

SEPTEMBER 14, 1899.

peace, make her set her face resolutely against anything which would bring on the horrors of war.

The traditions of England tend in the opposite direction from this. England's greatness arises in a great measure from the successes she has achieved in war, and the people, taking a laudable pride in the history of their country, are of opinion that peace may be and has been purchased at too great a price, whereas it has been preserved only by excluding the nation from having a decisive voice in the management of the political affairs of the world, or at least of the Eastern hemisphere. Hence arises the growing discontent at the foreign policy of Lord Salisbury's Government.

The last week has brought forth some new moves on the political chess-board which are as difficult to understand as they are unexpected.

On the 24th. of August, Count Muraviev, the Russian Foreign Minister, handed to all the foreign diplomats at St. Petersburg a note from the Czar declaring that "the maintenance of peace and the reduction of the excessive armaments now crushing all nations, is the ideal for which all Governments ought to strive, and proposing a general conference of nations which shall take into consideration the means of bringing about so desirable an object as the attainment of this ideal."

This proposition of the Czar has been regarded with jubilation by many who are sincerely desirous of seeing universal peace brought about. Among those who have joyfully welcomed it, Pope Leo XIII. is prominent. As soon as the proposal was made public, he wired congratulations to the Emperor Nicholas and offered every assistance in his power to promote the proposed conference.

Among English statesmen, several have expressed a hope that the proposal may lead to a satisfactory conclusion, but there is evidently a latent suspicion that there is a concealed purpose in it which is kept in the background.

It has been remarked that owing to the fact that Russia's proposed great railway through Siberia cannot be completed for eight or ten years, and that in the meantime the best possible thing for Russia is that peace be maintained, as she cannot be prepared for any great war till the railway is finished, the Russian desire above all things that peace be maintained for that period.

When the past policy of Russia is considered, there is room for the suspicion that the proposal is meant merely for the purpose of gaining time to prepare to strike a successful blow hereafter for the extension of its Empire in the East when the proper time comes. Hence, while some diplomatists praise the proposition somewhat effusively, others are content to say, like Lord Frederick Roberts of Kandahar, commander of the British force in Ireland, that "it will be most satisfactory if such a proposal can be carried out."

Whatever may be the opinion entertained on the matter, it is probable that none of the powers will object to attend the conference proposed by the Czar, in order to ascertain whether or not any practical result can be drawn from it.

It is noteworthy that the French press generally do not favor the Czar's proposition, as it would entail upon France the obligation not to seek for the Restoration of the lost provinces of Alsace and Lorraine.

It has been understood that great cordiality, and even an alliance offensive and defensive has existed between France and Russia. It is surprising, therefore, that one of the allies should make such a proposition without consulting the other. Nevertheless this is what has been done.

On the whole, it may reasonably be said, that while there are very great difficulties in the way of reaching the result which the Czar is professedly aiming at, it is possible, and perhaps even probable, that the Great Powers, through the proposed conference, may come to a conclusion to reduce their armaments, and thus lessen greatly the burdens which now oppress all the nations, and that they may arrive at some agreement which will ensure peace, at all events, for many years to come.

One should be fearful of being wrong in poetry when one thinks differently from the poet, and in religion when one thinks differently from the saints.—Joubert.

Great men are modest, because they continually compare themselves, not with other men, but with that idea of the perfect which they have before their minds.—Leopardi.

"GRAND OLD WOMAN"

Evidences of the tenderness and courage of devoted wives are not wanting. The following instance of the devotion and self sacrifice of the wife of the late Mr. Gladstone now related:

Once when Gladstone was making an out-door speech it began to rain. Quietly Mrs. Gladstone, who has the sweetest, most motherly face in the world, and who always accompanied her husband, stood up and, opened a domestic looking umbrella of the Camp species, held it over him. The spectacle which the old couple presented there standing together was so touching and appealed so thoroughly to the good feelings of the crowd, because of the striking picture of Darby and Joan domestically, that when a burly costermonger who had been loudest in his cat-calls and hooting of Mr. Gladstone up to that moment, suddenly shouted, "Three cheers for the grand old Woman!" every one responded with a will.

THE CHURCH AND SCIENCE.

On the twenty fifth anniversary of the founding of Boston University Bishop Hurst (Protestant), chancellor of the American University, said: "It is quite the vogue with certain Don Quixotes to charge the Church with being the protector of ignorance. 'Down with science, up with darkness!' is the cry they would put in the mouth of the Church. On the contrary, the Church is not, and never has been, the opponent of science. I will admit the formidable appearance of the fine padding called foot-notes in Buckle's 'History of Civilization' and Draper's 'Intellectual Development of Europe,' and some other books, mainly made up of those two, where it is made to appear that in the time of Galileo the Church took an opposite course. We forget that the persecutor of Galileo and all others who ventured to interfere with the growth of thought were only the administrators of the hour. It was never the wish of the Church. The clergy of Monte Cassino were the best astronomers of Europe. The Church itself has in no case been on the side of ignorance, but has always been the champion of the highest and broadest knowledge."

MINISTERS AND MINISTERS.

We are moved to pay tribute to the Protestant ministers acting as chaplains at the different camps in the South. They are liberal minded, well-meaning men, seemingly eager to do all the good in their power. Their kindly acts are not confined to religiousists: Catholics as well as Protestants share in the favors they are constantly bestowing. Some of these gentlemen go so far as to distribute Catholic periodicals, and one of them rode several miles to summon a priest to attend a dying soldier. This is noble conduct. The bigots among the Protestant clergy are not conspicuous since the war broke out; they hate danger as much as they do Catholics. The chaplain of the First Ohio Volunteer Infantry who said, "Though at home a Methodist, I am here the servant of Him who bore the Cross for our salvation," was just a trifle ambiguous; however, we hope that when this cruel war is all over and good Brother Henderson returns to his home, he will not be less liberal-minded than he was while in camp.—Ave Maria.

DIFFICULTY AND DOUBT.

Catholics who for one reason or another are more familiar with what is urged against the faith than can be said for it are liable to confound the sin of doubt which is one thing with the mere intellectual apprehension of objections which is something radically different. Doubt in matters of faith means simply that we hesitate to accept as true some dogma of the Church. A difficulty with regard to a dogma implies, not hesitation about accepting a dogma as true, but simply our own inability to demonstrate its entire truth and reasonableness. Cardinal Newman has some pertinent remarks about these two things. Difficulty and doubt, he says, are incommensurable; so that ten thousand difficulties could never amount to one doubt. We know that the doctrines of the Church, guided as she is by the Spirit of God, are true. And so, though the Gentiles mock us and the unbelieving meditate many objections, we still say, in the spirit of the monk Felix, "Lord, I believe, though I cannot understand."—Providence Visitor.

ENGLAND'S CUBA.

Yet once again the hard word of Mr. Gladstone seems to be justified—that "England never did anything for Ireland out of a pure sense of justice." After all the brave talk of statesmen and churchmen, the present government, after long deliberation, has decided against the endowment of a Catholic University for Ireland. If Ireland gets nothing else out of these debates, however, she has at least secured a new argument in favor of Home Rule; for the world has been shown conclusively that the imperial government is not willing to redress an Irish grievance even when it is proved such and the wrong might easily be righted. The Weekly Register, which has excellent opportunities for knowing the truth, states that Lord Salisbury's government could carry the measure through with much more than its usual majority; and that, though nearly all the members of the Cabinet were personally in favor of the measure, they feared to arouse the ire of the loyal Orangemen of the

kingdom. Thus politicians are much the same the world over; and when the great Anglo-Saxon Federation comes to unite us to our long lost cousins, Lord Salisbury and his colleagues will have had such a training as will justify them in aspiring to be aldermen in Chicago.—Ave Maria.

AN INDIGNANT PROTEST.

Duluth, Aug. 30.—The widely-known and so-called ex-nun, Margaret Shepherd, gave recently one of her lectures in Duluth, Minn. The indignant editor of the Microcosm, of that city, who calls himself a Protestant of the most avowed type, read the ex-nun and her hearers a piece of his mind. Among other things, he said:—"My knowledge of priests, convents and such things is very limited, but I do know that the land is filled with Catholic churches, schools, hospitals, benevolent and charitable institutions that radiate with a constant love and good feeling towards all mankind, and there is not a Protestant or a heathen revolving beneath the stars would suffer, sick or die within reach of any one of these institutions and cry in vain for help. When I am told that these same Sisters of Mercy who go upon the shell riven fields of battle or into plague-stricken districts of the tropics, to care for the dying are a sin-soaked association of bad women, then it is I feel like exhausting some accomplished ox-driver's vocabulary in the feeble expressions of my own emotions. Moreover, the average man of to-day in a fair judge of human nature, and usually knows a good woman when he sees her, and the real honest man is very scarce in this world who can look into the face of a Sister of Mercy without being impelled to take off his hat. Unless he is a brainless, bat-like bigot he can't get away from it. It is the one thing from which no honest man's heart can escape."

To those who hear and encourage her he has this to say:—"To those who knowingly and willfully assist in such work as that by which Mrs. Shepherd hopes to acquire the coin, are even worse than she, if that were possible. Those who thoughtlessly contribute to her purse are her real victims."

BEGIN AT HOME!

The eagerness of the American missionary for service amid the late Spanish possessions establishes a similitude between autocratic and evangelistic finesses. When your European autocrat has too much trouble on hand at home, he looks about for an excuse for a foreign war, so as to get some of the dangerous elements killed off in battle and the cries of the remainder drowned in the shouting of the chauvinists. We do not know why the American missionary should sigh for fresh fields and pastures new, if he be an honest man, when he has fifty millions of a population outside the church goes to work upon right here. But if he must go abroad in his apostolic zeal, we would refer him to the Bishop of Guilford, who recently proclaimed a day of public penance in his diocese because of the atheism, immorality and crime of the people. These are mostly Londoners, for the diocese covers a portion of that focus of civilization. Like wise to Judge Clayton, of Delaware county, this State, who has been doing the New Zealander gazing at the spiritual ruins of St. Paul's, and thus threatens over the subject:

"On Sunday I attended religious service at St. Paul's. I was painfully surprised to see such a small congregation. I do not believe there is a church in Chester that did not have a better attendance. I am told that there is the same want of religious fervor all over London. Why is this? Let us hope that philosophy is not destroying faith. God help the world when the sentiment of true religion leaves it."

But, indeed, there is no necessity to go even to England for a field of missionary enterprise. There are spots on our own social sun more appalling than those exposed by the author of "The Modern Babylon." This country shares with France the horrible distinction of preeminence in the revolt of maternity against the Divine decree. The pride of the women of other lands is to be the mothers of happy families; our philosophy has taught us better. Under the eyes of our public guardians the traffic in the "slaughter of the innocents," as the Pulpit of the Cross fittingly styles it, goes on day by day, as all readers of the daily papers know, without let or hindrance. To allude to this dreadful subject requires some nerve. We find the Ave Maria doing so guardedly in commending the above named Episcopalian organ for broaching it. These are some of the plague spots within the social organism from whence springs this missionary zeal for work among Catholic people ignorant of such hell-born horrors.

Let us, like the Danish Prince's mother, turn our eyes in upon our own souls, and if we do not shudder at what we see there, then are we past redemption, for we are past remorse.—Philadelphia Catholic Standard and Times.

AGAINST PROFANITY.

Holy Name Societies of Brooklyn to Hold Services September 25.

Brooklyn, August 23.—Preparations are under way for the annual rally of the Holy Name Societies of the Brooklyn Diocese. The rally, which was held last year for the first time, is a public protest against the use of profane and blasphemous language, so prevalent among men. It is to stem the tide of this very objectionable habit that the Society of the Holy Name was organized, and last year it was decided to make an open protest by a parade

through the streets, concluded by religious services held in certain selected churches. For this purpose the city was divided into seven districts. This year the division will include one more district. The societies within these districts meet in a body at some given point and march to the church selected for the services, where a sermon is preached.

The executive committee of the Brooklyn Diocesan Union of Holy Name Societies held a meeting in St. Patrick's Hall, Kent and Willoughby avenues, last Sunday afternoon and discussed the arrangements for the rally. Sunday, September 25, was named as the day on which the services will be held. The churches composing the various districts were also named, but the churches at which the services are to be held were not definitely decided upon. Last year about 9,000 men marched in line and entered their protest against improper language, and this year a larger number is expected.

MAKE PROTESTANTS OF US.

That was a good point that Archbishop Ireland made in his statement to the press about the future of the Catholic Church in the conquered Spanish colonies, when he said that the Protestants who are getting ready for missionary operations in those regions, might as well organize missions for the conversion of the Catholics of Washington: that when the republics of South America cut loose from Spain and Portugal Protestant missionaries flocked thither, yet after years and years of costly labor they have not brought about a change of religion there, and that they will be equally unsuccessful in Cuba, Porto Rico and the Philippines.

Indeed, Protestants are not consistent—they do not act on what they say. They allege that the people of Catholic countries are ignorant and that all that is needed to make them Protestant is education and the possession of the faulty Protestant translation of the Bible. Well, why do they not put that statement to the proof? The Catholics of the United States are intelligent people. Why don't our Protestant neighbors make Protestants of us? We can read and write. Why don't they tackle us? We number ten to twelve millions. We are easier to reach than the inhabitants of Havana and Manila. Our souls are just as precious. Missions to us would cost less. Why not make Protestants of us?

We have started missions to Protestants in this country in a dozen dioceses and have met with success. And the more intelligent, the more pious, the more virtuous the Protestants, the more success our missionaries have in making Catholics of them. We expect to go on until practically all Americans of good will are Catholics. That is not only our hope and prayer, but also our expectation.

But Protestants don't seem to believe in themselves or in their unstable and unsacramental religion. They send misfit preachers to the heathen and to Catholic countries, but right here at home, in all the strength of their power and the full glory of enlightenment, they let us Catholics go to our doom without making an effort to save us. Why don't they endeavor to make Protestants of us?—Catholic Columbian.

INFALLIBILITY AND INSPIRATION.

New York Freeman's Journal.

In an article recently we argued that the Ministry of the Church, composed of the Apostles, being infallible, the same Ministry of the Church composed of their legitimate successors is infallible.

This conclusion follows from the nature and mission of the Church. It is the Kingdom of Christ on earth, commissioned by Him to teach and govern His followers till the end of time. To the Ministry of this Church in the person of its first officials He said: "He that heareth you heareth Me," and "He that will not hear the Church let him be to thee as the heathen and the publican."

This Church, then, was intended by its Divine Founder to be perpetuated, and infallible. If not perpetuated His promise has failed. If not infallible, His words, "He that heareth you heareth Me," would not be true, for certainly those who heard Him heard an infallible authority.

It is clear, then, that this Church of Christ possesses at all times since its foundation every prerogative and faculty necessary for its existence, its perpetuity and the accomplishment of its mission. If its Ministry by a change of personnel has lost any of those things essential to its existence, then the Church has failed, and the promise of Christ has failed. As we cannot suppose this, we must conclude that all the attributes and authority originally given to the Ministry of the Church still remain in its possession, and that the change of personnel of the Ministry, from the Apostles to their legitimate successors, brought about no change in the authority and functions of that Ministry.

There is no way of avoiding this conclusion except on the hypothesis that the Church has failed, and if it has failed Christianity is not a divine dispensation. This hypothesis cannot be held by Christians. Therefore the Church is to-day what it was in the beginning. It is admitted that the Ministry of the Church was infallible in the beginning, not necessarily as individuals, but in their organic capacity as the Ministry. Therefore the same Ministry—though changed in personnel—is infallible to-day.

A correspondent, while admitting the force of this line of argument, thinks it proves too much. He writes: "If the official prerogatives and faculties of the first officials of the Church pass to their legitimate successors in office without limitation then not only did infallibility pass to the legitimate successors of the Apostles, but inspiration as well."

If inspiration were an attribute essential to the existence and perpetuity of the Ministry, or necessary to the Church in fulfilling its divinely imposed mission, the conclusion of our correspondent would be unavoidable.

But inspiration, as a permanent impulse, is not essential to the existence and perpetuity of the Ministry, not a necessary attribute of the individuals composing the Ministry, not necessary to the accomplishment of the Church's mission. We may go farther and say that it was not necessary to each individual Apostle to constitute him an Apostle, unless the command to go and teach be considered an inspiration, and then the successors have received the same command. It is not stated in the Scriptures that all the Apostles were inspired. When we speak of them as inspired, reference is had to those of them that were authors, who were inspired to write in such a way that what they wrote is such a way that all did not write it follows that all were not inspired to write, and yet those who did not write were as truly Apostles as those who did. Thus it is seen that inspiration was not essential to the Apostolic office. It was plus that office, and was given to certain of the Apostles for a specific purpose—the completing of the deposit of faith. It must be remembered that inspiration is a temporary divine impulse, not permanent condition. The deposit once completed the impulse to complete it ceased, and the Church once in possession of that revealed deposit became by divine appointment its guardian and infallible interpreter, and the office of the Ministry is to interpret what has been delivered by inspiration, and not to make or record new revelations.

Had it been the design of Divine Providence to make from time to time in the course of ages new revelations, occasional inspirations of the Church or of some members of her Ministry would have been necessary. But such was not the design of Providence. The deposit of revelation once completed was completed for all time. An infallible interpreter only was needed, and our Lord supplied that interpreter when He established and commissioned His Church.

Hence inspiration was a special and temporary prerogative given to certain of the Apostles for a specific purpose and not an official prerogative of the Ministry or of any member of it. This being the case there is no reason why it should pass to the successors in the Ministry. It is very different with infallibility. That is an essential attribute of that teaching corporation or Church of which Christ said: "He that heareth you heareth Me." Those who heard Him heard an infallible teacher, and those who hear the Church hear Him. The Church, then, must be infallible, not at any one time—as in the Apostolic age—but at all times till the great reckoning. To deny the Church this infallibility or to say that it has lost it is to say that the Church of Christ has failed: that the gates of hell have prevailed against it, in defiance of the promise of its Divine Founder.

But, our correspondent may ask, were not all the Apostles inspired, those who only spoke as well as those who wrote? We have the authority of the Church that those who wrote were inspired to write and guarded from error by Divine influence in writing. Nothing is said of those of whose utterances we have no record. They may or may not have been inspired to speak on the occasions they did speak. But it is not necessary to suppose so. The commission to preach the Gospel and an audience to preach to are sufficient to account for their speaking on those occasions, without supposing that they were moved by a special divine impulse on each particular occasion. Their zeal in the cause was sufficient inspiration to speak, but this is not the kind of inspiration we are talking about. We repeat, it must be kept in mind that inspiration is an impulse from without, from God, to do, to write, or to speak, and not a constant state. Considering the zeal of the Apostles it is not necessary to suppose that they never spoke unless impelled by this external impulse to do so.

Well, then, if they were not inspired to speak, of what authority were their words more than those of any other talker? This question arises from a confounding of inspiration with infallibility and the overlooking of the fact that while inspiration implies infallibility, infallibility does not imply inspiration. One commissioned to teach may be moved to speak by the obligation of obedience to that commission, and if infallible, speak infallibly. In this case one would not be inspired. Thus an Apostle would on a particular occasion taught in obedience to the command he originally received to go and teach, would be impelled by that command and not by inspiration. The impulse to act arose from a sense of duty and not from divine urgency to action called inspiration. The fact that he acted from a sense of duty and in obedience to a command, and not from inspiration, would be no argument against the infallibility of his teaching.

Inspiration impels to action and guards the inspired one from error in doing what he is impelled to do. Infallibility does not impel to action, but

guards the infallible agent in the execution of its commission, leaving the time to act to be determined by circumstances as they arise; just as a court does not give its decision until a question calling for it is presented. Inspiration supplies the body of revealed truth, the deposit of faith; infallibility guards and interprets it. The deposit of faith being complete and closed, the necessity for inspiration has ceased, as there will be no more revealed dispensations. The commission of the Church to go and teach all nations is confined to the announcing, with the authority of Christ, this deposit of faith, and interpreting it, as difficulties and doubts may arise in the course of time as to its meaning, and its application to changing human conditions. To execute this commission, infallibility not inspiration, is necessary. By this infallible authority all generations as they come and go have, as our Lord intended them to have, the same secure knowledge of His will and law that those who had lived in His own time and that of His apostles.

From all that has been said we conclude that our argument proving that the official prerogatives and faculties of the first officials of the Church passed to their legitimate successors, does not necessitate the inference that the successors were inspired, or that there was any need that they should be in order to be successors. The prerogatives of an office do not necessarily include every attribute, gift and faculty which some particular occupant of the office may possess. They include only those which the occupant possesses by reason of the office and without which he could not do the duties of the office. The inspiration which some of the Apostles received to write was not an attribute of their office—for all did not write—but the result of a special act of God, and for a particular and ultra-official end. It was not included in their commission, for they were not commanded to write. The commission to go and teach and baptize and forgive sins and govern the Church constituted them Apostles.

From the date of that commission they were the Ministry of the Church and exercised fully their apostolic office before any of them ever wrote a word. Consequently writing, or the inspiration to write, was not a prerogative of their office; it was plus the office, ultra official, and as such would not pass to their successors in office, any more than their knowledge of Greek, Hebrew, or Syro-chaldaic would pass to their successor. What did pass was every prerogative and faculty that constituted the office and without which the office and the divine commission with it would cease to be. Infallibility is a prerogative of this kind, and therefore it passed. Inspiration is not a prerogative of this kind, and therefore it did not pass, but ceased when the work to be done under its influence was finished and the deposit of revealed truth completed. Infallibility did not cease with the death of the Apostles, but passed to their successors, because the work to be done under its protection will cease only with the end of the world.

CARDINAL MANNING'S WORDS.

"I do not ask you to promise to be temperate," said Cardinal Manning on one occasion, "for you are baptized into Christianity, and are bound by your vows to be temperate. The men and women who cannot keep that promise will not keep a new one; but I urge you to pledge yourselves to abstain, if not alone for your own salvation, at least for the sake of your weaker brethren. . . . God created man to His own image, gave him intelligence, thought and will to control his actions. Happy are they whose bright intelligence has never been sullied by drink, whose thoughts are calm and pure, whose will has never lost its authority, who never at any moment have been laid prostrate by intoxication. Happy they who can lay their heads on their pillows even in the hour of death, with the conviction that no intoxicating drink has ever darkened that bright image which God has imprinted on their souls."

BLANCO TO TAKE COLUMBUS WITH HIM.

From the London Chronicle.

Marshal Blanco has received a very delicate mission from the Spanish Government. He has been commanded to remove from their resting place in the Cathedral of Havana the remains of Christopher Columbus and to bring them back to Spain. It will be remembered that Columbus, who died at Valladolid, was first buried in the Carthusian Church of Las Cuevas, at Seville. Twenty years later, in accordance with his expressed desire, his body was sent to San Domingo or Hayti and interred in the choir of the Cathedral. In 1796, on thecession of Hayti to France, the body of the discoverer was taken by the Spaniards to Havana and buried in the Cathedral there with very great pomp. Early in 1873 a box was found in the sacristy of the Cathedral of San Domingo containing a quantity of bones, and with them certain documents tending to show that they were those of Columbus. There is some probability, therefore, that the relics of the illustrious Italian which Marshal Blanco is to convey to Spain may not be those of Columbus at all.

Unwonted circumstances may make us all rather unlike ourselves; there are conditions under which the most majestic person is obliged to sneeze, and our emotions are liable to be acted on in the same incongruous manner.—George Elliot.