

WESTERN WATCHMAN



A CATHOLIC JOURNAL DEVOTED TO THE INTERESTS OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN THE WEST.

Established 1865—Vol. XXXIII—No. 35.

ST. LOUIS, MO., DECEMBER 24, 1908.

FORTY-SECOND YEAR

CREEDS OF THE PRESIDENTS.

Six Were Episcopalians, Four Presbyterians, Four Methodists, and Four Unitarians.

Some one has been stirred by the recent controversy over Mr. Taft's religious belief to tabulate the presidents according to their church affiliations. The St. Louis Christian Advocate prints the list, and from it may be seen, as that journal observes, that the creeds of the presidents "have been almost as varied as their policies and personalities."

"Washington was an Episcopalian, and one of his biographers says he was a communicant, while another declares that although he was a regular attendant on the services of that church, he was no more than an adherent and sympathizer. John Adams was a Unitarian, having been brought up in that faith and adhering to it all his life. Thomas Jefferson was repeatedly charged with being a free-thinker, some even said an atheist of the French school, but after his death his friends and family asserted that he was a believer in God and divine revelation, the immortality of the soul, and a future life, their statements being sustained, by certain letters and documents found among his papers. Madison and Monroe were both members of the Episcopal church, remaining in that connection all their lives."

"John Quincy Adams was a Unitarian and for most of his life was connected with the same congregation which bore on its rolls the name of his father. For the greater part of his life, General Jackson had no religious affiliation whatever, but in the evening of his days, and mainly through the influence of Mrs. Jackson, he attended the Presbyterian church, and after her death became in fact as well as form a member. On his estate he built a Presbyterian church and spent much money in contributing to its support."

"Martin Van Buren was not a member of any church, but was a regular attendant on the services of the Dutch Reformed church, near his home in Kinderhook, N. Y. William Henry Harrison was a communicant and for a time a vestryman in the Episcopal church. For a long time after his death his pew in Christ church, Cleveland, O., bore the silver plate indicating its ownership. In his inaugural address, he made what he called 'a confession of faith,' testifying to his religious belief. Tyler, like Harrison, was an Episcopalian, and personally a very devout man. Polk was not a member of any religious denomination, though in deference to Mrs. Polk, he generally attended the services of the Presbyterian church. During his last illness he was baptized by a Methodist clergyman, a friend and neighbor, and formally received as a member of the Methodist church."

"President Taylor was a regular attendant on the services of the Episcopal church, and although the testimony is somewhat conflicting, it seems probable that he was a member. Millard Fillmore was a Unitarian, born and raised in a family belonging to that denomination. President Pierce was a Trinitarian Congregationalist, and his religion is described as 'more of the head than of the heart.' Buchanan was a very acceptable member of the Presbyterian church."

"President Lincoln, although described by his biographers as a man of deep re-

ligious convictions, was not a member of any denomination, although he often attended the Presbyterian church. Andrew Johnson was not a church member, although during his residence in Tennessee he generally attended the Methodist church. General Grant never connected himself with any church; though when he attended services at all, it was generally those of the Methodists. It is said that shortly before his death he became a member. Hayes was for many years a member of the Methodist church. Garfield was the only president who ever officiated as a preacher and pastor. After leaving the pulpit for the platform, he remained a member of the Disciples of Christ. President Arthur was prominently connected with the leading Episcopal churches of New York City. President Cleveland was a regular attendant and, in his later years, it is said, a member of the Presbyterian church. President Harrison was a Presbyterian and for many years an elder of a church in Indianapolis. President McKinley was a Methodist. President Roosevelt is a member of the Dutch Reformed church. President-elect Taft is a Unitarian."

FATHER LACORDAIRE.

The Great Orator, Died December 6, 1861

The Frenchman has an inborn aptitude for oratory, and seldom, for any period, are the pulpit and tribune of his nation deprived of the illumination of genius. Among the greatest of modern French orators was Father Lacordaire. For years the delivery of a discourse by him had only to be announced to assemble a crowded audience, waiting with breathless interest for the words from his mouth.

Henry Lacordaire was the son of a village doctor of Recey-sur-Ource, in Burgundy, where he was born in 1802. The gentleness of his temper, for which he was afterwards remarkable, distinguished him from his cradle, and the fiery eloquence by which he was to work such wonders may almost be said to have been a gift of his boyhood.

His father died when he was four years of age, and his mother, a strong and courageous Christian, placed him at the age of ten, in the college of Dijon, where for several years he studied, showing a marked talent for rhetoric. He left college with the faith that his mother had so carefully cultivated destroyed, owing to the system of education, in which religion held but a secondary place. He then entered law school at Dijon, where he attained high celebrity in the local debates of the advocates.

In 1822 he went to Paris, where his legal talents soon attracted attention. Meanwhile, a great change was passing over his convictions. Lamennais had published his "Essay on Indifference." Lacordaire read and was convinced. Soon he expressed a desire to lead a religious life and was admitted to the Seminary of St. Sulpice, where he studied for four years, being ordained priest on September 22, 1827. Towards the close of 1829 the desire to lead an apostolic life led him to determine on embracing a career in the new and fertile field of America. At this time Bishop Dubois, of New York, was traveling in France, and Father Lacordaire had an interview respecting the project with Bishop Dubois.

"Who is there," said Father Lacordaire in a discourse, shortly after his interview

with Bishop Dubois, "who at moments when the state of his own country saddens him, has not turned his eyes toward the Republic of Washington? Who has not in fancy, at least, sat down to rest under the shadow of her forests and her lands? Weary with the spectacle I beheld in France, it was on that land that I cast my eyes, and thither I resolved to go, to ask the hospitality she has never refused to a traveler or a priest."

Father Lacordaire, having obtained the consent of his Archbishop, went to Burgundy to bid farewell to his parents and relatives. But while there he received a letter from a friend, which changed his course and determined him to remain in France.

In 1834 he began a course of lectures in the chapel attached to the College Stanislaus, in Paris, and his eloquence attracted the intellect of the country and established his fame as an orator. These discourses made such an impression upon Archbishop Dequelen that he invited Father Lacordaire to preach the Lenten course in the Cathedral of Notre Dame, in 1835. These sermons, which were admired, no less for their literary excellence than for their religious fervor, added to his fame.

In 1836 he went to Rome to study theology. He had already conceived the plan of founding a religious order in France, and, after preaching in 1838 in Notre Dame, he returned again to Rome and entered the Dominican Order, passing his novitiate in the Convent of Quercia, pronouncing his solemn vows on April 12, 1848. He subsequently published his "Life of St. Dominic," which ran through many editions in a few years and was translated into several European languages.

In 1841 he resumed his discourses at Notre Dame and preached afterward in the principal cities of France, exciting great enthusiasm everywhere, and increasing his fame.

From this onward he labored to re-establish in France the Order of Preachers, and struggled with the French Government for the liberty of the religious orders. On the outbreak of the Revolution of 1848 Father Lacordaire was elected to the Constituent Assembly and appeared there in his Dominican habit. He soon resigned when he found that his reconstructive theories would have little chance in the conflicts of partisan politics.

In 1854 he was appointed to the direction of the free college of Sereze, and preached his last sermon in Paris. Only once was he recalled from his provincial solitude. In 1860 he was elected to fill a vacant chair in the French Academy. Montalembert desired him to remain in Paris for a few days after his installation, but he answered:

"No, I cannot; it would perhaps prevent some of my children, who are preparing for the coming festival, from going to Confession. No one can say what the loss of one Communion may be in the life of a Christian."

With such zeal did he give himself to his new duties that Soreze, under his care, took rank as the first school in the south of France.

His observance of monastic rule was rigorous. "The great men of antiquity were poor," he used to say. "Luxury is the rock on which every one splits today. People no longer know how to live on little. A great heart in a little house is of

all things here below that which has ever touched me most." During the last two years of his life he suffered much from sickness, and he died on December 6, 1861; his last words were: "My God! open to me—open to me!"

A complete life of this eloquent Dominican, whose name is one of the most brilliant in the history of the Church in France, is yet to be looked for. Rich, however, as Father Lacordaire's life was in materials for such a book, it was a life comparatively poor in striking incidents—life whose best side lay apart from the world, and whose beauty could be seen only by the light of genuine religious spirit.

CHANGES IN THE MASS.

Past Practices in the Catholic Church Regarding Communion.

(From the Rosary Magazine.)

In the early days every one who remained through the Mass received holy communion; but even in the time of St. Chrysostom this practice was lapsing, as we find him complaining that many were content to receive the Eucharist once a year.

The Council of Autin, 670, declared that no one was to be held a Catholic who did not receive at Christmas, Easter and Pentecost. The Council of Trent, in the sixteenth century, desired that all who assist at Mass should communicate sacramentally, and required that every Catholic should at least communicate at Easter time.

Up to 1414 the faithful received from the chalice also at special times. The primitive Christian customs in Rome and elsewhere, however, and the oldest traditions also prove that communion in one kind was always common, and from the very first reservation in one kind was made not only for communion for the laity but also as "fermentum," sent as a pledge of unity and love from one bishop to another. In all these instances it was the Host only which was reserved.

When it was first objected that the Eucharist in one kind was not a complete Eucharist, the Council of Constance made it a universal discipline of the Church to communicate people, whether at Mass or not, in one kind only; the celebrant of the Mass alone receiving both the Host and the chalice. It is therefore a question of discipline whether the Eucharist be received in one or both kinds.

Communion in both kinds was more or less practiced up to the fifteenth century—that is, it was permitted, and in many places was almost universal. The Host was dipped in the chalice, as is still done in the East, though this practice was condemned by the Council of Clermont and by Paschal II.

For about six hundred years the Eucharist was received in the hands. An order was soon established in regard to precedence of communicants, and then the deacons, widows and others in the sanctuary received first after the celebrant; then deaconesses and consecrated virgins, children and lay men and women last.

A synod of Auxerre, about 578, decreed that the women should not take the Host in the uncovered hand; also that women must not touch the altar cloth when communicating. In Gaul, in the sixth century, people still communicated at the altar, not outside the sanctuary; then consumed the particle with their hand resting on the altar.



REV. D. S. PHELAN, Editor.

Those girls whom the President reprimanded on Thanksgiving Day had escaped from their chaperon and, not knowing who the two gentlemen ahead were, started a flirtation on horseback. These finishing school lassies are dangerous people to meet on lonely ways.

We have received the December Bulletin of the St. Louis University, containing among other interesting matter, a historical sketch of the institution from the pen of Rev. Father Fanning. We learn from it for the first time that the St. Louis University was founded in 1818, not by the Jesuits, but by Bishop Dubourg; and that its first president was a diocesan priest. The Jesuits took over the institution in 1829.

The latest news from the bedside, of the Bishop of Rochester is that his life is despaired of and the news of his death may be heralded at any time. We shall believe that Bernard McQuaid is dead when he is laid out and smiling in his coffin. He did not make his peace with Father Lambert, although we urged him to do it; and for that we shall mulct him many nice sentences of eulogy. He was a striking example of the "fortiter in re," if not in the "suaviter in modo."

The Supreme Court of the District of Columbia has condemned Samuel Gompers to one year in jail; John Mitchell to nine months in jail, and Secretary Morrison to six months in jail for violating its injunction issued last March. We feel sure that these men will never see the inside of a prison, and they should not. But they and all other laborers will now know that there are some things that united labor cannot do with impunity.

Now we know what aids our very low birth rate. It is the tariff. A young lady graduate of an Eastern college writes to the "Independent" to say so. Whereupon our staid contemporary puts on a grave and solemn look and says that such was not the purpose of the tariff; on the contrary its *raison d'être* was to protect our infant industries. A high tariff on divorce might remedy the evil complained of.

Everyone on both sides of the Atlantic has observed the close resemblance of character and disposition between President Roosevelt and the Emperor William. They are both honest and explosive; both careless of the conventionalities and impatient of restraint; and both of late inclined to tittle. The Kaiser has invented a tittle that effervesces without intoxicating and we move there be no duty placed upon the article by Congress.

"El Pais," Mexico's Catholic daily, announces that Rome has at last chosen a successor to the late Archbishop of Alarcon, Primate of Mexico. The prelate selected is Don Jose Mora, Bishop of Leon. The neoprimate is a man of great humility, as well as an indefatigable worker and scholar. Judging from his past, "El Pais" declares that under his reign the Catholic Church in Mexico will become one of the most notable forces on the continent, due to his administrative genius and capacity for labor.

Bishop Michaud, of Burlington, Vt., died in New York on Monday last. He had been ailing a long time and had recently made a visit to Lourdes. John Stephen Michaud was the son of a French father and an Irish-Canadian mother, and was made Bishop of Burlington in June, 1892, succeeding the saintly Bishop De Gossbreand, who was bishop of that see from 1853. Burlington is a diocese of Canadians, and it has taken both tact and prudence to harmonize the different elements. This the two bishops did to a remarkable degree.

Those stupid Lutherans are getting their big feet deeper and deeper in the manure. The latest attack of the "Lutheran" contains the question: what would Catholics do with the Protestants of the country if they succeeded in making the nation Catholic? Make them go to confession regularly and obey the Pope, of course.

The Emperor of Germany has taken the pledge, and will sit beside Taft on the international water wagon. It is the most sensible thing William ever did. Nearly all the heads of the great states are now teetotalers. What a change in the past fifty years! The whole world is just waking up to the truth that men, to be able to do anything at any time must keep their wits about them all the time.

It will not be many years before we shall be building Dreadnaughts of the air. The English people are thoroughly aroused to the possibilities of the airship, and they admit that England is no longer an island, but a country in the mainland of the navigable air. Steamships, fortifications and armies are now as useless as would be the battering rams of the ancients or the crossbows of the Crusaders. The Wright Brothers are the most wonderful revolutionists the military world has yet produced. We shall have to give a new meaning to what the Scripture calls the "powers of the air."

The daily press of the United States is fast running to seed; or, what is the same thing, into the penny drawer. Our daily papers are becoming as cheap as an almanac. They have no domestic telegraph service to speak of; and their foreign telegraph service is totally abandoned. If one wishes to know what is going on in Europe he must subscribe for a European paper. Take, for instance, the "Osservatore Romano." It is a paper of very limited resources; but it has more telegraph news from all the capitals of Europe than can be found in the largest New York dailies. We would much rather pay two cents for a paper and get one cent's worth of news, than to pay one cent and get nothing.

Catholic papers, as a rule, are entirely too mealy-mouthed in resenting and repelling attacks made on the Church by the Protestant press. We have often inadvertently on the vulgar and supercilious tone of our sectarian exchanges towards all things Catholic. The "Living Church" (Episcopalian) recently declared that "the Roman press" in America and England "constitutes perhaps the chief bar to friendly relations" between Anglicans and Roman Catholics; and that "those not in a position to see the Roman Catholic paper can have little idea of the violently polemical matter printed therein." To this charge the "Lamp," an Episcopalian periodical, replies that it has probably on its list of exchanges a larger number of Roman Catholic weeklies, monthlies and quarterlies than any other Anglican periodical; "therefore," says the "Lamp," "we think we are in a position to judge of the relative charity or want of charity toward each other of the Anglican and Roman press, and we do not hesitate to say, and to say it emphatically, that the burden of offense in this regard is on our side. . . . In view of the carping, snarling tone so generally employed by the Anglican church press in reference to Rome, we are frequently filled with admiring wonder at the forbearing and truly charitable spirit displayed towards ourselves by so many of the Roman Catholic exchanges that come constantly to our desk."

THE RELIGION OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE.

A Frenchman traveling in the Highlands was curious to find out what kind of a garment the Highlander's breeches was, and was surprised to learn that the Highlander had no breeches. When we ask what the religion of the American people is, we are forced to answer that the American people have no religion. They claim to be Christians in a way, to

differentiate themselves from pagans; but the great majority of them are unbaptized and belong to no church. But that is not all. They do not want baptism and they stubbornly decline any church affiliation. And what is still more; they do not want their children baptized or enrolled in the membership of any church. The church of the American people is the United States and their religion is pure and unadulterated secularism. We have not God in the Constitution, and we do not want Him there. We have no religion in our public schools, and we do not want any there. We have no objection to churches, but those who build them can use them. We will none of them. We don't mind the girls having a swell wedding, but the marriage is a secular and purely civil arrangement, and has no significance beyond what the contracting parties see fit to put into it. Without being hostile to any religion, the American people are unalterably committed to a bald secularism in everything. Some priests are foolish enough to think that the American people can be frightened into a compromise on the school question by showing the lamentable effects of godless education on the young. If half the youth of the country were in the penitentiary the American people would not be willing to save the balance by enforced religious instruction. They do not think religion is good for anything; being a mere empty and meaningless sentiment; or, to use a phrase of our coining: "a barren idealism." And we are educating the whole world in this cult. Secularism is the cry everywhere throughout the civilized, and even the semi-civilized world. They want no religion in any country in Europe today. There are good people everywhere—Christian, God-fearing people; but while they control the press and politics for the time being, the deep roar of the populace everywhere is for a government and social institutions from which religion shall be divorced completely. The people everywhere are clamoring, not for more, but for less religion; and they will not cease from agitation until the whole world is secularized.

The word "secular" has now a meaning it did not have before. It means a religion; a faith and a cult. That is why we do not like to apply the epithet to our clergy. Catholics do not like to say "secular priest," however honorable that designation once was, as signifying clergymen who, instead of devoting themselves exclusively to their own sanctification, seek their own and the people's sanctification also. But the priests of the orders hesitate to apply the term, because of its bad sound. The secular clergy are often the least secular of all the men who minister at God's altar. If we had our way the word "secular" would not in future be used save in derision and contempt.

But those who expect to see the American people repudiate the word for themselves and their attitude towards all religion will wait a long time. It is the word that best defines their politics, their domestic relations and their sentiments on religion. If we insist on more religion under our system of laws they will answer by giving us less. It is a dangerous discussion to stir up, and bootless as well as dangerous. In his report to the Holy Father Archbishop Glennon stated that there were 18,000,000 Catholics in the United States. Taking the population of the country at 85,000,000, which is not too high a figure, we have 67,000,000 who are not Catholics. Of these three-fourths, or over 50,000,000, are not baptized. What is the use of talking religion or religious education to these? Spitting against the wind.

AFRAID WE WILL GET THEM.

No one is more honest with Protestants than we are, for no one knows them better. There is a great deal of controversy now going on as to the attitude of Protestants towards Catholics holding political office. We have published statements from Baptist and Lutheran bodies, and individual declarations from prominent men in all the Protestant sects. They are all agreed on the question.

They would not vote for a Catholic for political office, least of all for the presidency of the United States; and they all give the same or similar reasons. Some say it is because Catholics owe first allegiance to the Pope, and therefore they cannot vote for them. Others declare that all Catholics believe in the union of Church and State; and they under no circumstances would vote to give them political power. Others give other reasons; but one and all declare that they would not vote for Catholics, and mostly all for the two reasons given above.

But is there not a reason behind these two reasons which these Protestants are not willing to admit even to themselves? Are not these two reasons too theoretical and entirely too academic for the majority of Protestants? They know very little of the meaning and import of allegiance, civil or ecclesiastical; and they do not know what Catholics understand by the term. They have a very vague and indistinct notion of the union of Church and State, and are not aware that such union exists more or less in every state in Christendom. What they really oppose and what they wish to emphasize by their vote is that they do not want to be dragged into the Catholic Church. They fear that if the Catholic Church should get the upper hand in this country she might induce the state to suppress all heretical worship and compel all to embrace the Catholic faith. And this fear is not irrational, if unfounded. The Church has persecuted. Only a tyro in church history will deny that. The Apologists in the days of Roman imperial domination inveighed against persecution and with Tertullian declared that "it was no part of religion to persecute religion." But after the days of Constantine and under the reign of that first Christian emperor the attitude of Christians underwent a change, and persecution of pagans took place in many places of the empire. A hundred and fifty years after Constantine the Donatists were persecuted and sometimes put to death. Against this extreme measure St. Augustine raised his voice; but he was willing that they should be despoiled of their churches and of their goods. Protestants were persecuted in France and Spain with the full approval of the Church authorities. We have always defended the persecution of the Huguenots and the Spanish Inquisition. Wherever and whenever there is honest Catholicity there will be a clear distinction drawn between truth and error, and Catholicity and all forms of heresy. When she thinks it good to use physical force the Church will use it. She is no better nor holier than God; and God has used physical force to bring people to embrace the truth. If the Church ever again finds herself in the same circumstances as surrounded her in the days of the Donatists and Huguenots and the Moriscos it is very probable that she will defend herself with the same weapons she used before. But will those conditions ever return? We hope not for the sake of both persecutor and persecuted. The Protestants of the world fear that the history of persecution will repeat itself. If so it will be brought about by themselves. They fear that they will be forced to embrace the Catholic faith. They never will be as long as they allow Catholics to profess their religion in peace. But if they want war they will be promptly accommodated.

But will the Catholic Church give bond that she will not persecute at all? Will she guarantee absolute freedom and equality of all churches and all faiths? The Catholic Church gives no bonds for her good behavior. She has made mistakes in her policy which she promptly corrected as soon as discovered. She has countenanced violence when more human measures would have been of more avail. Her children and her clergy have often been carried away by popular passion. But she gives no bonds that such things shall not occur again.

Why should the Church be required to furnish security of good behavior? Civil governments have been tyrannical. But we must have civil government. The state has oppressed, and kings have abused their power. But we must have the state to maintain order and protect life and property. So it is with the Church; only more so. We must have the Church. She is the means of grace to a lost world. She is salvation to all mankind. Without the state we have anarchy; without the Church we have spiritual chaos.