

The Catholic Record.

"Christianus mihi nomen est, Catholicus vero Cognomen."—(Christian is my Name, but Catholic my Surname).—St. Pacian, 4th Century.

VOLUME XXI.

LONDON, ONTARIO, SATURDAY, AUGUST 26, 1899.

NO. 1,058.

The Catholic Record.

London, Saturday, August 26, 1899.

U. S. EXPANSION.

Our cousins across the border are making the welkin ring with denunciations of the expansion policy of President McKinley. Is it because the boys in blue have failed to make a triumphal march through the Philippines, or because they resent being misruled by a clique of politicians? The government by the people and for the people and of the people is a phrase much used by the stump orator when addressing his intelligent constituents, but it seems nowadays as devoid of foundation as an airy fairy tale.

THE DEAD AGNOSTIC.

Strong, true words, Ave Maria, anent the individuals who are pointing out Ingersoll's place in the realms of eternal misery! If they who talk about God's love and truth would give evidence of it in their daily lives the way of the Agnostic lecturer would not be paved with dollars.

PROTESTANT MISSIONS.

We are informed by the editor of the Christian Guardian that the publication of his address to the annual conference was requested, especially for young people. This explanatory clause led us to believe the address was a species of exhortation, but we were, after reading it, convinced that the editor intended it as a statement of facts, setting forth the progress and triumph of Protestant missions in general and of Methodist ones in particular.

His description of "the idol of the pagan and crucifix of the Romanist," as emblems of the errors to be overthrown, shows a faithful imitation of ordinary ministerial tactics, but we are at a loss to understand why the accomplished gentleman, with his open Bible and gospel truth, should sully his columns with insulting epithets. The unctuously pious address reminds us of what Heep said about his mother: "I am afraid she ain't safe—immortally safe, sir. I should wish mother to be got into my state. I wish mother had come here. It would be better for everybody, if they got took up and was brought here."

We have no intention of comparing our worthy brother to the famous Uriah. He is, we believe, sincere, but not troubled about the "accuracy which is the badge of scholarship." His modesty is evidenced by the assertion that the Methodist missions have yielded more fruit than those of the first century. Without making any comment on that vainglorious boast which takes one's breath away, or comparing the average gentlemen who "takes the field," to the Apostles, who friendless and rich in nothing save indomitable faith, battled against the allied forces of error and iniquity, we shall refer to some of the countries touched upon by the editor, and see if Protestant witnesses have a similar opinion anent the success of missions to the heathen.

We have no intention of withholding our admiration for the good work done by our separated brethren; but we have no hesitation in saying that their progress has, despite the outlay of money and the advantages of race, been blasted with sterility. The editor points to Japan and the conflict with Confucianism. What the result of the conflict is must be imagined.

There are twenty missionary societies at work in Japan, and yet the Crucifix is high in honor with fifty thousand, who are loyal and faithful children of the Catholic Church. Miss Beckerstein, in her book on Japan as we saw it says "that it was impossible not to be struck with the present complications of religious matters in the country, as compared with the days of Xavier." Perhaps the Japanese have an idea that religion is something more than an experience, dependent on moods and sensations. The day of the Amen corner and revival are passing away. Even in districts on this continent in which Methodism was once a power, we learn from reputable authorities, that the language of unbelief has supplanted the outpourings of souls seeking to be saved from sin and speaking

of themselves as a godly people with sign of election upon them. But that is another story.

In China there are about 40,000 Protestants as compared with 1,095,000 Catholics.

Mr. Serr, in "China and the Chinese," writes:

"When in China we are grieved to our heart's core to see the servants of the Roman Church, infatigably and zealously working regarding neither difficulties nor discouragements; whilst too many Protestant missionaries occupy their time in secular pursuits, trading and trafficking, and transferring their purchase to a native at an advanced rate, although they receive a handsome allowance more than sufficient for their support."

In China, of course, there is the same bewildering variety of teaching. Impressionable females and enthusiastic youngsters send our Bibles by the hundred, to be used, we are told, for the making of fire-crackers, and then write glowing descriptions of the spreading light of the gospel.

Lieutenant Wood, of the U. S. Navy (quoted by Cardinal Moran), writes, in 1889, after visiting the stations in China and Korea, that outside the menials who live about the quarters of the missionaries, there are no Protestant converts, and that even those menials become backsliders when their wages stop. Reliable authorities who render no allegiance to Catholicity unite in saying that China can never be Christianized in the present divided state of the missionaries, and "that after thirty years of work at high pressure, brambles, and baneful weeds, instead of wheat, cover the ground."

India also claims the attention of our esteemed contemporary. We could quote Protestants who have left on record no unsparring tribute to the heroism and success of Catholic missionaries; but our space will only permit us to transcribe some of the "holy war" carried on by our brethren in that country.

In 1859 Sir James Brooke told the Missionary Societies at Liverpool what he thought of their work:—

"With the Mohammedan you have made no progress at all; with the Hindu you have made no progress; you are just where you were the very first day you went to India."

Rev. Dr. Beckerstein (quoted by Cardinal Moran) declared in 1858 that the missions to Hindus were flat failures. "They unlearn," he says, "their own superstitions, but they do not learn the Gospel of Christ. They become in fact intellectual, accomplished unbelievers."

Sir W. Hunter tells us that the natives in India regard the missionary "as a charitable Englishman who keeps an excellent cheap school, speaks the language well and drives out his wife and little ones in a pony carriage." If St. Paul, before starting on one of his missionary journeys, had required St. James and a committee at Jerusalem to guarantee him £300 a year, paid quarterly, and had provided him with a shady bungalow, a pony carriage and a wife, he would not have changed the face of the world.

It is rather strange, too, according to General Gordon, that the priests who carry the "Romanist" crucifix succeed, while the professional Protestant missionary fails.

Have they succeeded any better in Europe? We shall call upon, Rev. F. U. Macdonald, secretary of the Wesleyan Missionary Society, to answer that question. In 1897 he quoted the following report from Rev. M. Gallienne, president of the French conference:

"The general position of affairs is unchanged. A good deal of faithful work has been done, with the result of keeping up simply our numbers, and it is necessary, from the financial point of view, that our English friends should thoroughly understand that this is the story of French Protestantism in all its branches for the last quarter of a century. The MacAll Mission, etc., have failed to create any important religious movement."

Our contemporary must see that his brethren do not waste much eloquence on the missions to the heathen, and that "it's a great deal better not to know so much than to know so much that ain't so."

We disclaim all intention of depreciating the noble labors of Wesley, who more than once exhorted his followers to forsake the "miserable bigotry, which makes many unready to believe that there is any work of God but among themselves."

Enjoyment is only what we feel to be such, and the luxurious man feels no longer; satiety has lost him his appetite, while privation preserves to others that first of earthly blessings—the being easily made happy.—"Atheist Philosopher."

APOSTOLIC DELEGATE TO IRELAND.

The New Title Conferred Upon His Eminence Cardinal Logie.

Dublin, Aug. 14.—The Nation today announces that the Pope has appointed Cardinal Logie, Primate of Ireland, Apostolic Delegate to Ireland, for the purpose of presiding at the national synod of Irish Bishops to be held in 1900.

POPE LEO AND THE HAGUE CONFERENCE.

N. Y. Freeman's Journal.

At the close of the Peace Conference the following correspondence between His Holiness Pope Leo XIII. and Wilhelmina, Queen of Holland, was read by the secretary. The originals are in French, and the translation has been made for the New York Freeman's Journal:

THE QUEEN OF HOLLAND'S LETTER TO POPE LEO XIII.

Most August Pontiff: Your Holiness, whose eloquent voice has always been raised with so much authority on behalf of peace, having in your recent allocution of April 11 given expression to generous sentiments on the subject especially bearing upon international relations, I deem it my duty to inform you that at the request and on the initiative of His Majesty the Emperor of all the Russias I have convened a conference at The Hague for the 15th proximate, which will endeavor to discover means calculated to diminish the present crushing military charges and if possible to prevent war, or at least mitigate its consequences.

I am persuaded that Your Holiness will look with a sympathetic eye on this conference, and I shall be very happy if, in rendering me an assurance of this high sympathy, you will give your precious moral support to the great work about to be elaborated at my residence in accordance with the noble project of the magnanimous Emperor of all the Russias.

I eagerly seize the present occasion, Most August Pontiff, to renew to Your Holiness the assurance of my high esteem and personal devotedness.

Wilhelmina.

Lipburg, May 7, 1899.

POPE LEO'S RESPONSE TO THE QUEEN OF HOLLAND.

Your Majesty: We are naturally pleased at the letter in which Your Majesty informing Us of the meeting of the Peace Conference in the capital of your realm, has shown Us the attention of requesting Our moral support for this assemblage.

We hasten to express Our warm sympathy as well for the august initiator of the conference and for Your Majesty, who has consented to give it honorable hospitality, as for the highly moral and beneficial scope of the labors already inaugurated.

We consider that in such undertakings it is in a quite special way Our role to give not merely moral support, but effective co-operation, for the object is eminently noble in itself and is closely linked with Our august ministry, which possesses from the Divine Founder of the Church, as well as by virtue of tradition many times secular, a sort of high investiture as the mediator of peace. The authority of the Supreme Pontificate goes out beyond the frontiers of nations—it embraces all peoples to confederate them in the true peace of the Gospel; its action in promoting the general welfare of mankind rests above the particular interests which the different heads of States have in view, and it is better able than any other to promote concord among peoples whose characteristics so widely differ.

History, too, bears testimony to what Our predecessors have done by their influence in softening the unhappily inevitable laws of war, in even arresting all bloodshed sometimes when conflicts have arisen between peoples and between princes, in bringing to amicable settlement the bitterest contests between nations, and in courageously maintaining the rights of the weak against the pretensions of the strong.

And we also, despite the abnormal condition to which we are now reduced, have been able to put an end to grave differences between illustrious nations like Germany and Spain, and even now we are confident of being able to restore harmony soon between two nations of South America which have submitted their dispute to Our arbitration.

Notwithstanding the obstacles which may arise, we shall continue, since Our duty so imposes, to fulfill this traditional mission with no other end in view than the public good and without coveting any glory but that of serving the sacred cause of Christian civilization.

We beg Your Majesty to accept the expression of Our particular esteem and Our sincere wishes for your prosperity and that of Our realm.

LEO PP. XIII.

From the Vatican, May 29, 1899.

Many men live as if they had no souls. In their traffic of this life they scheme as if they were to live forever. In their preparation for death they trifle as if there were no life beyond the grave.—Cardinal Manning.

INGERSOLL AS WE SAW AND HEARD HIM.

Catholic Union and Times.

A gentleman whom we have known and respected for many years and who, we fear, is largely tainted with agnosticism, asks our opinion of Ingersoll as an orator.

In reply, we may say that we never heard—indeed, never saw the rhetorical unbeliever but once; and then by curious circumstance each saw and listened to the other. The novelty of the situation, we remember, caused no little humorous comment at the time; for it was surely a strange spectacle to see Ingersoll and a Catholic priest speaking from the same platform.

The occasion was a noted one—the thirteenth annual banquet of the New York State Bar Association, held in Albany, in January, 1899. The Legislature was then in session, with our quondam townsman—the Hon. William F. Sheehan—in the Speaker's chair; and it is no exaggeration to say that it would be rare to find a more brilliant assemblage than the one which thronged the Delevan banquet hall on that evening. We were honored with a seat between Judge Arnoux and the late David Dudley Field; and among the warmest felicitations we received at the close of the address we then delivered were the words of the noted anti-Catholic bigot, the late Col. Elliott F. Shepard of the New York Mail and Express.

Mr. Ingersoll was seated at the left of the chairman, six or eight chairs away. As before stated, we had never before seen him; and as he rose to speak we looked into his face and listened to his words with curious interest. Though we were not introduced to each other, we know that he recognized our name as the one assigned to the preface of Dr. Lambert's "Notes on Ingersoll"—a booklet that had phenomenal sale and that dealt a crushing blow to the infidel's blasphemies. But he must have either forgiven us for the severity of our strictures in that preface, or thought that evening he not only did not say aught to which priest could object, but, much to our surprise, he even quoted approvingly from the address of ours which he had just heard.

The impression which Ingersoll left upon us then was quite the opposite of what he was commonly reputed to leave on his lecture audiences. To them he was the "orator of laughter and applause" who poked fun at Moses and the prophets; scoffed at hell and devil; preached the pagan doctrine of Horace—"Eat, drink and be merry, for to-morrow you die;" who poetized about woods, valleys, mountains, winds, waters, flowers, firmaments, stars and suns; grew singularly eloquent over the tears of wife or mother, and revealed in the ringing laugh of a little child.

But on that evening, as we remember, he affected neither wit nor humor. No merriment pursued his lip or flashed his eye. No convulsing story rose to give point to his words or embellish their meaning. He spoke with deliberation and gravity; and in the unaffected earnestness of his utterance there was convincing evidence of sincerity. He kept the unabated interest of his hearers to the close; but we do not wrong to his memory when we say that of oratory—in the common acceptance of that term—with its mysterious thrill and hypnotic power, there was absolutely none.

And yet we have no doubt but that Ingersoll possessed the gift of oratory to a high degree. He was a conjurer with words and an artist in phrase; while his periods rolled along, at times, with the melody of the lute or the roar of waters. When to these we add his grace or gesture, his fire of eye and impassioned delivery, we can well imagine the secret of his power on great occasions—as, for instance, when he thrilled the Republican hosts at Cincinnati with the pictured glory of the "Plumed Knight."

As a speaker Ingersoll was undoubtedly brilliant; but as a thinker he was neither original nor profound. His admirers may be challenged to instance a single new argument he has advanced against the Christian religion. He was a copier and imitator. He eviscerated the writings of Voltaire, Rousseau, Paine and the noted anti-Christian scoffers of other days; and refurbished, with modern veneer, the castaway productions of their passions and dreams. On these he put the Ingersoll stamp; claimed as his own what was not his; so that the structure of his fame as a thinker rests on a lie.

Whether Ingersoll was sincere in his opposition to Christianity, or whether he ignobly entered upon that career for the purpose of putting money in his purse is not for us to say. Only He who searches the secrets of all hearts can judge. It is sad to think that a man like Ingersoll, who could have done so much to illumine the hearts and homes of his fellow citizens with Christian faith and hope and love, should have used the gifts which God gave him in laboring to blot this trinity of virtues from the life around him. He has assuredly done incalculable harm to the young of our land who would like to believe that there is no hereafter in which injustice

gratified passions are punished. While he has done his best to quench the lamp of faith that lights the way for wandering feet, he has sought to shroud forever the star of hope within the weary heart, and pluck from the longing soul the fadeless flower of love.

THE PAPACY AND PEACE.

Pope Leo's Exclusion From the Hague Conference one of the Chief Reasons For its Failure.

Roman correspondence of Freeman's Journal.

Rome, Aug. 2.—It is no exaggeration to say that the eyes of the whole world have during the last week been turned from the Peace Conference at The Hague to Leo XIII. and the Vatican. The correspondence between Pope Leo and the Queen of the Netherlands, which were read during the closing sessions of the abortive conference have revealed the fact that those who are really anxious for the success of the project were convinced that it was impossible to reckon without the Pope in discussing the peace of Christendom. As a host of misrepresentations have been published concerning the attitude of the Papacy and some of the powers in the preliminaries and progress of the Congress, it will be opportune to state the real facts of the case.

The first part in the matter played by Leo XIII. was the cordial co-operation he promised the project to the Russian minister to the Vatican, before the publication of the Czar's letter. The same minister was the medium of private communication between Russia and the Holy See touching the Conference.

When the different powers were asked to cooperate for disarmament Leo XIII. was not only included in the invitation, but was at the same time privately invited to assist in the drawing up of the programme. His Holiness did so, both orally through M. Gscharikov and in this letter to the Czar, in which he laid especial emphasis on the subject of arbitration. Pope Leo had very little faith in the possibility of inducing the great powers to disarm. Events have justified his scepticism. He was convinced, however, that the dangers of war would be vastly lessened if the powers could be induced to consider an arbitration board as a court of first instance in their disputes. Czar Nicholas at once acted on the advice of the Pontiff by making the question of arbitration the main one for the Conference and relegating that of disarmament to the second place.

During all the negotiations preceding the meeting of the Conference the Czar considered it a matter of course that the Pope should be officially represented among the delegates. Within the last month English and American newspapers have printed various statements concerning His Holiness' displeasure with the Czar for not being invited to send a representative. In some instances the dispatches conveying this information have been dated from Rome—as a matter of fact, they have all emanated from England. It has been all along perfectly evident to everybody here that the Czar set the greatest store by the Papal influence.

Meanwhile the Italian Government took no active steps to prevent the Pope's representation at the Conference. The Ministry were in an embarrassing position. If they permitted the Papacy to sit in council among the nations, they realized that modern Italy would cut a sorry figure beside the Pope's representative: if they objected in the face of the Czar's wishes, they called the attention of the whole world to the fact that they live in mortal fear of the eternal Roman question, which they have declared time and again to be dead and buried.

The cause which finally spurred them to action was a trifling one—so trifling that it has quite escaped the attention of the all-seeing press. During the progress of the arrangements, then, for the holding of the Congress a Catholic paper in Rome published an editorial in which it boldly asserted that no Peace Conference could amount to anything which did not settle once for all that Roman question which was forever cropping up, directly or indirectly, in European politics. The article was devoid of all authority—perhaps it would not be going too far to say that under the circumstances it was extremely imprudent. The Italianisimi immediately took alarm. The Ministry (eight out of the eleven Ministers were Free Masons) at once instructed Admiral Canevaro to insist on the Pope's exclusion and to threaten that in the event of his being included Italy would refuse to send her representatives.

The Czar was greatly distressed. Through his representative to the Quirinal he argued, nay implored, for the representation of the Sovereign Pontiff. Canevaro remained firm. Italy positively would not sit at a conference where the Vatican was recognized as one of the powers. If a choice had to be made between the inestimable moral influence of the Papacy and modern Italy the Czar thought that modern Italy should be thrown overboard. The Italians were therefore informed that the Emperor of Russia had decided to invite the Pope to take a formal part in the deliberations,

when Canevaro played his trump card. He was in a position, he said, to inform the Emperor of Russia that if Italy declined to send her representatives to the Conference England would follow her example.

It was useless to attempt anything farther. Italy had succeeded in excluding its dreaded enemy, the Papacy, and in doing so had killed what little hope existed of any serious results being effected.

During all this time the Italian newspapers were full of stories about the intrigues of the Vatican to secure representation, and some of these stories have found their way into newspapers abroad—the New York Sun, for instance. I know on the best authority that the Vatican did not take a single step to that end. It is no secret that His Holiness expected to be invited, and that he is grievously disappointed over the turn things have taken.

It would seem after all, as if the one great result of the *soi-disant* Peace Conference were to divide the world on the subject of the Roman question. It is interesting, too, to note how the world is thus divided. In spite of all that has been written to the contrary, that of the great powers Russia, France, Austria, and Germany were anxious to see the Vatican taking a part in the recent deliberations, those on the other side were Italy, England, and I have to add with much pain, the United States.

The discussion is not quite over. Many powers were not represented at the Conference, and it has been proposed that those be asked to subscribe to the arbitration scheme. Will the Pope be included among them? The old battle has begun again, and the United States are again on the wrong side. It is useless to speculate on the issue—and it is really of little consequence now whether the Vicar of the Prince of Peace take any part whatever in this most abortive of congresses. With all the mighty influence at his command Pope Leo could not galvanize it into life.

Voy Urbis.

THE LITURGY OF THE CHURCH.

"That non-Catholics should be ignorant of the language, dress and actions, in fact of all the symbolism in the services of the Church, is easily understood; but what should excite surprise is that so many of the faithful, who are constant in their attendance at the Divine Offices, do not know the precise meaning of the ceremonies they behold, nor of the words or singing they hear, nor of the different vestments worn by the priest on various days.

How many pious people, in fact, if you were to ask them, for example, why the Gloria in Excelsis Deo is omitted in the Mass which they have just heard, or why the priest wears, at certain times of the year, a green chasuble, would answer you, surprised at your question, that they know nothing about it! How few understand and can explain such an action of the celebrant at Mass; or can follow the prayers which precede the consecration, and after the prostrate and prayerful silence at the consecration, accompany the Divine Victim, thanking and glorifying Him till the end of the Sacrifice! We might say, in a word, that ignorance of the Liturgy of the Church is almost universal amongst the faithful; and yet this is a matter of no little importance to Catholics.

Dom Gueranger has given us this true definition: "The Liturgy is the collection of the symbols, of the chants and of the actions, by means of which the Church expresses and manifests her worship to God." It has also been defined: "The social form of prayer."

"Those who, for not having made a slight effort, understand neither the prayers nor the rites of the Church, little suspect the lasting happiness and sweet emotion they would otherwise feel in following this beautiful daily Office. It is well worth the study, for there is no monotony in the works of holy Mother the Church. Everything with her has a meaning, nothing is left undetermined, no detail, however small it may be, is useless. She knows well how to sum up entire creeds in a sign; how to clothe in most eloquent language the least action of the Son of God which the gospels have preserved to us. She changes not, and yet possesses variety. In the services proper to each day, look at the surprising diversity of the sequences and hymns; look at the opportunity she gives us,—if we will but understand it,—of going over every detail in the life of Christ, of walking by His side, of becoming—poor creatures though we are—the close companions of our God.

"But then, you will say, if the prayers of the Liturgy have such efficacy and strength with God, why do so many Christians neglect taking part in them, when all they have to do is to open a book of instructions, a few minutes before going to Mass or Vespers? It would take but a very short while to learn and understand the symbols, meaning and object of the service which they are going to attend."—Rev. Father Huysman, in the Working Boy.