

THE REAL STRUGGLE.

That there is a mighty struggle commencing in the religious world to-day, no one that observes can fail to perceive. Every imaginable weapon of offence and defence is polished and sharpened; from the arsenal of philosophy, science and literature, ammunition of every kind is drawn and placed in convenient spots where it may be at any moment available. But who are the contending parties? who are the giants of intellect that are about to wrestle for supremacy in that arena? Most decidedly one is the Catholic Church; but are we certain that the other is Protestantism? Not at all. We are positive that the end of this century will bring around the wave of revolution that has, almost regularly, every fifty years swept over civilization. The Church of Christ must be, as it ever has been, since the dawn of redemption, the persecuted victim of the envoys of Darkness. But, again, is that struggle, which has already commenced, to be carried on between the spirit of Catholicity and the spirit of Protestantism? We do not believe it.

True it is that men, like Rev. Dr. Kerr, of Glasgow, who delivered his tirade of most intolerant abuse against Catholicity, before the Pan-Presbyterian Council, will pour forth their long pent-up floods of hatred and anti-Christian bigotry against the Church of Christ; but these outbursts merely recoil upon the orators or writers from whom they emanate. When men, calling themselves Christian ministers, advocate from the very pulpit, the persecution of their fellowmen of another faith, the ostracising of their fellow citizens of another belief, their words have merely the contrary effect to that which they seek to produce. When men, like the Rev. John Laing, of Dundas, attempt to point out the way to national glory through the medium of perverting French-Canadians from their Faith, and do it in such a very unsatisfactory manner as he has, we see little danger to the Church in any Protestant denomination, nor in all their denominations combined—were they ever able to combine or unite them. If these men are their "big guns," their musketry must be of the pop-gun caliber.

Anyway, when the Protestant argues against Infidelity he makes use of Catholic doctrines and Catholic reasoning; when he argues against Catholicity, he makes use of Infidel principles and Infidel methods. So that the Protestant is more an observer, a "hurler on the fence," in the present instance—in this great struggle that menaces the peace of the religious world.

The contending parties are none other than the spirit of Catholicity and the spirit of Infidelity. The hydra of Infidelity appears with his numberless heads, each armed with a venomous sting and with eyes that blaze with the light of an inward hell. Indifferentism, Irreligion, Socialism, Radicalism, Illuminism, Revolutionism, anti-Clericalism, Atheism, Materialism—in a word the many-headed monster Modern Infidelity. Mr. William S. Lilly, in his recently published work "On Right and Wrong," has the following striking passage: "Look at France, with its prevailing atheism decreeing injustice as a law; its domestic virtue sapped by its popular literature of lubricity; its high places the prey of the most ignoble demagogues; all classes in antagonism; all social bonds loosened; popular passions—*passions de la cervelle et de l'estomac*—the only effective power left. That is the practical consequence of the substitution of the gospel of Jean-Jacques Rousseau for the Gospel of Jesus Christ; of the elevation of concupiscence—aptly symbolised by the Goddess of Reason—into

the place of conscience; of the 'dumb-buzzard idol' Man in the abstract, and his sophistical 'rights,' into the place of the living God and the duties binding us to Him."

Were certain writers to continue in this country as they have commenced, the day would not be far distant when these words of the eminent convert would apply to Canada. And who are the real apostles of the new gospel of Reason? They are the journalists; as journalists must also be the gladiators to meet them. How do we reason this out? Please follow us for a few short moments.

Chateaubriand once wrote: "Europe is hastening towards Democracy; the symptoms of the social transformation abound; the ancient society is perishing with the social order out of which it has come." Democracy is the dominant fact of modern civilization, all-invading, all-penetrating, remarking the nations by equality of rights and the power of numbers. There are, of course, different types of Democracy, the difference being due, chiefly, to the national temperament and national history. But whatever the varieties of its form, it everywhere means the advent of the masses to political power. To the decision of the numerical majority is the ultimate appeal, whether that appeal be made directly, by *plebiscite*, or indirectly, by means of a general election. To quote the same author: "Demos is King." (he don't mean *Demos* of the *Canada-Review*: he is dethroned). "How will he rule?" The Roman poet says: "Power which wisdom does not guide, falls, overweighted, in ruin to the ground." "Who shall teach the sovereign people in the way of wisdom?" asks Lilly. Who shall guide that sovereign people to understand matters of State, beside which even the utterances of Isaias are plain and simple? "The Press undertakes that task. Our journals are the guides, philosophers, and either friends or enemies of the masses, teaching them what they suppose themselves to think on well-nigh all subjects." For the majority of men their newspapers—for seldom they read anything else—are the direct sources of those floating opinions which have drifted into their minds, whereby they judge all social, political and even religious problems. The rights of the journalist is the "liberty of the press." To this we will refer next week, when we will point out what difference there is between *liberty* and *license*, as seen in the "Syllabus Errorum."

Novalis says, that "Man consists in Truth." The journalist, of all men, should consist in truth. The author of the "Ethics of Journalism," thus defines the duties of the journalist. "Accurately to state the facts, fairly to comment upon them, correctly to sum them up, and candidly to indicate the conclusions to which they point—such, surely, is the ethical obligation laid upon the newspaper publicist. The masses who look to him for guidance have a right to expect so much from him." Do all journalists keep to that precise standard? But let us not stray from the point! The spirit of Infidelity has engaged a portion of the press, and in its service that section of journalism will make war upon the Church. As the people take their politics to a great extent from the press, this faction of the newspaper world will and does seek to make the people take their religion from it and not from the Church. It forbids the priest to enter the domain of politics, while it does not scruple to intrude, red-handed, upon the sacred domain of the sanctuary. It is this enemy, this mouth-piece of false principles that must be met and crushed; "diamond cuts diamond," so must the Catholic press cross swords with the infidel

and anti-Catholic journalism that is daily becoming bolder in Canada. If we want to save our country from the fate of France, we must save our people from the men of the Voltairian school. It then reduces itself to a struggle, to the end, between the Catholic and anti-Catholic press: between Faith and Infidelity; the Church and anti-clericalism. The *Canada-Review* and its socialistic writers must be taught the lesson that it was upon the Cross these words were written: *in hoc signo vinces!*

UGANDA.

This Uganda business has created quite an amount of discussion both in the old world and in the new. Especially since the recent decision of the Gladstone ministry to abandon Uganda, the question has taken a political as well as a religious aspect. As to the political phase of the issue we have nothing at present to say; but as far as the religious dispute is concerned we desire to cast a little light upon the confusion. To commence at home, and with the best condensed expression of the ultra-Protestant view, we will quote an editorial that appeared in the Daily Witness of the twenty-ninth September last. Thus speaks our contemporary:—

The French Government is hardly justified in making claims upon England for the failure of Captain Lugard to protect the French missionaries of Uganda from injury during the recent disturbances in that province. Captain Lugard implored the French missionaries to place themselves under his protection in the residency during the troubles and while they were there they were protected but they left before the troubles ended and joining Captain Lugard's enemies gave him a great deal of trouble and brought ruin upon themselves. If Captain Lugard had not exercised his powers vigorously both the Protestant and Roman Catholic factions after injuring one another would have been destroyed by the Mohammedans.

We need scarcely say that the Witness is altogether astray, and evidently the writer of the foregoing gleaned his information from Captain Lugard's own report, written to protect himself from the consequences of his questionable conduct. We cannot better explain the real situation than by giving the opinions of men who witnessed the events with their own eyes, and who are consequently eminently qualified to speak upon the question. Listen to the Reverend Kenelm Vaughan, a missionary fresh from South Africa, and from visiting Maison Carree, in Algiers, the headquarters of the White Fathers, the missionaries of Uganda. He declares that he is well up in the Uganda question, and possesses many published and unpublished documents and letters relative to the late troubles there. From a sense of justice his knowledge of an Englishman's love of fair-play, he sent his convictions on the matter, to the Liverpool Catholic Times, as follows:

It is evident that there are two conflicting versions of the origin of Uganda war—one is given by Captain Lugard, who represents the East Africa Company; the other by Bishop Hirth, who represents the King and the Catholic party.

1. Captain Lugard's version, according to Thursday's Times, is that a Protestant chief was killed by a Catholic chief, whereupon he (Captain Lugard) demanded Mwanga to deliver upon the murderer. The King refused to obey his orders, whereupon he (Captain Lugard) felt himself bound in duty to appeal to arms for the maintenance of justice.

2. Bishop Hirth's version of the origin of the war is as follows: On the night of the 20th of January, 1892, in Mengo, the capital of Uganda, a Protestant chief named Muwanika, with a band of ruffians armed to the teeth, and bearing fire-brands in their hands, attacked the private house of the Catholic chief Mongolaba. Mongolaba, in mere self-defence, fired upon his would-be assassins and killed one of them. Captain Lugard on the same day called upon the king, and ordered him, under threat of war, to deliver up Mongolaba as guilty of murder. This Mwanga refused to do, for he knew that his faithful chief was innocent of murder, having killed the man not out of malice, but in sheer self-defence. This refusal of the King infuriated Captain Lugard and his party, and was the signal for the outbreak of the war. For on the 23rd Katekire, by order of Captain Lugard, armed 200 men in Fort Kampala with rifles and ammunition, and next day, having put in safety the Protestant missionaries with their cattle, they sallied forth at 2 p.m. and opened a heavy fire upon the king and his Catholic party, having wasted their homes and their church by fire and sword. Then the king and 4,000 of his Catholic subjects fled for refuge to Sese, a small island in Victoria Nyanza Lake. But they were not safe there long. For on the 30th Captain Lugard's army in fifteen armed boats followed them to the island, butchering and massacring until night the defenceless men, women, and

children who, for want of canoes, were unable to make their escape. This attack was uncalculated for, cruel, and contrary to the rights of nation, because it was an attack made upon defenceless men, women and children.

Now which of these two stories of the origin of the Uganda war is correct? It is evident from the following reasons that Bishop Hirth's statement is the true one.

1. In the first place Bishop Hirth's story is clearly told, and is full and circumstantial, and taken from his own diary a copy of which is before me; whereas Captain Lugard's account is vague and laboured. Dates and names are omitted, and certain paramount facts are also omitted, which, if told, would give a very different impression as to the origin of the war.

2. Bishop Hirth is familiar with the natives and their language, and consequently knows all that goes on not by hostile interpreters but by personal knowledge; whereas Captain Lugard, being ignorant of the language, is entirely dependent for news on the reports brought to him by his Mahometan soldiers, who are deceitful and known enemies of the Christian name, and rivals of the native race.

3. Again Bishop Hirth's report is impartial. He has no reason to misrepresent matters, for he hates the British flag, believing that under its protection Catholics will enjoy liberty and justice; whereas Captain Lugard's report leads, as Debats says, like a document carefully and leisurely written by the East Africa Company to relieve its agents of the responsibility for the massacre of January.

4. When in Zanzibar, the headquarters of Central African news, I learned that the political circles and consular authorities there were of one opinion, that Captain Lugard and his party were really the aggressors in this matter.

5. Lastly, the Marquis de Beauchamps, Dr. Moloney, and Mr. Robinson—the only survivors among the whites of the Katanga expedition, and my fellow-passengers on board the homeward bound "Ava"—all assured me that the universal opinion of unbiased men in those parts of Central Africa through which they had travelled is that Captain Lugard and his party are responsible for the Uganda war, and that the English papers have been entirely misled.

I have written this article merely on behalf of truth and justice.

The Liverpool Times comments thus: "Captain Lugard stands accused of various charges—charges so serious that they have been made the subject of diplomatic representations, and are being investigated by an officer dispatched to Uganda for this purpose by the Foreign office. Without waiting for the report of the Commissioner, the Spectator decides from the statement of the person accused, not only that he acted rightly in siding with the Protestants against the Catholics, but that the conduct of the Roman Catholic missionaries has clearly very little to be said for it."

The Spectator is evidently as bad as our Daily Witness.

CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS.

To-day the Catholic world in general, and the Catholics of this continent in particular, will hold high jubilee in honor of the 400th Anniversary of the discovery of America, by Christopher Columbus. It is a significant fact that of all the Christian denominations the Catholic Church alone joins the religious to the civil celebration of that great event. And most properly does she do so: for was not Columbus a Catholic, did he not sail under the standard of the Cross, and was it not in the name of God, as well as in that of his sovereign that he took possession of the New World? Last week we published the magnificent letter of Archbishop Fabre of Montreal, upon the great event that we commemorate to-day. It is an eloquent as well as a highly historical and religious document. To-day His Grace chants High Mass in the Cathedral chapel and from our altar, at the foot of Mount Royal, there ascends a sacrifice of thanksgiving, in unison with the different Catholic churches in America, Italy, Spain, and Portugal. From his watch-tower on the seven hills, the Vicar of Christ has looked out upon the world, and he has blessed the celebration of the four hundredth anniversary of the discovery of America. Lord Macaulay, in one of his famous essays, tells us how the Church of Rome may some day find adherents enough, in the great valleys between the Mississippi and the Gulf of Mexico, to compensate for her losses in the old world. Macaulay was prophetic: his words have come true. But he little expected that even the losses in Europe would be soon repaired and that her days of glory were only dawning. With the Church let us thank God and His Holy Mother for all the blessings bestowed upon the human race through the instrumentality of Christopher Columbus!