remarking that the peace of the "Roman Church" depends on itself and will not be disturbed except by its own imprudence. A most unjust and false insinuation. As though the recent disturbances in this city had been provoked by the imprudence of Catholics. What, pray, have Catholics done?--Whom have they insulted? Have the press and pulpit offended by exhorting the Catholic people to patience and endurance? Were they "imprudent" in showing respect to the slandered Mons. Bedini? But whom can they treat with respect if not a prelate adorned with virtues like him? Must they ask the German *Freemen* not to slander any guest they choose to have, and not to get up an excitement against him before they will be so "imprudent" as to treat him with hospitality?

"And if"--says the "Commercial"--and here he repeats the vile insinuations quoted above--if Catholics continue to do so and so, (which they never did) "these things will accumulate and fall upon their heads with a force that all peaceable citizens will deprecate while they cannot prevent it." In saying this he forgets what he himself said before, that when a mob is started it is as apt to do injuries to friends as foes--and that the mob spirit once aroused, will wreak its vengeance not on "communicants of the Roman Church" alone, but on others also.

472.

Editorial, *The Catholic Telegraph and Advocate*, February 11, 1854

The Power of the Press over Public Opinion.

There is no doubt but that the press, venal, and weak as it unquestionably is, exercises an immense influence over public opinion in this country and in England.

The popular sentiment seems to be almost entirely swayed by the public journals. This fact contains a problem worthy of attention;--i.e., how is it that men of such small caliber, as most of our journalists are, and writings of such trifling ability, are able to produce so great an effect? Most of our editors are young men of limited education, and of no very marked talent; and in their writings you will find no great force of logic, no comprehensive grasp of great principles, nothing of that power which seizes and controls thought. How then do public journals sway popular sentiment to such an extent?

Some people may imagine that the greatness of the influence, is satisfactorily explained by saying that it is exerted as the man who boasted of having moved a wagon, loaded with two tons of iron, exerted *his* strength.

He unfastened the lock, and pushed the wagon *down hill*. So do public journals. They do but follow the direction of popular sentiment, while it moves by the force of its gravitation. The press therefore does not sway popular opinion, but popular opinion sways the press.

The press never created an opinion. All the newspapers in the United States could not stand out, against any deep popular prejudice, for two weeks. But still, the difficulty in part remains. Even admitting that the press always goes with the opinion of the day, how is it that the wretched logic, and vapid declamation of our newspapers can even attract the attention of the people? We answer, the power of the press consists not in its logic or eloquence, but in its ability to manufacture facts, or to give coloring to facts that have occurred. All that editors can do with the avowed intention of propagating an opinion goes for nothing. When suspicion is once aroused, and examination evoked, the commonest intellect is placed beyond the possibility of being hoodwinked. But where events, are colored with a view to propagate a peculiar opinion, or where facts are made up for that purpose, the reader is not on his guard, and his commentary on the narration expresses the editor's opinion. Herein is the power of the press. It can give true facts, in their true light, and thus propagate true opinions; or it can give false facts, or distorted facts, and thus propagate false opinions. But its reasoning, its eloquence, what it does; *aperta fronte* go for nothing--precisely what they are worth.

The anti-Catholic crusaders understand this, perfectly. The most artful of them do not attempt argument or declamation; but employ all their talents in manufacturing

anti-Catholic facts. Search the columns of their newspapers from beginning to end; you will not find a solitary syllogism; you will see nothing but falsehood and misrepresentation. In this kind of hostility, the foreign Red Republican journals particularly, distinguish themselves. And men, with no slight knowledge of the world, are sometimes appalled, at the evidence which their effrontery exhibits of depravity, whose existence, in any human heart they had not before suspected.

Who, for example, would have dreamed that in America there were men capable of fabricating out of whole cloth, a slander so atrocious and propagate it with malignity, so persevering, as that by which the amiable and pious Monsignor Bedini was persecuted in this country? Yet we have seen it, and in that shameful fact, the power of the press has been exemplified, its character defined. Everybody, now, can see that the press has power to sway public sentiment only because it has the power to state, or mis-state, facts. But even that power is waning. It subsists, now, only because, most readers are impressed with a traditionary belief, that men are not bad enough to lie systematically, as a means of making money. But that traditionary belief [is] in fact being rooted out of the public mind; and the press is fast losing all influence over public thought.

473.

Editorial, *The Catholic Telegraph and Advocate*, April 22, 1854 (2)

[Doubter of a Reported Miracle.]

We observe in the *Pittsburgh Catholic* an able communication on the miraculous moving of the eyes observed in a beautiful picture of the Blessed Virgin, at Rimini, in the Pontifical States. It seems that the editor of the *Pittsburgh Despatch* has unravelled the whole mystery. *He* knows how it was done; he has known it ever since he was a boy--"Somebody was there moving the eyes!" Nothing simpler. Marvellous editor! to have known from his youth what nobody between Rimini and Pittsburgh ever thought of! "Somebody was there moving the eyes" of an oil painting! We make a proposition to this ingenious editor. During the fair to be held next week at Masonic Hall for the benefit of the orphans, an exquisite copy of the Madonna of Rimini, done in oil, will be raffled for. Now, if the editor of the *Pittsburgh Despatch* will come down to Cincinnati, and "be *there* moving the eyes" of *this* painting, as "he knows" how the eyes of that at Rimini were moved, we promise him, in the name of the admiring spectators, enough to purchase a residence in some city less smoky than Pittsburgh, where, free from editorial labors, he may pass all his days in the calm enjoyment of what "he knows." Marvellous editor! Does he suppose that a spirit of doubt could not flourish except in *his* smoky precincts, or an incredulous thought germinate elsewhere than in the dingier recesses of *his* brain? There were doubters enough at Rimini in 1848. At first they said the eyes did

474 - Untrustworthy Learning

not move at all; then when thousands saw them move, they said that the peculiar light of the little chapel produced the phenomenon. The picture was taken down from its place and carried to a large church, and the eyes still moved--and they said no more about it.

We see this Pittsburgh gentleman's solution of the miracle has been copied into one of our *Cincinnati* papers, and, no doubt, passes current among our bigots as something against the Catholics. Catholics are no more bound to believe the testimony of these witnesses than Protestants. All Catholics are bound to believe, is, that there *is* a God, and that if He pleases He *can* move the eyes of a dead picture, as easily as He can those of a living person. Whether He *did* choose to move the eyes of the picture in Rimini, is a matter of fact. If a Catholic chooses to maintain that all the good men and bad men, the pious Catholics, the Austrian Protestants, and Italian Red Republicans, who *said* they saw the eyes move, are liars, he will sin, not against faith, but against common sense alone. He will be no heretic, but only a fool.

474.

Editorial, *The Catholic Telegraph and Advocate*, October 7, 1854 (2)

[Untrustworthy Learning.]

We are surprised at the apparent candor of our cotemporary, the *Columbian*, in his article of last Tuesday under the caption "Jesuitical." He thinks it very strange that a Catholic king of a Catholic nation should have proscribed in this manner his Catholic subjects. And so thought the Christian world at the time, wondering to what lengths Atheism and Jansenism would yet be able to run, in the strength of their unhallowed union, against the Church. But he protests that he has no sympathy with the tyrant, "nor," he adds, with an insinuation that displays the *animus* in which his candor was assumed, "the principles of tyranny with which his instructors had poisoned his mind in his youth." This attribution of an act that proceeded from Charles' ungoverned passions, to principles instilled into his mind in youth, is a quibble inconsistent with the spirit in which the article of the *Columbian* was attempted to be written. We beg leave to assure our cotemporary that we did *not* "accuse the *Columbian* of vulgarity:" we said that his "prejudices" were "vulgar"--and they certainly are. He has been educated among ordinary, untravelled Protestants; and he has his notions of history, political geography, ecclesiastical affairs, etc., formed by what he has learned from them. He has never "examined for himself" the doctrine and discipline of the Catholic Church, or studied profoundly the history of Europe from the fall of the Roman empire, or investigated thoroughly the meaning and value of the education about which he is so enthusiastic. But when we say that our cotemporary is imbued with sentiments, views, and opinions drawn from the vulgar ignorance of Catholicity prevalent among candid

Protestants, we have no wish to accuse him of intentional vulgarity. We appreciate his views perfectly; we have held them, in times gone by, when we trusted to Hume and D'Aubigne, to the Edinburgh, Guizot, Hooker, and Palmer; and the happiest day of our life we count that on which we became convinced by study that our learning, derived from those and similar authors, was ignorance.

The Columbian was a Free Democrat, then a Free Soil, and then a Republican paper published in Columbus, Ohio from 1853 to 1856. Bishop Rosecrans chose a variation on this name for his Columbus diocesan newspaper, The Catholic Columbian.

475.

Editorial, *The Catholic Columbian*, May 29, 1875

[Questions from the *Journal* Answered]

The *Daily Ohio State Journal* of the 19th inst. protests its desire to deal candidly even with Catholics, and proceeds to state, "as points on which there can be no room for doubt."

"On the question of attendance upon the public schools, we need no explanation; the *Columbian* has declared Catholic parents excommunicated who send their children to the public schools. So of the division of the school fund: the *Columbian* demands a division; it asks as a matter of right that a share of the taxes paid for the support of public schools be placed absolutely at the disposal of the Catholic Church, for the support of its sectarian parochial schools; it utterly repudiates and anathematizes all purely secular schools, as instruments of Satan; and it loves schools where non-Catholic teachers read the Bible and repeat the Lord's Prayer as the devil loves holy water. On these points there can be no room for doubt."

This statement is truthful, partly, and partly calculated to mislead. Our judgment of purely secular schools is: They are unfit for Catholic children, and that Catholic parents can not be allowed the Sacraments who choose to send their children to them, when they could make use of Catholic schools. What they are for non-Catholic children is none of our business. One way of bringing up a child in unbelief is as good as another, and those who choose it can see to it. Schools in which the Bible is read and the Lord's Prayer recited are to us the same as meeting houses--not allowed to Catholics, with whom alone we are concerned in teaching what is right and what is wrong.

As a "next step," the *Journal* expresses our views pretty accurately, claiming them as his own. Here is the passage:

"We pass therefore to the next step, in considering the rights and obligations of citizenship in a Republic. We hold that the jurisdiction of the Church should be entirely

spiritual, and the jurisdiction of the State entirely temporal; that there should be an absolute and complete divorce between Church and State; that no question as to the civil accountability or allegiance of the citizen should properly arise, for the reason that his accountability to the Church is entirely spiritual, and his allegiance to the State entirely temporal. This is the 'American idea,' as we understand it. Under these definitions and limitations there can be no question as to superior allegiance, because they are distinct in character and function, in authority and sphere of action."

Then come certain questions couched in courteous language, which we shall answer candidly.

"1. What are the bounds and limitations of the Infallibility of the Pope, as understood by Catholics?"

The Pope represents the Person of Jesus Christ in teaching and guiding all men who are willing to be saved, to eternal life. The Son of God commissioned St. Peter as chief of the Apostles, to teach all nations "to observe all things he had commanded," and this end bounds and limits the Infallibility of the Pope.

"2. Can any case arise where a sovereign state in the exercise of its alleged or its undisputed civil power and jurisdiction, may come in conflict with the alleged or the undisputed spiritual power and jurisdiction of the Pope?"

Taking "undisputed" as it is obviously meant for "just" or "legitimate," we answer the question. None.

"3. If such case may arise, to which power, temporal or spiritual, would the faith and conscience of Catholics bind their highest allegiance?"

If such case should arise, it would arise, as it has arisen many times since the civil power crucified Jesus Christ, imprisoned the Apostles, put to death St. Peter, from usurpation of the civil power, and we must obey God, or conscience, rather than man.

"4. Does the Catholic Establishment, in Catholic countries and under Catholic rulers, recognize such relation between Church and State as to endow any civil authority with the right to nominate sacerdotal officers, for either educational or strictly religious services, to be supported by the State?"

Not as a rule. The Church has had the means of education she had provided, stolen from her by the civil government in many countries of Europe, and has accepted grants of money to educational and religious establishments in lieu of them. Governments may appoint ecclesiastics to civil offices, and hold them accountable, but if governments give anything to the Church, they relinquish all jurisdiction over it by the act.

"5. If so, are such officiates under direction or control of the Church or of the State, in case of disputed accountability?"

In any dispute we can conceive of, the most the Church could do would be to declare that such officiates would have to resign the civil office or their ecclesiastical

standing.

"6. Do the Bishops or other dignitaries of the Church represent the power and authority of the Pontiff within their respective jurisdictions; and if so, with what limitations and restrictions?"

Bishops do represent the power and authority of the Pontiff within their jurisdictions, with that "limit and restriction," and this other: that their judgments are subjects of appeal to the Pontiff, and revision by him.

"7. Is a Cardinal wholly a spiritual character, or are his obligations and duties both temporal and spiritual?"

A Cardinal is wholly a spiritual character.

"8. What is the meaning of his oath, which seems to the ordinary lay reader to transfer his allegiance, and all civil and political accountability directly to the Roman See?"

The meaning of the oath is that the Cardinal, being admitted into the Senate of the Pope, will perform his duties with fidelity. In former times each Cardinalate was endowed in some shape or other; and whatever is in the oath about temporalities has reference to those of which his office gave him possession. It has no more to do with transferring his civil and political allegiance, than have the vows made in Baptism.

476.

Editorial, *The Catholic Columbian*, July 24, 1875 (2)

[The O. S. Journal again]

The *Ohio State Journal*, champion of the public schools and scientific progress, as opposed to the medieval state of the public mind, finds it "interesting to learn from *The Catholic Columbian*" that the Protestant translation of "the Bible is a sectarian book."

The same intelligent organ of the meek and lowly postmaster says that the King James who gave his name to this translation of the Bible was dethroned by one William of Orange.

The same "Advanced Thinker" reported General Thomas Ewing as a "prominent and zealous member of the Catholic Church." And when we denied the proposition, he comes back on us with the accusation of playing a Jesuitical trick on him. A man may think it an "attempt at courtesy" to lie--and then deny his own words and lie again, and charge those who characterize his statements in proper terms as "working off opprobrious epithets," but we can not hold ourselves bound to humor his self-conceit, and to be grateful to him, because he is not quite as contemptuous and unjust to us as he might be.

The learned editor of the *Ohio State Journal*, who goes about correcting historical

and orthographical blunders, whilst he considers himself the highest authority in ecclesiastical matters, says:

"Warden Innis states that there are about 1,200 copies of the St. James' translation of the Bible in the Penitentiary library. The St. James referred to is King James the Second, of England, that good old Democratic Saint who was dethroned by a certain Netherland sinner named William. He didn't translate the Scripture, however."

Amenities of Anti-Catholic Journalism.

"We should suspect the *Catholic Columbian* of being under the control of some inebriated fishwoman."

"It simply shrieks out, like a red-mouthed brawler, 'you lie!'"--*State Journal* of the 21st.

It is no pleasure to us to characterize with Saxon words the statements by which the *State Journal* make their attacks on the Catholic Church. The discredit of the performance belongs, however, to the doers of the deed, and not to the chronicler.

They have started out to do campaign service in the political canvass by trying to make out an alliance between the Catholic Church and the Democratic party, which we know to be absurd and impossible. We believe they know it also. To make their crowning lie plausible, they are compelled to use almost numberless misrepresentations. They have to misrepresent the standing of Catholic papers, to misquote their language, and to distort the meaning of language quoted literally.

The *Journal* of this city has actually misstated the language of *The Catholic Columbian*, and then accused it of a "Jesuitical trick"--in getting an issue with its editor which he again misstates.

It has also misstated (possibly misunderstood) the words quoted in its own columns from the *Catholic Telegraph*.

We wish simply to warn our readers, that as long as there is political capital in it, they are to expect from the two journals of Columbus and Dayton the same malignancy of abuse and misrepresentation to which they have become accustomed in the *Cincinnati Times*, *Cleveland Leader*, and *Harper's Weekly*.

477.

Editorial, *The Catholic Columbian*, July 24, 1875

[The Church Superior to the World]

The *Dayton Journal* says that it has kept its readers posted upon the Beecher-Tilton scandal, although it afflicted a large portion of the community; it has discussed

spiritualism; it did not spare ink in the discussion of High and Low Church affairs; it has wrestled with camp meetings, baptism, Christian associations, politics, woman rights, and still the votaries of all these bore the infliction with wonderful and commendable patience. It wants to know, then, why Catholics make any fuss about its misrepresenting the Catholic Church. Ah, that's the point if you only knew. All other institutions are human, all other systems of religion, irreligion. You may vilify, you may misrepresent everything else with impunity, but when God's Church is assailed, you wonder at the exhaustless power that baffles your efforts. You stand amazed at the futility of your efforts, and must have recourse to the vilest slanders in order to have the appearance of a champion before the world, against which the Church of God wages a constant and untiring warfare. When her Divine Founder hung bleeding on the cross on Calvary's heights, all nature rose in its might to attest the enormity of the outrage perpetrated by unbelieving man; and so now, when she herself is the object of attack, her members rise up in all their strength and protest her sacred character. The *Journal* claims that it does not attack the faith of the Catholic Church but its politics. Politics are worldly motives. The Church does not need them. She is superior, infinitely superior, to the world. We could easier ascribe religion to the *Journal* than politics to the Church. The Republican organs of the State, in dragging the Catholic religion into political disrepute, are only damaging their own chances of success, for all sensible men are sick of such political schemes.

478.

Editorial, *The Catholic Columbian*, June 6, 1878 (1)

[Voltaire's Centennial]

The Sunday *Enquirer's* Europe correspondent stigmatizes those who detest the memory of Voltaire as "clericals." Perhaps names will come to mean something after a while. We have been saying for years that Christianity and the Catholic Church are identical. Maybe the victims of effete Protestant prejudices will begin to feel the inconsistency of their position, by degrees. To loathe the character of a professional scoffer at all faith in God, at all reverence for virtue, at all modesty and purity, of a theoretical and practical liar, of an ingrate and coward, who begged on his death bed for a priest, and was mocked by those to whom he had taught new ways of blaspheming, until his polluted soul fled from his vile body, is to be a "clerical." Well we are a clerical. "In the cathedral of Notre Dame," says this same correspondent, "was assembled an immense congregation (chiefly women) offering prayers of expiation for the sacrilegious centennial." If only women in France can appreciate what is manly, why then, bring in a Queen.

479.

Editorial, *The Catholic Columbian*, Sept. 19, 1878

[A Concoction of Outrages Exposed]

The editor of the *Sunday Herald* does not see any connection between "the fact that some southern people are dying of yellow fever," and the wisdom and decency of stopping the fomenting of bitterness and hatred towards them, in the North. We *do*. And when we reflect that this concoction of outrages on the Blacks, in the South, is made not in the interest of justice but because, as the *Herald* says, it is the road to party success, we see it all the more plainly. If Blaine and "the rest of them" want justice why do they slander the Catholic Church? Why do they scheme to rob Catholics of the right to educate their children, according to the dictates of their conscience? There is plenty of justice needed here in the North, to keep busy both tongue and pen of honest lovers of it.

480.

Editorial, *The Catholic Columbian*, Sept. 26, 1878 (1)

[The Crimes of the Cleveland Leader]

The Cleveland *Leader*, with customary mendacity, calls the Sandusky mob which lately hung a man in that city, for an outrage on a young woman, "an Irish Catholic mob." There was not one Irishman to five of other nationalities, we learn from reliable sources. Still that one should be made to feel the hand of justice, along with the other five. The same sheet finds fault with the Catholic priests of Toledo for assisting even to the scaffold, a Canadian criminal, some years ago. Why not? They would assist the editor of the *Leader*, even, were he to repent, after being sentenced, according to his merits! He talks against murderers! There is not an issue of his paper that does not "breathe slaughter." Yet, for all that, those same priests would hasten to his prison cell, and as soon as they heard him cry, "I have sinned in my lying and calumniating writings against God and His Church," they would stay by him even until they saw him hung.

481.

Editorial, *The Catholic Columbian*, Oct. 10, 1878 (1)

[The Bishop in Politics?]

"Ithurial," the profane rascal correspondent of the Cincinnati *Enquirer*, says that he interviewed the accomplished and talented Miss Lillie Darst about some political matter, while he was in Circleville, and she answered--"She didn't know--but believed it

was something about Bishop Rosecrans." Now Miss Darst has the most irreproachable record of any editor in Ohio. Will she please say that "Ithurial" prevaricated, or that she was mistaken in mixing Bishop Rosecrans' name, with the late bitter and unseemly Congressional contest?

F. Liberalism, Socialism

482.

Editorial, *The Catholic Telegraph and Advocate*, April 1, 1854

German Reformers of our Constitution.

If the American people do not discover the difference between *real* and *Red* Republicanism, it will be because they neglect to read what is written and published before their eyes. Conventions of German Red Republicans have lately been held in Cincinnati and Chicago, in which "platforms" have been published setting forth systematically the changes they propose to work in the American Constitution and American institutions. These changes are of the most radical and sweeping nature such as, once effected, would render it impossible for Washington and Franklin to recognize in our Republic the work of their hands and the fruit of their wisdom, since the shape into which they moulded it would be lost in its new form of European socialism.

Catholics are too accustomed to unfair treatment from popular opinion, to be surprised any more that themselves, though born in the country, though professing and feeling the most ardent attachment to our institutions as our fathers left them, should be denounced as enemies to American republicanism; while bands of foreigners, *in their capacity of foreigners*, meet in convention, avow their determination to "reform radically" the Constitution, change essentially our institutions, political, judicial, and social, with scarce a word of comment from the press. Yet to a novice in the world's ways the fact might be surprising.

No one can read the Chicago and Cincinnati "platforms" of these German "Freemanners," without being impressed with the conviction that they are the work of the same author. The reforms proposed, the order, qualifications, reasoning, with which they are proposed, are so alike, as to leave no doubt on our mind but that they emanated from the same head--were received, "cut and dried," by the subordinate societies from the central, with orders to publish them. In our belief, the same chief who sent from the throne of his irresponsible and invisible rule in "Fatherland," orders to his subjects in all the cities of the United States, to make simultaneous "demonstrations" of their hatred to whatever is good, against the Papal Nuncio, Mons. Bedini, sent also the Reform Platform, *in extenso*. If the American people are already indebted to the grand-master of the "Freemanners" in "Fatherland" for an attempt to *disgrace* our institutions by a savage inhospitality to a foreign ambassador, what will be

their gratitude to him now for the orders he has sent to *subvert* them? Of course, this "platform" proclaims enmity and proscription to Catholics "ecclesiastics." The ruffians who attempted to murder Mons. Bedini, and who writhe, like exorcised demoniacs, at the mere sight of a cross or of a priest, are expected to do all the evil *in their power* to the Catholic Church. But their reason for hating Catholic ecclesiastics is rather singular for persons that preach the *solidarity* of nations, and act under orders of the successor of Joseph Weishaupt in Germany. It is not the reason given by Proudhon, their affiliated brother and a Doctor of their sect,—that priests are friends of God; therefore enemies of the Devil, therefore *his* enemies—not the reason of their founder, Weishaupt, that priests are teachers of morality, therefore foes of his system—but that priests are under "foreign" dominion! Yes; from the midst of despotic Europe the chief of the secret societies sends orders to his subjects in America, to denounce Catholic ecclesiastics for their belief in One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, for their adherence to the centre of unity, because the Pope is a foreigner! We think he will find himself mistaken in his estimate of American intelligence!

The following are some of the evils which the grand-master of the German "Freemanners" sees in our country at present, and which he orders his followers to have remedied at once.

We select them from the "Platform," as published in the *Chicago Democrat*.

1. "Instead of securing liberty *to all*, more than three millions of men are condemned to slavery, and efforts are daily made to increase their number." This evil Congress must remedy, by destroying the Jeffersonian doctrine of State rights, and making a solidarity of the Republic.

2. "The color of the skin affects legal rights."

3. "In the phrase, all *men* are equal, *women* are not understood to be included."

4. "Penal laws of an expiatory character, such as the gallows and imprisonment for life, are in existence." It is as easy to understand a *Freemanner's* prejudice against *penal laws*, as it is his hatred of the Catholic religion.

5. Sunday laws, prayers in the Legislature, the Bible as a class-book, are allowed.

6. Atheists, to whom an oath has no sanctity, are not believed in courts of justice.

7. Governors of states are permitted to issue thanksgiving proclamations.

8. Churches and church property are not taxed.

9. Catholics are allowed to have pastors appointed for them in the way they believe willed by Christ.

10. The Jesuits are tolerated in the country.

11. Individuals are allowed the exclusive proprietorship of nature—that is, of the soil.

12. Parents are not *compelled*, as in Prussia, to send their children to school.

These are but a small number of the evils which the German Reformers propose

to remedy as soon as possible. Their enumeration of "evils" and of reforms has seemed "incongruous" to a cotemporary. To us it appears as logical a development of their principles as could be expected from half-educated men, struggling not to wound American feeling while making a display of anti-American and atheistical views.

To understand a *Freemanner's* views, you must remember his two fundamental errors--one, as to the *end*, the other, as to the *means*. In his atheism, he makes the supreme *end* of man to be *sensual enjoyment*, or, as he phrases it, "prosperity for all." In his folly, he imagines that the *means* to accomplish this end are statute laws; forgetting that if the end of man be not *justice*, but *pleasure*, laws are nugatory. Keeping this atheism and folly in view, the whole "platform" is logically intelligible.

If to eat and drink, "to *prosper*," be the supreme good of man, no individual can be deprived of sensual enjoyment without injustice. Whence no exclusive ownership of the soil can be permitted, or of its products, except such as every one wishes for his own eating and drinking. Whence, too, laws should be passed against sickness, cold and hot weather, and similar impediments to sensual enjoyment.

If pleasure be our last end, then pleasure's god is our god. But the God who was crucified between two thieves, is not the god of pleasure. Hence the Freemanner's war to the knife against Jesus Christ, and those who preach Him "crucified."

If man's final destiny is completed in this world, since the arbiter of one's destiny is god, and since the state unquestionably guides our *temporal* destiny, the state is god. Whence the veneration that once exempted churches from taxation as temples of God, is transferred to the temples of the new god--the state schools.

And inasmuch as man can have no rights but such as God chooses to give him--if the state be god, then man, the *individual*, has no rights before the state. Whence Catholics may elect their Church officers according to the dictates of the state, in a "democratic manner," but may not plead the rights of conscience to choose them according to the will of Christ.

These deductions are logical enough, it seems to us, and so are the rest, which we have not time to write down. Once admit the great socialist contradictions, that man is a mere beast, as to his *end*, but is yet an intellectual creature, (a subject of legislation), as to the means of arriving at his bestial enjoyments, and there is nothing obscure in the platform. We shall see with what success our German Reformers will labor, and whether the mandates of the "solidarity" leader in "Fatherland" are to be the law of America.

483.

Editorial, *The Catholic Columbian*, March 6, 1875

The Spirit of the Commune

We have had our ideas of the Commune from the deeds of rapine, incendiarism and blood, with the howlings of the mobs while engaged in them, which have been described to us by many authors--and the Communists have seemed to us as so many lunatics, frantically on the scent of blood and destruction. But the Communists of Europe are not lunatics--they are philosophers. They are not striking out wildly, hitting whatever happens to be in reach, because their chains gall them painfully, but are working systematically to an end for society which they have accepted, and are determined to reach. They are the elite of Advanced Thinkers in Europe, and in many parts of America. They communicate with one another, and act much in direct concert, with whatever machinery gives them any control over public opinion--and with wonderful sagacity keep urging society on toward the point in which their "religion of the future" is to become the religion of the present.

What is this religion of the future? Here is the basis of it. Man has his all of good and evil--like the other animals--within the limits of this life. There is no future judgment, no heaven, no hell. The matter of which we are composed will assume other shapes, enriching the soil or adding to the dust, but we shall be no more. "We have no future life," says one of the expositors of their creed, "but the lives of our descendants, who are to honor our memories and profit by our discoveries." "The system directly opposed to Freemasonry," says an Italian member of the sect, "is that which teaches that man--in this life--is on a journey, and that he must look beyond it for the full recompense of his good deeds and the punishment for his evil ones." This principle laid down, see at once what startling consequences follow:

1. In the first place the supreme good is earthly enjoyment--"a sound mind in a healthy body," say the philosophers, who pretend to reason; "food, clothing, and sports," say the multitude, who only feel.

2d. The supreme evil is whatever deprives a man of the means, or of the power, of enjoyment. Sickness and death, which take away the power of enjoyment, cannot be helped. But poverty, which shuts off the means of enjoyment, can be helped by the equal distribution of what goods the earth brings forth, or wit contrives, or toil puts into shape. Therefore, those goods should be held as common.

3d. Whatever stands in the way of this enjoyment of the world's goods is hostile, and must be destroyed, if possible. But the usages of society, governments, with all their machinery of courts, judges, police, prisons, stand in the way of this enjoyment. Therefore, rulers are the natural enemies of the people.

The religion of Jesus Christ is also in the way of this end of man. Therefore, the

religion of Jesus Christ is hostile to the human race. Jesus Christ, who did all He could, by word and example, to persuade men to be content with poverty, and love it, was an imposter and a cheat. His representatives--the priests, and especially the religious orders who counsel alms-giving to the rich, faithful service and honest labor to the poor--are in the plot with rulers to swindle the people out of their rights, to cheat them out of all the happiness that they can ever expect. Hence, the hostility of the higher grades of the secret societies towards rulers, temporal and spiritual. This explains Garibaldi's avowed hatred, not only of the Pope, but of Jesus Christ.

The intensity of this hate is nothing wonderful. The desires of the human heart are so deep and so strong that they take in Eternity--make a flame fierce enough to mount up to the very throne of God.

But Communism brings them all down to within the span of time, saying to the soul, "Look upon the wealth, the glory, the pleasure of the body, as you hurry on to the grave; and seize them as you fly along, for you have no other good; cut, burn, slaughter all who would keep you from them, for if you lose them, you lose all." The worst torment of the damned is unsatisfied desire; but this unsatisfied desire gnaws the soul of the atheist, who, being poor, considers himself damned while he lives.

No wonder, then, he gnashes his teeth, brandishes the torch, strikes with the steel, howling out his very soul in the savage, "Down with Pius IX! Down with government! Down with Jesus Christ."

This is Communism--the spirit of Bismarck, Garibaldi and Serrano, spread among the masses. The hatred of Christ which kings have exhibited in their treatment of the Church, and which is now rising with irresistible logic in the hearts of the people to worry them.

484.

Editorial, *The Catholic Columbian*, August 19, 1876 (1)

[Socialist Unbelievers]

There are two classes of unbelievers; one class knows nothing of religion, its teachings or the grounds on which it rests its claims. The other knows what religion is, and hates it because it is good. The European socialists are of this latter class. They love darkness rather than light, because their deeds are evil. They acknowledge God to be what Christianity represents Him to be; and His only begotten Son to have done all the Church teaches He has done to save men from being ruined. They hate God for His greatness and purity as Milton's hero in *Paradise Lost* hated Him, or as Shelley's, when he called Him "the omnipotent Tyrant." They hate Jesus Christ because he taught that poverty was a more blessed condition than wealth. They hate monks and nuns because they try to practice angelic virtue; priests because they tell the people to be patient and

look forward to eternity for the righting of wrong and the reward of suffering. Those who do not know the Church's teachings are converted with comparative ease when they happen on the knowledge of the truth. But the others are beyond the reach of everything but prayer and the all-powerful grace of God. We have never met an American Communist.

485.

Editorial, *The Catholic Columbian*, August 29, 1878 (2)

[Socialism]

Editor Catholic Columbian:

Isn't it a scramble for bread and butter all around? The honest toilers gain their living by the sweat of their brows producing value to society for more than they consume. All the others, ministers, lawyers, doctors, men of science, eat off from the laboring man. So do the middle men between producers. So do capitalists, money lenders and office-holders. So do thieves, robbers, gamblers, and swindlers generally. In principle what is the difference between the various classes who live without work? All are thieves alike, there can be no happiness for poor people until the world is purged of all aristocrats. SOCIALIST.

Ans. "Socialist" is in the radical error of his tribe, i.e. of taking for granted that all human happiness is bound up in eating and drinking. "Man liveth not by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." If this were not so, where would be the use of living at all? As for professional men living on the toil of others, that is all nonsense. Priests live to diffuse the knowledge and dispense the Sacraments of Jesus Christ, through which alone true happiness can be attained. Ministers of false creeds simply place themselves in a market where there is a demand for them, and sell themselves for what they will fetch. If there is any injustice done, those who furnish the demand are chiefly the blunderers.

As a general rule, men make more sacrifices to gratify their passions than to supply their needs. But this is not the fault of those who sell candy and beer--but of those who buy.

If a man does not like doctors he is free to die without them. If he objects to lawyers, let him draw up his own contracts, and take care of them. If he hates middlemen let him carry his own wheat to market, and go to Sheffield personally for a pair of sheets.

But does not Socialist see plainly that every amelioration of society must come, not from destroying what feeds passion, but from curing the passion itself? Put the one set of leaders out of the way, and you give place to another set. The people who destroyed the monuments of the true faith in some countries of Europe only went from

a true to a false worship, brought in the poor laws instead of the spirit of mercy, the county infirmary as a prison for paupers, instead of the monastery the house of God's poor.

For society to give a living to genuine men of God, or honest workers in the field of science, is a small thing. Only for the first, the toilers would never know the use of toiling and never attain its reward. Only for the second, they could do nothing more than pick berries and dig up roots with their fingers, living like wild beasts in the open air.

If his own theory is true, what business has "Socialist" to waste time in writing for the newspapers? Is he not aping the manners of the aristocrat, when he leaves off toiling and producing, and spends time in trying to be a leader, and money in buying foolscap and a stamp?

486.

Editorial, *The Catholic Columbian*, July 31, 1875 (1)

Liberalism

The *Freeman's Journal* of last week has a leading editorial on the "Results of Liberalism in Spanish America," in which the San Salvador affair is disposed of in a very plausible manner. "Liberalism" such as the Church experiences in Germany is one of the leading characteristics of the government which is exercised under the influence of Free Masonry.

The revenues of the Church and all Church property were about to be confiscated, and the aged Bishop of San Salvador repeatedly ordered his pastoral to be read warning Catholics, who are the natives, how great a crime the government was about to commit. 'Tis true that the Catholics heeded the good Bishop very little, they cared no longer for their religion, and the *Freeman* remarks that the political "scrimmage" in San Salvador, was between two sets of scoundrels. The scoundrels who were *in* power proposed to rob Catholic property. The scoundrels *out* of office made use of this proper ecclesiastical denunciation to oust, by violence, the scoundrels in office. The faction of scoundrels out of power, and the faction of scoundrels in power, in San Salvador, are scoundrels all the same. It is a vile thing on the part of the *Herald* correspondent to attempt to link Catholic influence with either of the beggarly factions. The *Herald*, also, was caught napping, in letting its stupid correspondent get off on it so absurd a thing as the following:

What share religious fanaticism had in this melancholy chapter in the history of Central America is proved by another well substantiated fact, which would scarcely be believed at this advanced period of the nineteenth century, and which is this:--On the person of dead rebels, says the *El Universo* of San Salvador, were found

487 - Liberalism in Religion

PASSPORTS TO HEAVEN,

signed and sealed by the Bishop of San Salvador, which read as follows:

Pedro, abre las puertas del cielo al portador que murio per religioni.

Jorge, Obispo de San Salvador.

That is: "Peter, open the gates of heaven to the bearer, who died for religion."

The stupid correspondent calls this a "well substantiated fact," and gives only, as authority, the say so of a worthless paper. But see how this stupid San Salvador paper gives itself the lie. The *Herald*, we suppose, has the means, in its own office library, of proving the error of this stupid correspondent, and of the San Salvador *Universo*. There is in San Salvador a Bishop of the See. He has a Coadjutor, Bishop of Arsinoe, *in partibus infidelum*. The name of the Bishop of San Salvador is Thomas Michael Pineda y Zaldena.

The name of his Coadjutor is Lewis Carcamo. There is no other Bishop in San Salvador. So Jorge, Bishop of San Salvador, is not only a fiction, but a very stupid fiction on the part of the concoctor of the fable. We have no doubt, however, that tens of thousands of "highly intelligent" baptized Catholics--graduates of the godless schools, will swallow the absurd story as true, and sigh because those deluded Central American people have not had the advantages of a godless school education!

487.

Editorial, *The Catholic Columbian*, Sept. 25, 1875 (5)

Liberalism in Religion

Frequently we hear the assertion made by those who call themselves *liberals*, that it makes no difference to what religion a man belongs, provided only he lives a good moral life. We are all striving for the same destination, they say, and it makes no difference which road we take, even though it be not the most direct one, provided we finally arrive there.

The object of every religion, they argue, is to give men a moral training, and thus enable them to attain the end of their existence. Every religion is therefore good.

In answer to this, we must say, that the argument of the liberal is not only false, but absurd.

No person can admit the existence of God, the necessity of a first cause, and reasonably deny his dependence upon that first cause, and consequently the necessity of a religion of some sort.

But let us come down to the proposition of the liberal--"every religion is good." This proposition gives us the license to commit the greatest crime of which man is capable. Let us examine the meaning of it. It means simply that whatever act of idolatry man may commit, into whatever error he may fall in regard to Almighty God, it is just as pleasing in His sight as the purest act of worship. Mahometanism and

Buddhism are also religions, they too teach a code of morals. Yet they deny Jesus Christ, and their members prostrate themselves before Mahomet and Buddha. [This indicates a deficient knowledge of Islam, or possibly just of the term "Mahomet" or Muhammad, on the part of the Bishop.]

If every religion is good, then is truth an error; to adore the true and only God, or worship the devil in idols, all one and the same thing.

The Jews, before the coming of Christ, had a religion. They adored the true God; they were His chosen people. Yet Christ came down from heaven to change that religion, and to institute a new one. If what the liberal says is true, there would be no necessity for this.

But he may argue, "Well we are not talking about Jews and idolators. When I say that it makes no difference to what religion a man belongs, I mean, of course, a religion which acknowledges Jesus Christ; for the Scripture says we must believe in the Lord Jesus, if we would be saved." Suppose we limit his proposition thus far; it is none the less absurd.

Protestantism is divided into numerous sects, each one differing from the other. This difference can only be with regard to what they believe. Their very names imply a distinction and a distinction without a difference is logically an impossibility. Hence it follows that while some hold a certain truth to be revealed, others deny it altogether.

Starting out with these premises, let us bring the proposition of the liberal into play again. If every religion is good, then it would follow again that truth and falsehood would be one and the same thing. That it would be equally good, for instance, to adore the Blessed Sacrament on our altars as we Catholics do; or to believe in the Sacrament of Penance, or to look upon it as ridiculous; to hold that Christ is God as most Christians do; or to regard Him as a mere creature, as do the socinians and unitarians.

The doctrine of the liberal is therefore a false one, and is plainly making a mockery of Jesus Christ.

Our Blessed Lord came down from heaven to found a Church by means of which the merits of our redemption might be dispensed to all mankind. He made that Church the depository of His doctrines; promised His own assistance and that of the Holy Ghost, lest she should ever fall into error; confirmed His doctrines by numberless miracles and by the blood of thousands of martyrs. Yet after all this, those new-fangled teachers come forward to tell us that it makes no difference to Jesus Christ what we believe, provided only we live good and moral lives. If this is not plainly making a mockery of Him, we are greatly mistaken.

If their doctrine is true, what is the use in the preaching of Protestant ministers, since they would gain nothing if we were all to become Protestants; nor would they lose anything by all becoming Catholics, since even Catholicism is a religion and every religion is good.

But they say Catholics are so intolerant. We will not stop to answer that question today; it has been refuted so often that its upholders must be entirely blinded by prejudice not to see that it is false. But even if it were so, which we deny, have not Catholics a sort of right to be so, since we hold that what is not true is false, and consequently that one religion is not as good as another. During our late civil war we beheld the spectacle of frail women, going forth for God's sake, amid a hail of shot and shell, to tend to the wounded and dying. Today we see those same women, sacrificing home and earthly happiness, in order to tend to Catholics and Protestants alike in our hospitals. Does this look like intolerance? On the contrary how have our so-called liberals acted? Certainly not very liberally. We see those same Sisters of Charity driven out of Mexico; the Pope a prisoner in the Vatican; the bishops and priests of Germany imprisoned or driven into exile--even in our own State of Ohio we Catholics are abused for applauding liberty of conscience in our prisons. One of our own priests, in a country town not a hundred miles from Columbus, was threatened with arrest for attending a man dying of the small-pox, though no mention was made of the doctor, who visited the house a great deal oftener than the priest did.

Does this look like liberalism, or does it look like intolerance?

But enough. God knows we do not wish to be otherwise than charitable, but we can scarcely open a newspaper, in which we do not find our religious convictions grossly misrepresented.

We, however, expect nothing else but persecution. The disciple is not above his master. Christ himself was persecuted in the name of religion, and so religious were His persecutors, that they would not even allow His body to hang upon the cross on the Sabbath day. We have always been persecuted, and yet we are stronger than ever. "The blood of martyrs became the seed of Christians," says Tertullian. "The gates of hell shall never prevail" against God's Church, and her wondrous vitality is a shining proof that she is not the work of man.

Truth is necessarily one. Christ has made but one revelation; whatever is not true is false. Since, therefore, such is the case, it follows that every religion is not good, for there can be but one true Church.

488.

Editorial, *The Catholic Columbian*, January 31, 1878 (5)

[Narrow-Minded Liberalism]

The greatest of shams is the man who believes implicitly in himself. You have seen him and heard him talk, reader. "I discard all prejudice; to me all creeds are alike." "How alike?" you take it upon yourself to say. "Equally good." "But none true?" "None true altogether, none entirely false. You see I am no bigot; I am liberal." "Liberal? What

488 - Narrow-Minded Liberalism

of?" "Of my creed." "Have you any?" "Well, yes, I suppose I have, but I am not bigoted about it." The truth is, he does not believe in anything, nor care about anything connected with God or eternity, but is just as bigoted in favor of his indifference as he imagines other people to be in favor of their beliefs. Tell him that liberalism in theory is illogical, inconsistent, and hypocritical, and he will reply that you are gone too far in bigotry to be talked to. Prove your assertion, as you easily can, and he will never speak to you again. Yet all the time he honestly believes that it is broad-minded to believe in nothing, and narrow-minded to have God for teacher.