

AMERICA

A CATHOLIC REVIEW OF THE WEEK

Vol. I.

APRIL 17, 1909

No. 1

CONTENTS

CHRONICLE.

New York's First Cathedral—France—Reform of Finances in Germany—New President of the Centre Party—The British Budget—Italy's Political Program and Cabinet—First Plenary Council of Canada—No Canadian Dreadnought—The Canadian House of Commons—Newfoundland's Cabinet Crisis—Russia—Woman Suffrage1-4

QUESTIONS OF THE DAY.

Editorial Announcement—Rebuff to the Orleans Lodges—Red Cross Messina Funds Not Used to Proseletyze—Blessed Jeanne d'Arc—Catholics and Socialism—The New Premier of Newfoundland—Emily Virginia Mason5-11

CORRESPONDENCE.

General Situation in Italy—Result of the Recent Elections—No Danger of Anti-Clerical Movement—Italy's Position in European Concert—The Case of Padre Murri—An English Outlook—Death of Bishop Johnson—Meeting of English and Welsh Bishops—England and Germany—By-Elections—Paris—The Late Postoffice

Strike—Accusations Against M. Simyan—Heavy Loss to Business Interests.....13-15

EDITORIAL.

The Guadalajara Trouble—The Facts in Prof. Schnitzer's Case—Dr. Patton and the Pope—Strong but Not Extreme—Patriotism and Religion in France—The Tariff Issue.....16-17

LITERATURE: BOOKS.

The Maid of Orleans (Poem)—Personal Recollections of Joan of Arc—The Maid of France—Jeanne d'Arc—The Catholic Who's Who and Year Book—Catholic Foot-steps in Old New York—Supplementa Editioni Decimae Septimae Compendii Theologiae Moralis—Fouard's Life of Christ—Jeanne d'Arc's Coat of Arms.....18-20

EDUCATIONAL.

Religion in Indian Schools—Fifth Annual Report, Reverend Superintendents of New York Catholic Schools—The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching—The Status of Gaelic in New University of Ireland—Catholic German Students' Societies.....21-22

SCIENCE.

Farthest South—A Novel Form of Telescope...22

ART.

Exhibition of the Academy of Design—Der Tabernakel einst und jetzt—The Illuminated Roll of the "Exultet"—Exit the Dolls24-25

ECCLESIASTICAL NEWS.

PLATFORM AND PULPIT.

Rev. M. Sheedy, D.D., on Socialism—Bishop Dougherty's Appeal for Parochial Schools...24

OBITUARY.

Rev. Joseph H. Slinger, O.P.—Rev. D. V. Phelan—Francis Marion Crawford.....26

CHRONICLE

New York's First Cathedral.—More than local interest is attached to the very notable celebration of the one hundredth anniversary of the laying of the corner stone of old St. Patrick's Cathedral, New York, which will begin on April 23. While the sacred associations of what is to Americans a venerable antiquity cluster about old St. Peter's, in Barclay street, which was built nearly a quarter of a century earlier, the glory of a sacred pre-eminence, long possessed, will for generations of Catholics to come hover over the hallowed precincts of old St. Patrick's. Were historical records wanting, the choice one hundred years ago of Ireland's Apostle as the patron of the cathedral church would point unmistakably to the nationality as well as to the active faith of the early worshippers on Manhattan Island. In 1808, Father Anthony Kohlmann, with the aid of his fellow priest, Father Benedict Fenwick, the future Bishop of Boston, opened a school in Mulberry street in a house opposite St. Patrick's, and in June of the following year these pioneer priests began the erection of the church which was to serve for so many years as the cathedral of the new diocese. Kohlmann the Austrian and Fenwick the Marylander appropriately selected as patron of the new church the apostle of the land whose children formed the bulk of the growing Catholic population. Besides the other distinguished bishops who have been associated with the sacred edifice, it was here that Bishop Hughes and his successor, the first American Cardinal, John McCloskey, were consecrated, and from this place

they accelerated the marvelous development of the great see over which they presided with so much credit to themselves and so much edification to the Catholics of their own diocese and of the country at large.

France.—A special cablegram from Paris to AMERICA, under date of April 14, 1909, announces that many bishops have invited their people to decorate and illuminate their house-fronts next Sunday in honor of the beatification of Jeanne d'Arc. Contrary to the newspaper reports circulated in the United States, there is no truth in the rumor that Archbishops Mignot and Fuzet are to be disciplined. No meeting of the French hierarchy will be held in Rome; and it is absolutely false that Austria has communicated to the Vatican a protest against the holding of such a meeting.

Sixty-five French bishops and four thousand French visitors have arrived in Rome for the ceremonies of the beatification of Jeanne d'Arc. No consistory is foreshadowed for the nomination of cardinals.

Cardinal Andrieu, Archbishop of Bordeaux, suppressing the diocesan association, substitutes therefor centralization at the Archbishop's house with penny subscription for the maintenance of public worship.

The Archbishop of Sens publishes a letter protesting against the confiscation of his Grand Seminary, which the government wants to transform into a house of detention for fallen women.

The Socialist Congress thinks it should leave to members the free expression of their religious opinions, and refuses to enter into alliance with the radicals.—DENNIS.

Reform of Finances in Germany.—With the disappearance of the war clouds from the horizon of European politics, the attention of the nation is more undividedly directed to the reform of the financial system of the Empire. The necessity of such a reform is generally granted. The people are also resigned to the fact that the reform will include a considerable increase of the taxes. Rates are urged on tobacco and wine, gas and electricity, and also on advertisements. It seems probable that the tax already levied on beer will be increased and the inheritance tax extended to wives and children. The matter is rendered more difficult by the provision in the constitution of the Empire that all direct taxes must be reserved to the states, the central government being allowed to impose indirect taxes only.

Chancellor von Bülow is resolved to carry the reform by the votes of the so-called Bloc parties, and without any dependence upon the votes of the Centre. The newspapers of this party complain that all amendments proceeding from it are infallibly rejected, and this is conceded by the opposite parties. The "Bloc," on the other hand, is itself in no very smooth working condition. It comprises too many heterogeneous elements. The leaders of the so-called "Little Block" are trying to bring about a compromise which will re-unite the "Bloc-Brothers" and make them submissive to the Chancellor's wish.

As a result of the slow progress of the reform, rumors were frequent that Chancellor von Bülow was going to resign and the Reichstag to be dissolved. As either event would ensure a veritable upheaval in German politics, the persistency of the reports shows how deep is the excitement among the people.

New President of the Centre Party.—Catholic papers report that the Centre Party of the Reichstag has chosen Baron George von Hertling to succeed Count Hompesch as President of the Party. Besides having a record of nearly thirty years' service in the Reichstag, Baron Hertling is favorably known as a university professor and author of several important works. He began his career in 1867 as "Privatdozent," i. e., unsalaried lecturer in the University of Bonn. A strong opposition to the Vatican Council and later on "Kulturkampf" tendencies swayed the then teaching body of the University. While other "Privatdozenten" were soon promoted to the rank of professors, young Hertling, who was known as a staunch Catholic, had to wait thirteen years before this well-merited honor was granted to him. His talents and ability were better appreciated in Bavaria. In 1882 he accepted the position of "ordinary" professor of philosophy in the University of Munich. In 1891 he was made life member of the Bavarian House of Lords. And then the Berlin authorities who had so long slighted him began to recognize his excellent qualities. From 1898 to 1902 Baron Hertling represented the German Government in the transactions with the Holy See for the establishment of a faculty of Catholic Theology

in the University of Strassburg. His meritorious services in this commission won for him a high Prussian Order, and the Pope distinguished him by the Grand Cross of the Order of St. Gregory. Von Hertling is also one of the founders and most active members of the Görres-Society, the purpose of which is to encourage, direct and materially subsidize enterprises of Catholic scholarship.

His prominence in the Centre Party is evidenced by his unanimous election to the presidency, the members of the party voting for him by acclamation. There is, according to the *Germania*, a general conviction "that under Hertling's leadership the party will continue the great traditions of its great past."

The British Budget.—The by-elections and the clamor for a larger navy are not the sole sources of worry to the Cabinet. The calculation of the British national revenue for the fiscal year 1908-09, which official returns issued on March 31 made possible, enables one to grasp the difficulty facing the Chancellor of the Exchequer in his preparation of the budget. According to the official returns, the national revenue is nearly \$25,000,000 lower than the revenue of the preceding year, and \$7,500,000 lower than the estimate made by the Chancellor. Two elements will add to the burden of the current financial year—old age pensions, estimated to require \$43,750,000, and an increase of \$13,750,000 in the cost of the navy. The total expenditure of this year will be about \$62,500,000 higher than that of the year just closed, and with last year's actual deficit to reckon, Mr. Lloyd-George has prepared in his budget a statement for an estimated deficit of \$65,000,000.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer may choose to draw upon the sinking-fund, but it is inevitable that proposals for new taxation will be advanced. In this event increased license duties will undoubtedly be levied, and an income tax taking a large proportion from big incomes may be looked for. There is talk, too, of a new land tax. But while the budget proposed by Mr. Lloyd-George may make much financial history in England during the current year, budget secrets are invariably well kept in the land across the sea, and until the Chancellor himself shall have spoken, his plans can only be matter of conjecture.

Italy's Political Program and Cabinet.—*La Tribuna*, a ministerial, though not a monarchical paper, is of the opinion that the recent elections have shown that the Italians as a people are unfitted for the use of the ballot. Italy is neither France nor England—it has no parliamentary traditions. The ballot may be very good as a law; but laws are of no avail unless they go hand in hand with *costumi*; "Libero il voto" is good in theory, but when ballot-boxes are overturned and broken open how are the votes to be counted? Moreover, personalities and local interests weigh more in elections than the interests of the State. Nevertheless, the issue before

the electors was the increase of the army and Italy's position among foreign powers. The answer of the country was that the army and navy must be strengthened, and present alliances maintained. The recent Servian affair has shown that the *Triplice* is the strongest factor in European affairs to-day. Italy must prepare, not for offense but for defense. Activity in the arsenals and ship-yards of the country must be increased, yet in such a way as not to give any power reason to resent such activity.

And thus the load of militarism on Italy's back is once more added to. Things have altered very little since an Italian Deputy, nearly twenty years ago, said to René Bazin: "Our security, perhaps, and certainly our pride, require us to go on imitating our neighbors."

Signor Giolitti has been through so many cabinet crises that one more will not matter. His reputation for stubbornness may, however, keep his unpopular cabinet together for a long time. All his ministers are unpopular with one or other section of his supporters: Tittoni, because of his Balkan policy; Casana, because he shows vacillation in the War office; Mirabello, because of weakness in the navy; Rava, because he speaks too much and does too little; Cocco-Ortu, because he coquettes with new plans and schemes, yet does nothing solid for agriculture; Schanzer, because he has not carried out promised postal reforms; Bertolini, because he is too autocratic; Orlando, though a good jurist is politically inconsistent; Lacana has failed to farm the revenues properly; Circano has shown he knows nothing of finance. Giolitti's answer to all criticism and all demands for the removal of this or that minister is, "I have chosen him. If he is unfit the fault is mine; if he goes I go also"—and seemingly there is no one to take Giolitti's place.

First Plenary Council of Canada.—More than five years ago the project of having a plenary council in Canada was communicated to the hierarchy by the Apostolic Delegate, Mgr. Sbarretti. Work was immediately begun in preparation for these great church assizes: theologians, chosen by the various archbishops, met in Ottawa in March, 1904, and drew up a rough draft of the decrees to be submitted to the proposed council. Now at length these arduous preparations have borne fruit. It is officially announced that the Holy Father has granted permission for the holding of a Plenary Council. Final instructions concerning its convocation have been sent by the Cardinal Prefect of the Congregation of the Council to His Excellency the Most Rev. Donatus Sbarretti. The Council will meet in the historic city of Quebec, the Mother See of Canada, in August of this year. The welcome news has been received with great gratification by all the Catholics of the Dominion.

No Canadian Dreadnought.—The Dreadnought agitation, begotten of the excitement produced by Mr. Asquith's discovery of Germany's naval activity, had spread to Canada, when Mr. Foster attempted to pour

oil on the troubled waters of tempestuous patriotism by moving "that Canada should no longer delay in assuming her proper share of the responsibility and financial burden incident to the suitable protection of her exposed coast line and great seaports." Mr. Foster's speech was fluent and persuasive, but very moderate. Sir Wilfrid Laurier was in very good form. In lofty and patriotic language he declared his admiration for British institutions and his resolve to make every sacrifice to maintain them. While feeling, even more deeply than Mr. Foster, that the British Empire was a necessity to the onward march of modern civilization, he could not accept the exact wording of the resolution, and proposed an amendment which, without urging immediate action, yet affirmed Canada's willingness to take up its share of the Empire's burden. Mr. Borden, leader of the Opposition, followed in a temperate and conservative strain and practically endorsed the stand taken by Sir Wilfrid Laurier. The House unanimously adopted Mr. Foster's motion as amended by the Prime Minister and Mr. Borden.

The *Toronto Mail and Empire*, the chief organ of the Conservatives, is not at all pleased with this decision. In its issue of the 5th inst., it says editorially:

The colorless, spiritless resolution passed by the House of Commons cannot be the end of the matter. A resolution addressed to this particular crisis ought to be prepared and passed without delay—a resolution, that is, declaring for the contribution by Canada of the cost of at least one Dreadnought. In his noble speech on his own resolution—introduced weeks before the present naval situation was made known, and having particular reference to the better protection of our own coast fisheries—Mr. Foster stated that the Opposition was prepared to support the Government in offering the price of a Dreadnought or any other contribution to the Imperial navy. Let the Government side go as far, and the House will declare itself in a manner worthy of the representative chamber of the chief of Britain's daughter States.

The Canadian House of Commons.—On April 2, in the Canadian House of Commons, ex-Judge C. J. Doherty moved a resolution calling for a sweeping investigation of all the spending departments. This motion was so carefully worded that it elicited from the Prime Minister, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, high praise for the dignified parliamentary style in which it was couched, although he did not admit Mr. Doherty's premises, and still less did he approve his conclusions. The debate was proceeding very smoothly when Mr. Foster, one of the most prominent and influential members of the Opposition and a master of sarcasm, flouted the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, giped at the heads of other departments, accused Holiday, Drolet and McAvity of stealing money from the public treasury. Sir Wilfrid replied: "I have only this to say to Mr. Foster: that, having now spent a long life in the public service, I never had a man suggest that I profited by the people's money." Then pandemonium reigned for a time in the House. Finally,

after a long and stormy period of recriminations from both sides, Mr. Foster proved that Sir Wilfrid had broken one of the rules of the House, which forbids any member to use offensive words against any other member, and obtained a formal retraction from Sir Wilfrid, coupled, however, with a warning to Mr. Foster that he should not browbeat his political opponents. At the end of that same stormy sitting Judge Doherty's motion was defeated 94 to 54, a government majority of forty.

Newfoundland's Cabinet Crisis.—A despatch from Sir Edward Morris to AMERICA explains the political situation in Newfoundland. The General Election last November returned eighteen Bondites and eighteen Morrisites. Sir Robert Bond, being in power when the election occurred, retained office till the Legislature convened. The day before the session opened Sir Robert Bond advised the Governor of Newfoundland to dissolve Parliament and hold a new election. The Governor, following a well established British precedent, declined to dissolve until all other expedients were exhausted. Sir Robert Bond thereupon resigned office without attempting to meet the Legislature. The Governor accepted his resignation and invited Sir Edward Morris, as leader of the Opposition, to form a ministry and to endeavor to conduct the legislative business. Sir Edward Morris agreed, chose his cabinet, took a month to study the details of his predecessors' work, and then met the Legislative Assembly which had prorogued when Sir Robert Bond resigned. Sir Edward Morris proposed one of his followers for Speaker, though this placed him in a minority on the floor of the House. Sir Robert Bond refused to allow the election of this candidate for the speakership. This intensified the deadlock. Sir Edward Morris then advised dissolution. The Governor tried to secure a coalition cabinet. Failing in this he granted Morris dissolution and retained him in power while facing the country, on the ground that Bond enjoyed that advantage in November, and Morris, having equalled him despite this drawback, had now a better prospect of giving to the colony a strong, stable government through a substantial majority.

The latest news from Newfoundland is that there will be another General Election on May 8, and that Sir Edward will have the advantage of going to the country with the reins of power in his hands.

Russia.—In the *Historical Review* of St. Petersburg there lately appeared an article by P. Korenevsky descriptive of the scenes in Chelm, Russia, when the ukase of religious toleration went into effect. The district was one in which the Greek Catholic bishopric was suppressed in 1875 and the Greek Catholics forced to become Orthodox.

According to the writer, it appears that in all the district of Chelm there were, according to the government reports, about 120,000 who went over from Orthodoxy to Catholicism, but these figures were far below the

actuality. Twenty Orthodox parishes have been already abolished, for in them there remains not a single parishioner. The sudden return from Orthodoxy to Catholicism is thus described by the author: As soon as the manifest of April 17, 1906, appeared, the eagerness of the people to become Catholics began. In one place they shouted on seeing the placards: "To the church at once; down with the popes (Russian priests)! Away with the schismatic belief!" Then they rushed *en masse* into the Catholic church, crying, shouting and praying, and announced anew their Catholic belief. The Polish bishop was sent for. When he came in a few days, the people drew his carriage, went in procession to the Catholic church, which was decorated from the ground to the cupola; the streets were decorated, and streamers, garlands and bouquets were seen everywhere, and as the bishop passed people fell on their knees and stretched forth their hands asking his blessing. The bishop gratefully received them into the church, professing the faith from which they had been driven some thirty years ago. The author concludes that the Orthodox clergy, having lost their flocks, will have to work more energetically, but, as he observes, their good work will come all too late to be of much effect.

Woman Suffrage.—Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt of New York, president of the International Suffrage Alliance, was warmly welcomed in Berlin last week. Her address before the German suffrage societies drew immense audiences and resulted in giving the woman suffrage movement in the Fatherland the liveliest impetus it has ever known. Unfortunately for her cause the facts do not appear to bear out her claims that signs are most promising for the movement's success in the United States. Whilst the spectacular methods of certain radical sisters in England and in America give the cause a certain manner of advertisement, it yet remains true that there is little of real success following their efforts. Here in the States there is an organization known as the Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women, which, though not so much in the public eye as the Suffragettes, is working hard in the opposite direction. A distinguished English woman, recently in this country, declared that the woman suffrage movement in this country was in process of defeat. The statement was, of course, at once challenged by the suffragists, but despite the challenge the assertion seems to be true. A test of the popularity of the movement and of the strength of its growth has been had in state after state, and nowhere do we find any evidence to substantiate the claims of the suffragists. It is but a few weeks since a bill carefully prepared for presentation to the New York Assembly, and urged with many of the spectacular methods that have come to play a part in the movement, was denied a favorable report in committee, although its advocates were granted every courtesy when they applied for a hearing.

EDITORIAL ANNOUNCEMENT

The object, scope and character of this review are sufficiently indicated in its name, and they are further exhibited in the contents of this first number.

AMERICA will take the place of the monthly periodical, *The Messenger*, and continue its mission. It is in reality an adaptation of its precursor to meet the needs of the time. Among these needs are a review and conscientious criticism of the life and literature of the day, a discussion of actual questions and a study of vital problems from the Christian standpoint, a record of religious progress, a defense of sound doctrine, an authoritative statement of the position of the Church in the thought and activity of modern life, a removal of traditional prejudice, a refutation of erroneous news, and a correction of misstatements about beliefs and practices which millions hold dearer than life. These needs, moreover, are too numerous, too frequent and too urgent to be satisfied by a monthly periodical, no matter how vigilant or comprehensive it may be. The march of events is too rapid, and every week has its paramount interests which are lost or forgotten, unless dealt with as soon as they arise.

In the opinion of many, a daily organ would be required to treat these interests adequately. Until such time as a daily may be possible, if really desirable, the weekly review we propose to publish is an imperative need. The newspapers which appear every week under Catholic auspices in the United States, Canada and Mexico do not attempt to chronicle events of secular interest or to discuss questions of the day in the light of Christian principles. They are for the most part diocesan or local journals, many of them excellent in their way, but limited in the range of subjects, and circumscribed in territory. There are hundreds of these local Catholic weekly newspapers, but not one general Catholic weekly review; or, to express it in terms which will appeal to many of our readers, we have no organ in America similar to *The Tablet* in England, and such an organ is quite as much needed here as it is indispensable there. Even the most unfriendly critic of this leading English Catholic weekly will admit that to it the Church in the British Isles owes much of its standing and influence. A periodical of equal merit in America will be of incalculable benefit to religion.

There is still more need of a first-class Catholic weekly periodical in this Western Hemisphere, and a wider field of utility for the same than in England, because with us, non-Catholics as a rule are not only more ready to hear our views, but they are also more eager to have us exert our proper influence in the national and social life. When counselling Father Coleridge, at the time he was planning *The Month*, Cardinal Newman advocated a periodical which would induce Catholics to take an intelligent interest in public affairs and not live as a class apart

from their fellows of other beliefs. His counsel applies to Catholics in America even more than it applied in England in his day. We are of a people who respect belief but who value action more. We are going through a period when the most salutary influences of religion are needed to safeguard the very life and liberty and equal rights of the individual, to maintain the home, to foster honesty and sobriety, and to inculcate reverence for authority, and for the most sacred institutions, civil as well as ecclesiastical. We are more responsible than our non-Catholic fellow citizens for the welfare of thousands of immigrants of our own religion who come to us weekly, and for their amalgamation into the national life. We are responsible also for much of the ignorance of religious truth and for the prejudices which still prevail to a great extent, because, satisfied as we are of the security of our own position, we do not take the pains to explain it to others or to dispel their erroneous views.

The object, therefore, of this Review is to meet the needs here described and to supply in one central publication a record of Catholic achievement and a defense of Catholic doctrine, built up by skilful hands in every region of the globe. It will discuss questions of the day affecting religion, morality, science and literature; give information and suggest principles that may help to the solution of the vital problems constantly thrust upon our people. These discussions will not be speculative nor academic, but practical and actual, with the invariable purpose of meeting some immediate need of truth, of creating interest in some social work or movement, of developing sound sentiment, and of exercising proper influence on public opinion. The Review will not only chronicle events of the day and the progress of the Church; it will also stimulate effort and originate movements for the betterment of the masses.

The name AMERICA embraces both North and South America, in fact, all this Western Hemisphere; the Review will, however, present to its readers all that interests Catholics in any part of the world, especially in Europe. It will preserve and expand the popular features of *The Messenger*, namely, the editorial, chronicle, reader or book reviews, notes on science, literature, education and sociology. Special short articles or leaders on current topics of interest, biographical sketches of prominent persons, comments on passing events, and correspondence from international centres, will be among the additional features which the editors hope to make equally popular with the readers of the new Review. Owing to the wide scope of its contents, and its strict avoidance of proselytism and of all unnecessary controversy, it is hoped that the Review will prove attractive, not only to Catholics, but to the large number of non-Catholics who desire information about Catholic affairs.

True to its name and to its character as a Catholic review, AMERICA will be cosmopolitan not only in contents but also in spirit. It will aim at becoming a representative exponent of Catholic thought and activity with-

out bias or plea for special persons or parties. Promptness in meeting difficulties will be one of its chief merits, actuality will be another. Its news and correspondence will be fresh, full and accurate. Courtesy will preside over its relations with the press and other expounders of public sentiment. Far from interfering with any of the excellent Catholic newspapers already in existence, AMERICA will strive to broaden the scope of Catholic journalism and enable it to exert a wholesome influence on public opinion, and thus become a bond of union among Catholics and a factor in civic and social life.

The task of editing this Review has been undertaken at the earnest solicitation of members of the Hierarchy and of prominent priests and laymen. Indeed, not a few non-Catholics have frequently expressed a desire to have such an organ of Catholic thought and influence, and surprise that nothing of the kind has hitherto existed. The Archbishop of New York, in whose jurisdiction the Review will be published, has cordially approved the project. It goes without saying that loyalty to the Holy See, and profound respect for the wishes and views of the Catholic Hierarchy, will be the animating principle of this Review. The board of editors consists of men representing various sections of North America. They will be assisted by eminent collaborators and contributors drawn from all ranks of the clergy and from the laity in every part of the world, some of whose names we publish in this number.

Bureaus of information established in the leading cities of Europe, Mexico, Central and South America will supply prompt and correct information concerning Catholic interests. Telegraph and cable will be used when needed, and neither labor nor expense will be spared to make AMERICA worthy of its name.

—•••—

The mayor of Orleans has given a gentle rebuff to the masonic lodges in that city. They had petitioned him to grant them a place in the procession in honor of Blessed Jeanne d'Arc on May 8th. French Freemasons honoring Blessed Jeanne d'Arc would be too much; and the mayor tells them very gently that their fellow townsmen would prefer their abstention. Two years ago a purely civil and military celebration was attempted, but, as the mayor naively admits, "in spite of a regiment of cavalry, and the military bands supplied by the Government, the whole affair fell very flat. It brought no joy to the hearts of the people." This year the religious authorities and societies are to be invited. In conclusion he assures the Freemasons that their fellow citizens will be grateful for their absence.

—•••—

A special despatch received 14 April from our Roman correspondent states that the alleged misuse by the Red Cross Society of funds collected for the Messina sufferers is not established. It was reported that some of the officers had applied part of the money to the support of orphanages under sectarian influences.

Blessed Jeanne D'Arc

The action of the Church in beatifying the Maid of France finds perhaps a wider and warmer sanction than was ever accorded a similar event. Writers of all schools have been prodigal of praise, notably Mark Twain in our own country and Andrew Lang abroad. Even such critics of the Maid as Anatole France who would eliminate the supernatural, concede that she was pure, brave, disinterested and supremely good. The tribute of the London *Times*, representative of English Protestant opinion, deserves citation.

"Even those who deride or deny the claims of Rome to pronounce on such matters will allow that few more noble figures have ever been held up to the veneration of their fellows. In the whole history of the Middle Ages there is no story more simple or more splendid, no tragedy more mournful than that of the 'poor little shepherdess' who, by her passionate faith, raised her country from the depths of degradation and dejection, to die the cruelest and most shameful of all deaths at the hands of her enemies. The elevation and the moral beauty of Joan's character have won the hearts of all men."

To eliminate the supernatural from her career is impossible. Dunois and other veteran leaders declared on oath that the Maid knew intuitively the right movements in war and statecraft better than general or statesman. She had recognized the King, read his heart, divined victories, surrenders, her own capture, the final triumph, and many other contingent events near and remote. Where did this unlettered shepherdess acquire such knowledge? All admit her truth, good sense and healthy alertness, yet she repeatedly affirmed: "I know not A from B, but I do know that God has sent me to save Orleans and crown the Dauphin," adding that in all her predictions her Voices had instructed her. Even if for a moment she denied them—and one recantation is more than doubtful, the other a proved forgery—she died for this declaration. What theory can replace it?

Jeanne d'Arc insisted from first to last that she was "sent of God"; the captains and men-at-arms who followed her in camp and field declared on oath that they regarded her as "The messenger of God," the sole Deliverer of France; and to soldier and civilian, maid and matron, "she seemed, in all that she said and did, a thing divine." To-morrow in St. Peter's Basilica, Pius X, who has already proclaimed that "she was called by God to defend her country and accomplished a feat that was deemed impossible," will solemnly ratify the sentiment of her contemporaries, and make her veneration co-extensive with the world.

Five centuries have almost run their course since her friends hailed her as a Heaven-sent Deliverer and her enemies condemned her as a sorceress. Meanwhile the passions of men have ebbed and flowed, now bearing the Maid to the altar's height, now sweeping away what memorials her friends had raised or her enemies had

left. The English and their partisans had cast her ashes into the Seine, and even her heart which their fires could not violate, while their chroniclers assailed her reputation. French Huguenots and atheistic republicans tore her statues from their pedestals, as their literary heirs are trying even now to tear her image from her country's heart; but all those years the mothers and maids and true men of France have kept her memory warm. Pope Calixtus III, reversing at her mother's prayer the judgment of her enemies, vindicated her character and honor. For the rest the Church waited calmly, unmoved by partisan or national bias, till the perspective of time and change grew large enough to determine the "heroicity" of her virtues. It is only true heroes and heroines that the Church consents to crown. The practice of faith and hope, charity and chastity, justice, fortitude and other Christian virtues in an heroic degree, is an essential requisite for Beatification. The story of her life is ample proof that Jeanne d'Arc possessed this requisite.

A Soldier-Maid, a Virgin-Saint; burned on the pyre, incensed at the altar; at seventeen Deliverer of a Nation, at nineteen a Martyr—hers is a story unparalleled in history. The perfidious trial and inhuman cruelty at Rouen had one fortunate result: it drew out her heroic character and qualities and handed them down to us under oath. Every detail of her life is sworn testimony.

In 1429 three-fourths of the French people acknowledged Henry VI of England as their king, and Orleans, the only city of importance that resisted, had already proffered conditional surrender. The uncrowned and despairing Dauphin was contemplating flight, when an unlettered shepherdess of seventeen appeared before him, announced herself as "Jeanne the Maid sent of God for the deliverance of France," recognized him disguised among his courtiers and revealed the secrets of his heart. Of war she knew nothing; only in obedience to her Voices, St. Michael, St. Catherine and St. Margaret who had tutored her for years, had she "come into France"; they had told her she was "chosen by God" to free Orleans and crown the king. It mattered not that wide territories lay in the way, bristling with hostile fortresses and cities, that Rheims, the traditional sacring-place of his ancestors, was then in the hands of his enemies; God had sent her to do these things and they would be accomplished.

The Maid overruled all objections, overcame all obstacles and entered Orleans in triumph. The garrison was a demoralized rabble—"a thousand French would flee from a few hundred English"—but in a few days the Maid imposed her law on this unruly mob. Confession, Communion, Holy Mass, good conduct and reverence was her discipline; then conditions were reversed. She waved aloft her snow-white banner displaying "Jesus-Maria" and Christ blessing the lily of France, and all followed where she led. In a few days Orleans was free; in a few weeks the rout at Patay had destroyed the legend of English prowess, cities and forts surrendered, Rheims

opened its gates, and the Dauphin was anointed Charles VII, King of France. As she stood by his side, holding aloft her triumphant banner, Jeanne was the idol of her people; she had not yet been tested by adversity and the sheen of her glory might have hidden deficiency of virtue. The test was at hand.

She sought no honors or recompense; she would go back to her mother and her village; but the mission of her Voices ended with the coronation, and in their silence she obeyed her King. So far she had imposed her will on King and Council; now she yields obedience without question. Though the Voices had foretold her capture "in a year and little more," she went boldly into danger. Hampered by ingratitude and treachery she harbored no resentment; and when she fell into her enemies' hands and fire and torture threatened her, she was immovably loyal to the King and Council that abandoned her.

Her trial was the cruelest mockery since the days of Caiaphas. Cauchon, a bishop expelled from his see as an English partisan, was set up by Warwick and Winchester to legalize a sentence already determined. The merciless cruelty of judge and earl brought into stronger contrast the marvelous virtues of their victim. Allowed neither counsel nor confessor, her appeal to the Pope denied, tortured by crafty interrogators in court and dungeon, the answers of this friendless, illiterate girl of nineteen manifest a power, nobility and courage worthy of a heroine and saint.

She would not betray the King's secret or permit him blame: "As for my deeds I burden no man, neither my King nor any other; if fault there be it is my own." She would not recant her Voices and her mission:

"I had rather be torn to pieces by four horses than come into France without God's leave. . . . If I saw the fires lit, if I was in flames, I would say no other thing."

When she did see the fires lit and was in flames her joyous cry rang out: "My Voices have not deceived me!" and their names were the last on her lips except the name of Jesus. "Faithful even unto death," she has won the faith of men. Her heart was cast into the Seine, but it still beats in the pulse of Christendom.

The Rehabilitation process rounds out her story, but her enemies' investigation sufficiently attests her marvelous personality, her purity, piety, gentleness, her simple fearless loyalty to God and country and an unselfishness unique in history. On every record the heroic nature of her virtues stands in relief. In her life the natural and supernatural are inseparably blended. Her piety and modesty shone out "in armed and ironed maidenhood"; she was always Jeanne the Maid. Her hands never struck the foe, but often bound their wounds. The legend on her banner, "Jesus-Maria," was written in her heart.

The testimony of her Curé and her friends is her life's epitome: "There was no one like her." Whether we view her in war or peace, in Council, Court or dungeon,

on the ramparts or the pyre, truly "there was no one like her." Her Voices did more than announce her mission. St. Michael the Warrior Angel, St. Margaret the Virgin, St. Catherine tried by an unjust judge and condemned to a cruel death, surely accompanied and inspired her, and filled her soul with their characteristic notes till all had blended into a type unique, the Warrior-Martyr-Maid.

Her Voices are not silent; she interprets them to-day to a larger audience. At their call a dying nation woke and sprang into glorious life; but the faith and virtues which the Voices typified and the Maid illustrated, seem dying now in the land she loved. France with all her faults has done much for God. Her warriors saved Christian civilization on many a field and her missionaries spread it through the earth. Resplendent with the new glory of to-morrow's ceremony, the blessed Maid of France seems to exhort her people to awake once more and be faithful to that which made them glorious; seems to exhort all men to be brave and true, speaking not only through the Church that crowns her, but through the Voices of pure womanhood in which man should ever find an inspiration.

She said to Cauchon: "I appeal from you to God," and again: "To the Pope and to God first, I appeal." Both have answered. In declaring Blessed this matchless Maid, Pius X is crowning the brow of Heroism and raising Patriotism to the Altars of the Church.

MICHAEL KENNY, S.J.

Catholics and Socialism

We are frequently asked: Can a man be a socialist without ceasing to be a Catholic? How far may a Catholic accept the teachings of Socialism? What should be the attitude of a Catholic towards Socialism? Why has Socialism been condemned by the Church? What is the real meaning of Socialism? All these practically resolve themselves into this one question: "How far is Socialism consistent with Catholicity?" I shall try to answer this question as briefly as possible.

It would be foolish to make light of the grievances of labor or to condemn unreservedly all that Socialism aims at. We need not close our eyes to facts. We have nothing to fear from truth and from clear ideas on this, as on every other subject. Every intelligent Catholic admits, as well as the socialist, the glaring injustices from which the proletariat suffer. Without being a socialist, the Catholic is a social reformer; in other words he stands for the amelioration of the condition of the laboring classes; but, unlike the socialist, he desires to gain that end by legitimate means.

It would be a mistake to suppose that when you have drawn a harrowing picture of the evils growing out of the unequal distribution of wealth and the heartlessness of organized capital and greed, you have established the right of Socialism to displace the existing social order.

Both social reformer and socialist admit the need of reform, but differ in the means for its accomplishment. Both start out with the same premise: that the conditions requiring remedy are deplorable. But, says the socialist, Socialism is the only remedy, because by collectivism or common ownership it removes the cause of the evil, which is the inequality of conditions resulting from the unequal distribution of wealth. No, says the social reformer, Socialism is neither the only remedy nor any remedy at all, because it rests on false principles, is untried, impracticable, impossible, unjust, whether considered as a scientific system, a plan of reform, an industrial revolution, a practical program, a revolutionary or evolutionary theory.

There are many measures advocated by socialists and called by them socialistic which are not so, unless they be regarded as steps to the socialistic ideal. For instance, state regulation of industry, wages and hours of labor, single tax, inheritance tax, taxation of incomes, municipal or national ownership or administration of railways, gas, post-office, water, electric light, traction lines and other public utilities, are not really socialistic nor even evidence of society drifting towards Socialism. No doubt these enterprises can be fitted into a socialistic scheme, but they are quite compatible with the existing social order and some of them exist under it. As long as the right of private property remains unchallenged, unimpaired and intact, as long as compensation is given for property taken, no Catholic goes beyond his political rights or violates his religious duty by advocating such measures. Socialism has no right to claim as its exclusive possession whatever aims at the improvement of social conditions.

Many who call themselves socialists are not so in the true sense of the word. They are far from being anarchists or atheists; on the contrary, they are God-fearing men, sincerely desirous to better the condition of the poor and unwilling to adopt any unlawful means; they reject the extravagant teachings of the irreligious leaders, as far as they advert to them at all as connected with socialistic aims. They are simply mistaken and misled in supposing that Socialism, as taught to-day, is merely an economic program that has nothing to do with morality or religion. Many do not see that there is a natural antagonism between Socialism and the Church, because they ignore the distinctive marks of that economic system. Now common usage makes Socialism signify a comprehensive remedy for social evils, which proposes to transform not only the industrial system but the entire moral order on which Christian society has hitherto rested. Balfour expresses the idea very tersely when he says: "Socialism means, and can mean, nothing else, than that the community or the state, is to take all the means of production into its own hands, that private enterprise and private property are to come to an end, and all that private enterprise and private property carry with them. That is Socialism, and nothing else is Socialism."

This was the one meaning of the word recognized by Pope Leo XIII when he examined and condemned the teachings of Socialism. Whoever holds the central doctrine of collective ownership and denies the right of private property is a socialist and cannot call himself a Catholic; whoever disowns these two doctrines may be a Catholic, for he is not a socialist.

The philosophy on which Socialism rests is materialistic; its theory of human life is unchristian. The leaders of this cult continually insist that man's universe is confined to this world, that he should think only of this life. They say in theory and in practice that this is the only world worth living for, that the next world is uncertain and unknowable. They believe that man's happiness and success are measured by the amount of good things he possesses here below. In other words, the view of man's origin, end and destiny is perverted or obliterated. The rank and file of socialists are fast becoming inoculated with these opinions. It is plain that men imbued with such notions are demoralizing associates, that such an atmosphere of thought and innuendo is unwholesome and dangerous for Catholics, utterly at variance with what they are bound to believe and practise. As a consequence those who become radical socialists do not need to be read out of the Church. Experience teaches that sooner or later, of their own free will and by the logic of events and of consistency, they cease to be Catholics.

It is unfortunately too true that nearly all the leaders of Socialism are pronounced enemies of any form of supernatural religion, with all the consequences which such a position implies. In this respect Shaw, Hyndman, Quelch, Bax, Pearson, Blatchford and Bebel, agree with Marx and La Salle in regarding Christianity as an absurd superstition or worse. Almost without exception the leaders are distinctly anti-religious. If not anti-Christian and anti-theistic they are very definitely non-Christian and non-theistic. They have grafted these errors irreparably on Socialism and made them an essential part of the system. Their ultimate aim is to sweep away, with the system which gave them birth, religious institutions, morality, the constitution of the family, individualism, and all our accepted social relations.

If well meaning men among the socialists hope to conciliate the Church, the true friend of labor, the traditional helper of the working classes, the historical and natural ally of the down-trodden and oppressed, they should compel their leaders to eliminate from their programs and platforms declarations that are as unnecessary for gaining social emancipation as they are ethically unsound and religiously offensive. They should confine themselves to political and industrial agitation, without dragging in religious issues. If the leaders of Socialism had the true interests of the toiler at heart, if they sought with singleness of purpose social reform capable of immediate and effective results, they would purge the organization of materialism, atheism and unbelief; they would adopt a program acceptable to every workingman

no matter what his creed; they would establish a platform so broad that no man would be obliged to do violence to his conscience and convictions in order to stand upon it. At present they practically exclude Catholics by injecting into the system tenets which no Catholic can accept. Do they realize what powerful assistance they reject, what strong opposition they invoke by their narrow, prejudiced, and short-sighted policy, by forcing to the front their intolerant and untenable religious views? We can all stand together for social reform, if it is kept free from religious entanglements; but we can never win the day till all the forces of labor are united. To accomplish this unity, common morality must be recognized and respected. The fire-eater, the radical, the bigot and the blatant unbeliever must be relegated to the rear. The liberal, broad minded, tolerant, reasonable and sensible leaders who respect religion and do no violence to the convictions and conscience of the Christian workman, must be put on guard.

Social reform needs all the allies it can muster. It should not be throttled in the house of its professed friends before it can assemble its forces.

M. P. DOWLING, S.J.

The New Premier of Newfoundland

Sir Edward Patrick Morris, K.C., late Minister of Justice, and afterwards leader of the Opposition, has been chosen Premier of Newfoundland. He is still comparatively a young man for so exalted a position, for he was born in May, 1859, and is therefore not yet fifty. He began his education at St. Bonaventure's College, St. John's, Newfoundland, and completed his college course in the Catholic University of Ottawa. He entered the Legislative Assembly of England's oldest colony in 1885, and was Attorney-General and Minister of Justice in the Bond Cabinet from 1903 to 1907, when he joined the Opposition. Political parties in the island are so evenly balanced that the general election last November gave to each party eighteen seats. Thereupon Premier Bond asked for a dissolution and was refused. Apparently it would not have been strictly according to the constitution to dissolve parliament until the other party had made an effort to conduct the government. So Sir Robert Bond resigned, and Sir Edward Morris, the leader of the Opposition, formed a cabinet which was to meet the House on the tenth of this month. The new Catholic premier, whose father emigrated from Waterford, and whose mother was from Tipperary, will need all the resources of his well-known tact and courage to maintain what in the present circumstances may truly be called the balance of power.

The appointment of Sir Edward Morris implies a great deal more than appointment to a Governorship which is in the gift of the Crown and therefore implies no choice by a majority of the people. That a Catholic should be appointed governor of a British colony sup-

poses indeed special personal fitness for the post, recognized as such by the authorities in London, but it does not suppose a popular vote. Still less does it suppose any kindly feeling towards Catholics. There have been several Catholic governors of largely Protestant provinces, but their appointment was never taken as a sign that Protestant prejudice was diminishing there.

In one sense appointment to the premiership of a self-governing British colony means even more than the election to the presidency of a republic, in that the presidents of most republics—Mexico, which under Porfirio Diaz is a republic only in name, being the notable exception—are elected only for a fixed term of years, whereas a prime minister may remain in power so long as he retains his popularity. For instance, Sir Wilfred Laurier has been Prime Minister of Canada for nearly thirteen years, and Sir Oliver Mowat was Premier of Ontario for twenty-four years.

In a presidential election in this country, the President may be chosen first of all, and then, by consequence, the party he represents. Generally speaking, in the British system the contrary takes place. It is first the party which is victorious, then the most popular member thereof is chosen premier. When the General Election results in a tie, one of two things may happen: either a new election takes place or the Premier resigns with his cabinet and another member is called upon by the Governor to form a new cabinet. This latter alternative was adopted by the Governor of Newfoundland, who sent for an Opposition member to offer him the premiership. As Sir Edward Morris is the recognized chief of this party, the Governor naturally offered him the premiership. This offer is tantamount to king-making, for as soon as the premier accepts, the governor practically becomes his obedient humble servant, a mere signing machine. The governor may, indeed, in a moment of political crisis, dismiss one prime minister and choose another; this actually happened in Canada twice since Confederation and each time in the Province of Quebec, which has always been bolder in its interpretation of the constitution of Canada than any other of the federated provinces; but the governor must be very sure of popular approval before he dares to adopt so drastic a measure.

So long as the premier of a British province commands a good working majority of the Legislature, he is practically the ruler of his province. He may even introduce fundamental constitutional changes which would be impossible in the American system without a direct appeal to the vote of the people. If, for example, those intermittent bursts of agitation against the continuance of the Canadian Senate were to become chronic and widespread, the prime minister of Canada might bring about the abolition of that important parliamentary body which, at the time of the confederation, forty-two years ago, was considered a mighty bulwark of British traditions. In point of fact two at least of the Canadian provinces, Manitoba and New Brunswick, which started with an upper as well

as a lower house of legislature, have abolished the former without a word of protest from the federal authorities at Ottawa.

To those who bear in mind that Newfoundland continued to persecute and ostracize Catholics long after such unwise conduct had gone out of fashion in other British colonies, the choice of Sir Edward Patrick Morris, a staunch Irish Catholic, as premier of the oldest of English colonies redounds both to his own credit and to that of the people of Newfoundland.

LEWIS DRUMMOND, S.J.

Emily Virginia Mason

On the 16th day of last February, Emily Virginia Mason died in the City of Washington. It was the end of a life which nearly reached the span of a century, for it began in 1815. Emily Mason was a woman of very exceptional gifts of nature, easily a leader, decided and ready in her judgments, clear visioned as to both persons and circumstances, and withal of wonderful refinement of character—anything but a mannish woman.

During just half of her long life she was non-Catholic. Brought up "a genuine Episcopalian," as she said, "I was confirmed at the age of fifteen, and prayed and attended Church just as any ordinary good girl would do." But she further explained that this was pretty much on the surface of her soul, being rather religiosity than religion. The events of her early life were of such interest as to quite absorb her, and distract her mind from things divine. Her family were the Masons of Gunstan Hall, her uncle being George Mason, the intimate friend of General Washington, with whom he bears company on the great monument in Capitol Square, Richmond. Her education was solid, and she improved it by serious reading up to the very end of her life. She accompanied her father to the Territory of Michigan in 1831, and was a bright ornament in the home of her brother, Stevens T. Mason, whilst he served his two terms as Governor of that State.

Returning to Virginia in the forties, she shared the various fortunes of her family, always admired and sought after, but never marrying. During the early fifties she lived in Alexandria, adjacent to the Episcopal Seminary, having intimate acquaintance with the late Bishop Johns to whom she was related by marriage, and with many notable clergymen, at that time professors or students at the Seminary, among them being the late Henry Potter, Bishop of New York. These associations were the primal causes of her entering the Catholic Church.

During their social intercourse in Miss Mason's parlors and dining room, she heard them discuss religion. They were, to her surprise and scandal, all at variance about the gravest Christian doctrines, made no scruple of showing it, and even joked about it. They have no rule of Christian faith, she thought, and she wondered and was

distressed. Here were her first gleams of holy doubt. She had previously come across a volume of "Tracts for the Times," read it attentively, and imbibed High Church principles.

Her doubts were soon transformed into peremptory assaults of conscience. "It was trouble that started me afoot in search of true religion," she afterwards said, "financial difficulties, and the saddest visitations of death. My Episcopalianism gave me no strength to suffer. It was of some help in prosperity and totally broke down in adversity. I made up my mind to get to the bottom of the religious question, and I wrote to Bishop McGill. He sent me a kind letter and some books which I devoured greedily. One Sunday afternoon I stole away to the Catholic Church in Alexandria so as to see what Catholic worship felt like. I had often been to St. Ann's Church, Detroit, but my mind was then too girlish, and I was overflowing with the gaieties of our life there, so the religion staid outside of me. As I went into the church in Alexandria Benediction was just being given. I stood at the back of the pews, looked towards the Altar, all ablaze with candles, and heard the little bell ringing. I went over to a man kneeling and almost prostrate, and said to him: 'What does that bell mean?' He quickly reached up his hand and pulled my sleeve, and said: 'That's God! kneel down!' And down I knelt." She experienced a sensation little less than miraculous on this occasion.

After the service she sought an interview with one of the Jesuit Fathers who served the parish at that time. Some months afterwards she was received into the Church by Bishop O'Reilly of Hartford, in which city she was visiting a Mrs. Barnard, a member of the Desnoyer family whom Miss Mason had known intimately in Detroit. Said her sister to her: "If it were my cook that became a Catholic, I shouldn't mind it; but my sister!—well, I suppose I must be resigned to the disgrace."

No sooner a Catholic than an apostle. It is not too much to say that Emily Mason, from the day of her conversion till extreme old age, joined in every Catholic work of charity or religion she could get into, and always took a masterful share. Nor was this mere outward activity. She was one of the most devout women her priestly friends ever knew; so all of them will testify. She was well acquainted with the entire range of ordinary ascetical literature, and even with not a few of the mystical writers. She was ever a frequent communicant, and a first rate convert-maker. Her aristocratic lineage, her delightful conversational powers, her widely extended acquaintance, her wit, her stately grace and even beauty of person, all were used wholly for God and His Church. Charity of various kinds was her favorite occupation. Her career was interrupted by the Civil War, which drove her North out of Washington and Baltimore, where she had principally resided. So powerful a figure did she present that the Secretary of War

had her shadowed by detectives as far as New York City. She threw them off at last, and obtained letters to Archbishop Purcell, who in turn secured her passage up the Ohio and Kenawha to General Rosecrans' headquarters in the Gauley mountains, late in the autumn of 1861. She was sent by the General under flag of truce into the Confederate lines and immediately took charge of hospital work for wounded and sick soldiers. Her experiences from the beginning to the end of the war should have been given the advantage of detailed narrative. A slight glimpse of their absorbing interest is enjoyed in reading some articles she published in the *Atlantic Monthly*, as late as the autumn of 1902.

The war over, Miss Mason at once took charge of the orphan girls of Confederate soldiers. Some of these she still cared for up to her last illness. "Pretty old orphans by this time," she said smilingly. She fed and clad and schooled and married them, loving them like a mother. How did she get the money to do it? She gave all she could of her own little means—not much, to be sure—and she begged everywhere and with a resistless mendicancy. One of the sources of revenue was her pen, which was like the rod of Moses in the wilderness, bringing forth flowing streams of charitable contributions. A by-product of this is found in several beautiful and historically valuable pieces concerning the great war. Perhaps her best service to the literature of that epoch is a compilation of the songs of the Confederacy, exhibiting a singularly interesting collection of poetical attempts, a good number of them having decided lyrical merit, all of them bearing valuable witness to the tone and temper of the South during the awful struggle between the sections.

The close of her remarkable career was illustrated by the high honors given to her brother, Stevens T. Mason, by the State of Michigan. By the zealous exertions of a young friend of Miss Mason's, Mr. Hugo Gilmartin, of the *Detroit Free Press*, the legislature of the State made a generous appropriation for the removal of the Governor's remains to Detroit, and an artistic statue of bronze was erected on the site of the first State House. Last Decoration Day Miss Mason unveiled the statue amid splendid civil and military ceremonial, in the presence of the Governor and Mayor and very many other dignitaries, as well as a great assemblage of citizens. This home-coming of Michigan's first and greatest chief magistrate was to his long surviving sister an event of indescribable interest.

It was the forecast of her death, which was full of the most edifying incidents of piety. As she entered Holy Church under the auspices of the Jesuit Fathers, so did she profit by their ministrations when she entered her happy eternity, as her dwelling at the time of her death was in the Jesuit parish of Holy Trinity, Georgetown, D. C.

WALTER ELLIOTT, C.S.P.

CORRESPONDENCE

General Situation in Italy

ROME, MARCH 28, 1909.

I cannot more usefully begin my collaboration with your paper than by giving your readers a short sketch of our political, economic and religious situation. It is a matter not always understood very clearly by outsiders, and the difficulty of grasping it must be vastly increased in a Democratic country such as America. It will be my endeavor to be brief though accurate.

As might have been expected, the result of the recent elections has not substantially altered the position of the government. The Liberal-Progressive Party, which had been in power, retains out of a chamber of 508 Deputies, its old majority of 300 votes, which assures its life, and, if we may believe, its program pledges it to action. True, the socialists have gained some seats; but on the other hand the radicals and certain groups of the right, opposed to the government more on personal than on political grounds, have lost correspondingly. The radical seats have been gained for the most part by what are known as the Catholic Deputies, i. e., men of religious belief who have accepted the revolution as a *fait accompli*, and stand for certain principles, but do not in any way form a Catholic party, no such party existing or being possible in the Chamber.

The speech from the Throne was more remarkable for what it did not say than for what it did. Under the circumstances this is something to be grateful for, and was hardly to be expected from the King, whose sympathies with the anti-clerical *bloc* becomes more and more pronounced. The "wise ones" think, and rightly, that he is playing with fire. In any case it is clear the Giolitti ministry is more than strong; political elections cannot trouble it; it will break up when it is ready and then will come chaos and confusion, and our home and foreign policy as well as our social economic situation must suffer.

At this moment there is no question of burning importance in domestic legislation before the Chamber. The immensity of the Sicilian disaster is now but a memory. Politics easily make us forget the nation's sorrows. The whole world flew to our assistance; it only remains to be seen how that assistance will be made use of. The contributions received by the Pope will most assuredly reach the proper quarters; the six million francs (\$1,200,000) he received have been entrusted for distribution to faithful hands. The government has nominated a committee for the orphans, but its partisan methods are not approved of by open-minded men. The strikes which brought such misery in Emilia are over; capital has won another fight against labor, and at this writing it would seem that the Italian Socialist party, taught by its past failures, does not intend to employ strike methods again in a hurry.

Just now there is no serious danger of an anti-clerical movement in Italy. To be convinced of this it is only necessary to review the actual situation. Freemasonry, it is true, is actively allied with Socialism, but the Italian mind continues to be deeply Christian in spite of everything, and a little effort on the part of lovers of order and religion will yet save Italy from material and moral disaster. Moreover, neither the present Chamber nor the government itself will ever join hands with the faction which tried to stir up religious war such as that which

France has gone through. The fact is that in the Chamber there is an absolute majority of men sent there by the direct aid of Catholics, who, with the permission of the Holy See, voted at the late elections. Again, the government, apart altogether from the fact that the ministry always respects the opinion of the Chamber, has everything to gain from keeping on good terms with the party of law and order, even though in so doing it does not always meet the hearty approval of the Quirinal, which would gladly see the government in the hands of the *bloc*.

The government's main object in keeping peace at home is to be in a position to assist in keeping peace away from home. Italy's position in the European concert is well known. For the past twenty-five years it has been bound in a solemn alliance which does not permit of independent action in matters of importance; and indeed unaided it is unequal to carry any such action through. Rome, Vienna and Berlin joined together, make up a moral force the like of which there is not in Europe, and it is to be hoped this triple alliance always uses its power in the cause of justice. Rome and Berlin are fast friends, and although, as the German Chancellor puts it, Italy takes an occasional waltz with the *hated* France, Berlin pretends not to see and condones these petty unfaithfulnesses of its morganatic partner. This imperial generosity is appreciated in Rome; and it is another cause of gratitude that Berlin does not object to Italy's fifty year old friendship with England, another antagonist of Germany. With Vienna things are not quite on the same footing; if the alliance with Berlin is more or less a marriage of love, that with Vienna is purely a matter of convenience. The terms of the triple alliance are kept fairly secret, but it is well known that the maintaining of United Italy is one of the conditions under which Italy joined the alliance. Rome and Vienna have common interests in the Adriatic, and trade interests between the two countries are extensive.

To complete my sketch of the situation in Italy, I must touch on the religious question. The relations between official Italy and the Vatican are those of an armistice in politics, and of peace in matters of administration. The government, by means of its administration, seeks to co-operate with the Church in every possible way. This will be dealt with in a future letter, and facts given in proof of it. Politically the Roman Question, which is never spoken of, is the stumbling-block, and time rather than the schemes of men must remove it. But the religious question has another side of more actual interest and ecclesiastical importance. I mean the struggle against Modernism, which periodically causes lamentable episodes. Modernism in Italy is rather a matter of discipline than intellect or advance of thought. It may be looked on as a result of the wild-cat Christian Democracy Agitation of unhappy memory, now dead and buried for some years. Out of its dishonored ashes arose a spirit of independence which led away some of the younger clergy, in certain parts of Italy, more eager for novelty than for depth and soundness of doctrine.

The leader of Christian Democracy was the Rev. R. Murri, a priest, a clever speaker, by no means an orator, conceited but shallow, who, by his words and his writings, has led many astray. Two years ago he was suspended *a divinis*, but not won back from his headlong course; in fact, suspension seems to have made him reckless in his utterances, and it is with regret it must be noted that he continued to receive secret encouragement from the malcontent element of the clergy. In the re-

cent political elections he stood as candidate for one of the districts in the Marches, got the support of the Socialists and was elected deputy. The Holy See admonished him canonically, and then excommunicated him with the greater excommunication, which, under the present discipline of the Church, simply means exclusion *a divinis*. This is the latest event in the war against Modernism in Italy. Elsewhere, as I have said, Modernism may be an intellectual movement, but in Italy it is almost entirely a revolt against authority. You must know that after the publication of the Encyclical *Pascendi*, containing such a keen analysis of the heresy of the twentieth century, there were some who drew up an intricate classification of Modernism, and discovered a political and sociological Modernism in what was but an abortion of true Catholic teaching and papal instruction on such matters. So that from Modernism of thought, which is the real and genuine Modernism, the name Modernists was given to all those who happened to differ in any way from these writers; and the result of this superabundance of polemics has injured rather than aided the cause of truth, which has no worse enemy than a poor or over-zealous advocate. However, wisdom is making itself heard at last, language is becoming more moderate, and bitterness is dying out; for it has always been the wish of the Holy See, while hating error and sin, to be gentle and kind to the sinner.

I do not go into further particulars owing to exigencies of space. If need be, in a future letter I can return to the matter and endeavor to make it clear. The religious no less than the political situation of the Church in Italy is far from being in a bad way.

L'EREMITE.

The Late Post Office Strike in Paris

PARIS, APRIL 3, 1909.

The post office strike that took place in Paris last month is an event of some importance, not so much on account of its immediate consequences as by reason of the light it throws on certain mental and moral conditions that are fraught with danger. For the first time the post office servants of a great nation, by proclaiming a strike, placed the Government of their country in a position of grave difficulty and caused financial and commercial losses, the extent of which is considerable.

Strangely enough, the crisis that so closely affected the safety and well being of thousands, did not, as might have been expected, excite the indignation of the public, and this is in itself a significant symptom, as it reveals, on the part of the conservative and orderly fraction of the nation, a latent and unexpected feeling of sympathy with the malcontents. Indeed, to all thoughtful minds the recent crisis assumes proportions far beyond those of a mere ordinary strike; it has a deeper meaning, it implies danger ahead, a danger that touches upon the whole system of government in France.

To the general public, to foreigners especially, the strike came as a surprise; not so, however, to those who, for years past, have noticed the growth of a spirit of discontent, not among the avowed revolutionists and socialists, but among the quiet, steady, peace-loving class of public servants, who hitherto seemed free from subversive tendencies.

The grievances which the post office strikers brought forward to justify their rebellion were founded on the arbitrary methods of M. Simyan, who fills the post of

Postmaster-General. In a certain measure their grievances appear justified, and M. Simyan's antecedents are not calculated to inspire confidence. He was originally a second rate doctor in the département du Rhône, noted for his socialistic opinions, and he owes his present position rather to his radicalism than to his ability. He is accused, by his female subordinates especially, of roughness and rudeness in his manner, an accusation that would hardly justify so serious a measure as a strike if it were not backed up by graver charges. The rebels complained that M. Simyan, by changing the mode of promotion that previously existed in the post office, opened the door to favoritism and injustice. They asserted that their political and religious opinions were made the subject of harassing "espionage"; that, if these opinions happened to be contrary to those advocated by the government, they were exposed to unfair and tyrannical measures. Thus, a certain "directrice des postes" in Brittany was removed to an inferior post, not because she in any way failed to fulfill her duties, but simply because she was present at a religious procession and allowed her son to be enrolled among the choir boys of the parish church. Although all the discontented "employés des postes" are not by any means martyrs for the faith, instances of intolerance such as this one are of frequent occurrence among French officials, a fact that the citizens of a free country find it difficult to grasp.

In addition to the accusations of favoritism and injustice brought against M. Simyan and generally supported, it must be owned, by strong evidence, the Postmaster-General is considered as possessing neither the technical knowledge nor the moral influence that are necessary to one in command. His subordinates are aware that he was, in past years, one of the most fiery promoters of the unjustifiable strikes of Monceau les Mines, and that a newspaper, edited under his auspices, invariably encourages strikes throughout the country. He was, therefore, peculiarly disqualified to control the rebels of the post office. Moreover, he is known to be a tool in the hands of the advanced radical and anti-clerical party, and finally, as we have observed, he has modified the system of promotion in the post office in a manner that leaves him free to favor those whose political and religious opinions fall in with the views of his party.

The post office officials have, it must be owned, endeavored for many months past to state their grievances to and to obtain redress from their chiefs, but their efforts met with no response. Vague hopes and promises were held out to them, but, as a rule, their demands were put aside with a contemptuous indifference that exasperated the delegates who spoke in the name of the rest. When once the strike was proclaimed it was directed with an earnestness and energy that, if we consider the possible consequences of the movement, were strangely impressive. The strikers never asked for an increase of salary; they demanded certain alterations in M. Simyan's rules, and, above all, they clamored for his dismissal.

Their claims were, no doubt, partly justified, but, taken as a whole, the strike is a dangerous symptom. "Every feature of it," says an English paper, "points to the movement as an outline of the great political revolution which is being persistently and mathematically prepared by the leaders of the syndicates or unions." And, after making every allowance for the strikers' righteous indignation, the fact remains that they caused grave danger and discomfort to their country.

It is easy to imagine the heavy loss entailed by the

strike in the world of finance and trade, but only those who were staying in France last March can realize the curious feeling of isolation that was experienced in Paris and in the provinces. The postal service was suddenly interrupted, the telegraph ceased to act, and, at one time, even the telephone could not be used. Business losses were estimated at £500,000 daily, and at one time it appeared as if Paris, the headquarters of the movement, was to be deprived of food as well as of letters. The tradesmen who sell provisions at the "Halles" were prevented either from corresponding with their purveyors in the provinces or from sending them money; consequently the latter ceased to buy or to send provisions of meat, vegetables and eggs to the Paris market. A few important firms formed an association and sent messengers to Belgium daily to post letters or telegrams to their correspondents on the Continent. In a town in the south of France, twelve hours from Paris, the presence of a Paris doctor was required for an urgent case, but as neither a letter nor a telegram could reach him a messenger was despatched by train to bring him back. The Mayor of Biarritz, with remarkable enterprise, organized a special courier service for English visitors and sent a messenger to Dover with letters and instructions to bring back the replies. Many English and American travelers, however, who were expecting remittances, found themselves in sore distress for a few days.

A curious and unexpected feature of the crisis was the equanimity with which the excitable and emotional French people bore the material loss and grievous anxiety that attended the strike. Even the conservative papers struck a note of extreme indulgence with regard to the rebels, betraying more sympathy with them than with a government whose unprincipled policy was the real cause of the movement.

The situation of the ministers was, during some days, one of extreme difficulty, and M. Barthou, the minister of "les Travaux publics," faced it with a certain energy. Not only were communications stopped between Paris and the provinces; worse still: at a moment when the possibility of war in the East caused general agitation, the French Government was cut off from its agents beyond the frontier.

At the outset the Government endeavored to frighten the rebels into submission, but soon the set purpose and quiet perseverance of the leaders of the strike impressed the Cabinet and negotiations were opened. The post office delegates were received by the Ministers and in the end all their demands were granted save one—M. Simyan, their hated chief, being allowed for the time being, to remain at his post. It has been argued that by entering into negotiations with the strikers the Government betrayed its weakness, but no other course was open to the Ministers, whose moral strength has been long since weakened by their concessions to the radical party. Certain features of the post office strike are distinctly alarming: for the first time a class of public servants, well known as steady, quiet, respectable men and women, suddenly rebelled against their chiefs; their grievances, however real they might appear, being out of all proportion with the grave evils entailed by the movement.

But the real secret of the crisis lies deeper than the discontent of the post office servants; it is part of a social system that is at the present moment thoroughly undermined. For years past, the Government has flattered the evil passions of the multitudes; it has urged the working classes to assert their rights and neglected to teach them their duties; it has deceived them by false

promises of wealth, emancipation and happiness, and, by its crafty and relentless religious persecution, it has destroyed in the souls of the young the principles that alone make a nation morally strong.

The form of government matters little, but whether it be a monarchy or a republic, every Government that wishes to exercise a powerful influence must needs hold to the fundamental principles of justice, religion and morality that are the basis of public order and peace.

The power of syndicates, associations and unions among workers of all description is gaining ground in France as elsewhere; it would be folly to run counter to the movement, but, to direct it wisely and well, needs higher ideals and a stronger hand than those of the men who, at present, control the destinies of the country. "We can hardly call Government an association of politicians whose object is to use for their own ends the passions and vices of the democracy," writes M. Jules Delafosse, a leading French journalist; and M. Maurice Barrès, a member of the French Academy, touches the right note when he points out that Cabinet ministers who owe their official position to the encouragement they have given to strikes, are hardly qualified to preach order, discipline and respect to their discontented subordinates.

BARBARA DE COURSON. (B. N.)

An English Outlook

LONDON, APRIL 3, 1909.

The Catholic episcopate in England has lost one of its veterans by the death of Dr. William Anthony Johnson, Titular Bishop of Arindela, March 27. Bishop Johnson was a Londoner, born as long ago as 1832. He studied at Douai and at the English College in Rome, where he was ordained in the Advent of 1857, and where, two years later, he took the degree of Doctor of Divinity. When he began his work as a priest in the newly established diocese of Westminster, Cardinal Wiseman was at its head. One Sunday in 1865 his successor, Archbishop Manning heard Dr. Johnson preach a sermon, and next day to his utter astonishment the young priest was summoned to the Archbishop's house and told that he was to live there as one of his secretaries.

This was the beginning of forty-four years of unbroken activity under three successive Archbishops. He became Archbishop Manning's chief secretary and in many ways his right hand man. Cardinal Vaughan kept him by his side in the same capacity. He had been made a canon of the Metropolitan Chapter and gradually became its senior, when he was appointed its provost. In 1904 he was named Vicar-General, and next year on his completion of forty years of work at the Archbishop's House the bishops of England unanimously requested the Archbishop to petition the Pope to recognize Dr. Johnson's service to the Church by raising him to the episcopate. Hence the Titular Bishopric of Arindela, an honor Dr. Johnson would have avoided if he could, for there never was a more unassuming wearer of the mitre.

London journalists, non-Catholic as well as Catholic, will long remember with gratitude his patient, helpful courtesy whenever they came to him for information. He made friends of all who had any dealings with him. To the poor he was a generous helper. Most of the purse his friends presented to him, when he was raised to the episcopate, was very quickly distributed in this way. There never was a harder, more persevering worker. In those forty-four years he never took any holidays but a single day of rest now and then. Once