

THE CASKET.

\$1.00 PER ANNUM.

A CATHOLIC JOURNAL NON-PARTISAN IN POLITICS.

\$1.00 PER ANNUM

FORTY-SIXTH YEAR.

ANTIGONISH, N. S., THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 9, 1897.

NO 34.

THE CASKET.

PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY MORNING.

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTIONS, \$1.00.
No Subscriptions discontinued until all arrearages thereon are paid.
Subscriptions in United States are discontinued at expiration of period paid for.

ADVERTISING RATES.
ONE INCH, first insertion, SIXTY CENTS.
second TWENTY CENTS.
Special Rates for periods of two months or longer.

Advertisements in Local Column inserted at the rate of 10c. per line each insertion.
Changes in Contract advertising must be in on Monday.
Marriage and Death Notices inserted free.
Obituary Poetry not inserted.

JOB PRINTING.
Neat and Tasty Work done in this Department.
Facilities for all Descriptions of Job Printing are A-1.

THURSDAY, SEPT. 9th.

Mr. Andrew Lang, in a recent magazine article, makes the statement, doubtless not less true than startling, that if Newman's "Grammar of Assent" and Ruskin's "Modern Painters" had been published within the last ten years "they would hardly have attracted any attention at all, outside a narrow circle." He lays the blame for this state of affairs upon the taste for fiction, the newspaper habit, and the utterly undue prominence given by the daily press to the heroes of athletics. "The result," he says, "is that, to an extent that ought to occasion all serious observers no little alarm, the great reading public is rapidly becoming unable to assimilate any ideas at all." Men may differ as to the cause, but of the fact itself there can be no question among thoughtful observers. A comparison of the periodical literature of the day with that of twenty-five years ago will afford pretty strong proof of it. Take up almost any magazine whose life reaches back that distance and compare the contents of one of its old issues with those of its latest numbers. Explain, if you can, the difference in weight on any other supposition than the truth of Mr. Lang's contention. The editor will doubtless tell you that if he puts weight into its pages he will take it out of the publisher's purse. The scholarly treatment of questions is no longer in demand. Not meat for strong men, but milk for babes, is what is wanted. Fancy a writer in *The Catholic World* of the early seventies disposing of "Socialism and Catholicism" in a little over six pages, as does the contributor of the initial article in the current number of that magazine! Imagine a journalist in those days sneering at a quarterly Review because its articles were weighty, as a Catholic editor did at *The American Catholic Quarterly* only a few weeks ago!

To ascribe this state of things, however, to the reading of newspapers and novels, is, to our thinking, to mistake for the cause of the disease that makes it only one of its symptoms. What makes "the reading public" confine its attention to the daily paper and the latest novel? Why do the youth of both sexes, after leaving school, take exclusively to a diet of these? Obviously because the education they have received has not been such as to give them an interest in anything more solid. That is where the trouble lies. The mind of the child in the modern school is frittered away upon a score of different subjects. He gets a smattering of everything, and pursues no one study to a sufficient depth or with sufficient earnestness to give him any grasp of mind. He leaves school a mental dyspeptic. Our fathers often counted their school life by months; but when they left school they could take up a volume of history, biography, travel, poetry, or even controversy, and keenly enjoy it. Put the average youth of to-day who has just "graduated," into a library composed of such works only, and he would be "bored to death"; he would remain just so long as the door was locked upon him, and on being released would rush to the nearest news-stand or book-stall for "something to read." We boast of our "popular education," but if the stream of education be widening, it is just as surely growing shallower from year to year. The "education" that turns a youth out into the world with no taste for good literature and no intellectual interests is a miserable sham.

Like the little girl of whom we are told in the rhyme that—

"When she was good—she was very, very good,
And when she was bad—she was horrid."

Goldwin Smith in his moral and philosophical opinions oscillates between the soundest orthodoxy and heterodoxy the most extreme. The subject of divorce is one of those on which he displays the former. Speaking of a case recently reported from the United States, where a woman is said to have "married" her fifth husband, all the four preceding ones being alive, and two of them being present at the ceremony, he says: "These people denounce the Mormons, though the only difference is that between simultaneous and successive polygamy;" and he cites with approval the remark of the Roman satirist who called such a woman a legalized adulteress.

Goldwin Smith, however, is, as he proclaims himself in the paragraph on science and religion which we quoted last week, an out-and-out Agnostic. Holding the indissolubility of marriage, he must therefore look for some other sanction for that indissolubility than the ordinance of God. And this is where he finds it. "Marriage," he tells us, "is a restraint laid by the majority on the passions of the strong in the interests of the weak." Did ever schoolboy thus outrage logic! To protest against persons availing themselves of laws, made by the majority, to remove the restraint of marriage, and in the same breath to say that that restraint is itself but the imposition of the majority! Surely if it be the majority that imposes it, the majority can likewise relieve from it! If adultery be nothing more than an offence against the law, what is the meaning of the self-contradictory expression, "legalized adultery?" We suppose Prof. Smith would call it an unlawful act which is lawful. What rank absurdities men fall into when they leave the clear realm of truth and go wandering in the mist and fog of error!

That "The Bystander" (the pseudonym under which Prof. Smith writes his "Comments on Current Events" in the *Toronto Weekly Sun*) is not always in a fog, is shown by the very next passage, in which the variable little girl gets good again. Who could more effectually "ally with some cool drops" of common-sense the "skipping spirit" of the female revolt than he does in the following sentences?—

An agitation for the omission of the word "obey" in the [Anglican] marriage service is said to be on foot both in England and America. The question as to the omission or retention of a particular phrase is of little importance. But the question whether the family is to have a head is one of the greatest importance, both to the family itself and to the State, of which the family is the basis. What is in fact sought by this agitation is the formal deposition of the head of the family, and the innovators are bound to show how, when the head has been deposed, the order of the family is to be maintained. They will also have to tell us who is to be responsible hereafter for the family to the State. At present the man is responsible, and this, together with the necessity of maintaining domestic order, forms the justification of his power. If the family is without a head, whom are the children to obey? Is the emancipation from domestic authority to be extended to them?

AN IMPORTANT SUBJECT.

We trust that the Letter of the Holy Father on Education, which we gave to our readers last week, will receive at their hands the close and careful study to which, by reason both of the source whence it emanates and of the importance of the subject dealt with, it is entitled. It is not by any means the first utterance of the Church on the subject of Education. There never was any excuse for the erroneous views of the professing Catholic who looked with favor on the separation of religious and secular instruction: he must, if he was not quite illiterate, have had at least a strong suspicion that those views were at variance with the teaching of the Church. At the same time he might not know just where his opinions were condemned. Now, however, by reason of the publicity given to the Holy Father's Letter to the Bishops of Austria, Germany, and Switzerland, and of the wonted clearness of his instructions, no Catholic who reads anything can longer be in doubt as to the Catholic position regarding education.

And we cannot, moreover, help regarding it as providential that this pronouncement should be made by the present Pontiff and at this late hour in his illustrious reign. From the disposition of Leo XIII. to secure essentials by conceding as much as possible in non-essentials, he has acquired a reputation for great liberality. This trait of the Holy Father, it must be observed, is in some quarters greatly exaggerated. Designing men, aided by the ignorance or bad faith of certain Catholic publicists, have grossly and grotesquely misrepresented Leo XIII. as a partisan of religious liberalism. One wildly erratic writer, who has adopted a pen-name signifying "the nameless one," and who, though demonstrated again and again to be a false prophet and a teacher of error, is still occasionally quoted by such Catholic editors, persists in representing the Supreme Pontiff as a man given up entirely to the propagation of revolutionary and socialistic principles. All such representations, it is scarcely necessary to say, are absurdly and outrageously false: there is not a sentence in the voluminous writings of the Pope, nor an act in his long pontificate, to justify them. They have no other foundation than the readiness of the Holy Father above referred to—a readiness which, so far from being at variance with the traditional policy of the Church, is in perfect accord with it—to waive mere non-essentials for the sake of what is essential.

This feature of the policy of Leo XIII., while it is wrong to exaggerate its extent or to represent it as a departure from Catholic traditions, has, as we have remarked, won him a reputation for liberality. Many doubtless supposed—indeed within recent years it has been boldly asserted—that the whole policy of the Church on the question of schools had undergone a decided modification—that it was much more "liberal" than it had been. Only a few weeks ago one Catholic editor, with whom the wish was father to the thought, drew practically this conclusion from the appointment of Cardinal Satolli as Prefect of the Congregation of Studies. The Pope's Letter, which was printed in the very next number of the editor's own paper, was the answer to his observation.

Leo XIII. represents to the world at large the high-water mark of liberality in the Catholic Church; and now the world has Leo XIII.'s teaching on the subject of Education; and it is found to be precisely the same as that of all his predecessors who have spoken upon it—the same as that of the Church has ever been. Not one jot or tittle of the Catholic demand for religious schools, for religious teachers, for religion permeating the entire work of the school, does he abate. Many of our non-Catholic friends will be sorely disappointed at this. They had thought—and unfortunately some Catholics who should have known better had encouraged them in the expectation—that the present liberal-minded Pope would abandon the old narrow and exclusive (as they consider it) policy of separate schools for Catholics. Catholics, they thought, were out-growing this,—at least all but the Clericals and Ultramontanians. Had not a great Catholic Minister of the Crown in Canada gone out to Manitoba and told the people there that it was a crime against the country to have Catholic and Protestant children educated separately! It was true, that Catholics repudiated the man's utterances and denounced him as a traitor; but those who did so were "Clericals"—narrow-minded medieval moles whose weak eyes could not stand the light of the nineteenth century! Leo XIII., the broad, liberal Pontiff, had no sympathy with such men: he would never sanction their antiquated views. He was a man of the times. He would speak and show those men that the world had advanced beyond the Middle Ages.

Well, he has spoken on this subject of Education, and he has disappointed those who expected him to reverse the policy of the Church, just as he did those who were confident that so sagacious a student of "the higher politics" (to quote the phrase of the Nameless One) would never commit such an impolitic act as to pronounce Anglican Orders invalid. The beautiful dreams of a "liberal" Catholic educational policy have vanished into thin air. Since Leo XIII.—that Pontiff so liberal—is as "medieval" as the worst Jesuit on this Education question, all hope of such a policy is gone.

It is well that our non-Catholic friends

should be disabused of their groundless notion that the Catholic demands on this subject can be modified; but it is better still that all Catholics should themselves understand that this is not a question upon which there can be any difference of opinion among us—that it is not a mere non-essential upon which we can make concessions in the matter of principle. The rule of the Church is and must ever be the same in regard to it, though special circumstances may in particular cases render impracticable the carrying out of that rule.

And why this immutability of the Church's demand for education permeated by religion? It flows from the very nature of education itself. What is education but the making of man—the fitting him to attain the end of his existence. That end as we all know, is his eternal salvation. Hence nothing is true education which does not fit the man for that end. The difference between the Church and other religious bodies, is that while in theory all hold this to be the man's last and all-important end, she alone realizes it and keeps it ever in view. Everything else with her is subordinate to that. With her God is not a Being entitled to one day out of the week, or a certain hour out of the day: Every hour of every day is His. Her churches are always open, for the same reason that her schools are always separate. She does not understand the separation of religion from other affairs.

With the sects, in practice, it is different. Religion is something for Sunday: their church-doors are locked on other days. For evidence of their superiority as religions they point you to the wealth and prosperity of the peoples belonging to them—clearly showing that, whatever they hold in theory, in practice they regard the attainment of wealth and worldly prosperity as the great end of man. Very naturally, then, they are satisfied with an education that will fit him for that end. Religion is very good in its place, but they do not see why it should be mixed up in things with which, in their view, it has nothing to do.

This whole controversy regarding religious and secular schools, so far from being a controversy as to the end of man's existence.

NOTE AND COMMENT.

By DAVID CREEDON.

Sir Wilfred Laurier having said that the three personages who had impressed him most during his trip abroad were the Queen, Gladstone, and the Pope, a French-Canadian journalist gently hints that he should add the name of President Faure. Were it permissible, we should like to inquire what M. Faure has ever done to deserve such a classification. As far as can be seen, he appears to be a man of very moderate abilities. Nor can it be his exchanging the religion of his youth for political success which renders him so worthy of admiration in the eyes of a journal ostentatious of its Catholicity. But perhaps Francomania as well as Francophobia exists in the old Province of Canada. Which of the two is the more detestable it would be difficult to determine.

Dr. Brownson used to say that he had no special admiration for the Irish as Irish, but an intense admiration for them as Catholics. There are many who will say the same of the French. They are in the van of missionary labor throughout the heathen world, they contribute the bulk of the money and the majority of the men to this work. France is emphatically a Catholic nation, its people as a whole are deeply religious. But as for the little knot of infidels who would make the world believe that they are the literary, scientific, artistic and political life of the nation,—they are deserving of as little respect from Catholics as the fetish-worshippers of darkest Africa.

Joseph de Maistre once called history a vast conspiracy against truth. At the present day many of the conspirators are turning Queen's evidence, but the majority are still faithfully performing the assassin's work. Father Yorke in the *San Francisco Monitor* is turning his powerful searchlight on one of those so-called historians, P. V. N. Myers by name, whose insidious lies about the Catholic Church are being taught at the public expense in many schools of the United States. A still later production of similar quality is "A Short History of Medieval Europe, by Profs. O. J. Thatcher and Ferdinand Schwill."

The *Boston Literary World* calls it a capital advanced school-book, just after quoting a paragraph which misrepresents ornamental life as a going out "to live in the desert and find the way to God without the aid of the Church and her means of grace." Such a statement proves the Chicago professors either exceedingly ignorant or exceedingly untruthful, in any case utterly incompetent for the task of historians. The life of the western hermits was by no means as far removed from the world as that of the solitaires of the Thebaid, and yet the latter made careful provision for the visits at stated intervals of priests who should administer to them the Sacraments of Penance and the Holy Eucharist.

Aubrey De Vere's recollections of Newman have reminded me of a sketch by one who knew the great Oratorian much more intimately. James Anthony Froude writes thus in one of his volumes of "Short Studies": "When I entered at Oxford, John Henry Newman was beginning to be famous. The responsible authorities were watching him with anxiety; clever men were looking with interest and curiosity on the apparition among them of one of those persons of indisputable genius who was likely to make a mark upon his time. His appearance was striking. He was above the middle height, slight and spare. His head was large, his face remarkably like that of Julius Caesar. The forehead, the shape of the ears and nose were almost the same. The lines of the mouth were very peculiar, and I should say exactly the same. I have often thought of the resemblance and believed that it extended to the temperament. In both there was an original force of character which refused to be moulded by circumstances, which was to make its own way and become a power in the world; a clearness of intellectual perception, a disdain for conventionalities, a temper imperious and wilful, but along with it a most attaching gentleness, sweetness, singleness of heart and purpose. Both were formed by nature to command others, both had the faculty of attracting to themselves the passionate devotion of their friends and followers."

Of Newman's religious poems Froude says "It was hard to say why they were so fascinating. They had none of the musical grace of the 'Christian Year.' They were not harmonious; the metre halted, the rhymes were irregular, yet there was something in them which seized the attention and would not let it go. Keble's verses flowed in soft cadence over the mind, delightful as sweet sounds are delightful, but are forgotten as the vibrations die away. Newman's beat pierced into the heart, and mind, and there remained. The literary critics of the day were puzzled. They saw that he was not an ordinary man; what sort of an extraordinary man he was they could not tell."

He quotes "Lead, Kindly Light," calling it "the most popular hymn in the language," and goes on: "It has been said that men of letters are either much less or much greater than their writings. Cleverness and the skillful use of other people's thoughts produce works which take us in till we see the authors, and then we are disenchanted. A man of genius, on the other hand, is a spring in which there is always more behind than flows from it. The painting or the poem is but a part of him inadequately realized, and his nature expresses itself, with equal or fuller completeness, in his life, his conversation and personal presence. This was eminently true of Newman. Greatly as his poetry had struck me, he was himself all that the poetry was, and something far beyond. I met him now and then in private; I attended his church and heard him preach Sunday after Sunday; he is supposed to have been insidious, to have led his disciples on to conclusions to which he designed to bring them, while his purpose was carefully veiled. He was, on the contrary, the most transparent of men. He told us what he believed to be true. He did not know where it would carry him. No one who has ever risen to any great height in this world refuses to move till he knows where he is going. He is impelled in each step which he takes by a force within himself. He satisfies himself only that the step is a right one, and he leaves the rest to Providence. Newman's mind was world-wide. He was interested in everything which was going on in science, in politics, in literature. Nothing was too large for him, nothing too trivial, if it threw light upon the central question, what man really was, and what was his destiny. He was careless about his personal prospects. He had no ambition to make a career, or to rise to rank and power. Still less had pleasure any seductions for him. His natural temperament was bright and light; his senses, even the commonest, were exceptionally delicate. He could admire enthusiastically any greatness of action and character, however remote the sphere of it from his own. Gurwood's 'Dispatches of the Duke of Wellington' came out just then. Newman had been reading the book, and a friend asked him what he thought of it. 'Think!' he said, 'it makes one burn to have been a soldier.' But his own subject was the absorbing interest with him."

At some other time I shall quote what this distinguished writer, himself perhaps after Newman, the greatest master of English prose, or at least as *equal* with Macaulay, has to say of Newman's conversational powers and of his preaching.