

## The Catholic Record

Price of subscription—\$1.50 per annum.  
United States & Europe—\$2.00.  
Publisher and Proprietor, Thomas Coffey, LL. D.  
Editors: Rev. James T. Foley, B. A.  
Thomas Coffey, LL. D.  
Associate Editors: Rev. F. J. O'Sullivan,  
R. F. Mackintosh.  
Manager—Robert M. Burns.

Advertisements for teachers, situations wanted, etc., 50 cents each insertion. Remittance to accompany the order. Where CATHOLIC RECORD Box address is required send 10 cents to cover expense of postage upon replies.  
Obituary and marriage notices cannot be inserted except in the usual condensed form. Each insertion 50 cents.  
Approved and recommended by Archbishops of Canada, the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, and St. Boniface, the Bishops of London, Hamilton, Peterborough and Oshawa, N. Y., and the clergy throughout the Dominion.

In St. John, N. B., single copies may be purchased from Mrs. M. A. McGee, 249 Main Street, and John J. Dwyer.  
In Sydney, N. S., single copies may be purchased at Murphy's Bookstore.  
In Montreal single copies may be purchased from J. Milloy, 241 St. Catherine St. West.

LONDON, SATURDAY, AUGUST 2, 1919

### LLOYD GEORGE HAS PALTERED WITH THE IRISH

Lloyd George has officially shelved the Irish question. In a reply to Mr. Devlin, the Premier stated before the assembled Parliament that the British Government had tried already to supply the principles of self-determination by means of the Irish Convention but that the Nationalists were divided. Moreover, he stated, Ulster does not want self-determination.

So rests the Irish Question in so far as Mr. George and his colleagues are concerned. But these gentlemen are insincere and have been insincere in their Irish policy from the time of their inception into Office. They have labored under a dual fallacy one side of which has insisted upon settling the Irish question by remedying the barbarous conditions of land holding; the other side which regards Ireland and its people as existing for the welfare of England, the governing class.

Now it is impossible to placate a Nation whose Parliament has been robbed by attempting to offer an inferior substitute in return. This is exactly what the Unionist party has endeavored to do since the passing of the Land Act in 1883. Moreover, it is entirely out of keeping with sane Government to act on the assumption that the governed class exist for the welfare of the governing body. This, likewise, is charged against the Imperial Government in the case of Ireland: Because Ireland would eventually become the Heligoland of the Atlantic; because she would possibly interfere with British commerce; because, as a nation, Ireland soon would be in a position to compete on a small scale with industrial England, the latter country has determined to hold in check any of such possibilities being realized. The apparent but officially unexpressed motive for this action is found in England's policy of Materialism and selfishness—a policy which curtails all freedom of action on the part of the Irish, lest, any freedom being granted, Ireland would be the cause of diminishing the piles of gold in London vaults.

Ireland's claim for freedom need not be reiterated here. Nor is there any necessity of justifying this claim. Both the principles of morality and the pages of even a prejudiced history have long since substantiated this claim. The law of reason and its directive force have lost all quality of persuasion with the paltering politicians of England. Their one guiding law is that of expediency—an expediency whose eyes are ever cast upon its own navel; an expediency of godless selfishness.

Of late it has been the custom of every Englishman to recall the hackneyed phrase: "Mind your own business." This word of advice has been cast at the United States from the lips of the highest and of the lowest politician; from Lloyd George to Carson. But the United States of America are intent upon minding their own business when they are interfering in Irish affairs. There is not one tenth of all Americans who have much sympathy for England. There are over ninety per cent. of business Americans who are anxious to curtail English commerce; who are gladdened to hear of the miner's strike; who take genuine pleasure in seeing England financially embarrassed as is she today. Americans are minding their own financial and national business when they are stirring up antipathy against England. On the other hand, Great Britain is blundering in her policy of expediency when she is alienating the good will of the few remaining Americans whose sympathy and religion are bound up with the principle of the rights to small nations.

Were Lloyd George not so navel-minded; so insular in his likes and dislikes; so blind to his own national shortcomings, he would be more conversant with the trend of affairs in the United States of America. United States is further moved from England today than was she in 1914. Americans, almost as a whole nation, are disgusted with the insincerity of England in the latter's dealings with Ireland, and they are anxious to see the commercial ruin of their only serious rival.

Let Lloyd George pocket his fine feelings towards the Americans. Although they are an admirable people; although they practice fair play while the paltering Englishmen preach it, nevertheless they have little sympathy for "perfidious Albion." It should not be that we strain our alliances with them to the breaking point. But this is surely coming if the English policy of Irish oppression is continued. England will save Ireland, perhaps, but will lose control of Canada.

The infantile statements emanating from the British premier such as: "Ireland is not one nation in race, religion, temperament or anything constituting the essentials of a nation"—these and such statements discredit the intellectuality of Mr. George. He might have remarked that there is no nation on the face of the earth, and, especially, England herself that is one and undivided in these essentials which constitute a nation. Let him put aside these pretenses which he offers as an excuse from further dealing with the Irish question. Let him revise his policy of expediency and see if he can discover why Ireland should be free, at least in the sense that Canada is; why United States with its thousands of Irish and Germans and English haters should not be stirred against us; should not discount our Canadian money; should not hold mass meetings attended by Government authorities to devise ways and means of combating selfish England. If the British Government is wise, even materially it will treat Ireland not as a serf but, at least, as a colony. When this day dawns, then and not till then will the Americans cease plaguing England.

Moreover, the pretext that the Irish will not agree among themselves, will not benefit the British Cabinet; it will not excuse them from manfully settling the Irish question. Mr. Wilson, the friend of England, soon will be out of office. In his place there will be found a man more in accord with the present American Senate and Congress; more opposed to England. Before that day arrives let the hitherto paltering Englishmen put on the cloak of sincerity and do their share in keeping up the relations which now exist between Great Britain and America. At present they are merely straining. Soon they will break.

### K. OF C. MIS-APPROPRIATING MONEY!

By this late date the Orangemen have pocketed their prejudice for another year and are prepared to listen to reason. On July the Twelfth their ears were filled with a loathing, calumnious discourse which had been prepared in the unclean scullery of prejudice and which was served up by Reverend Mr. Trumper with ignorance *a la mode*. It is not intended to give notoriety to this pulpiter. Rather, it would be more charitable to cloak his name with the garment of silence and to offer our sympathies to his parishioners who on occasional Sabbaths sit out his sermons and listen to his personal explanation of the Scriptures, which, we surmise, are as carefully prepared as was this eloquent address delivered at Exeter, Ontario.

On first thought, there was the temptation to become vulgar; to stigmatize him with the short, sharp rooseveltian sword. But on consideration it is evident that no man can formally tell a lie without knowing that he is doing so. In other words, a mendacious man must have knowledge. At least, he must know that what he is saying is false.

Now in the case of Mr. Trumper, there is no one who is rash enough as to say that the Reverend gentleman is guilty of a falsehood. It is downright ignorance which is troubling him. But it is inexcusable ignorance of such a type that his harm can be measured by no short newspaper article.

However, it is better to quote from the Reverend Gentleman's address and allow our readers to judge for themselves. He says, in a speech delivered at Exeter:

"Although an elaborate appeal was made towards the last of the War for the Knights of Columbus huts, not a dollar of that money ever reached France. Mr. McKegney, who has been a chaplain, will bear me out in that. The money was used by them for propaganda work in Canada. Etc. . . ."

This excerpt is found in the London Free Press of July 14.

Now it is a fact that the Knights of Columbus spent money to erect and to maintain the Catholic Huts in France. If the Reverend Mr. McKegney spent less time in investigating the condition of affairs in Ireland and more time attending to his chaplain's duties, it would be possible for him to substantiate this statement.

But Catholics are not dependent upon him to sustain their honor in the matter of Catholic Huts. Nor are we content to imitate Mr. Trumper in making categorical statements without presenting facts to uphold them. At the risk of drawing fire upon General Turner and having him called a Catholic bigot and a liar, we shall append a letter received by Colonel (Rev.) Workman and since made public property. The letter reads as follows:

Headquarters of Overseas Forces of Canada.

Argyll House, 240 Regent St., London, W. I.  
19th June, 1919.

My Dear Colonel Workman:—As I understand you are issuing a final report on the work of the Catholic Army Huts in England, I wish to place on record my high appreciation of the magnificent work you have done in this connection. The three Clubs in London and those in Bramshot, Witley, Seaford, Ripon, Rhyl, Epsom, Bexhill and Cooden have been a God-send to our men, and I feel sure that I am voicing the opinion of the people of Canada when I thank you on their behalf for providing their boys with such facilities during their absence from their own homes.

As you know, I have at different times visited your Clubs and have been much struck with the liberal way you have furnished them. The men I know have appreciated the writing paper, cigarettes and other comforts which have been provided. I also want to thank you for the assistance you have given us in the transport by providing free cigarettes, games, chewing gum and writing paper.

I can assure you that your hts have been the means of gladdening the hearts of thousands of Canadians.

Yours sincerely,  
(Sgd.) R. E. W. TURNER,  
Lt. Col. W. T. Workman, C.B., M.C.,  
A.D.C.S. (R.C.),  
Oxford Circus House, W. I.

This letter received from one who holds such a distinguished office in the Canadian Army proves that the Catholic Huts were in operation Overseas; that cigarettes and other things were distributed free of charge. Now it is not possible to set down such an organization in the Old Country without having spent some money to do so. But, still withal, Mr. Trumper has said what amounts to a contradiction.

Other letters of appreciation for services rendered by the Catholic Army Huts have been written (and made public) by Major-General Fielding and by Camp Commandant Colonel Hill.

Supposing that Mr. Trumper were asked to prove his damning charges, could he do it? Supposing that he is expected, in the name of a gentleman, to make public apology for his unwarranted statements, will he do it? In the meantime we shall be content to take the word of General Turner and of thousands of our returned men who have experienced the hospitality, the free cigarettes, etc. (which have been administered by those in charge of the Knights of Columbus Huts. As for Mr. Trumper, he should know that Christianity demands of him to undo the harm which either his prejudice and malice or his ignorance has been responsible in creating.

### THE BOY WAS FATHER OF THE MAN

BY THE GLEANER

Among the many chaplains who served in the Allied armies at the front there was perhaps none who by his works and his personality clothed such a volume of praise from all classes as did Father Frank Duffy of the old Irish Catholic Regiment, the 69th of New York. He was guide, counsellor and friend to the "boys" and is now the beloved of their parents whom he has consoled, the idol of his own people, the hero of the populace and, if he chose to be, the lion of society. The Colonel of his regiment declares publicly that should there be another war he would be pleased to serve as corporal

under Father Duffy. He speaks a few words in the dining hall of the Hotel Belmont and in a few minutes three hundred thousand dollars is added to the national treasury. The question naturally suggests itself: Was this man raised aloft on this unprecedented wave of popularity by some fortuitous causes, or was the honor paid him due to intrinsic merit? Was it that his association with such a well known regiment merely focused the popular vision upon him and surrounded him with a halo of glory, or was it that the strong light but made his exceptional qualities as a man and a priest stand out in still bolder relief?

Among the multitudes that welcomed him back to his parish in the Bronx was a venerable priest who was quite competent to answer that question. The success of "his boy" was no revelation to him, however much the American manner of enthusiasm might have been: That priest was Rt. Rev. Mgr. Murray, pastor of the Canadian parish at Cobourg—for be it known that Father Duffy and that other hero, Vice-Admiral Sims of the American Navy whose name is a household word, spent their boyhood days in the old towns of Cobourg and Port Hope respectively. When Father Murray came to Cobourg forty years ago his first Mass in that parish was served by the little lad whose fame is now heralded abroad by the press of a continent. At the age of sixteen Frank Duffy had obtained his first class, or what is now known as senior leaving, certificate at the local High School. He then entered St. Michael's College, where, as at home, he was facile princeps in the academic arena. It was within those old familiar walls that the writer first made his acquaintance. In those days a very large percentage of the pupils were American. The result of this was occasional rivalries that sometimes threatened to disturb the peace of the student body. In those contentions that arose from time to time no one even among the faculty exercised a greater influence in the cause of peace and order than did the philosophy student who has since shown himself so efficient in the government of men.

From St. Michael's the young ecclesiastic went to St. Francis Xavier College in New York where he was taught for a time. Here his ability as a disciplinarian and as a teacher came under the notice of the late Cardinal Farley who was at that time Vicar-General of the Archdiocese. At the latter's solicitation he applied for exeat from the diocese of Peterborough and entered the old Seminary of Troy to complete his theological studies. He was ordained in the home of his boyhood by the late Rt. Rev. R. A. O'Connor. The day of his priesting, the first public ceremony held in the present edifice, was a memorable one for the good people of Cobourg for it marked the culmination of their hopes for one whom they all loved and in whom each entertained a pardonable pride.

Father Duffy was early appointed to a professorship in the new seminary at Dunwoodie where he taught with marked success and contributed frequently to the pages of theological reviews. But craving for pastoral work led him to ask Cardinal Farley for a parish. "I have nothing fitting to offer you," said the Cardinal. "Are you not opening up a new parish in the Bronx?" said Father Duffy. "Yes," replied the Bishop "but it has neither church nor presbytery nor school." "Give it to me, your Eminence," said the zealous young priest. To-day there is a church, priest's house and school with nine hundred pupils attending.

These facts give an answer to our opening question and prove that in Father Duffy's case, as in most similar cases, the boy is father of the man, and that abiding honors come not fortuitously but as the result of zealous persevering efforts.

MEANWHILE HOW many of those who attended this "Three Hours Service," adopted not only by Anglicans but by other Protestant sects in England during the War years, stopped to reflect that they were but borrowing once more from "Rome," and, not only that, but from the Jesuits. The "Three Hours Service" described is but an emasculated reproduction of the Three Hours Agony or the Seven Last Words long annually commemorated in Catholic churches throughout the world. If the same zeal was but manifested by Protestants for the underlying realities of these beautiful devotions the church-union question would soon reach a solution—the only solution.

FIUME, THE Austro Italian port on the Adriatic which is so much in the world's eyes these days has had an eventful history. It was a town during the Byzantine Empire, was ruled by its own Dukes in the ninth century, and in 1471 passed into the possession of Austria. It was declared a free port in 1739, and in 1776 was united to Croatia by Empress Maria Theresa. In 1809 it was occupied by the French, re-taken by the British in 1813, and restored to Austria in the following year. Ceded again to Hungary in 1822, its wanderings among the nations were not yet ended, for, after the revolution of 1848-49 it was annexed to the Crown lands of Croatia, under which control it remained till it came again in 1870 into the kingdom of Hungary. Now, after a thousand years and more, whose, permanently, is it to be?

### NOTES AND COMMENTS

THE FINDING IN TEXAS of the skeleton of a man eighteen feet tall will, if verified, give rather a rude jolt to those pseudo-scientists who never tire of descending upon the "fables" of Old Testament history. Archaeology and anthropology are yet only on the threshold of the ante-diluvian world, and there are mysteries innumerable yet to be solved. As Champollion proved generations ago, the more science learns by investigation and legitimate deduction, Bible history and chronology are proportionately vindicated.

THE TORONTO Globe's editorial sermon of last week treats of "Christ

and the Nations" as manifested in the international controversy over the efficacy or non-efficacy of the new League of Nations. The article is thoughtful and reverent throughout, due allowance being made for the extremely hazy conception of the Divine Person of the world's Redeemer which prevails today throughout all Protestant Christendom, and is especially noticeable in this article.

THIS LACK of apprehension of Christ's divinity is seen in the comments of the Globe writer on certain words uttered by Senator Borah during the course of the debate on the League in the United States Senate. "It," he said, "the Saviour of mankind should revisit the earth and declare for a League of Nations, I would be opposed to it." These words according to the Globe "reveal a remarkable state of mind," but what to "old-fashioned" Christians is still more remarkable is that they are treated as a debatable point throughout the article. Instead of being shocked or appalled by so manifest a repudiation of Christ's authority and, necessarily, of His divinity, they are dealt with simply as evidence of a "serious mentality" on the part of Senator Borah. This to the thoughtful reader tends to nullify what otherwise would be the force of his argument and brings into the strongest relief the essential lack of apprehension on the part of the writer of the meaning and purpose of the Incarnation.

IN SPITE of the Bishop of London's prohibition, Miss Mand Royden, described as "assistant minister of the City Temple," preached the "three hours service" last Good Friday in a church of the metropolis. The rector himself, we are told, introduced the lady, who "looked very pretty in a surplice," supported by a choir of ladies wearing "purple cassocks with white surplices," who also "looked very pretty." This innovation of women in the pulpit, which was very strongly combated by a section of the Church of England, but at the last Convocation was supported by at least three bishops, has therefore come to stay. The Bishop of London is helpless to stop it, as of authority he has none. Every rector of a parish is, as the incident proves, a law unto himself in such matters. Where will it all end? A French writer calls it an "elegant solution to the poor church problem;" "the vicar would appoint his wife curate, and his children would serve at the altar, the revenues thus remaining in the family."

MEANWHILE HOW many of those who attended this "Three Hours Service," adopted not only by Anglicans but by other Protestant sects in England during the War years, stopped to reflect that they were but borrowing once more from "Rome," and, not only that, but from the Jesuits. The "Three Hours Service" described is but an emasculated reproduction of the Three Hours Agony or the Seven Last Words long annually commemorated in Catholic churches throughout the world. If the same zeal was but manifested by Protestants for the underlying realities of these beautiful devotions the church-union question would soon reach a solution—the only solution.

FIUME, THE Austro Italian port on the Adriatic which is so much in the world's eyes these days has had an eventful history. It was a town during the Byzantine Empire, was ruled by its own Dukes in the ninth century, and in 1471 passed into the possession of Austria. It was declared a free port in 1739, and in 1776 was united to Croatia by Empress Maria Theresa. In 1809 it was occupied by the French, re-taken by the British in 1813, and restored to Austria in the following year. Ceded again to Hungary in 1822, its wanderings among the nations were not yet ended, for, after the revolution of 1848-49 it was annexed to the Crown lands of Croatia, under which control it remained till it came again in 1870 into the kingdom of Hungary. Now, after a thousand years and more, whose, permanently, is it to be?

Be troubled at nothing, not even at your defects; be humble on their account but correct them peaceably, without being discouraged or cast down.

If you are faithful in doing the will of God in this life, your own will shall be accomplished throughout eternity. The Heart of Jesus is at least worth yours. Leave all and you will find all in the Sacred Heart.

### THE COMMON GROUND OF RELIGIOUS UNITY

Though the founders of the new American Church agree that accidental beliefs—trifling matters like sin and the Scriptures and the Providence of God—are of so slight an import that the new religion need hold nothing definite about them, they are convinced that unity in essentials will be easy of accomplishment. Indeed, there is a bond already existing between the sects because "our roots are all set in the same soil."

Put concretely by Dr. William T. Ellis, who is writing of the religion of the soldiers: "They find themselves comrades with one God, one Saviour, one heaven." Dr. Miller, in the article before quoted, thus lays down the essential doctrine of the unified Church: "Of course we must believe in Jesus before we are fit candidates for His Church." Belief in Jesus, then, is the sole essential in the eyes of one minister; belief in God, a Saviour, and heaven, the sole article of Dr. Ellis's creed. Surely here is an easily accessible ground on which all the sects may meet and agree. Here is justification for the assertion that all denominations have their roots in the same soil, and that, by waiving unessentials, they can clasp firm hands on what is of really vital import.

Can they? Not many years ago a certain group of ministers from a single religious denomination met in conference on just one of these essentials: "What think ye of Christ?" The result was a sad shock for those who felt that there was a common bond of belief between the members of at least a single sect. Some of the convention believed that Jesus was true God, the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity. Some believed Him a man raised by adoption to a Divine sonship. Some believed Him merely man, the greatest of the prophets and the Son of Man. The convention adjourned without coming to any decision on just what the denomination as a body really believed about Jesus Christ. The truth was that between them there was no real bond of belief.

Now if one determination had such diversity of belief in Christ, what could be expected as the essential belief in Jesus common to all the sects? Let it be stated at once: there is no such common belief. Dr. Miller admits as much: "Of course, we must believe in Jesus before we are fit candidates for His Church. But a belief is personal, heart-deep, determinative of conduct. Believing in Jesus means accepting His teachings and His standards, living in the spirit of His life. You must not interpret that universal life just as I do, but if we are both honest and sincere and conformed to His life, we belong together under the banner of our common King."

This may all be very clear to the Protestant accustomed to accepting a Christ hazy and indistinct as a figure seen far off in the distance. To the Catholic it will seem a simple evasion of a difficulty. To believe in Christ, he rightly maintains, is to hold something pretty definite about Him; and it makes a decided difference whether, for example, that something pretty definite is a belief in His Divinity or not. If I believe that Christ is Divine, I can and should offer Him the honor due to God alone; I am forced by my faith to kneel in prayer and adoration before Him. If I believe Him merely man, such adoration is simply idolatry. Can other than a slovenly idealism see an essential bond in such contradictory beliefs?

As for accepting His teaching and His standards, that principle applied in the Protestant fashion, has been precisely what broke the sects into a thousand fragments. As an aid to unity, which Dr. Miller evidently intends it to be, it must strike anyone acquainted with history as supremely ridiculous. The High Church Episcopalian who holds that Christ taught the Real Presence in the Eucharist is separated by a clear line of cleavage from the Congregationalist who regards such a belief as rank idolatry. And certainly there can be said to be little in common between the Quakers, the members of the Salvation Army, the Unitarians, and the Christian Scientists, all of whom "accept His teachings and His standards" just as they personally interpret them.

The same fundamental differences hold where heaven or the doctrine of a Saviour are concerned. The title of Saviour can be referred to Jesus in only the most vague and indeterminate way unless we look on Calvary as the sacrifice of a Divine Victim to wipe away the debt that stood out against us. Are all Protestants united in a common belief on this point? Do they, furthermore, all look forward to heaven as a certainty in this day that perhaps heaven is the reward of those who have lived justly, and that there may be a hell for those who incur the Divine wrath?

So while there is an almost infinite disparity among Protestant sects in the matter of "unessential" dogmas, the dissonance on what is "essential" seems, after a brief examination, to be at least as marked. Our sects do not agree on essentials; they positively disagree on non-essentials, and yet there is to be a common bond of faith in Jesus, His doctrines and His standards, that is to make possible the union of all sects into a great American Church. Clearly it is only when a person talks largely and loosely, and optimistically declines to see how far his

platitudes are at variance with actually existing facts, that he can take for granted agreement in essentials. Thanks to the Protestant principle of private interpretation, the sects have reached a point where only in a single fact, the name Christian, do they seem to possess even an apparent unity.

No one will wonder, then, that almost every writer praising the great American Church goes very slow when he comes to just what religious doctrines that Church will hold. He knows very clearly what it will not hold; it will not be creed-bound; it will discard dogmas as irrelevant; it will ask but little in the way of faith. Further than this, it will insist very little on creeds; for, after all, it is not faith but deeds that count in God's sight. Protestantism has surely turned turtle since the days when Luther, banging his pulpit, denounced those who proclaimed that good works were of any necessity, and taught that faith without works was the only road leading to justification. Once faith was all important; works, worthless. Now the same Protestantism teaches that works are all important; faith matters not in the least.

If the founders of the great American Church are seriously bent on unifying the sects, they have only two courses open to them: either all belief, even in the so-called essentials, must be regarded as unnecessary for membership in the new Church, or some person or body of persons must be appointed to determine just what essential beliefs shall be required.

The first course will make the great American Church a huge farce; a purely negative thing, teaching nothing, affirming nothing, asking of its adherents nothing, offering them nothing. The second course could easily be made to tickle the fancies of every body who is humorously inclined. Protestants years ago threw religious infallibility and the person in the world claiming infallibility overboard as decidedly non-essential. This is, in consequence, rather a late day in which to look for some one competent to say with authority just what is essential and what is unessential in matters of faith.

But let us suppose that a committee of ministers is chosen from among the sects to draw up a platform on which all the members can take a common stand. They set themselves to the grim task of propounding a creed that any of their sects will be willing to accept. The meeting is called to order, and within half an hour they find that their conflicting dogmas nullify one another in a fine series of cancellations. The Unitarian will not allow the new Church to teach the Divinity of Christ, while the Episcopalian refuses to consider a Church that pronounces Christ to be mere man. Resultant: The great American Church can teach nothing whatever of the nature of Christ. The Baptist will not belong to a church that rejects all the Sacraments; the Presbyterian declines to hold communion with a body that makes them an essential. Resultant: The great American Church has nothing to say on the matter of Sacraments. The Congregationalist representative believes that the Church should teach that hell exists, whereupon frenzied protests are flung at the chairman's head. Resultant: The great American Church declines to say whether or not there is a hell.

Where will it all end? In a dismal, stricken silence on everything spiritual and supernatural. There is no spiritual common denominator for the sects as they now stand, and a church built to accommodate them all cannot pronounce a single doctrine without alienating at least some of its members. Once more the great American Church turns out to be a negative thing, a thing of denials and silences.

Let me ask the reader what the spiritually hungry will find in such a church full of doubts and difficulties and conflict of opinions? They ask it a question, but not so much an hollow echo comes back in answer. It can tell them much, very much about what they need not believe; but on the fundamentals of the supernatural life, it can say just nothing, simply because it has nothing to say.

Unity it may get in this way, the unity of a patchwork or of a notion-counter or of a meeting mob; but it will obtain it by renouncing all right to voice a definite opinion on any of the supernatural truths for which the world waits eager-mouthed. It cannot answer a single question awakened by the war in the minds of our soldiers. We may call that unity if we wish; but it is unity bought at the price of everything worth having.—Daniel A. Lord, S. J. in America.

### THE CENTURY OF THE PEOPLE

Cardinal Manning of England—"The Cardinal Democrat" whose work in behalf of the laboring classes can not and should not be forgotten, was frequently charged with leaning to Socialism, in fact was named as a Socialist. In writing to Count de Mun of France, he once wrote, "My letter has caused irritation in England. I, like you, am charged with Socialism. But here, Socialism is little studied—it is a party cry. The coming century will belong neither to the capitalists, nor the bourgeois, but to the people. If we win their confidence, we can counsel them. If we oppose them blindly, all good may be destroyed. I hope much from the