



ARISTOCRACY

PROMOTED BY PROTESTANTISM

Scathing Denunciation of Sectarianism.

HOW PROTESTANTISM PUBLICLY REPUDIATES THE POOR.

Grand Tribute to Catholic Charity for God's Beloved Poor.

The following able article from the current issue of the North American Review, requires no words from us to add to the force of its truthful arraignment against Protestantism as the promoter of aristocracy in this country.

When the English first reared an altar beside the James River in the little settlement which the fortune hunters of England established with such difficulty, there were no marked differences of rank amongst the men who knelt before it. Few were there who were not of gentle birth when the colony was founded, but, some years later, when the population was less homogenous, we may be very sure that within the sanctuary walls regard was held for him who could wear the gay clothing and the gold ring, rather than for him whose plain speech and plain garb proclaimed him simple instead of great.

PROTESTANT CHURCHES DESCRIBED.

Two hundred and fifty years have gone by, and the world has made more progress in that time, we are told, than in many cycles of Calvary. Year by year Protestantism has eliminated one harsh feature after another from its statements of belief, and has adapted itself more and more nearly to the needs of humanity, it is claimed. The rude meeting houses of the colonial period have given place to costly churches, it is true. Inside of these temples the light, passing with difficulty through painted glass, reveals an interior filled with carefully upholstered seats, where the foot falls upon the softest carpets, and where the pealing organ swells the note of self gratulation.

SELFINESS AMONG THE SECTS.

But the plain, unfastidious people would not feel at home amongst us, say the wearers of the gay clothing. They naturally prefer to be by themselves. This is true enough, and so fashionable Christianity builds a mission church for unfastidious Christianity and its Sunday meditations are not therefore disturbed by any Dives and Lazarus contrasts being thrust before it. Of all the Protestant churches in America, the writer's own church, the Episcopal, is generally styled the most aristocratic, but its Ritualistic wing has done and is doing much to relieve it from this imputation, and the Ritualistic clergy, as a whole, are little disposed to recognize class distinctions. Next after the Episcopal Church the Unitarian is perhaps the most exclusive, the one farthest removed from sympathy with the spiritual needs of the poor.

that "the better class of Methodists" attend one of these churches in preference to the other. The tolerant Presbyterian or Congregationalist will tell you that "really the better class of Methodists are more like ourselves," which he thinks is a very gracious, liberal-minded statement of the case, and "the better class of Methodists" affect to look down upon the preachers of their plainer co-religionists. Should there be several churches of one faith in any community the scale of respectability may have any number of degrees marked upon it, from the Gothic structure in the fashionable quarter to the mission chapel that has for neighbors saloons and squalid tenements.

HOW ARISTOCRACY IS FOSTERED.

The whole fabric of American Protestantism is inwrought with the notion that class distinctions must exist, must be intensified in fact, in the houses it erects to the worship of a Divine Being who is supposed to care nothing for such distinctions and whose Son, when on earth, condescended with fishermen and "the lower classes" generally in preference to the company of "nice people." Honorable exceptions exist here and there without doubt, but the great, stubborn fact remains that American Protestantism does foster an exclusive, aristocratic spirit. The humble mission chapel develops in time into a church. Its seats are replaced at length by cushioned pews; a costly carpet covers the floor that once boasted nothing better than a cocoa matting, an imposing organ succeeds the unpretentious melodion, the sunlight comes at length through many-colored panes. All these things are certainly sweet and commendable in their nature, for it is surely right to beautify and enrich His temple to the best of our ability, but along with them the spirit of exclusiveness invariably creeps in, and after a time Lazarus is made to feel that his ragged coat is out of keeping in so fine a place and he is assured that he will feel much more at home in the new mission which the church has been so good as to build for him. And, once again, gay clothing and gold rings have it all their own way.

But all this is not the fault of Christianity or of American Protestantism, it is simply a fault inherent in human nature, it may be urged. Is this indeed so? Let us see.

WHERE TO FIND THE TRUE CHURCH.

A stone-throw from the Protestant church may often be seen a church surpassing it in beauty, a church whose marbles are carved with even more richness of design, whose windows blaze with even deeper coloring, a church whose existence the Protestant would like to ignore even while he emulates its architecture, but which, when forced upon his notice, he characterizes as the church of the housemaids and Irish laborers.

"The housemaids' and laborers' church!" Heaven be praised that there is such a church, for Protestantism has little to offer these members of the community. At the door of this despised church is the holy water font, the use of which is common to all the congregation, its presence at the entrance serving to emphasize the fact that worldly distinctions must be left outside the door. The wearer of the gay clothing and he of the tattered sleeve on an equal footing in this sanctuary. Dives and Lazarus kneeling side by side in a Roman Catholic temple is a sight that may often be seen, but the Protestant church-goer rarely beholds such a spectacle in his own church. Whatever the relative merits of the two faiths may be, one must admit that the Roman communion, in America at least, has encouraged, in the majority of cases, the idea of equality of man in the presence of the Maker he has come to worship, while the Protestant communion, has from the beginning fostered an aristocratic, exclusive spirit, which has resulted in making its churches but too often religious club houses, and in deepening the caste distinctions which practically deny the brotherhood of man.

NO PLACE FOR THE POOR MAN IN PROTESTANTISM.

Say what we may, the Protestant Church has no place for the poor man within its pale. The wealthy churches snub him till he leaves them for unfastidious churches or comes to go to church altogether, and the sectarian churches which lay no claim to being fashionable are yet not overgracious to the very poor worshipper who ought to be content with the religious cold viands proffered his kind at the mission chapels. It would not be pleasant to find a ragged, dirty stranger in our cushioned pew next Sunday. These comfortable seats be for well-nurtured, well-dressed Christians who have listened approvingly to the Gospel all their lives, and who are very far from hungering and thirsting for the Bread of Life. Away with you, Lazarus, to the mission chapel where you belong! You shall hear a tenth-rate preacher there whom you can better understand, and on Sunday afternoons we will graciously come there ourselves and question you about the Carpenter's Son, who had not where to lay his head, and the probable distance of Jericho from Jerusalem. We say to ourselves that the uncomfortable direct Bible texts relative to the poor and to our kinship with them are not intended to be taken literally. There must first be a careful study of surrounding conditions. What was suitable and proper to be done at the opening of the Christian era, and in Judea, is not at all the right thing to do now in these United States, nineteen hundred years later, and amongst a wholly different people. And, crowning argument of all, an attempt to follow out literally the New Testament teachings respecting those whom we have always with us, would infallibly result in upturning the foundations of society. And no doubt such literalism would bring with it just such a result. And the preservation of society is heaven's first law beyond question. Let us do nothing to violate it. After this manner do "the nice people" argue, and so Lazarus is sent abroad to Protestantism's back door, the mission chapel, and Dives leans back in his pew and listens graciously when the clergyman admonishes him never to turn his face away

from any poor man in order that the face of the Lord may never be turned away from him. Is it any wonder that Lazarus, his soul filled with the scornful reproof of the wealth and with the despatchfulness of the proud, sometimes fails to perceive the great kindness extended to him, and either turns from religion entirely or enters the church that makes him in his rags as welcome as the sinner who dines sumptuously every day.

ARISTOCRACY THE BACK BONE OF SECTARIANISM.

American Protestantism has no acknowledged duties to perform to the poor man who is so unfortunate as to be within its pale, if we may judge by its bearing toward him. Judged by its works it is no system of faith for the poor man to cling to, whether he be respectably poor or utterly destitute. Whatever gracious message Protestantism may once have had for him it has none now, to all appearances. For years it has steadily turned its face away from the poor man. Its ears have long been dulled to the voice of the poor man asking to be recognized as an equal before God in its temples. Its eyes are too dim to see aught of Lazarus but his rags.

Was it not that faith that has no care for the feeble folk for whom Christ died. Was it not that faith which preaches the gospel of pre-eminence to the rich and of humble submission to the poor. Was it not that faith which gives to him that hath, and from him that hath not taketh away even that which he hath! And was it not American Protestantism because of its pride, its hardness of heart, its "civilized heathenism" that wears the mask of Christianity and crucifies afresh the Master it assumes to adore!

A PRIEST CURES RABIES.

THE EFFECT OF VAPOR BATHS AND THE INHALATION OF OXYGEN.

NEW YORK, March 1.—The Rev. James J. Curran, of the Catholic Rectory at Arlington, N.J., has been credited with curing an authenticated case of rabies, the patient being William Klee, twelve years of age, whose parents reside in Paterson. A reporter called on Father Curran Wednesday and he related the case. He said the lad had been taken away from the institution by his mother, but he had returned Jan. 17.

"Five days afterwards he showed unmistakable symptoms of rabies, violent convulsions, and attempted to bite those who tried to hold him. There were spasmodic twitchings of the muscles all over the body, enormous dilatation of the pupils of the eyes, the iris looking like a fine drawn line. He suffered from great pain at the pit of the stomach and inability to swallow the saliva, and when in convulsions he gave vent to violent growlings and continuous barking. The boy had at the same time, disturbances of the head and seemed to suffer from pains in the back. The latter would throw him into convulsions. At the same time his tongue seemed natural and the pulse normal, though slightly irregular.

"I ascertained that a large mongrel mastiff had bitten him on the little finger of the left hand on January 2nd. The local physician had been called in and gave the boy a dose of morphia which seemed to have no effect on him. I was instructed by the sister who had charge of the domestic arrangements to give the boy a vapor bath. For a long time I have given hydrophobia careful study having had extensive practice in medical matters. I concluded that a vapor bath in conjunction with the inhalation of oxygen would be extremely beneficial in this case. I superintended personally the giving of the bath. A large pail was filled full of water and placed on a gasoline stove which we use for printing purposes in connection with the rectory. When the water began steaming, a chair was placed over the pan, and the boy wrapped in blankets was seated in it and kept there for half an hour.

OBITUARY.

THE LATE REV. J. H. TABARET, O.M.I.

OTTAWA, Feb. 28.—The Rev. Father J. H. Tabaret, O.M.I., D.D., the respected Principal of the College of Ottawa, was struck by heart disease when at dinner to-day and expired half an hour afterwards. He was born in the Department of Lisere, France, in April, 1825, and became Principal of the Ottawa College in 1853, since which time he has been the chief factor in its success. His sudden death has cast a gloom over the College and the city, and his funeral on Wednesday will be enormously attended; he was almost worshipped by those who came into contact with him and his place will not be easily filled. As a scholar he stood in the first rank, as a man he possessed a character of wonderful strength.

RENOUNCING HER RIGHTS.

VIENNA, Feb. 27.—Arch Duchess Maria Theresa Salvator, daughter of the Arch Duke of Tuscany, will, before her marriage to Arch Duke Charles Stephen, brother of the Queen Regent of Spain, take an oath renouncing all rights of hereditary succession to the Austro-Hungarian throne. The ceremony will take place in the presence of all the members of the Imperial families, Presidents of the Austrian and Hungarian parliaments and privy councillors.

IRISH HOME RULE.

IRELAND WANTS NOT SEPARATION, BUT A LEGISLATURE, WITH POWERS EQUAL TO THE DOMINION'S—ULSTER NATIONALISTS.

NEW YORK, March 1.—The Independent of to-day publishes an article by Mr. Justin McCarthy, member of Parliament, setting forth in intelligible form for American readers what Mr. Parnell and his confederates include in their demand for Home Rule. The following comprises the essential features:—He begins by saying that the Nationalists do not demand separation, but would not be satisfied with mere local boards; that very many Irishmen would be glad of separation, but they recognize that the spirit of the age does not favor small, independent States, but rather an agglomeration of States, and that, therefore, "the question of separation does not come into practical politics now."

All the Irishmen, he says, certainly all the responsible Irishmen, are well content to see Ireland a part of Great Britain, provided she is a partner with England on fair terms. If she is, they are willing that Ireland should be in partnership, but they are not willing that she should be in subjection. What they say to English statesmen is this:—"Give Ireland the right to manage her own affairs within the line of the seafoam that washes her shores, give her the right to do for herself what every State in the American Union has a right to do for itself—what every one of the English colonies in Canada and Australia can do—give us this much and we are willing to live in friendly partnership with you." As to imperial affairs, we could easily arrange. A compromise might be found. My own idea of a satisfactory system would be to have a Home Rule Parliament for England, another for Scotland, and, if need were, yet another for Wales, as well as for Ireland, and an Imperial Parliament, in which all should be represented, for imperial affairs—affairs of common interest. This would be just such a system as you Americans have, as Canada and Australia have. But neither England nor Scotland wants a Home Rule Parliament for herself just yet. I say "just yet" because the demand and the necessity will come some day. Sooner or later England and Scotland will find that it is not possible to get through local, parochial, national and imperial business in one centralized legislature. But just yet this is not fully recognized, and, therefore, there is a certain difficulty about establishing a system which should give Ireland, and Ireland alone,

A DOMESTIC PARLIAMENT.

and at the same time allow to Ireland a full representation in the Imperial Parliament, Englishmen say:—"It is unreasonable that you should expect to come over here and take part in the management of our affairs, while we are not to be allowed to have any share in the management of your affairs." I do not think there is much in the objection, but the objection is made, and has to be taken into account; therefore, I at least, should be quite willing to accept a Parliament in Collegegreen, Dublin, and to give up all right to a seat in the Imperial Parliament at Westminster. Some arrangement could easily be made as to Ireland's share in the common taxation and her voice in Imperial affairs. No serious difficulty would arise about that. Give us an Irish Parliament, and we will show that we are ready to meet England on fair and reasonable grounds of compromise and arrangement as to other matters; but it must be an Irish Parliament, not a system of Local Boards. What is the difference? We would be very great. In principle the difference is the difference between what we want and what we do not want. We want to have the existence of the Irish National Parliament, free to make what laws it will for the internal administration of Ireland. We could not accept the control of the Parliament at Westminster, or of the Sovereign acting on the suggestions of English advisers. That would be to hand us over to the control of the English majority again; we should be quite willing to accept the control of the Sovereign acting on the advice of her Irish Minister—the same principle as that which prevails in Canada and Australia. Of course it would be merely nominal control; just as it is in Canada and Australia, and in England herself. The control of the Sovereign in these countries never again can be anything but nominal. The control of an English Ministry over Ireland's domestic parliament would be a very real and altogether intolerable control. Ireland would be quite willing to give any requisite guarantee by an article in

A WRITTEN CONSTITUTION.

or otherwise for the protection of the minority in all their freedom of conscience, in all their rights of whatever kind. Nothing could be less needed than such a guarantee. Nothing is farther from the mind and the heart of Catholic Ireland than to do the slightest wrong to the Protestants of Ireland. With the simple exception of O'Connell, all the great Irish leaders have been Protestants, and some of O'Connell's most powerful supporters were Protestants. See Fitzgerald, Robert Emmet, Lord O'Brien, Thomas Davis, John Mitchell, Isaac Butt, Charles Stewart Parnell—all Protestants. Among the new members elected to serve Ireland's national cause in the Imperial Parliament are several earnest Protestants, who would be rather amused if they were asked whether they were not afraid of being deprived of their freedom of worship if an Irish Parliament were to be established. What about that northern province of Ireland which we hear of as "Protestant Ulster"? I ask my American readers to get well into their minds the fact that the majority of members returned to Parliament from the Province of Ulster are nationalists, and are devoted followers of Mr. Parnell. Let us name some of them:—Mr. Healy, Mr. Biggar, Mr. William O'Brien, Mr. William Redmond, Mr. Arthur O'Connell,

nor. Every American has heard of these names and knows that they are the names of men absolutely devoted to the Irish national cause. These men, and many others like them, are now the chosen representatives of Ulster constituencies. Mr. Sexton went near to carrying a division of Belfast. I was only twenty votes behind my Orange competitor for the representation of the Orange city of Derby. Tell me of the Protestant being oppressed by his Catholic neighbor in such a country and under such conditions! But by all means let the guarantee be given if it is brought necessary. Let it be given in any form that national men can devise. I shall make no trouble about that.

ENGLAND AND THE UNITED STATES.

BRITISH INFLUENCE IN THE REPUBLIC—THE WORK OF JEWISH ALLIES—HOW THE LATE CIVIL WAR WAS FORCED ON THE AMERICAN PEOPLE.

Prominent members of the Rothschild family have declared that the people in America do not rule, but that money rules. It is probably not an exaggeration to state that the Rothschilds could concentrate (with six months' notice) five thousand million dollars at any given point. The following is from the Boston Journal, Dec. 23rd, 1884:—"No wonder that Mr. McLean of the Cincinnati Enquirer (Democratic) is disliked by many Democrats, when he says that Senator Bayard as Secretary of the Treasury would be the clerk of August Belmont, the agent (in America) of the Rothschilds." The head of the Rothschilds banking house has recently been raised to the British Peerage on account of his eminent service to the Crown.

The above mentioned August Belmont, ever since the Rebellion and until recently, has been Chairman of the National Democratic Executive committee. He offered to defray the most of the campaign expenses if Mr. Bayard was made the Democratic nominee for President of the United States.

In the January number of the North American Review—Mr. Richmond—a Democrat and a friend of Mr. Bayard, who is now U. S. Secretary of State, calls his attention to that, and urges him to resign on account of his pro-British sympathies. The Rothschilds advanced large sums of money to start and uphold the Southern Confederacy. Benjamin D'Ireland, the Jewish Premier of England, was closely intimate with them, also with Judah P. Benjamin, the Jew who was in 1850 a British subject and at the same time United States (Democratic) Senator. Benjamin was the intimate friend and co-conspirator of Jefferson Davis, who made him his Confederate Secretary of State. (After the collapse of the rebellion, Mr. Benjamin returned to England and rose to the head of the English Bar.) The following is from the speech of General T. W. Sherman on "Fathers' Day," New York, Dec. 22nd, 1884:

"I wish to impress upon the young men here that the civil war was imposed upon us; that the people of the South did not want civil war. It was imposed upon us by their leaders who sat in the halls of Washington. If from the beginning of the world to the present day there ever was a conspiracy, a conspiracy in the Winter of 1860-61 was a damnable conspiracy, and I speak of it with knowledge, because I myself was then a citizen of a Southern State."

The facts are clear enough. The instigators of the rebellion had for their object not so much the establishment of a Southern Confederacy as the destruction of Republican Government in America, the dismemberment of the Union into small parts and their final absorption into the British Empire. Thus a few conspirators well supplied with money excited elements of discord in the Republic and brought on the terrible slaughter of the civil war, solely that England might make a conquest of the American people for trade and political purposes. The world, and England in particular, is horrified by the blowing up of public buildings in London. Is not the slaughter of hundreds of thousands of our citizens, indirectly caused by England, a vastly more abominable crime? Whatever may be the chances for success, English politicians will not cease to carry out this line of policy as long as they can do it without danger to themselves. Their agents will not only intensify existing differences among us, but promote new ones.

It is the unvarying policy of England in getting rid of rival powers and making conquests, to set their people at variance, making them the instruments of their own downfall, while she safely looks on and at the opportune moment, with the hypocritical excuse "In the interest of humanity and the stoppage of bloodshed," she steps in and takes possession. This Satanic policy laid the foundation of the British Empire. Every addition to it of populated lands has been accomplished in this manner, and she has kept firm hold of them with her blood-sucking trade policy, keeping them in a weakened condition. By this means she holds the two hundred and fifty millions of India.

With one purpose in view since the American Revolution, she has secretly applied the policy of "divide and conquer" in the United States, never for a moment relinquishing the hope of final success. Every consideration of justice, patriotism and public prosperity demands that this policy be sternly met by the utmost vigilance. It constitutes an ever present menace. Only by making it extremely dangerous to its authors, the English aristocracy and American monarchists, shall we avoid shooting down our own kindred in periodical civil wars.

Adequate power to cope with this alarming evil cannot be secured without an extensive combination of determined Americans with this specific object in view. In the interests of humanity and our country, the time has come to

THE CATHOLICS OF FRANCE ARE LOYAL TO THE REPUBLIC.

PARIS, March 1.—The three Cardinals of France have addressed the following protest to M. Grevy:

To the President of the Republic.

MONSIEUR LE PRESIDENT.—The Ministerial declaration read in the Senate and in the Chamber on January 16th, and now publicly placarded in all the communes of France, casts upon the clergy accusations of the gravest kind. A few weeks ago the Minister of Instruction and Public Worship incriminated the conduct of the clergy at the election. These incriminations, generalized and confirmed by the ministerial declaration, compel us to speak. To keep silent any longer would be to admit the accusation directed against us. It is true that in France an anti-Christian minority is seeking to identify its hatred of religion with the Government; but it is also true that the clergy, faithful to the defence of the sacred cause of religion, are more and more devoting their energies to separating the latter from the phantasms and hatred of politics. It is not the place to enter here into details. If any ecclesiastics have, in the electoral struggle, forgotten the limits imposed upon them by the character and nature of their functions, they form rare exceptions. The responsibility of isolated acts cannot with any justice be cast upon the entire clergy, or upon the Government itself could take the responsibility of the acts of all its agents. The clergy do not in the least ignore the gravity of the present situation from the religious point of view. We shall be ready, like our fathers, to suffer all things so long as we are asked for nothing contrary to our conscience and our honor. We shall not forget the words of authority which lately reminded us that the Church does not condemn any form of government in itself. These words shall always be the rule of our conduct towards the State; nor can we allow our love and devotion to our country to be called in question. We are, therefore, fulfilling a duty, and we are assured of the assent of our colleagues in the episcopate in placing in your hands, Monsieur le President, this respectful protest against the unmerited accusations which the ministerial declaration has published against the French clergy. We are, with respect, your humble and devoted servants,

J. H. CARDINAL GUIREAU, Archbishop of Paris.
L. M. CARDINAL CAYROT, Archbishop of Lyons.
J. P. CARDINAL DESJOURS, Archbishop of Toulouse.

MR. DAVITT'S WELSH TOUR.

LONDON, Feb. 27.—Mr. Michael Davitt left this afternoon for Dublin. Just previous to his departure he said:—"I shall remain in Dublin about two weeks, after which I shall visit the southern part of Wales. I am entirely satisfied with the development of the land question in Wales, and strongly impressed with the belief that the interests of the Welsh, Irish, and English producers are identical. I could have no more convincing proof of this than is furnished by the fact that between forty and fifty English constitutions, among which my speeches in Wales have had considerable circulation, have invited me to address them upon the land question in Great Britain. All attempts to raise religious issues in Wales have failed so completely that further efforts have been abandoned, and an illustration of their ill success can be found in the fact that in certain Welsh constituencies, where the kind of tactics have been extensively employed, the electors have expressed a disposition to offer Mr. Parnell a nomination for Parliament at the next elections, should he wish to stand as a candidate for a Welsh seat. The misery existing in Kerry has made a very much deeper impression upon the people in Wales than one who has not been recently among them can imagine, and the causes which led to that lamentable state of affairs, as well as those which prevent the immediate application of remedies, are well known and carefully considered in Wales. The property of the Earl of Kenmare and other Kerry landlords is being heavily mortgaged to English insurance companies. The needs of the landlords are as pressing as those of their tenants. The clamour of the companies for interest long due forces the landlords to demand of their tenants rent which they cannot pay, and the most merciless evictions follow. The distress in the Western Islands is more terrible still, as the soil in that region scarcely yields sufficient to supply food, and certainly nothing with which to pay rent. I have written to Mr. Morley an urgent letter to-day, insisting upon immediate action on the part of the Government towards the relief of the distressed and oppressed, which the people of Ireland are subjected. I am hopeful of a brighter political future, providing that Mr. Gladstone vindicates Mr. Parnell's confidence in his intentions."

THE IRISH PROBLEM.

LONDON, Feb. 27.—Mr. Biggar, in an interview to-day, stated that he had no quarrel with Mr. Parnell, and that he enjoyed that gentleman's complete confidence. Mr. Biggar declined opening the old Galway sores. During the interview his manner was easy, gay, and sweetly demoralized as ever. Mr. Davitt, in an interview, said: "I have the greatest hopes of Mr. Morley. God forbid that the Castle glamour will have influence over him. If he fails, constitutional rule in Ireland will be ended, and blood will be mixed with water in our streets."

SEXTON AND CHURCHILL.

LONDON, Feb. 27.—It is not expected that the Government will give a day for the consideration of Mr. Sexton's censure of Lord Randolph Churchill for his Belfast crusade. The Parnellites will move to adjourn; and in the discussion on the motion they will likely take an opportunity to give the House of Commons some information concerning the parleying between themselves and Lord Churchill on the question of home rule.

AN ELECTION AT GARDIFF.

LONDON, Feb. 27.—Sir E. J. Reed, lord of the treasury in the Gladstone Ministry, was re-elected to Parliament from Cardiff to-day. He received 5,708 votes, against 4,645 for Llewellyn, the Conservative candidate. At the general elections the poll stood:—
Sir E. J. Reed, Liberal, 5,689
Henry Harbon, Conservative, 4,429