

VII. Interactions with the World

H. Church and State

d. Germany

518.

Editorial, *The Catholic Columbian*, April 10, 1875 (3)

[Bismarck's Claim to Souls]

The *Ohio State Journal* of Monday morning contains a political article against Mr. Heitmann, which has done its duty in the municipal election, but which as a contribution to the mass of slander and misrepresentation blinding the eyes of many American people to the light of divine faith, demands notice at our hands.

Messrs. Reinhard & Fieser in their card, and Mr. Heitman in his, denied that the Democratic candidate for Mayor had ever agreed with Bismarck in his persecution of the German Catholics.

The *Journal* pretends to see a quibble in this form of expression, and berates Mr. Heitman for not saying explicitly that he does not approve of Bismarck. The distinction is drawn in the following language:

"No intelligent man anywhere in the world, in this age, approves religious persecution. One need not, we trust, be suspected of approving religious persecution because he believes with Bismarck, that the citizen owes his first allegiance to his own country in all secular matters, and believes that no Pope or other spiritual authority can rightfully claim a higher secular allegiance than the local temporal authority has a right to claim. Does Mr. Heitman believe this? He has been very careful not to say whether he does or not--yet this is the gist of the whole matter.

"In his own card, while answering the extreme courtesy with which we have treated him by the most discourteous epithets, he does not say whether he believes Catholics in this country owe their highest allegiance to the United States Government, as we claim, or to the Pope, as the Ultramontanes claim."

The editor of the *Journal* is conceded to be an intelligent man. He must tell the truth when he says he does not approve of religious persecution. Yet he approves the policy of the persecutor. There are Franciscan Sisters in charge of the orphans on Friend street, who were driven from Germany by Bismarck's policy. They had never meddled in secular matters, and had committed no crime, except to believe in one holy and apostolic Church.

Two priests belonging to a certain religious order gave a mission in Portsmouth two weeks ago. They were of a large band exiled by Bismarck's policy.

That the "Ultramontanes" (a mild nickname, in comparison with those we may expect, as new outrages against courtesy will be needed to justify old ones) claim allegiance to the Pope in secular matters higher than the local temporal authority has a

right to claim, is a pure calumny made out of maliciously confounding "secular matters" with secular attempts to usurp authority over spiritual concerns.

We noticed some time ago a misrepresentation of some speech by Archbishop Manning, about the Pope's claim to temporal authority, in distant countries, copied into the *Journal* in common with other newspapers, and that the correction, which followed it about two weeks later, was *not* copied into the *Journal*.

It is now nearly twenty years since the Cincinnati *Times* was in the midst of a career of prosperity, built up by systematic and persistent lying against the Catholics and the Catholic Church. The chief actors in that injustice have gone to their account, and the money gained by it has been scattered, and the concern merged with the *Chronicle*. What lesson did that apostate boy then learn, or what curse incur, that the old iniquity should be repeated, and the old disasters overwhelm new victims?

+ + +

Another informant has stated that when in Germany Heitmann wrote letters for the *Westbote* in which he approved Bismarck's policy in opposition to the Ultramontanes. In that we decidedly agree with Mr. Heitmann.--*State Journal*, April 3d.

We place this frank declaration on record in order that our readers may be able to understand what they are to expect from those who control the party of freedom and equal rights in this country. It does not appear to us to be the private sentiment of its author, but rather the platform of his clique adopted simply for present necessities and intended for use while it will render service.

Bismarck's policy towards the Ultramontanes is to deny them rights of conscience, rights of property, and rights of domicile. They are not to judge for themselves what they shall cling to as God's revelation, but the Emperor is to judge. Their priests are not to be under the authority appointed by Jesus Christ; but under that of the police. They are not to be treated as the owners of the schools, colleges, houses and revenues they have paid for, but the government is the owner. The pay for ecclesiastical property "appropriated" in former times by the government, is called government subsidy, or aid, and can be withdrawn at pleasure, when the Ultramontanes will not alter their faith to suit the government decrees. Peaceable and self-sacrificing religious can be exiled, their houses seized, their private means confiscated, because they desire to remain true to the vows they made in the beginning of their vocation.

The chiefs of the Ultramontanes--their archbishops and bishops--can be fined and imprisoned for neglecting to obey orders which they could not obey without sin. The government can dictate to the Ultramontanes what they shall read, even of current news, to writers what they shall write, and to speakers, including the priests of God, what they shall say.

This is "Bismarck's policy in opposition to the Ultramontanes," a policy, the

fundamental principle of which is that the Emperor has the absolute proprietorship of both the souls and the bodies of his subjects. Now we do not believe that the mass of Americans, who are so earnest in civil rights measures, will decidedly approve of this policy thus rightly understood.

519.

Editorial, *The Catholic Columbian*, April 17, 1875 (1)

IMPERIAL GERMANY.

More German Tyranny-Some More
of the Policy which our Neighbor
of the Journal "Decidedly Approves."

BERLIN, April 11.--the Roman Catholic Bishops, soon after their conference at Fulda, addressed a petition to the Emperor William in person, remonstrating against the withdrawal of state grants to the maintenance of which they declared the honor of Prussia was pledged. They also protested against being required to obey unconditionally the state laws.

The ministers authorized by the Emperor have replied, expressing regret that the bishops should object to obey laws which are always obeyed in other countries, and adding that the bishops would have reserved the fatherland from peace disturbing confusion if they had remained faithful to their own convictions and to the warnings which they proclaimed before the Vatican Council.

The North German *Gazette*, as semi-official journal, says: "The article of the Berlin *Post* contains much truth in one respect, but combined with such anxious views that we must contradict it. Our international relations are by no means as unfavorable as represented. While reorganization of the French army is disquieting, it does not aim at the solid establishment of the French forces, but is undertaken for obvious purposes. The *Post* overrates the influence of the Papal party, and the Jesuits in Italy and Austria. Their power is happily insufficient to prejudice the good understanding between the sovereigns or nations concerned. The *Gazette* thinks the same may be said in regard to France."

The so-called state grants are the government commutations for Church property, seized in years gone by.

In their reply the ministers prevaricate. There is no country on earth where such laws as they speak of are obeyed. They are resisted in Russia, China and Japan. The Turk does not pretend to such tyranny. The resistance is going on in Switzerland. Such laws are no longer insisted on in England and Austria. As to their impertinence in telling the bishops that they would have kept the peace if they had remained faithful to their convictions, it is of a piece with liberal hypocrisy generally. For those liberals know full well that the war against the Catholic Church was determined on before the Vatican Council, and would have taken place all the same had that Council never been

held. The Russian revival of the old Roman idea of an empire has been the goal of the Prussian monarchy for a long time. And now the proposition is boldly made to alter the constitution of the nation so as to give the police department the power of appointing pastors, and forbid all intercourse with the Holy See.

Thus time vindicates the Catholic Church from each calumny invented against her. For years we have been declaring that Catholics are not attached to the absolutisms of European countries, and do not believe in unconditional submission to the behests of rulers. And, now, Catholics are the only opposition to the claims of the most odious despotism the world ever witnessed. And the liberals turn round and abuse them for not yielding!

+ + +

THE CATHOLIC COLUMBIAN exposes the real point of all disputes as to where allegiance is due, in the following paragraph:

"When we say that the Church claims no right to exercise authority in temporal matters, we mean matters that are really and in good faith temporal. A government cannot make a spiritual matter temporal by pretending to legislate upon it. What Catholic priests shall preach and to whom they shall administer the Sacraments, what communication they shall hold with the head of the Church, are spiritual matters, and Bismarck cannot make them temporal by passing so-called laws about them."

You will observe that, in order to get up the most deadly lively dispute as to where allegiance is due, it is only necessary for one party to say that a thing is temporal, and the other party to say that the same thing is spiritual. It is not necessary to raise any question as to the authority of the Church in temporal matters.--*Ohio State Journal*

An intelligent witness of such a dispute ought therefore to examine the disputed points, and judge whether the matter is temporal or spiritual. The Bismarck policy claims the right of the government--

1. To appoint and dismiss pastors.
2. To prescribe the course of studies in theological seminaries, and to authorize or refuse Holy Orders.
3. To shut off all communications between the Catholics of Germany and the successor of St. Peter--the august prisoner of the Vatican.
4. To control the donations of Catholics made for Church purposes.
5. To supervise, censure and correct what pastors preach to their people.

In a word, it claims for civil government what the Czar of Russia claims--and what Augustus Cæsar and Nero claimed.

Is this matter temporal or spiritual?

The same number of the Journal contains the following recantation of the "decided approval" given to Bismarck's policy in a previous issue:

520 - Further Remarks of the *Ohio State Journal* on Bismarck

We do utterly abhor all religious persecution. We shall go the length of the universe farther than the COLUMBIAN in denouncing any and all forms of persecution for conscience sake. The conflict between the fugitive slave laws and the Higher Law, in this country, is still too recent for us to doubt that cases may have arisen in Germany where it is difficult to decide between the rights of the temporal power and the rights of conscience. That the "blood and iron" man will not hesitate to ride over everything in the way of his own interpretation of the rights and jurisdiction of the temporal power, we do not doubt. But surely, no one skilled in casuistry should have held us as assenting to the definitions of Bismarck in bounding his own jurisdiction, for the reason that we have assented to the principle upon which he bases his right to the matter wherein he assumes jurisdiction.

We are glad to place our cotemporary's hatred of persecution on record.

To be sure, it would have been handsomer to say, "What we meant was, that supposing Bismarck to be contending for really temporal rights, we approve him. Now, having been very busy lately, we have only had time to learn from our European exchanges (we do not read German rapidly) that there was some disagreement between Bismarck and the Catholic Church. And, as we have learned from our superior education among the most enlightened people of this advanced age, that the Catholic Church always was, is, and will be, wrong in every imaginable controversy, we approve of Bismarck, without, however, assenting to Bismarck as bounding his own jurisdiction."

520.

Editorial, *The Catholic Columbian*, May 1, 1875

[Further Remarks of the *Ohio State Journal* on Bismarck]

The *Ohio State Journal* of Thursday, April 22d, contains a denial of having ever approved Bismarck's course in Germany. Here are the editor's words.

We have neither canted nor recanted. We have simply endeavored courteously to show that one may approve an axiom in statecraft without being held to approve or disapprove relations between Church and State, and assumptions by the state of power to regulate the Church. We believe as little in the right of the State to regulate the Church, as in the right of the Church to regulate the State. The State has rightly nothing to do with the Church, and the Church has nothing to do with the State. The functions of the one are entirely secular, and of the other entirely spiritual. There can properly be no conflict, for the reason that the jurisdiction of the one is entirely separate and distinct from the jurisdiction of the other. They are as distinct in their elements as matter and spirit. The *Columbian* could not do a greater injustice, if it were to represent one as approving a given system of hygienic treatment for bodily ailments, because

520 - Further Remarks of the *Ohio State Journal* on Bismarck

he had expressed a belief in the doctrine that the body is material and the soul immaterial.

We would not misrepresent willfully any one's position, or even attribute to one the logical consequences of his position if he shows unconsciousness of them.

The *Journal* approved Mayor Heitmann for writing letters to the *Westbote** from Europe justifying Bismarck. Mayor Heitmann and Messrs. Reinhard and Fieser published cards denying that Mr. Heitmann had ever written letters approving Bismarck's persecution of the Catholic Church. The *Journal* rejoined that Heitmann was evading the issue, the question being, not whether he approved of persecution, but whether he approved of the policy of Bismarck. From this the *Columbian* took for granted that the *Journal* did approve of Bismarck's policy, and proceeded to show from Bismarck's actions what Bismarck's policy is, and therein is what the *Journal* calls the misrepresentation.

The editor now says that he "simply approved of the (Bismarck) doctrine that the subject owes his higher political allegiance to the civil power of his country, etc." But this is not the Bismarck doctrine, as Bismarck's acts show. And the editor in approving Bismarck, and meaning to approve only "the doctrine that the subject owes his highest temporal allegiance etc.," misrepresented himself, as he does again in the article we are now speaking of.

The sneer of the *Journal* at "the minds the Church is accustomed to deal with," seems very absurd, when you reflect that the Church has been accustomed to deal with all classes of minds for the past eighteen hundred years; from those as brilliant as that of the editor of the *Journal* to those others as dull as that of the editor of the *Columbian*.

The insinuation that the editor of the *Journal* gets one kind of statement from the Allocutions of the Holy Father and Monsignor Capel, and a different kind from the *Catholic Columbian*, is one that ought not to be made without specifications. Certainly we consider ourselves better authority as to what our belief is than Monsignor Capel, or any man's reading of the Allocutions of the Holy Father. It may seem to the editor of the *Journal* "arrogant and supercilious pedagoguery" in us to pretend to say what we believe and what we do not believe; but there is no help for it. We must say it; and must consider ourselves better authority on in than Mr. Gladstone or any other "champion."

The following must be quoted entire to be understood:

When the Church was ruled by men of policy and sense, as well as Christian charity, such blunders were impossible. But when priestly arrogance seeks to override the most independent and free thinking of all peoples, forcing the most extreme of all mere dogmas into collision with cherished civil rights, to the destruction of our system of secular education and free schools, and to the making of our tax levies and civil order subservient to a priestly hierarchy, we can wonder at nothing. "Whom the gods wish to

* The German-language newspaper of Columbus.

destroy they first make mad;" and the Romish Church is speedily making it impossible for the most liberal of the secular journals to defend it against the assaults of a sectarian press. It is a sad and suggestive fact that there is but one so-called 'Independent' newspaper in the United States today, that preserves such an attitude toward the Roman Catholic Church as to protect it from the anathemas of the priesthood. This shows that there is as little of the sagacity of the serpent as of the harmlessness of the dove in the leaders of the Church, within the boundaries of the United States.

Now for our want of policy, sense and Christian charity, we humble ourselves before the Searcher of hidden faults. But that we have "forced any extreme dogmas into collision with any civil rights," through our "want of sense, policy or charity," we steadfastly deny. The extremist dogma we have taught is that it "shall profit a man nothing if he gain the whole world and lose his soul"--that every one ought to be instructed to remember his Creator, in the days of his youth--and that it is not lawful for Catholic children to be sent to instructors who will impress it on their minds that they have no soul to save, and that the religion of Jesus Christ is an antiquated delusion.

Whether it is "priestly arrogance" for the Catholic hierarchy to teach this doctrine to "the most free thinking of all peoples," depends on whether they are representatives of Jesus Christ or not. If they are not, it may be arrogance--it may be self-delusion. If they are, those of whom Jesus Christ said, "He that hears you hears me," their teaching is no arrogance but plain duty. To tax a man to pay for educating his own and other people's children in a way his conscience does not approve, is no civil right but a civil wrong. And if a man chooses to form his conscience on the teachings of a priestly hierarchy which he believes appointed by Jesus Christ, he does not interfere with anybody's "cherished civil rights." We need no defense from the "most liberal secular journals." All we ask of them is not to lie about us.

Outside of unreasoning prejudice we cannot see why a man's being "ecclesiastical" should be to the discredit of what he says. What is there in the fact that a citizen of Ohio devotes himself to a career of study and labor for the good of others, which makes him so unmeasurably the inferior of the immigrant from another state who gives himself to the often crooked ways of getting office? We cannot see.

In taking leave of the *Ohio State Journal*, we freely accord our testimony to the general fairness with which it has been conducted from the time of the change five or six years ago up to that now occurring.

521.

Editorial, *The Catholic Columbian*, May 15, 1875 (4)

GERMANY.

The Suppression of Religious Orders.

The expulsion of religious orders from Germany by the Prussian government has been inaugurated by laws against the Jesuits and all "kindred orders" at the beginning of the conflict between the Holy See and Bismarck. The victims of this first measure were all the Jesuits and the Redemptorist Fathers, whose institutions were very flourishing. Besides them, some other religious congregations had to suffer, particularly those which take care of the education of children.

This first law did not seem decisive enough, as there were too many reasons of complaint against the government, when Sisters of St. Francis, or Brothers of the Christian Doctrine, or others like them, which have nothing to do with the Jesuits and are no "kindred orders," were exiled under that pretext. Therefore a new law against them was thought of and is at present before the House of Representatives of the Prussian Diet. It was originated in Dusseldorf some time ago by the governor of that district, largely inhabited by Catholics. He addressed his petition to Mr. Falck, the Minister of Public Instruction and Worship. This minister introduced the bill in the legislature. It provides that all religious orders shall be excluded from Prussia. Existing establishments are forbidden to receive new members, and their present organization must be dissolved within six months after the passage of the bill. Partial exception is made in favor of religious engaged in the work of education, which may prolong their existence four years, and of those whose object is the care of the sick which may continue their organization, but are liable to dissolution at any moment. Associations thus continuing are to be subject to the supervision of government officials. The property of the convents is not to be confiscated, but will be temporarily administered by the state.

This is the new law. It denotes, by its conception, a great ignorance of its object and the usual dishonesty of the Prussian government.

Who does not see that those partial exceptions are a folly, with the condition added that orders engaged in the education of children and in the nursing of the sick have to be subjected to the supervision of government officials! The reason why this law is conceived in such a way is because the government needs those orders for some time more--the ones for the schools, as the state institutions do not yet provide a sufficient number of teachers; the others for an impending war, or other calamities, when no one else wants to risk his life for charity's sake. Thus we understand well what these partial exceptions mean in the mind of Mr. Falck; but we wonder at the ignorance of the great statesman, believing, after all the lessons received to the contrary

from the Pope and the bishops, that the Church will submit herself to the supervision of state officials. He must know that the Catholic Church regards herself as sovereign in everything she does for the education of her people, and also in her charitable enterprises. These things belong to her spiritual empire, and in these she recognizes no king and no government as her superior. Consequently no religious community will accept the superintendency of the state, and the law is equivalent to an unconditional expulsion.

Concerning the property of the convents, the intentions of the government are unmistakably dishonest. They will not confiscate this property; it is not sold, but administered temporarily. This is evidently but a lie calculated to deceive the world at large. In whose name will they administer those estates? Certainly not in the name of their owners, for the government does not expect the orders to come back again after having expelled them and legally these orders do not exist any more in the eyes of the government, even if they continue their organization in foreign countries; nor will they administer them in the name of the Catholic Church, which they have already robbed in every way possible. For whom will they administer them? For themselves! Therefore Mr. Falck should have proposed the law as follows: *All religious orders are excluded from Prussia. The government will confiscate their property at the earliest moment possible.*

There are about 9,000 persons whom this law makes homeless. Since its introduction in the Prussian legislature, it has been proposed in the Federal Council to make it a general law for the whole German Empire. We do not doubt but that they will be successful. Thus the number of homeless people will be greatly increased.

Although it seems at present a terrible blow to the Church in Germany, it will confer largely to the growth and prosperity of the Catholic Church in other countries. The United States offer to those orders the greatest field of labor. Others will go to Chile, Peru, Ecuador and Brazil, where they already have their pioneers; Japan and India will also have their share. The organization and spirit of German religious bodies are most excellent, as we observe wherever we meet them, and thus they will undoubtedly contribute powerfully to the spreading of Catholic faith and charity.

522.

Editorial, *The Catholic Columbian*, Aug. 14, 1875 (2)

O'Connell and the German Bishops

It was but natural that his Eminence Cardinal Cullen and the Lord Mayor of Dublin turned their eyes toward the persecuted Church in Germany on the occasion of the O'Connell centennial celebration. The Ireland of O'Connell and Catholic Germany of today claim the honor to be the champions of religious liberty against tyrannical oppression of the secular power. Both are struggling for the same sacred cause and a

mutual sympathy is growing fast between the two countries. The noble example of Ireland's greatest son is certainly not without a deep influence on the firmness of the German bishops. What he so successfully obtained by his courage and brilliant talents for the emancipation of the Catholic Church in Ireland and England, the German Bishops will obtain for their people by their heroic resistance to a more fierce and brutal power.

This is the meaning of the invitation tendered to the archbishops of Cologne and Munich and the Bishops of Treves, Münster and Paderborn. Four of these dignitaries of the Church have been in prison for the cause of Jesus Christ, and deserve the attention and gratitude of all Catholic people. Besides them, Mr. Windthorst, the leader of the Catholic deputies in the Parliament at Berlin, the most powerful orator of Germany, was also invited to attend the celebration.

The Bishops as well as Mr. Windthorst declined the invitation of the Lord Mayor of Dublin. The reason is obvious. Their visit to Ireland would have been interpreted by Bismarck as an act of hostility, in allying themselves with a foreign nationality. Prudence and even the character of the conflict between church and state in Germany do not allow the Bishops to appeal to foreign countries in their behalf. They have the full approval of all the Catholics of the globe; they have the moral support of the whole Church, the universal kingdom of Christ. They need no human help and will not appeal to any nation. Let King William go around begging for the approval of Lord Russell and gain auxiliaries in the ranks of the Italian banditti, ask little Belgium to prohibit processions, and demand from France to suppress newspapers and pastorals; hunt up "Catholic" conspirators against his own and his dear Bismarck's lives; distribute to a lying press the stolen estates of the King of Hanover. This is his own policy, but we do not need such alliances, the Church being strong enough by herself to fight even a man like Bismarck or his imperial master.

But, although the German Bishops will not beg for the approval or the assistance of any worldly power, a government of people does well in supporting by their sympathies these Bishops in their struggle for liberty. And so Ireland did.

The liberal press is disgusted at this character given to the Centennial in Dublin. They call it an "Ultramontane" demonstration. They do not say "Catholic," because their liberal turn of mind inclines them to give us but contemptible names. They wish it to be forgotten that O'Connell, the great advocate of liberty, was not a liberal, but a devoted son of the Catholic Church. They cannot but express admiration for his spotless name and would honor themselves with it, but the Church which they hate claims his name, hence their disgust, or rather anger.

We should not, they say, make the centennial celebration of so great a man a protest against Bismarck's policy. But how is it possible to remember the name of O'Connell, who fought his whole life for the liberty of the Catholic Church in his

country, and not to condemn at the same time all tyrants and all kind of oppression? Every freedom-loving heart should protest against Bismarck, but because it happens that we Catholics advocate liberty of conscience, the liberals will not join, just for the same reason for which Know-Nothings clamored against us on the occasion of the Geghan bill's passage.

523.

Editorial, *The Catholic Columbian*, Aug. 28, 1875 (4)

A Lingua Iniqua

We have a vague impression of having lighted upon a sentence like this in some Know Nothing paper. "Certain Germans who have seen the evils coming from the mixing up of Church and State affairs are among those who unite in the anti-Catholic platform of the Republican Convention."

There are certain Germans and certain Americans and even more certain Irishmen who have seen this "evil." That is, there are certain men of all countries who blaspheme. They are good looking men--have no mark of Cain on their brows, no symptom of diabolical possession in their address and manners. And yet they speak evil of what is good as easily as they utter curses. What evil have these German people seen coming from the influences of the Catholic Church? They have seen their country dotted over with institutions of learning, piety and mercy by Catholic faith. They have seen these institutions seized and sold by lawless force in the midst of fierce wars. They have seen the faith remain and build again institutions of learning, piety and mercy in their midst. And now they see this ruthless robber, Bismarck, this callous materialist, who has taken Nero and Julian, and the first Napoleon for his model, again seizing upon the goods of the defenseless and thrusting them into prison and exile. "Which is it?" we ask of any candid man. Does the Church interfere with the state, or the state with the Church? Does the householder meddle with the burglar, or the burglar with the householder? Which is to blame--the highway robber or the man he robs? Bismarck wants to establish an empire that shall enthrall not only the bodies of twelve hundred thousand hirelings of the government, but the souls of those who have to work to pay them their salaries. He wants a clergy that shall preach to order, and a people that dare not think. And here, in America, in the free West, persons made shallow by anti-Catholic hatred are ready to applaud him, because he tramples upon justice and liberty in the name of anti-popery! What does liberty mean if it does not mean liberty for me as well as you?

e. Mexico

524.

Editorial, *The Catholic Columbian*, June 12, 1875 (2)

Liberalism

We have a clipping from an Anglo-Spanish paper, *The Two Republics*, containing an exultant letter to the editor of the *Official American Gazette*, from which we extract a terse summary of the victories of Liberalism over the Catholic Church, by an English Liberal who served under "that Zapoteco Indian" (as he calls him), Juarez:

SIR: There reaches us from Mexico the most important news we have received from that country since its independence from Spain. The grand revolution in favor of progress and conscience, which the "Liberal" party has there been waging for forty-two years, at length culminates in the passage by Congress of a law which prohibits any civil authority or corporate body from participating, in its official character, in the exercise of any religious creed. All religious "feast days" are suppressed. The designation of Sunday will only exist for the purpose of permitting employees to repose on that day from their labors. Religious instruction and the official practice of every creed are prohibited in all the establishments of the federation. No religious demonstration can take place publicly, except in the interior of churches.

The ministers of all creeds are prohibited from wearing special costumes or distinctive dresses, outside of their churches.

All their reunions must be public, but confined to their places of worship. No religious institution can acquire real estate or hold hypothecations of the same. The sisters of charity are abolished. The State recognizes no monastic order nor permits its establishment under any form or pretense whatever.

Brave laws! They have a ring of civilization in them which Europe might imitate to advantage.

Our readers will please observe, those *are* brave laws.

They are the kind of laws which Mr. Edward Noyes, formerly Governor of Ohio, would consider "brave" when he, lyingly, said in the Republican State Convention that the Geghan bill for liberty of conscience was passed under the lash of the priests.

These laws mean simply the suppression of all belief in a future world and the robbery of all funds which charity offers for the helpless.

How "brave" a law is that one for the suppression of the Sisters of Charity!

What valor in forbidding men and women to live in prayer and study and works of charity!

How chivalric and statesmanlike to define by act of Congress the cut of a clergyman's clothes!

What a spirit of liberty pervades the law forbidding religious demonstrations outside of churches!

525 - Catholic Church in Mexico

"They *have*," indeed, "a ring of civilization in them"--the civilization of the world and of the denial of all conscience and law but the law of brute force.

"The Mexican Liberal party," says this ruffianly atheist, "was born in 1834. Its problem was to destroy the organization of the Catholic Church and to exhaust (i.e. steal) its \$300,000,000 of property," vested in hospitals, orphan asylums, houses of education, and churches.

When Maximilian came to Mexico he had to restore to religious communities 5,000 houses and 150 convents. Back as far as 1842 the writer of this article remembers hearing talk of what might be done in Mexico by the aid of the Church's wealth. It struck his fancy even then that the project of seizing on that wealth as if it were lying around in the commons was a ruthless and unprincipled act. What else? Your adventurer finds a hospital with sick and sisters in it. He seized it under the law confiscating church property. He drives the sick and the sisters into the street, makes some "improvements" in it, and rents it to a hotel keeper. He has exhausted it. In the minds of these Liberals, the weak, the poor, the sick, the religious priests, Catholics who are only anxious for peace, are *not people*. They are not even cattle, but only rubbish to be cleaned off from "church property" in order that it may be "exhausted."

This is the civilization to which Gov. Noyes and that lying Danforth--who brazenly declared that the Geghan bill was put through by votes bought with priests' money--devote their talents.

525.

Editorial, *The Catholic Columbian*, June 19, 1875 (3)

Catholic Church in Mexico

Too Much Government.--Here is a sample:

"Office of the Constitutional City Authorities of Mexico. Section 2nd, No. 146. In a meeting held yesterday the following was approved:

"No sign or signs can be placed on any business or industrial house of the city without the permission of the respective Aldermen to whom they shall be brought for revision and correction."--Cal. paper.

This is another example of the sort of government which, like Bismarck's in Prussia, aims at the total suppression of everything intimating the existence of the Catholic faith. Mexicans have always evinced a high appreciation of the works of art, and accordingly have expended their genius in the embellishment of their shrines, churches and chapels, in a manner that may serve as a fitting example to those who claim to be their superiors in the grade of civilization. Their ardent love of display in religious ceremonials, the simple pious ideas they strive to carry out in the performance of their everyday duties, have ever been the subject of ridicule by the enemies of their faith. What, now, has appeared distasteful to the modernized Government of Mexico in

the simple signs of the workshops, stores and other business houses, is the display of some pious symbols, such as I.H.S. in monogram and a cross; the Sacred Heart with a cross; M. and rays of glory; the Lamb of the sacrifice; the chalice or some religious legend that these people have been wont to place upon their signs from the time that they first received the light of the Gospel from the teachings of the Catholic missionaries. In every part of Mexico, signs could have been embellished with such pictures as we meet with in Catholic churches, chapels, etc., and in houses where the occupants preserve the ancient faith. In this the Government finds cause of condemnation. An inspector must stamp *demonstratur* on the simple sign of a cigar manufacturer, or a candy vendor, before it can be fastened to its place.

This spirit of antagonism to the Catholic Church is fast finding its way among all governments, urged on merely by the impulse of passion, avarice and ignorance, and prompted to deeds of injustice and oppression by men whose highest ambition is the subversion of all social order and the establishment of infidelity. Of course, such attempts will be ultimately in vain. Despots, tyrants and persecutors run their career of crime and die, but the Church of God stands up prominently and brilliantly amongst the surrounding desolation, resting more firmly than ever, if such could be the case, upon the rock that the sea of human passion cannot move from its base. A duty, however, is now incumbent upon all Catholics. The whole world has been consecrated, at the request of our Holy Father, to the Sacred Heart of Jesus, and this duty which Catholics should feel themselves bound to perform, is to pray unceasingly to this adorable Heart that it would regard with compassion the many who daily outrage and insult it, that it would enkindle a more ardent love of God amongst all nations, and that it would strengthen the faith of those who through violent temptations may be led astray and fall into the dreadful chasm of indifferentism and viciousness.

Prayer is the weapon with which the Church obtains her victories, and that victory which overcometh the world is our faith.

f. Canada

526.

Editorial, *The Catholic Columbian*, Sept. 11, 1875 (2)

[State vs. Church in Montreal]

The Know-Nothing press catches eagerly at a bit of news that comes from Montreal, from which it appears that a certain man named Guibord, dying a member of a secret and forbidden organization, was refused burial in consecrated ground. Appeal was made to the Privy Council and a royal decree was issued commanding Guibord's remains to be buried in consecrated ground. The bishop, however, strenuously refused his consent, and of course, as it was a matter of spiritual authority, the trustees obeyed

their bishop rather than the state, for the state outstepped its bounds. The rougher class of people, who are ever aching for a row, of course took advantage of the state of affairs consequent upon the determination of Guibord's friends to bury him in consecrated ground, and gathered in a crowd at the cemetery gate, prevented the entrance of the hearse into the grave yard, and finally drove it off with stones and sticks. The military have therefore been summoned to put down a "Catholic riot" and see that the royal decree is executed. The determination of Guibord's friends to oppose the commands of the Church only proves that they were not of its faithful children, and were ignorant of its teachings. No more could a non-repentant person be permitted Christian burial than a non-repentant sinner could claim absolution of his sins. If we once admitted that the State has power over the Church in spiritual matters, we must necessarily admit that the State could dictate the terms upon which a sinner might be admitted into heaven, for Christ has said to His Church, "he that hears you, hears me, and he that despiseth you despiseth me." We could not approve of the action of the mob, for such a body is seldom, if ever, reasonable, nor do Catholics justify the action of those who by physical force prevented the desecration of their grave yard. Catholics have in all ages submitted to every sort of desecration with martyr's fortitude, awaiting the action of a just Judge, who will one day manifest to the world that it persecuted Him in the Church which he established.

Editorial, *The Catholic Columbian*, Sept. 25, 1875

Guibord, the Quebec member of a secret society, who died without the Sacraments, had no right to burial in consecrated ground. In purchasing a lot in the Catholic cemetery, he got simply the right to be buried there, subject to the laws of the Catholic Church. Dying an apostate, his friends had no more right to place his corpse in that lot than they had to build a shanty and open a saloon on it. The English court decided in substance that no contract is binding when the Catholic Church is a contractor, and that the church yard must be desecrated. The Archbishop of Quebec decided to submit to the decision, and to fence off the Guibord grave from the rest of the enclosure, so as to save the whole cemetery from desecration. But some French Canadians got excited about it and resisted the burial by menacing demonstrations. That is all the Guibord case.

Editorial, *The Catholic Columbian*, Nov. 20, 1875

Guibord Burial

Notwithstanding the fact that the friends of Guibord, backed by the police and military, were expecting a row at the burial of his dust and ashes on Tuesday last, still the telegraph informs us that no excitement could be aroused on either side, and the

526 - State vs. Church in Montreal

press of the country, as well as the plug-uglies of Canada, who were anticipating a scrimmage, were sadly cheated out of an anticipated feast. The good Archbishop and priests of Montreal extended their influence in the prevention of a row, and succeeded. It was not owing to the presence of police and military that the ruffians did not attack the procession. Why did Guibord's friends leave him at the grave? Why did they not have the powerful escort accompany him to the gates of heaven, and usher him in? Vain, foolish men! to make a mockery of God and His holy religion.