

The Catholic Journal.

VOL., II NO. 10.

ROCHESTER, N. Y., SATURDAY, DECEMBER 6, 1890.

PRICE, 3 CENTS.

A Protestant Answered. CRITICISMS ON THE CHURCH CLEVERLY REFUTED.

The Jesuits and Their Motto—The Slanderous Charge that They Teach "The End Justifies the Means."

(Contributed to the JOURNAL.)

[CONTINUED.]

It is not to be wondered at that the Jesuits have been charged with teaching that "the end justifies the means," because even our Blessed Lord was accused of teaching false doctrine. You remember, no doubt, how they slandered Him before Pilate's Court when they said, "We have found this man perverting our nation and forbidding to give tribute to Caesar," whereas he had taught them in plain language to "render unto Caesar what is Caesar's and to God what is God's." He also reminded His disciples and followers of the treatment they must expect. "The disciple," said He, "is not above the Master. If they have called the good man of the House Beelzebub, how much more them of the household?" St. Matt. x, 24 and 25. Remember that Beelzebub is "prince of the devils," whose "end" is revenge upon the Almighty, and this "end," in his private judgment, "justifies the means," which is the destruction of souls. So, it seems the charge, in other words, was made against Christ Himself, since they called Him Beelzebub. And St. Paul tells us in his Epistle to the Romans iii, 8, that the Apostles also were so accused: "And not rather," says he, "as we are slandered and as some affirm that we say: let us do evil, that there may come good." So you see the same charge has been made against Christ, against His Apostles, and against the Jesuits. Let them make what attempt they will, they cannot prove their charge, for a negation cannot be proved. The accusers in each particular case stand on the same unhallowed ground—calumny—of which Shakespeare says:

"No might nor greatness in mortality
Can censure scape; back-wounding calumny
The whitest virtue strikes."

Dr. Cox, Protestant Episcopal Bishop of Western New York, repeated this stale charge against the Jesuits a few years ago in Rochester. His neighbors, the Jesuits of Buffalo, called upon him in justice to substantiate the charge. Every opportunity was given him. They offered him free access to their library, that he might consult the theological treatises of the Jesuits, and warranted him the kindest treatment. Moreover they put up a purse of \$1,000, to go, if I remember aright, to the poor of the city of Buffalo, in case he could verify his charge. What did he do? He held his peace until the local and other papers began to poke fun at the gallant soldier who had entered the lists without the "necessary" equipment. For a true picture of the plight in which he put himself read the twenty-eighth, twenty-ninth, thirtieth, thirty-first and thirty-second verses of the fourteenth Chapter of St. Luke's Gospel!

Interest grew and great was the amusement the Rt. Rev. old gentleman caused when, to stop the clatter, he attempted a justification by quoting from a cyclopedia the "Jesuitical" principle: "Finis determinat probitatem actus." He showed not so much his intellectual or moral weakness by the source from which he took the quotation. But he translated it: "The end justifies the means!" Ha, ha, ha, excuse me, but I can't help it. He could just as well have translated

it: "The end is the other extremity," but that would not be to the purpose! Did he know no better? Or did he count upon the supposed ignorance of those anxiously interested in his triumph?

The principle told decidedly against him. It is a very old principle, as old as the oldest system of judicature that the world has ever known. Therefore it can scarcely be called a Jesuitical principle, but is rather a Catholic principle which the Jesuits and all good people hold or admit. The correct translation is: "The end determines the morality of an act."

To show you how this principle has place in the moral code: Suppose a man is brought into court charged with murder. The accused pleads that he shot the man while under the impression that he was shooting a bear coming toward him in the dark. The question of the accused's guilt or innocence must be determined then, by the so-called end or intention of the killer. If he thought he was killing a bear, he was not guilty of the crime of murder. If he knew that he was killing a man, then he was guilty of murder. So, "the end or intention determines the morality of an act." This is simply common or moral law. The principle belong to what are called the Sources of Morality, which are three, namely: the object, the end, or intention, and the circumstances of an act. It is plain from the case given, what is meant by the end or intention. The object is simply the deed. The circumstances are all the accidental details which attach to the deed and serve to show what was done, and why.

Now, the plain teaching of the Church, and consequently of the Jesuits, on this score, is that these sources, one and all, must be good, otherwise the act is vitiated. Hence the axiom:

Bonum ex integra causa; malum e quocumque defectu; which may be translated:

That deed is good which from its every source is undefiled.
And that bad which bears a taint.

Your definition of what you style "Ignatius' Motto" is ingenuous and perfectly in keeping with Protestant tactics. It is a thing only partially defined, like the "two-legged horse." You give as the meaning of the "Motto" that "We can do anything for the good of the Church, even persecute, put in prison, torture and kill all who will not become Roman Catholics."

This is the very essence of silliness, but it is your definition. Logic requires that a definition contain all that is in the thing defined, nothing more, nothing less. Your definition, besides being slanderous and silly, violates the rule of logic by defect; because it had to be a case of special pleading that would catch the so-called Roman Catholic and let the Protestant escape! "The end justifies the means" is a general proposition, and must be dealt with as such before any particular definition of it can be made, but you give a particular application and no other. It is a false and execrable principle however applied; but the correct definition of it is an important thing for the truth of the matter. St. Paul defined it exactly when he said "We are slandered in that they say we teach: Let us do evil that good may come."

Those, whether so-called Catholics or Protestants, who hold the principle that the "end justifies the means," simply hold the justifiableness of any evil done under the impression that good may come from it. And you know murder is not the only evil, nor is persecution, imprisonment or torture. Every crime, every sin is an

evil; therefore every crime, or sin, to which the particular mind may avert as the source from which some alleged good may come is reached by this wicked principle.

(TO BE CONTINUED.)

IRISH NEWS.

Mr. Patrick O'Brien, who represents North Monaghan, has resigned his seat in order that his constituents may be represented in Parliament during the coming session, which it is supposed will be a most important one. The honorable gentleman's sentence to six months' imprisonment for alleged contempt of Court at Tipperary is the cause of his resignation.

The thirty-fifth session of the School of Medicine of the Catholic University of Dublin was formally opened by Archbishop Walsh, (who is Chancellor of the University), on Nov. 5. Professor Nixon (Dean) read an address of welcome to the Archbishop. The latter addressed the pupils at some length, and made the announcement that, being recently elected Chancellor, he had decided to establish a yearly Chancellor prize in the University, for whichever study the faculty may select.

At the chapel of the Presentation Convent, Oranmore, on October 28, Miss Kathleen Fagan (in religion Sister Mary Rose), daughter of Thomas Fagan, of Athboy, Meath, and Miss Ellen Clarke (in religion Sister Agnes) daughter of Mr. John Clarke, of Balinglass, Wicklow, received the white veil, and Miss Margaret Conaughton made her religious profession.

Mr. John Kelly was released from Tullamore jail on Nov. 2. In the evening he went to Dublin, a large number of the people of Tullamore escorting him to the railway station.

The handsome new Convent of the Sacred Heart, in Cookstown, was formally opened on Nov. 6, when the Sisters of Mercy, who had been temporarily staying in the lay house, entered into possession. Archbishop Logue made a brief address, pointing out the great advantage of an educational training under a religious community. Archbishop Croke solemnly blessed the building and afterwards celebrated the first Mass in the Oratory.

On November 4, a magnificent silk flag, on which was inscribed the word, "Unconquerable Tipperary," was hoisted by Lady Robinson, on the Square, at the upper end of William O'Brien street, New Tipperary. Addresses were made by Lady Robinson and Father Humphreys. It will be remembered that the police tore down the flags in the same place a number of times, but they were always replaced by the people.

Among the countless heart-rending scenes attending evictions in Ireland, the following sad case may be taken as a type of hundreds of others. A family named Boyd, consisting of nine people, were recently evicted by Lord Arden. For more than a month they had lived under a boat, erected as a shelter, by a ditch. The Rev. A. Finerty, P. P., of Ballyskeery, who recently visited them, described their condition as most pitiful. They barrowed under the ditch at night for shelter; the water was flowing under their miserable bed, and their clothing was rotting with dampness. The boat had to be covered with manure both to keep out the rain and to give a little heat. There is no house in the neighborhood where the unfortunate family could be sheltered, and they would not be allowed back to their former home as caretakers.

JACK AND TOM.

(Written for THE JOURNAL by NAWIN.)

(Continued.)

CHAPTER II.

What right have they to claim institution by Christ? None whatever. The "Church of the English" or Episcopalian makes the greatest pretensions. And whence came it? It was the outcome of the rebellious intellect and proud heart of a profligate rascal who threw religion to the winds because the representative of Christ on earth, a child of the Immaculate Virgin Mary, refused to bless his unholy liaison with a shameless woman while his lawful and virtuous wife was yet living. Because the gratification of his unholy lusts was interfered with by the Holy Father, Henry VIII threw off his religious mask and proclaimed himself the apostle, the founder of a new religion! A pretty spectacle forsooth! And an edifying head from which to emanate! A beautiful exponent of the Divine Savior's life and teachings!

"I will grant all you say about the English Church, Tom. I don't have much respect for it myself. In fact, my father says it is but a pup of the Catholic Church, and that, if he had to accept either, he would far rather throw in his lot with simon pure Catholicism."

"Yes? Well I can't say as I agree with your father in his view of condemnation of the English Church. I am glad to say it retains many Catholic forms and hope, in time, to see it reunited to the fold from which it has divorced itself. By the way, Jack, is not your father a Methodist?"

"Yes."
"Strange, then, that he should hold the views he does. The Methodists owe allegiance to Wesley, who was himself an intense Episcopalian."

"True, but he was disgusted with abuses which existed in the Church and started a crusade against them."

"Quite right. But to his dying day Wesley remained an Episcopalian, and regretted deeply the denomination he had unwittingly instituted. I am rather curious to hear how your father gets around the fact that his Church was really instituted by Henry VIII. Clearly the Methodists can trace their existence no further back, unless they run afoul of the Catholic Church, and I never yet heard they admitted the Catholic Church as a truly Christian denomination."

"I will endeavor to explain as clearly as I can. My father believes there always has been an invisible Church, composed of all those who, in different ages, believed in Christ, loved His religion, and worshipped Him in spirit and in truth; that the number of these was known only to God; that they were invisible to the world and were not necessarily connected with any visible Christian communion, but yet always existed, pure in faith and strong in charity, in the midst of the surrounding corruption."

"My dear fellow, that is a mere assumption without proof, and is fraught with endless contradictions and inconsistencies. Where is the evidence of the constant succession of immaculate and invisible Christians? If they were invisible how can you prove their existence?"

"I suppose history will enlighten you."

"Not on that point. History bears evidence only to things that were palpable and visible."

"Don't reason tell you there must have been such sort of thing?"

[CONTINUED.]

Bishop Watterson of Cleveland, O., has appointed Rev. James Mahoney as his secretary.

THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION.

Why the Catholic Church Upholds the Doctrine of Catholic Belief.

St. John the Baptist was sanctified before his birth, but some time after his conception; Catholics believe that the Blessed Virgin was, by a special privilege, preserved Immaculate, that is, free from the state of original sin, from the first moment of her conception.

The Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary, or her conception without the stain of original sin, refers to her soul, not to her body; for it is an admitted principle in theology that a human body is not in itself capable of guilt and of the stain of sin, as sin causes a moral and not a material stain. The Catholic Church teaches that in all other human beings descended from Adam, the soul when created and united by God to the infant body yet unborn, necessarily contracts, by thus becoming a child of fallen Adam, the stain of original sin, which can afterwards be washed away by having the merits of Jesus Christ applied to it; but that, with the Blessed Virgin Mary, it was otherwise, for, at the very instant in which her soul was created and infused into her body, she was preserved from contracting the stain of original sin, by having sanctifying grace bestowed upon her in the very first moment of her existence, and this through the foreseen merits of Jesus Christ; her son, which were applied to her in the way of prevention, and therefore, in a special and most perfect manner.

The Koran of Mahomet, written twelve centuries ago, declares (chap. 3) that Mary the Mother of Jesus was always protected from all the attacks of Satan.

The doctrine of the Immaculate Conception was solemnly defined as an article of Catholic faith by Pope Pius IX, speaking *ex Cathedra* December 8, 1854. In the book of Genesis (iii, 15) God said to the serpent: "I will put enmities between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed."

According to all ancient interpreters this is a prophecy. The woman mentioned is Mary, the Mother of Jesus Christ, and the seed of the woman is Jesus Christ Himself, the Redeemer of mankind. Certainly the enmity which exists between Jesus Christ and the serpent, that is, the devil, is a perpetual one, and excludes sin of all kinds. But the same enmity, it is here declared by God, should exist between the woman (that is, the Blessed Virgin Mary) and the evil spirit. Therefore it follows that the enmity which exists between the Virgin Mary and the devil must be a perpetual one, necessarily excluding all sin, and, therefore, also original sin, which of itself suffices to enslave a person to the devil.

Theodoret, St. Ephrem, St. Cyril of Alexandria, St. Maximus, Bishop of Turin, St. Chrysostom, and many others of the early Fathers, support the doctrine in their writings. In fact, St. Cyril says: "With the exception of Christ and His Blessed Mother, we are all born in sin."

Who can believe that, it being in the power of God the Son to exempt the Blessed Virgin, who was to be His Mother, from contracting the stain of original sin, he did not do so? Who can believe that, it being in the power of God the Son to prepare a spotless holy temple wherein to dwell incarnate, He preferred to have one which had been first profaned by the stain of original sin?

Mr. Barry Sullivan, the famous Irish Tragedian, is seriously ill at his