

Naish, V.  
Christianity & national  
prosperity

Div.Sch.  
BX  
1644  
.N357  
1898







W. T. Wisley  
with the author's compliments



---

CHRISTIANITY & NATIONAL PROSPERITY.

A REPLY

TO THE RIGHT REV. DR. WELLDON'S PAPER,

"THE CHURCH'S IMPERIAL MISSION."

BY REV. V. NAISH, S. J.,

CATHOLIC CHAPLAIN, DARJEELING.

THIRD EDITION REVISED.

(These Lectures were delivered at the close of 1898.)

---

Price eight annas.

Q



PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY M. APEL,  
AT THE CATHOLIC ORPHAN PRESS,  
CALCUTTA.



# CHRISTIANITY & NATIONAL PROSPERITY.

A REPLY

to Dr. Welldon's paper, "*The Church's Imperial Mission*," read at  
the recent *Anglican Church Congress*

BY REV. V. NAISH, S. J., *Catholic Chaplain, Darjeeling.*

## ERRATA.

- Page 12—6 lines from top, "about all" should be "above all."  
,, 36—middle of page, after "Kingdom of Prussia" put comma and  
not fullstop.  
,, 36—9 lines from bottom "populatian" should be "a population."  
,, 45—10 ,, ,, "exagsrated" ,, "exaggerated."  
,, 49—10 ,, ,, "unparelleled" ,, "unparalleled."  
,, 59—2 lines from bottom "Stock" should be "Shock."  
,, 67—last line "hat pauperism" should be "that pauperism."  
,, 81—middle of page "unwilling it may be" should be "unwil-  
lingly it may be."  
,, 87—middle of page "noawdays" shou'd be "nowadays."

She has lost her native virility. She has lost it because three centu-  
ries ago she saw the light and might have cherished it, and turned  
away from it. Not to her nor to any Latin or Roman Catholic  
country, as it seems, does the future belong. It belongs to the non-  
Catholic nations, and among them pre-eminently the English."



In his recent address to the Anglican Church Congress Dr. Welldon has sounded no uncertain note. Neither the subject matter nor the style of his paper is original, and the address would probably have passed unnoticed but for the fact that the speaker is the Metropolitan-elect of India, and that his words are clearly intended to be a manifesto of his principles, a kind of pastoral charge sent on in advance to his future subjects. Let me candidly acknowledge at the outset my admiration of Dr. Welldon's conspicuous frankness and honesty. He speaks exactly as a Protestant Bishop, sent out by a Protestant Government to do Protestant work in this country, should speak. There is no beating about the bush for him, no running with the Catholic hare and hunting with the Protestant hounds. He has nailed his colours to the mast long before his barque has touched the troubled waters of the Indian Ocean, and we shall all watch with respectful interest the way in which he will steer through the shoals and quicksands that beset Calcutta.

I have no doubt that he will be absolutely true to his principles, and not deviate by a hair's breadth from his Protestant profession of faith. It may be indeed that the address and its bearing on Dr. Welldon's future in this country will be received with mixed feelings by the flock he is destined to rule—let us hope and pray—for many long years to come. Those feelings are not our concern. But whilst we admire his honesty, our sympathies as Catholics are frankly with the High Church party. Those of us who have studied the question cannot help seeing in the present Catholic upheaval, within the very shrine and citadel of Protestantism, the work of the Almighty's hand, which is "filling up the valley and bringing low the hill," that "the way of the Lord may be made straight" for the return of our separated brethren to the old true Church of their forefathers.

After all, the English people were **ROBBED** of the true Faith. They did not part with it willingly. Kings and nobles, actuated by lust and avarice, conspired to tear England away from the divinely appointed centre of Unity. The mass of the people had a very unwilling share in that great act of national apostacy.



We are encouraged by the words of the highest Catholic prelates at home, and of the Pope himself, to regard the majority of English Protestants of our day as being in good faith, belonging, we trust, to the soul of the Church, even though from inherited prejudice they refuse to submit to its visible authority. No wonder then that we gladly welcome the vanguard of the returning force which has strayed so far from our side during the last three centuries.

We have watched with delighted eyes their noble lives, modelled after the Catholic ideal. Vowed like ourselves to celibacy and the privation of worldly goods and pleasures, they preach Christ crucified in the only way in which He can be preached with success to the natives of India. Hence, amid the trials which have come upon them of late at the hands of their fellow Anglicans, we have had no sympathy with the self-seeking demagogues who attack them. Whilst the Anglican Bishops were dumb in Parliament, Irish Catholic members raised their voices in indignant protest against the brutal buffooneries of Kensit and his crew.

We know that the Catholic party in the Church of England must pass through fire and water before they can enter into their rest, and so we stand watching their trial with prayerful interest in the present and silent hope for the future. In them all thoughtful observers must recognise the 'fine flower' of English Christianity. Amid the reeling chaos of conflicting sects to which the Anglican Church is now apparently reduced, we look to them for the forward movement towards sanity and unity in religious matters, not to the noisy School of Muscular Christianity which is soon to have a footing on the shores of India. For them, the Catholic-minded English, have the prayers of the universal Church been offered up during years past, that the light may soon break upon the

"Confused alarms of hurry and fight,  
Where ignorant armies clash by night."

\* \* \*

I have thus defined our position towards the two great parties in the Anglican Church, because it is generally assumed



that, when Catholics are drawn into a controversy, their hand is against everyone.

The converse is undoubtedly true. However deep and bitter may be the dissensions existing between Protestant sects the ranks are closed when once the Catholic forces are in the field; an instinct of self-preservation and common dislike of the great Mother Church of Christendom binds together, in an unstable alliance, the most conflicting parties. But this feeling is not at all shared by Catholics.

We are trained to discriminate closely between the various degrees of voluntary error and involuntary ignorance or prejudice to single out and do justice to the elements of good that are nearly always embedded, like precious veins, in the baser minerals. This spirit, the only one proper to a Church conscious of its world-wide and everlasting mission, prevents us from indulging in vague generalities and sweeping assertions that cannot be verified. It saves us from the display of bad taste which is shown in seizing the occasion of an unpopular nation's defeat to score a passing success, to secure the applause of the gallery by attacking and misrepresenting that nation's faith and rudely brushing against the wounds still raw and bleeding.

Englishmen, as a rule, do not care to hit a man when he is down in fair fight with them—much less one who is down in a fight with which the Englishman has no personal concern. A feeling of good taste and delicacy alone might have restrained Dr. Welldon from making the recent disasters of Spain the peg on which to hang his manifesto against Catholic nations in general, and from executing a kind of Protestant war-dance over the defeated Dons.

In a subsequent portion of his address he thus characterizes a well known English defect in words far stronger than I would dare to employ—

“The race of which we are members and representatives needs religion. *I know no race that needs it more, or even so much.* We are proud and hard; we are full of narrow insular prejudice; *we are apt and disposed, as recent events have too well shown, to ride roughshod*



over the personal and national feeling of others, and to take it for granted that any end can be justified by any means, so that the standard of our fatherland is borne ever onwards."

This is a strong and just confession, nobly expressed. What a pity Dr. Welldon had not written that before he wrote the passage referring to Spain which I quoted at the commencement! Had he done so, he would have saved himself from presenting an object-lesson of the truth of his own criticism.

\* \* \*

Another more important result of the wider Catholic spirit which the Church fosters in her children is that controversy, for its own sake, is distasteful to them. They love the quiet and tranquil development of their religious life. As "good wine needs no bush," the true Church does not require the cheap and noisy advertisements dear to ephemeral sects and parties. She loves her divine mission, the simple exposition of her truths in the light of day, the simple parental teaching of her children. She engages in controversy only when their interests are concerned, or the manifest good of those outside her fold, who are in honest doubt or ignorance, requires it. Her growth like her beauty, is "from within,"—the growth and beauty of a monarch of the forest, not of a parasite which feeds on the lives of others—

*"Crescit occulto velut arbor aëro"*

"She grows like forest-tree in noiseless lapse of time."

The noble line of Horace is as true to-day of the spiritual growth of Christian Rome as it was then of the pagan hero's fame.

My object, then, in taking issue with Dr. Welldon, is not to say sharp things about my friends in the opposite camp, but to prevent his most misleading views of modern history from injuring the faith of my own people, and keeping back the truth from those outside the Church who are prejudiced against us by such flippant criticisms.

The school of "Surface-scrapers," as they may be called, and of whom Dr. Welldon is the latest example, began with Macaulay, that prince of superficial story-tellers. His shallow essays and history have dazzled the minds of most Englishmen



by their brilliant style, and blinded them to the woeful inaccuracy of his historical deductions. He it was who made popular the fallacy about the meanness, misery and failure of the Catholic and the nobility, comfort and success of the Protestant nation. Once started it was eagerly accepted by the great, gullible British Public, which adds to its many excellent qualities profound ignorance of foreign history and a dense lack sympathy with foreign nations. Like Mr. Pullet, in George Eliot's novel, the British Public has a "great capacity for ignorance" of such subjects, and that ignorance has been successfully traded on by the Macaulay school of surface-scrapers.

I propose, then, in my next lecture, which is entitled "The Materialistic Test of Christianity," to examine what I consider to be the root-fallacy of such writers, *viz.*, the making men material wealth and prosperity the test of religious truth or falsehood. That is the great error of our day, and deserves to be carefully examined.

I shall then take up the very considerable oversight of Dr. Welldon in neglecting to consider national character and national resources, apart and distinct from religious forces, and especially the enormous differences created by the presence or absence of coal and iron in different countries. His specific statements will then be examined in detail, and finally I shall state my objections to employing a century-old method of classifying nations as Protestant and Catholic.

The nineteenth century has witnessed no change more important, from the religious and historical point of view, than the gradual breaking down of the work of the Reformation, and the continuous growth of Catholic ideas and principles, along with the increase of Catholic population, amongst those very peoples which, a century ago, were exclusively Protestant. The humiliations of the Bourbons, the Bonapartes and the Hapsburgs have, under God's Providence, strengthened the Catholic cause by transferring millions of Catholics to the allegiance of Protestant Sovereigns. In a word, the disasters of Catholic nations have been the gain of the Catholic Church.



## II.

### The Materialistic Test of Christianity.

“Rescue me out of the hand of strange children, whose mouth hath spoken vanity: and their right hand is the right hand of iniquity:

Whose sons are as new plants in their youth:

Their daughters decked out, adorned round about, after the similitude of a temple:

Their storehouses full.

Their sheep fruitful in young . . . their oxen fat.

There is no breach of wall . . . nor crying out in their streets.

They have called the people happy that hath these things—but happy is that people whose God is the *Lord*.”—Ps. 143 (*Catholic Version*).

Since I gave my first lecture in reply to Dr. Welldon's paper, the home mail has brought us an account of the great farewell meeting held in Exeter Hall to wish God-speed to over 160 missionaries of the Church Missionary Society, who are leaving England for the East. The Chairman, Sir John Kennaway, referring to Dr. Welldon's appointment as Metropolitan, remarked:—“In the new Bishop of Calcutta we have a man who will not let Rome have her own way altogether.”

These words confirm the impression made by Dr. Welldon's paper on the “Imperial Mission of the English Church,” and make it clear that his coming is intended to open a new era in the relations of Christians in India, to substitute for the wise conservatism of his predecessor what will prove to be, I fear, a noisy and distinctly Protestant policy.

I regret the intended change of front on the part of the Anglican rulers. If my forecast prove correct, we Catholics shall be sorry for the sake of Christianity; for, situated as we are in India,

“Rari nantes in gurgite vasto,”

a handful of European Christians amongst millions of pagans, it has always seemed to us the wiser and sounder policy to live, if not in actual alliance, at least in peaceful truce with our Christian neighbours. There is so much new ground for all to break out here, so much fresh work for all to undertake



that 'to agree to differ' in silence about contentious matters is, in most cases, the true Christian policy.

Tempting as have been the opportunities to indulge in sarcastic controversy over the present condition of the Anglican Church, Catholics have mostly refrained, and it has always been a relief for me to turn from reading the pious platitudes of the Bishops and the frothy declamations of the Church demagogues at home, and contemplate the excellent work done by sober and earnest Anglicans in India. But it would seem that all this is now to be changed, and Catholics are thrown on their defence. We cannot allow judgment against us to pass by default, when unsound views of Christianity are presented, supported by bad history.

\* \* \*

In this lecture I propose to examine the root-fallacy of Dr. Welldon's paper, namely, the making mere national prosperity and commercial expansion the test of true Christianity. This is evident from the tone of the address, but especially from that part which refers to Spain. I quote his exact words:—

“Spain is to-day an “anæmic” country. She has lost her native virility. She has lost it because three centuries ago she saw the light and might have cherished it, and turned away from it.”

In a future lecture, I shall deal with the question of the downfall of Spain, and I hope to prove, to the satisfaction of my audience, that a very different set of causes from those connected with Spain's religion proved fatal to the supremacy of that once mighty nation. At present we have to consider this question:—was Christianity intended primarily to make nations great, enterprising and wealthy, and consequently are material resources and trade expansion to be made the standard and rule by which a country's Christianity is to be judged? To state the question thus is to answer it.

You have already remarked, from my first lecture, that Dr. Welldon frankly gives up the case for the *spiritual* condition of England. I recall his exact words:—



“The race of which we are members and representatives needs religion. *I know no race that needs it more or even so much.* We are proud and hard, we are full of narrow insular prejudice; we are apt and disposed, as recent events have too well shown, to ride roughshod over the personal and national feelings of others, and to take it for granted *that any end can be justified by any means*, so that the standard of our fatherland is borne ever onwards.”

I confess that I never knew till now that Englishmen, so honest and straightforward individually are in their collective capacity as a nation so entirely ‘jesuitical’! Their Protestant rulers for the last three centuries must clearly have been ‘Jesuits in disguise’;—and the name by which England is known on the Continent, ‘Perfide Albion,’ is, according to Dr. Welldon, a perfectly accurate description, though I hesitate to subscribe to his judgment.

I suppose it was his profound conviction of this unpleasant truth about his own country that led him to fix material power and prosperity as the standard of true Christianity. One is irresistibly reminded by Dr. Welldon’s address of the comical reply which the great American humorist puts in the mouth of his typical Yankee, when the latter is reminded that his go-ahead maxims do not quite square with the ethics of Christianity.

“But John P. Robinson, he  
Sez, they war’nt up to everything down in Judee!”

The Spaniards have a funny saying about the principal virtues of an American. It runs thus in Castilian—“*La fè en el dinero, el esperanza en el vapor, y la caridad en la mujer*—which may be freely translated—“Believe in dollars, hope in steam, and love woman.”—The luckless Dons have now abundant reason to meditate on the truth of their proverb, but till the cynical phrase touches a profound truth, namely, that some nations, which are loudest in their public profession of Christianity, are the least ready to give practical application to their principles—that great national wealth and expansion are sometimes purchased at a very unchristian price, the crushing down of the poor at home and the slaughtering of the native abroad.

Can there be found in history a better object-lesson of national hypocrisy than the wheelround of American opinion



on the merits of the Cuban question? It reminds one a little of the historic instinct which prompts another people to spread the Gospel light wherever gold can be found. Before the war, and for the purpose of justifying it to the Puritan conscience, the Cuban was a hero, "a patriot rightly struggling to be free," and the Spaniard was a bloodthirsty tyrant. But now that Cuba and the rest are safe for the States, the Cuban patriot is found to be a predatory cut-throat, and the Spaniard blossoms forth into a soldier and a gentleman! Indeed, if report be true, the captured admirals and generals have some trouble in escaping, not from the fire of a Yankee platoon, but from the embarrassing attentions of American ladies.

The truth is that every nation has its own special defects. Even those that think themselves far more Christian than their neighbours generally have a heap of stones in their glass house, and are apt to be inconsiderate in using them.

I do not mean by thus poking a little fun at the Protestant peoples to admit for a moment that Catholicism is calculated to degrade or disintegrate a nation. I trust to show, in the course of these lectures, that in all the truest elements of national prosperity—in all that really makes for the welfare and happiness of the majority—the cultivation of the religious sense amongst the masses, the enforcement of moral laws by efficient moral sanctions, the even distribution of national wealth, the care of and consideration for the poor, (two different things it must be remarked), the development as a national duty of art and music with the object of brightening the lives and elevating the tastes of the toiling millions—in these and many other ways the Catholic compare most favourably with the so-called Protestant nations.

I say "so-called," because, whereas the Latin races are almost exclusively Catholic, the Anglo-Saxons are now very largely leavened with Catholicism.

About half the German race is Catholic. In the German Empire, (which does not include the entire German race),



there are just 20,000,000 of Catholics out of a total of some 55,000,000,—and the German Catholics form the strongest and most united party in the Empire—that mighty Centrum which beat Bismarck to his knees at the gates of Canossa, and without which no German statesman can rule.

Belgium, the most prosperous and progressive country in the world, sustaining in comfort 100 persons more to each square mile of its territory than Great Britain, is entirely and most devotedly Catholic—the only country on earth where a frankly Catholic government has held undisputed sway for the last fifteen years, and seems likely to prolong that sway indefinitely.

Holland, which at the beginning of this century had only  $\frac{1}{4}$ th or  $\frac{1}{5}$ th of its population Catholic, has now a little over  $\frac{1}{3}$ rd of its people devoted children of the Church, and at the present rate of increase those who are still young may live to see the Dutch people half Catholic.

The British Empire has now just 10,000,000 of Catholic subjects, probably the largest single Christian denomination, if the Anglican Church would frankly recognize the enormous differences that divide the three great sects which it shelters in its comprehensive skirts—the High, Low, and Broad Church parties.

In the United States there are now 12,000,000 of Catholics out of a total of 65,000,000, and the annexation of Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines will bring those 12 up to 20,000,000.

Now, if the Catholics be taken apart from their Protestant neighbours in the Anglo-Saxon races, I should like to know how much genuine Christianity would be left anywhere except in Great Britain. Certainly the moral and religious statistics, (divorce, non-attendance at any place of Divine Worship, &c.), of Protestant Germany and Protestant America seem to point to a progressive relapse into a wealthy and refined paganism. It has been said, I know not with how much truth, that half London is unbaptised; whereas on the other hand it is precisely



in those so-called Protestant countries that the Catholic Church is advancing most rapidly, and displaying its inherent qualities of undying vigour and perpetual youth.

The only entirely Protestant nations existing in the civilised world at present—Russia I presume does not count in that, and Russia is anything but Protestant, she prides herself about all on being Catholic of the Catholic—are Sweden, Norway, and Denmark, those poor remnants of a mighty Protestant past.

\* \* \*

All this I admit is a slight digression from my immediate subject, but when one is confronted by a series of vague and inaccurate statements, it is necessary at times to digress in order to define our position and indicate the scope and course of our enquiry.

I need not weary you by recounting,—what every one who reads his Bible knows all too well,—that, if we must choose between poverty and wealth as the test and standard of true Christianity, our Divine Master has fixed on the former and not on the latter as the badge and sign of His true followers. Further, I may say that the attempt to make wealth, splendour and prosperity the criterion of religious truth is nothing short of an insult to Him who said—“It were easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter Heaven.—Blessed are the poor in spirit—Blessed are ye when they shall revile and persecute you.—If thou wilt be perfect, go, sell all thou hast and give it to the poor.—Take up thy cross and follow me.”—Who gave as the crowning and decisive sign of His being the Messiah—“Behold, the Gospel is preached to the poor.”

I gather then from what has been said that it is a most pernicious fallacy, speaking now as Christians and not as mere worldly wealth-worshippers, to estimate religious vitality and religious worth by the world's standard of money and power.

This poison has crept into the vitals of the Christian nations, and unconsciously Christian ministers have come to flatter the great infidelity of our age, which, for the mighty text that



rang through all the centuries of Faith—"We have not here a lasting city but seek that which is to come"—has found the modern substitute—"Here on earth is the only home we know or care to know!"—which has changed the Gospel of atonement for sin by pain and sorrow for the cult of wealth and pleasure and bodily ease. Men crave a religion now-a-days which shall eliminate hell and gradually improve purgatory into heaven—the heaven of the sensual sophist, whose cry has ever been:—"let us eat and drink to-day, for to-morrow we die"—a religion which shall assure its votaries that moral precepts are nothing more than states of feeling, and conscience a disturbance of the diaphragm. "Many sins are forgiven her because she hath entertained much!"—How often now-a-days is a shady past covered over and forgotten to man and woman alike, not in the spirit of Christian hope and forgiveness, but for the sake of the glittering splendour of a millionaire's palace, and the lavish social bribes that ill-gotten wealth can pour into the lap of venal flatterers! I distrust and dislike those fulsome pæans of mere material wealth and national prosperity because they pander to that besetting evil of our time, the cult of money, the neglect of heaven.

One concession I gladly make in conclusion to Dr. Welldon—Catholicism can do much in moulding for good the national character, but it cannot change altogether that character, any more than it can modify those material sources of national wealth which so profoundly affect the national character. It cannot, any more than Protestantism, change the dreamy and unpractical Southern into the hard-headed and enterprising Northern. There is much the same difference of temperament between the Neapolitan and the Belgian, that there is between the easy-going, pleasure-loving Protestants of the Southern States and the alert Yankees of New York and Massachusetts. Catholicism cannot, any more than Protestantism, turn the patient vine-dressers of Champagne and Rhineland into the hardy sailors of Brest or Hamburg. It cannot whisk away the coal and iron of England and the United States and plant them in Spain and Italy, anymore



than it can unmoor Great Britain and anchor it in the South Pacific. Climate, geographical position, and the presence together of coal and iron in a given country are enormous factors in the development of the national character and the production of national wealth.

Lord Dufferin has acutely observed that the value of countries possessing coal and iron must be calculated by their *cubic* contents, and not merely by their *superficial* area. When men see wealth close at hand they grasp it, and it grasps them. Where there is no such prospect, men live at ease, and more often gain in happiness what they lose in energy.

Take a globe and turn it till England comes directly under the zenith. You will find that nearly all the land of the world is grouped in the northern hemisphere round London as a centre; the southern hemisphere is then for the most part unprofitable sea—the ‘barren fields of ocean’ that the Greek poet loved to sing of. Clearly England, with its coal and iron, its climate and position, was destined by nature to be the centre of the world’s manufactures and commercial activity; and gradually, as the advance of steam power and electricity narrow the Atlantic to a Strait, to share that central activity with its mighty off-spring of the West.

Examine the coast line of Great Britain. Where in the rest of the world can you find a border so strangely sinuous and indented, not with the inhospitable cliffs of Greece, but with the constant easy reaches of mingled sea and river, where navies love to ride, and the trappers of the wave can net in safety their silvery spoil? Clearly again England is destined by nature to be the Mother of a mighty seafaring people, for whom the broad waters will be a surer pathway to conquest and race-expansion than the land is for others. It is the rim of a continent, not of a country, that hems the sea-blown mantle of Britannia,—that little land, made so great by the energy of its people and the abounding natural gifts lavished on it by God.

Has England made a return to God’s poor commensurate with His gifts or equal to what is done for them by far poorer



Catholic countries? That is a question we can discuss hereafter I think enough has been said to show that there is no need of dragging in religious differences, as Dr. Welldon has done, to explain the progress or retrogression of nations, when there is a simpler and more rational explanation to hand in the natural differences created by climate, geographical position and mineral resources.

### III.

#### Dr. Welldon's Historical Inaccuracies.

“The future belongs among the nations of the world to the Christian nations . . . No political or philosophical thinker expects, as a probable event, that any non-Christian nation will attain to a dominant or prominent position among mankind. Among the Christian nations, again, the future belongs to the nations which are Protestant, or, to speak more correctly, non-Catholic. The Russian Race, the German, and the *English* race, in its two great divisions on one side of the Atlantic Ocean and the other, are the races which are spreading over the face of the world . . . Upon the whole, it may be said that wherever there is a people which is stationary or retrogressive it is Roman Catholic; wherever there is a people that is progressive and imperial it is Protestant. No decadent or dying nation in the world is Protestant . . . Not to any Latin or Roman Catholic country, as it seems, does the future belong. It belongs to the non-Catholic nations, and among them pre-eminently to the *English* . . . It is not a dead or a dying empire like the Spanish or the Portuguese or the French . . . The Reformation may, or may not, have been a movement of religious truth; it was undoubtedly for England a movement of imperial energy; and **whoever disparages the Reformation is beyond all doubt a bad patriot.**” (*Extract from Dr. Welldon's address.*)

If anything in the following Lecture should hurt the feelings of any reader, I deeply regret it. But my excuse must be found in the exasperation caused by Dr. Welldon's cruel taunt, where he says that the millions of Catholics in the Empire, and the many Protestants as well, whom conscience and history force to deplore and disparage the Reformation, must be *bad* patriots, another word for disloyal subjects of our Queen.

In my two previous lectures I have striven to define the Catholic position in this controversy which has been forced upon us, and to point out the great fallacy of making wealth and national prosperity the test of true Christianity. I now proceed



to examine Dr. Welldon's statements in detail, and commence with what I venture to call his historical inaccuracies. These are of two classes, first, those affecting contemporary events,—secondly, those that deal with the past. I begin with the former, as we naturally take a greater interest in them, and are better fitted to form an accurate judgment in their regard.

How, at the very outset, I ask, could Dr. Welldon have written these words—“no political or philosophical thinker expects, as a probable event, that any *non-Christian* nation will attain to a dominant or prominent position among mankind,” with the fact of Japan's recent advance to power before his eyes? What nation on earth has made a greater bound forward in the last thirty years—a bound that has brought it to the front in the comity of nations, and has completely altered the calculation of statesmen with regard to the balance of power in the world?

You remember Lord Rosebery's significant speech, at the close of the Chino-Japanese war, in which he declared that the old Eastern question had been completely overshadowed by the far more important question opening up in the East of Asia. Why, one can hardly walk the streets of London to-day, or visit one of those great dockyards where ironclads are built, without becoming conscious of the fact that the tawny race from the rocking islands of the Pacific is fast pushing Japan into line with the great Christian Powers. The scramble for China, which is certain hereafter to cost so much blood and treasure, is directly due to the great advance made by its rival.

Passing by the first “*lapsus calami*” I come to Dr. Welldon's philippic against the Catholic nations in general. There is no mistaking the *gusto* and pompous triumph with which he waves the banner of English protestantism above their prostrate forms. His note is unmistakably the ‘robustious’ one of the Clerical Jingo—an unwelcome sound, I take it, on the shores of India, even to friends and followers. We Catholics are all in disgrace together! All,—French, Spaniards, Portuguese—all involved in the same sweeping political anathema of the ex-headmaster of Harrow!



Strange—is it not?—that no mention has been made of Austria and Italy! Italy especially, that darling of the Protestant North, to whom England stood sponsor at her baptism, with full Freemason rites, into the family of European nations! Perhaps certain recent and very unpleasant events, which show how Italy has taken to heart the advice and encouragement to get rid of tyrants—that advice and encouragement which were thundered out for years in the columns of the “*Times*”—may have given pause to the expression of sympathy with and approval of the doings of England’s god-child in the South. However that may be, the fine Italian gold seems to be a trifle dulled for the moment, and the roses of Tuscany do not smell as sweet as they did to English nostrils, especially since that barbarous Negus of Abyssinia sent United Italy flying before him at Adowa, and that by means of the plundered rifles of the Pope’s army, foolishly presented to him by the Italians after the occupation of Rome!

Anyhow, it is strange that Dr. Welldon has omitted what may seem to some a capital illustration of his text, and has reserved his denunciation of national failure for France, above all countries of the world. I shall deal in a separate paper with the Spanish question. But France! to take France above all others as the example of a ‘dying empire’—these are Dr. Welldon’s own words—at the very moment when the cry of France’s undue expansion and too pressing vitality is ringing in British ears every day!

It really passes comprehension how a man holding the position of head-master of a great English school could have displayed such transparent ignorance of contemporary history! Mathew Arnold, a great Englishman and Harrowman to boot, has left on imperishable record his admiration of the abounding vital energy of the great French nation. For him at least the people of France ‘*lived*’ more than any other people. I think we may fairly put Mathew Arnold’s judgment before that of Dr. Welldon.

Look at the actual facts of the case. We all remember how in 1871 France rose staggering to her feet from the bloody faint into which she had been beaten by the ponderous hammer-



strokes of Bismark and von Moltke, her forces routed on every field by overwhelming numbers, the flower of her army held captive in the German fortresses, her treasury depleted, drained by that awful blood fine of £200,000,000, her government overthrown, her whole administration disorganised:— who then would have dared to predict that, within a single generation, she would stand as she stands to-day, gay and buoyant as of old, but far stronger by land and sea than she has ever been in recent times, far wiser also, taught by her disasters to lie low when she ought, and to press forward when she can? What other nation in Europe could have rallied so quickly after so fearful a calamity? In spite of her disasters, France is a great and wealthy nation to-day, and presses Great Britain more closely than any other rival in the secular race for conquest and expansion.

Let me give a few facts and figures to show the rapid increase of France in wealth and power. They are taken from the *Statesman's Year Book*—the best English reference-book on such questions—(edition of 1898).

Total National Wealth—Public and Private combined—in pounds Sterling, of the United Kingdom and France contrasted:—

U. K.	France.
£10,037,436,000	£8,080,000,000
( <i>Sir R. Giffen's estimate in 1885.</i> )	( <i>M. de Foville's estimate.</i> )

The yearly income of the United Kingdom is not given. M. Leroy Beaulieu estimates the yearly income of France from all sources at about £1,000,000,000, of which *three-fifths is the product of personal labour*. The yearly income of the United Kingdom may be greater, but owing to the terrible depreciation of agriculture in England, and the rapidly increasing difference between Imports and Exports, it is fairly certain that *personal labour*, the true test of a healthy nation, does not claim the same high percentage of the national income in Great Britain as in France. We stand aghast at the spectacle of a people turning over £1,000,000,000 a year on a capital of £8,000,000,000. This is a dying nation according to Dr. Welldon!



Take another set of figures in contrast—National and Local Revenues of the United Kingdom and France at the present day compared—

	U. K.		France.
National	£ 112,000,000	National	£ 136,000,000
Local	£ 88,000,000	Local	£ 30,000,000
Total	£ 200,000,000	Total	£ 166,000,000

The figures, if they prove anything, prove that France spends far less than England on local wants and conveniences, and far more on national objects—In other words France as a *nation* is more vital and patriotic than England, a conclusion which I leave for Dr. Welldon's consideration!

It would be impossible for me now to give you the details of France's army and navy. You can read them for yourselves. They fill several pages of the *Statesman's Year Book*, and impress one with the magnitude of the sacrifices made by the French people to secure a really efficient force by land and sea. All men who have given serious thought, and not flippant criticism to this subject, know right well that France is far stronger to-day than she has been since the time of Napoleon the Great. We may not like all this. As loyal subjects of the British Empire we cry out sternly to France—'Touch at your peril the land sealed to Britain by the blood of Gordon!' But, as men, we cannot withhold our tribute of admiration for the marvellous vitality and energy of the French nation, and for the heroism of her explorers, who like De Brazza and Marchand have borne the Tricolor through the heart of Western and Central Africa, and have abolished for ever the horrible mutilations and inhuman sacrifices of Dahomey and its hinterland.

At this moment more of the map of Africa is stained with the colour of France than of any other nation. Madagascar is hers: Indo-China is hers;—and wherever her banner is borne, there France, prodigal of her best gifts in the service of humanity, pours out her Christian Missionaries in ever-increasing numbers. These be true Missionaries, intent solely on propagating Christianity and not trying to propagate Christians as well



Caledonia. We Irish, whatever we may be, certainly are not and never will be either English or Anglo-Saxon. We are all subjects of the British Empire, but not all Englishmen. Of the Americans I think it may be fairly said that, from the European point of view, they are *becoming* a nation, but are not quite one at present, owing to the enormous masses of European emigrants still unamalgamated. I think it is equally true to say that their nationality, whether it be taken as already formed or only in process of formation, is very far from being English, is in fact distinctly American. I see no further need of speaking in these lectures of the American branch of 'Anglo-Saxondom.' The Catholic Church is doing very well indeed out there. It is advancing, so people say, 'by leaps and bounds.'

The Irish, who according to Dr. Welldon ought to be either a decaying or a Protestant race, are multiplying faster than others in the States. Their natural genius and aptitude for public affairs give them an enormous and increasing influence in the government of the Country. True friends of the Empire believe that it would not be safe for Britain to count on American support in a great crisis. The Irish and Americans have long memories that go back to the end of last century and the middle of the present one.

\*\*\*

Dr. Welldon's remarks as to the decay of the Latin races invites the question—has he given a thought to Central and Southern America? From Mexico to Cape Horn the great continent belongs to the Latin races and the Spanish tongue. A century or two hence it will be one of the richest and most thickly populated portions of the world. The tide of Latin emigration is setting fast in that direction. Brazil alone has taken in half-a-million of Italians within the last ten years. Here are the latest and most reliable statistics from the 1898 edition of the *Statesman's Year Book*, relative to the increase of population in Mexico and South America during the 20 years past, and with the increase of population has come a corresponding increase of wealth and commerce. I take the leading Republics for which statistics have been given. I need hardly add that Mexico and S. America are entirely Catholic in the sense in which Dr. Welldon uses the word.



I take the Latin American Republics in order, as given in the *Statesman's Year Book*, for 1898 putting in brackets after each name the years in which the increase of population is noted, and then giving in millions and decimal fractions of millions the former and present population and the increase in each case. Fractions of one hundred thousand are omitted.

	Former Population in millions.	Present Population in millions.	Increase in millions.
Argentina (1869-1895) ...	1·7	3·9	2·2
Brazil (1872-1890) ...	9·8	14·3	4·5
Chile (1885-1895) ...	2·5	2·7	·2
Columbia (1870-1895) ...	2·9	4·0	1·1
Mexico (1879-1895) ...	9·9	12·5	2·6
Salvador (1886-1894) ...	·6	·8	·2
Uruguay (1879-1896) ...	·4	·8	·4
Venezuela (1873-1891) ...	1·6	2·3	·7
TOTALS ...	29·4	41·3	11·9

Increase of population in 20 years—40 per cent.

Republics for which no statistics of *increase* have been given—

Peru	...	...	3,000,000
Bolivia	...	...	2,000,000
Guatemala	...	...	1,360,000
Ecuador	...	...	1,270,000

Taken altogether, from Mexico to Cape Horn there must be at the present moment 50 millions of Catholics. When to these are added 15 millions in the United States and Canada, we have a grand total of 65 millions of Catholics in the American Continents, not counting those of Cuba and West Indies. This would give a clear majority of more than 10 millions of the Catholics over the Protestants in the New World.



We may note with thankfulness, that as those great countries fill up there are fewer wars and revolutions, and the condition of the Church steadily improves. The evil workings of secret societies have introduced grave disorders into Church and State in S. America. Pope after Pope has tried to reform, but the efforts of Rome in the past have been constantly baffled by the determined opposition of Atheistic leaders and their revolutionary followers. On one occasion the present prefect of the Propaganda, Cardinal Ledochowski, had to fly for his life from a S. American republic after executing a Papal Mandate. Thank God, the dawn of a better day has come, due mainly to the wise policy and conciliatory temper of Leo XIII; and in the increasing tranquillity of the different States and the increasing numbers and zeal of the Clergy, we find a sure omen of coming success: that success which has ever attended the Catholic Church when her efforts to reform discipline and morals have not been thwarted by the tyranny of the State.

I fear this lecture has been not a little discursive. You must have been reminded of Dr. Johnson's couplet:

“ Let observation with extensive view  
Survey mankind from China to Peru.”

It is not my fault, but Dr. Welldon's. He has led us on this long tramp abroad. I feel tempted in conclusion, as an Irish Priest, to say a word about the two nations which, above all others, have suffered in the evolution of Modern Europe. The Poles and the Irish have been tried beyond human endurance, and yet they have preserved their vitality unimpaired, thanks to the vivifying influence of that Faith to which they are so devotedly attached. The noble words which Horace puts in the mouth of Hannibal, at the darkest hour of Roman history, may be applied to Poland and Ireland to-day as fitly as they were then to Rome—

“ Duris ut ilex tonsa bipennibus  
Nigrae feraci frondis in Algido  
Per damna, per caedes, ab ipso  
Ducit opes animumque ferro.”

“ Like oak free-lopped by woodman's steel  
On Algidus' dark-leaved crest,  
She draws from loss and bleeding weal  
The strength that fires a nation's breast.”



In the Russian Empire of to-day the Polish provinces are the richest, the most progressive and the most densely populated. The Irish race is advancing both at home and abroad. At home, it has gradually won back the lands so often cruelly confiscated. It has won, too, a large measure of self-Government, which will greatly further its future development--Abroad,

“ *Quae regio in terris nostri non plena laboris?* ”

It is hard to find a country in the world, even beyond the ambit of English speech, in which Irishmen have not made their mark. The MacMahons, the O'Donnells, the Taaffes, the Nugents, the MacDonalds have shed lustre on the arms of more than half the countries of Europe. They have led in peace and war alike. Go to far-off Chile and you will find a province and a splendid new cruiser named after the Irish admiral O'Higgins. They have whitened the battle fields of India with their bones. They have watered with their blood the nascent growth of North and South America alike. Even in London, they say that the daily Press might shut down and the docks lie idle, if the Irish were suddenly evicted from the capital of Anglo-Saxondom.

Not many years have passed since the avenues to power and high station were opened to Irish Catholics. Have they failed in the race with their better equipped English and Scotch rivals? After all there is no illustration so good as one taken close at hand here in India. When the great crisis of the famine came upon us more than two years ago, that calamity, compared with which plague and earthquake are trifling, when the lives of millions hung in the balance, who was the man that stood in the breach? An Irish Catholic, one of a decaying race! The highest distinction ever conferred on a Lieut.-Governor in India marked our gracious Sovereign's appreciation of the skill and resource, amounting to positive genius, which were shown in fighting famine in the N.-W. Provinces and Oudh. Here again in Bengal, who was the mainstay of the local Government in a similar encounter? Who was singled out above all the other officials to receive the thanks and high approval of his Chief? Again an Irish Catholic! And these men have been always proud of and loyal to their Faith and Fatherland.



Dr. Welldon will soon be amongst us. He will meet such men as I have spoken of, and will, I trust, both unlearn and learn a little. He will unlearn that narrow insular prejudice which he himself has described as the besetting sin of English Protestantism ; and he will learn that sentiments and expressions, which are quite *in* place amongst Anglican *coteries* at home, are quite *out* of place here in India, where men have broader and juster views about the Catholic Church than obtain in the charmed circle of Mrs. Proudie, and nobler work to hand than that of setting well-meaning folk of opposite creeds by the ears over foolish controversies.

---

 IV.

### The Trade Test of National Prosperity.

“The future belongs to the non-Catholic nations and among them pre-eminently to the English. Some few figures which every school-master, as I hold, should impress upon his pupils, are significant of the high and splendid destiny of the English race. The British Empire, including its various spheres of influence, contains a population of 400,000,000 souls. It covers one-sixth part, perhaps one-fifth part, of the habitable globe. The annual imports and exports exceed in value the sum of £1,000,000,000. And it is not a dead or a dying empire like the Spanish, the Portuguese, or the French ; but it is advancing with such rapidity and energy that it may be said to stand in the face of no peril so serious as its own magnitude.”—(*Extract from Dr. Welldon's address.*)

Before proceeding to give my lecture I desire to say a word in reference to last Sunday's address. If any feel aggrieved by it, I would ask them to remember the provocation we Catholics have received from Dr. Welldon. In the most significant passage of all to be found in his address, which I must now bring forward in self-defence, he declares—“Whoever disparages the Reformation, whether he be a good theologian or not—I do not now consider that question—*is beyond all doubt a bad patriot.*” This means in plain English that the many millions of her Majesty's Catholic subjects, and the many High Church Protestants, whom conscience and history force to deplore and disparage the Reformation, are, according to Dr. Welldon, *disloyal*. So then the Earl Marshal of England, who is also the Conservative Post



Master General, the Lord Chief Justice of England, the Lieutenant-Governor of the N.-W. P. and Oudh, the Prime Minister and several members of the Cabinet of Canada, the Ambassador to the Porte, the Governors of Trinidad and Tasmania, a crowd of her Majesty's Privy Councillors, Under-Secretaries of State, Lords in waiting, ex-cabinet Ministers, some forty Peers of the realm, Judges of the High Courts in every part of the Empire, General Officers of the Army, Civilians holding high places of administration and trust here in India, some 40,000 officers, soldiers and sailors of her Majesty's forces—all these, because they disparage the 'Reformation,' must be 'bad patriots'!

Mr. Gladstone once permitted himself in a moment of irritation to make a similar remark, and he apologised handsomely for it afterwards by appointing a Catholic, and a Convert from Protestantism, to the highest position in the Empire. I think we have a right to expect that Dr. Welldon will withdraw at least this unfortunate remark. As I write, the honours' list for the glorious victory of Omdurman comes to hand. The first named of the four Victoria Crosses given is Captain Kenna, whom I know for certain to be a Catholic and a Stonyhurst boy. The third is Private Byrne, who by his name is most likely a Catholic also. The only Chaplain decorated is the Catholic priest, Father Brindle, whose breast is already covered with Egyptian medals, and who now heads the list of the D. S. O., having lately received the Good Service pension. I think that this is the best possible answer to Dr. Welldon's cruel taunt about our disloyalty. I have no personal grudge against Dr. Welldon. From his utterances, however misguided and imprudent they may be, I take him to be the type of the manly, straightforward Englishman, who says openly what others say in private. He has hit hard at us, and we are hitting hard back at him. Englishmen like a good stand-up fight in war, religion, politics and the prize ring. When I have had my say out, I think those who read my lectures will find that the fight has been a fair one, and that Catholics and Protestants will be better friends by having a clearer understanding of each other's position.



I now take Dr. Welldon's trade test of national prosperity as a test of true Christianity. According to him Spain has fallen because she remained Catholic, and England has prospered because she turned Protestant. He gives certain facts, which he wishes every school master to impress on his pupils, with regard to the British Empire's enormous expansion and commercial activity.

I have been long enough at Dr. Welldon's trade to understand the importance of not taking a one-sided view of such facts. I think school-boys should be taught to compare and contrast different countries, so as to take a just view of the whole world, so far as that is possible. I have accordingly, with considerable trouble, extracted from this year's *Statesman's Year Book* the comparative volume of last year's commerce in really Protestant and really Catholic countries; and having reduced the foreign money standards to £ sterling, I have placed those countries in a rough order of commercial merit.

I must premise *first*, that I do not attach much importance to this test, because, as I have already explained in a previous lecture, commerce and trade expansion depend on quite another set of causes than religion. It seems to me moreover degrading to Christianity to make its success or failure a matter of £. s. d. However as Dr. Welldon has got on to this controversial field, it may be interesting if not profitable for us to follow him.

I premise *secondly*, that though I have given in three parallel columns the area, population and commerce of each country, I make the order of merit depend rather on the ratio between area and commerce than between population and commerce. My first reason for doing so is that we are considering this matter not from a tradesman's point of view, but from the higher plane of trade as an index of race-power and race-expansion. Consequently the overspill of a nation however poor, (if the ratio of population to commerce be taken), must be reckoned as an enormous and indeed the principal factor of national wealth. Take for example Sweden and Italy, the Protestant North and the Catholic South,



in contrast. If the ratio of population to commerce be taken then Sweden is much wealthier than Italy. But Italy in the past ten years has added three millions to its population at home, besides sending out two millions to N. and S. America; whereas Sweden has never done anything of the sort, and is never likely to do it in the future. From Dr. Welldon's point of view then, I think that I am justified in taking rather the ratio of *area* to commerce than of *population* to commerce, waiving, because he has taught me to do so, the enormous differences caused by climate, geographical position, and mineral wealth.

Another reason for taking the area-trade instead of the population-trade ratio is that, whereas the latter would favour the United *Kingdom*, it would be fatal to the trade supremacy of the British *Empire*. Take Dr. Welldon's own figures for the latter—400,000,000 of people and £1,000,000,000 worth of commerce. This would give a beggarly £2-10 a head to the British Empire, and place it very low indeed in the trade competition of the world. Indeed, whatever ratio is taken for the *Empire*, area or population compared with commerce, the result is very poor, and only proves the valueless character of such tests. Britain's pull is of course in the trade of the United Kingdom and not in that of the Empire.

*Thirdly*, I wish to explain in advance that such statistics are always more or less misleading, from the fact that no two countries have exactly the same standards for computing the value of their trade and commerce. Thus, as the *Statesman's Year Book* points out in a valuable note to page 78: "The important difference between the system of the United Kingdom, and other systems is that the former shows the value at the time of import and export, whilst in most other countries the values are computed at the prices of a year or more before." This cuts both ways of course, and we must perforce neglect such an important difference in making our comparison.

Another cause of uncertainty is that, whereas certain countries like the United Kingdom return the total volume of their *general* commerce, others give no general return, but instead furnish the



separate volumes of special, bullion and transit trade. By *special* commerce they mean goods other than precious metals, which are imported exclusively for the use of the importing country, and goods, exclusively the product of that country, exported by it to others. The terms 'bullion' and 'transit' commerce then explain themselves. In making my calculation for such countries I have added together the special, bullion, and transit commerce, in order to arrive at the total general commerce. It is I admit a rough method of computation. But as all methods of dealing with the enormous figures to which the commerce of the world has swollen are necessarily rough, I think I am justified in doing as I have done.

Finally, I may premise that I have taken for comparison only those countries which are overwhelmingly Catholic and Protestant. Russia, for reasons already given, I set aside. In any case, one-third of the coal and one-seventh of the iron and textile output of the enormous Russian Empire are produced in that small fraction of its area which is known as Russian Poland. Switzerland with 40 per cent. of its population Catholic, Germany and Holland, both more than one-third Catholic, the United States with probably one-fourth of its white population Catholic, are set aside, as the number of Catholics in these countries is so great, and their commercial activity is so considerable, that they must be considered as having an integral share in the wealth and commerce of their respective nations. Some may object in the case of the United States. But it is well to remember that whether you take the area-commerce or the population-commerce ratio for the United States, the result is disappointing at least for the present.

The countries taken then for comparison are the U. Kingdom ( $\frac{6}{7}$  Protestant,  $\frac{1}{7}$  Catholic) and Sweden, Norway, and Denmark, (which may fairly be grouped together as Scandinavia, and which are overwhelmingly Protestant) on the one hand, and on the other Belgium, France, Italy, Austria, Hungary, Spain and Portugal—(the last two grouped together as the Iberian Peninsula). No need to say that all these countries are overwhelmingly Catholic. Austria-Hungary is the only one in which Protestants form a



perceptible fraction of the population, numbering under 4,000,000 out of a total of 42,000,000 or somewhat less than 10 per cent., whereas in the United Kingdom Catholics number at least 14 per cent. of the total population. You may say that such comparisons are fanciful. I agree with you; so many conflicting factors should be nicely adjusted and balanced one against the other in estimating a nation's real wealth and commerce. But Dr. Welldon has led the way on to this particular field of enquiry, and I simply follow in his footsteps.

Here then are the tables, which I have carefully gone over several times, showing the result of what may be called Protestant and Catholic trade competition, compiled from last year's returns found in the *Statesman's Year Book* for 1898.

Table showing area, population, and commerce.

	Area in 1,000 square miles.	Population in millions.	Commerce in £ millions Imp. Ex. Total.
Belgium ...	11 $\frac{1}{3}$	6 $\frac{1}{2}$	122 108 = 230
United Kingdom ...	120	39	450 295 = 745
France ...	204	38 $\frac{1}{2}$	197 184 = 381
Italy ...	114 $\frac{1}{2}$	31	49 44 = 93
Austria-Hungary ...	264	42 $\frac{3}{4}$	*64 68 $\frac{1}{3}$ = 132 $\frac{1}{3}$
Spain	197 $\frac{1}{2}$	17 $\frac{1}{2}$	31 $\frac{3}{4}$ 37 = 68 $\frac{3}{4}$
Portugal			
Iberian Peninsula ...	233 $\frac{1}{2}$	22 $\frac{1}{2}$	40 $\frac{3}{4}$ 43 $\frac{1}{2}$ = 84 $\frac{1}{4}$
Denmark	15	2	21 16 = 37
Sweden			
Norway			
Scandinavia ...	311	9	53 41 = 95

\* The Austrian florin is taken at 1s. 8d.



From these tables it will be seen that in commercial activity and power of production the Belgian stands far ahead of everyone else in the world. Whatever ratio you take, area-commerce or population-commerce—he is far in advance of the Britisher. If you take the area-commerce ratio he is three times as active—if the population-commerce ratio, twice as active ; the average share of trade per head in the United Kingdom being £18-14-1, whereas in Belgium it is £35-7-8. But not in trade alone, but in most of the factors of true national progress, the Belgian is miles ahead. His pauperism is *nil* compared with that of England. Wealth is much more evenly divided in Belgium than with us. Each square mile of Belgium has 100 more people on it than the square mile of the United Kingdom. And yet as a nation they are far more comfortable. Money goes much further there than with us. Outside of Brussels and two or three other fashionable centres £300 a year will carry a man as far as £500 a year in England. There is more railway open per square mile of surface in Belgium than in the United Kingdom and the lines are cheaper for travellers. The Belgian steam-tram feeder lines up to the ordinary railways (*chemins de fer vicinaux*) form a net-work of commercial nerves along the country roads, which is entirely wanting in Great Britain. Millions of pounds' worth of liquid manure are yearly wasted in the United Kingdom or shot into the rivers as liquid poison, whereas the Belgians know the value of every litre, and when they have taken what they want for themselves, they sell the rest to other countries as *poudrette*. Their technical and art schools are far beyond those of the United Kingdom. Wherever you go in Belgium, apart from natural scenery of which there is little except in the South, there is always something beautiful to look at, either of the old or of the new—the old glories of the middle ages, jealously guarded from decay, but not 'restored' out of all shape and beauty. There, as Ruskin would say, the Vandals of the Reformation have not dashed down the carved work with axes and hammers, and bidden the wild flowers bloom in the cloisters and the night winds chant in the galleries.



And yet in Belgium the new is ever rising up in reverent imitation of the old, but still with an utter absence of that pedantry in art which so disfigures countries that have for centuries lost touch with the Ages of Faith. Above all, in the careful cultivation of small farms, that great desideratum of the U. Kingdom, the Belgian stands without a rival in the world. When Napoleon the Great passed through Flanders he called it '*le jardin potager de l'Europe*'—Europe's kitchen garden. It is literally true to say that many a Belgian family lives and thrives on the amount of land which goes to waste in the ditches and roadsides of a large English farm. During the years I spent in Belgium, I have often seen, out in the country, miles away from a town, a 'farm' of 10 or 12 acres, of which two would be orchard and flowers most skilfully raised, two or three more under asparagus or some such delicate and costly vegetable, sent on by tram and rail in a few hours to the port of shipment for London, two or three more acres would be under flax which is carefully scutched and made up at the farmer's own house during the evenings, and only a modicum of the farm would go for the coarser and cheaper produce.

Ghent is, I believe, the greatest centre in the world for the rearing of exotics and costly plants. The city is surrounded in part by miles and miles of glass-houses in which this most delicate trade is carried on. Finally and most important of all, in their manner of settling important strikes, and strikes are the great rock ahead for the commercial supremacy of England, the Belgians have shown their political and social wisdom in making the law step in after a certain point of danger has been reached, and enforce the decisions of '*les Conseils des Prud' hommes*', as the arbitration boards are called.

And, as if to complete the crushing argument furnished by Belgium against the Catholic-race-rot theory of Dr. Welldon, that little country, one-tenth of the U. Kingdom in size, has within the last few years taken over an immense slice of Africa. Few thought at the time that the Belgians would remain long in the Congo. But instead of giving up their



gigantic task, they are working harder than ever at it. They have built their railway up to Stanley Pool ; their native forces, led by capable Belgian officers, patrol the banks of the mighty river and its affluents and penetrate into the recesses of that immense region. They are marking out and establishing military and trading posts, missionary centres and agricultural colonies, till at last it seems likely that, in spite of many misgivings and much head shaking on the part of old fogeys at home, young Belgium, inspired by the daring genius of Leopold II, means to hold on to and develop the great Congo Free State. To sum up, Belgium, whilst remaining the most Catholic country in the world, is at the same time the most prosperous and up-to-date of all. In iron-work and machinery, she is underselling England even in England's own markets : the Belgian financiers and engineers are pushing to the front in such widely sundered parts of the world as China, Africa, and South America : even dear, old, sleepy Bruges is waking up at last and shaking the dust of centuries from her feet preparatory to her sea-bath ! (Bruges *Port-de-mer* scheme.)

How is all this to be reconciled with Dr. Welldon's theory of the decadent Catholic and progressive Protestant races, especially as he has only to travel a day and a night along the North Sea to witness real national decadence in Denmark, Sweden and Norway ? The grandest of English battle songs tells of the day, not so far past,

“ When to battle fierce came forth  
All the might of Denmark's crown,  
And her arms along the deep proudly shone.”

Where to-day is the fleet that wrestled so bravely and so long with Nelson ? Where are the mighty warriors of Sweden that followed Gustavus Adolphus and Charles XII from victory to victory right through the heart of Europe ? Alas ! If our immortal friend, Dugald Dalgetty could come to life again, how strangely altered for the worse would he find that people which sent forth in his day ‘The Lion of the North, the bulwark of the Protestant religion’ ? I know of no contrast more destructive to



Dr. Welldon's theories than that presented by intensely Catholic Belgium and intensely Protestant Sweden. Thinking men will see in this not the result of religious differences, but the working out of economic and natural causes reacting on national character : they will admire the native energy and bull-dog grip of work, characteristic of their northern breed, as well in the Catholic Belgian as in the Protestant Englishman.

Of the trade returns of the U. Kingdom we may remark, before passing on to other countries, that the most noteworthy point is the enormous and rapidly increasing difference between Imports and Exports. In ten years the former have increased by £60,000,000, and the latter have remained stationary, now falling now rising 10 or 15 millions according to the ebb and flow of the trade current. The great increase of Imports proves the enormous increase of Britain's reserve of wealth, and its greatly enlarged purchasing power ; or to put it simply, Britannia can now afford to go shopping all over the world to her heart's content, without any fear of her bills being left unpaid by John Bull. There is however another side to this question which should be noted.

England is no longer a self-supporting country. Roughly speaking, two-thirds of the corn required to feed the people of the U. Kingdom must come from foreign lands. Some political economists see in this a source of great future danger. The luxuries of to-day may become the necessities of to-morrow ; and though such fears are probably exaggerated, it is possible that the excess of Imports over Exports, if it goes on increasing, may yet give trouble at least to the Free Trade Party. On France I have spoken at length in my last lecture. Her exports and imports very nearly balance, and the exports of France and Belgium combined just equal those of the U. Kingdom.

Austria-Hungary, the Empire of the Danube, is a great Catholic power, and is advancing in wealth and commerce, its total trade having increased 17 % between 1880—1896. Austria by the judgment of capable and impartial judges has done wonders for the betterment of Bosnia-Herzegovina. We are of course



for ever being told that Austria-Hungary cannot hold together ; it has been on its last legs, according to Protestant authorities, for many years past. But somehow it does not break up. What would happen if it did break up? A new Catholic Confederation would form round Hungary and still bar the advance of Russia to Constantinople, and that would happen in Germany, which Bismarck foresaw and dreaded, the Empire would become half Catholic half Protestant. But the Catholic half united by a common Faith, inspiring a common patriotism, would soon control the factions into which Protestant Germany is being slowly disintegrated by the solvent forces of atheistic Socialism.

Let me read for you here an instructive note which has recently appeared in the '*Tablet*.' "Several Catholic organs in Germany gave recently published instructive statistical tables, which tend to show that the strongest bulwark against the rapidly growing power of Social Democracy in the German Empire is to be found in the Catholic Church. From these we gather that in 1893—the last election for which the detailed returns are as yet published—out of 963,307 Social Democrat votes given in the Kingdom of Prussia. 177,213 votes were cast by the Catholic part of the population ; in Bavaria, out of a total of 125,952, the corresponding number was 76,340 ; and adding all other parts of the empire, out of a grand total of 1,786,783 votes in favour of Social Democracy, the number attributable to Catholic voters was but 346,266. Stated in other words, the Catholics form a good third of the population, but their contribution to the Social Democrats is less than one-fifth of the total votes. The power of resistance of the Catholic population, therefore—chiefly, of course, the working classes—is more than double that of the non-Catholic portion of the nation."

The last country of which I have to speak this evening, Modern Italy, is one which from Dr. Welldon's standpoint, not mine, must be held to refute his Catholic-race-rot theory. From the Protestant point of view, Italy, which fifty years ago was "a Geographical Expression," is now a nation and one of the great powers of Europe. No doubt the enthusiasm of England



for Italy has sensibly cooled of late. The disaster in Abyssinia, the riots in Milan, the tyrannical measures adopted in consequence, which recalled unpleasant memories of King Bomba's doings in Naples, the Bank scandals, corrupt ministers and venal deputies of Monte Citerio, above all the pervading and increasing distress of the people produced by Italy's crushing taxation of foodstuffs, all these reasons have given pause to English admiration for United Italy. Yet not all these calamities put together constitute such a danger for the Southern Kingdom as the delay in settling with the Pope and ending the scandal of the Roman Question.

It must not be thought that the Pope and Catholics in general are opposed to the unification of Italy. The wisest and greatest Pontiffs have striven and suffered for that unity. 'But Italy for the Italians with the Pope independent' is one thing, and 'Italy for the Piedmontese with the Pope a virtual prisoner' is quite another. The Pope is not free, and cannot exercise his office as Head and Supreme Pastor of the Christian world so long as Rome is in other hands than his. The Pope is not merely a glorified Archbishop of Canterbury. He is a great sovereign, the spiritual ruler of 250 millions of Christians. He has more complicated and intricate relations with the rulers of the world than any other potentate. His business is with Emperors and Kings, and he should have an independent state of his own in which to transact that business. You cannot ask an Emperor to meet you in the back-parlour, or tell a King to sit down on a hall chair.

That is the true meaning of the Roman Question, and Catholics throughout the world will never rest quiet till their Spiritual Sovereign is once more free and independent. What particular form that independence will take is not for us to affirm. That is God's secret. But we know that He has delivered His Vicar out of greater dangers in the past, and that in His own good time He will save him from the present peril. One thing more we may affirm. Never will United Italy find a Pope more anxious to save the national pride and preserve the national unity, in the settlement of the Roman Question, than the great Statesman



and true Italian Patriot who rules the Catholic world at the present moment.

As the years roll by the books of the Sibyl may be burned one by one, but their price will be the same, rather it will be enhanced by delay. Rome can wait, Italy cannot. The unnatural union of force and fraud combined, which has distorted out of pristine shape and beauty the lovely form of the Queen of European Art and Grace, cannot last. The great heart of the Italian nation is sound and loyal to the Catholic Church. Nowhere else have Protestant missions proved such a ghastly failure. The people is frugal, industrious, deeply religious, and is multiplying more rapidly than most other nations.

The Czar of Russia, the Emperor of Germany and many other potentates have found it to their interest to resume direct relations with the Holy See. Great Britain alone of all the European powers holds back. God grant that the time may never come when our rulers shall discover too late the wisdom of Napoleon's advice to his general, "Treat with the Pope as if he were the master of one hundred thousand soldiers." That is one of the soundest dictums of European policy. When all is said and done, the freedom and independence of the Holy See are the best guarantee of national loyalty and peace in Europe, the only sure barrier against the on-rushing tide of Socialism and Revolution.

---

V.

### The Downfall of Spain.

"Upon the whole it may be said that wherever there is a people which is stationary and retrogressive it is Roman Catholic; wherever there is a people that is progressive and imperial it is Protestant. No decadent or dying nation in the world is Protestant. It is impossible at the present time to insist on this contrast without some reference to the downfall of the Spanish Empire. Spain has long been, and is still, the most faithful daughter of the Roman Church. She alone among European nations reveals by her civil and ecclesiastical polity what would probably be the state of the civilised world if again it should subject itself to the tyranny which England shook off once for ever at the Reformation, and we have seen the last relics of the



mighty empire of Charles V torn at length from her impotent and degenerate grasp. I know no historical contrast more impressive or instructive than that between the Spain and Great Britain of the sixteenth century and the Great Britain and Spain to-day. Spain, in the language of one of her leading statemen, is to-day an "anæmic" country. She has lost her native virility. She has lost it because three centuries ago she saw the light and might have cherished it and turned away from it. Not to her, nor to any Latin or Roman Catholic country, as it seems, does the future belong. It belongs to the Non-Catholic nations and among them pre-eminently to the English."—(*Extract from Dr. Weldon's address.*)

Since my last lecture was delivered, the home mail has brought us a very interesting correspondence in the '*Spectator*' on the subject of Dr. Welldon's address. In answer to "Inquirer," Dr. Weldou replies in a letter, which has been published in the Calcutta '*Statesman*' of November 19th. In the course of that letter we read—"He ('Inquirer') asks if it is right that national success should be treated as a test of true religion. *I did not so treat it in my paper.*" But how is this to be reconciled with the extract I have just read? I put the two sentences side by side and leave Dr. Welldon to settle the difference between them to his own satisfaction. I have been hopelessly baffled in the attempt.

*Address of 28th September.*

"Spain has lost her native virility because three centuries ago she saw the light and might have cherished it and turned away from it."

*Letter of October 19th.*

"I did not treat it (national success) as a test of true religion."

It seems clear to me that the theme chosen by Dr. Welldon for the Bradford Congress was suggested by the recent disaster of Spain. Of the good taste shown in that selection I have spoken in a former lecture. To-day I propose to inflict on you a certain amount of Spanish History, from which I hope to make it clear that Dr. Welldon is wrong both in his facts and his deductions, that the rejection of the blessed light of the Reformation was not the cause of the downfall of Spain, and that



Dr. Welldon is merely romancing when he says that 'Spain has long been and is still the most faithful daughter of the Roman Church.'

When Dr. Welldon and myself were school boys in the Sixties, there was a favourite stock question often set in the English History paper, of which I have still a troubled memory. It ran thus—'Explain the following sentence—'To the loss of Calais we as Englishmen owe our liberties.'" I remember the terrible calamities, such as boys alone can conjure up, which we, in our profound knowledge of the philosophy of history, saw impending over England if the dream of the Plantagenets had come true; if Paris and not London had become the centre from which England was to be ruled; if Britain were to sink to be a mere dependency of her great and wealthier rival, then!—but the horrors of the possible situation overcame our youthful imaginations, and patriotism and bad grammar wrestled for the mastery! Well, the fate from which England was saved by her ultimate defeat at the hands of Joan D'Arc was inflicted on Spain by the selfish and short sighted policy of Charles V and Philip II.

Spain's history in modern times presents what is perhaps the saddest example to be found in Europe of the '*arrested development*' of a great nation. When the Spaniards arose hardy and exultant at the end of the Moorish wars, there were to hand all the materials for building up the structure of enduring national greatness—a rich country, a splendid race—great by reason of its hard-won victory over the Paynim, but greater far by its firm grasp of the principle of modern freedom, the responsibility of the Sovereign and the rights of the people—"los fueros de los Comuneros" as the Spaniards were the first in Europe after the English to call them. Then there came to rule Spain from his northern home that splendid fraud of the Renaissance, Charles V, the son of the mad princess of Castile, and with him came the downfall of the national liberties.

I pause for a moment to note how Dr. Welldon's habitual inaccuracy clings even to his very phrases. Referring to the



late Spanish-American war he says—" We have seen the last relics of the mighty empire of Charles V torn at length from Spain's impotent and degenerate grasp." I was taught at school, and had to remember it at my personal risk, that Charles V was not merely King of Spain, but also 'Emperor' of Germany and the Low Countries; and I should imagine that the mystic legend 'made in Germany,' 'made in Belgium,' must remind many a pensive English manufacturer that there are some stray relics of the empire of Charles V left about in Europe.

Dr. Welldon meant of course to speak of the empire of Philip II. On the death of Charles, Germany passed peaceably to his brother Ferdinand, Spain and its dependencies to his son Philip II. But to return.

The young King Charles (Charles V of Germany) brought with him from the Low Countries a host of Counsellors and favourites, who treated Spain as if it had been a conquered province, with little regard for legitimate claims or national susceptibilities. Ximenes had deprived the nobility of a large proportion of their privileges, which were both excessive in themselves and oppressive to the people, and had even succeeded, by a diminution of their territorial possessions, in reducing their exorbitant power. By his decision and firmness, by a sagacious combination of force and forbearance, by the justice of his measures, and their popularity with the burgher class, ever ready to lend their aid to the humiliation of their aristocratic rivals, he had so conducted and executed what in effect was a great social revolution, that, with the exception of some slight commotions quickly appeased the internal tranquillity of the country suffered no interruption. When, however, Charles became Emperor of Germany, and, being about to leave Spain, demanded large subsidies from the Cortes of Castile, whom for his better security he had assembled, not at Valladolid, but, contrary to custom, at Compostella, the people of the chief towns, jealous of their privileges, showed determined signs of resistance, and required that their grievances should be redressed before they would vote the supplies. The inhabitants of Toledo were especially loud in



their remonstrances, while those of Valladolid, who resented the transference of the Cortes to Compostella, rose in open mutiny, and would have prevented Charles continuing his journey to the latter town, had he not succeeded in making his escape in the midst of a violent tempest. A majority of the Cortes, however, sided with the King, and granted the money for which he applied. Charles, now indifferent and defiant, left Spain without paying any attention to the complaints that had been laid before him, or making any provisio<sup>n</sup> to meet the threatening insurrection. Then began the war known in history as "*La Guerra de los comuneros*," "The War of the Commons," so fatal in its termination and so remarkable in its lasting results—one of which, not the least important, was the wound received by Ignatius of Loyola at Pampeluna and the consequent foundation of the Jesuit Order. At first, success shone on the arms of the champions of national rights, but the trained force of the veteran mercenaries of Charles V was too much in the end, and with the capture and execution of Juan de Padilla, the brave and noble leader of the 'insurrection,' the liberties of the Spanish commons were for ever extinguished in blood.\*

It is worth our while to pause here for a moment and compare two similar events with most dissimilar results in the histories of England and of Spain. More than two centuries before the attempt of the Spanish Commons to preserve their historic rights, DeMontfort, that most Catholic of English Warriors and Statesmen, had fought and died for the liberties of the English People. His conqueror, the greatest and wisest of English Kings, Edward I, (also a strong Catholic! *pace* Dr. Welldon!), was careful to preserve those liberties and make money out of them for his Scotch and Welsh wars. The real greatness of England dates from that distinctly Catholic period, as we shall see in the next lecture. But in Spain it was just the reverse. The English Edward's great kingly heart beat ever for the welfare of England; Charles V, Philip II and their successors treated Spain as a mere

---

\* The writer is indebted for a great part of these details to the Introduction to the "Life of St. Ignatius of Loyola" by Stewart Rose (late Countess of Buchan.



pawn on the great chessboard of European politics. When the insurrection of the Commons failed in England, English liberties were preserved and fostered ; when the similar event happened in Spain two centuries later, Spanish liberties were crushed for ever. The Spaniard was driven in upon himself. That natural expansion of a gifted nation's mind and character, which, if it had received fair play by the gradual development of popular rights and of *national* as opposed to *regal* ambition, would, as in England, have carried Spain to the front rank of great powers and maintained her there, was stunted and driven under by the suicidal policy of Charles V and Philip II. That sacred force which springs from a sense of equal personal rights and equitable share in the nation's government and profits, and which requires the spacious halls of Parliament for its free play and full power, was in the case of Spain 'cabined, cribbed, confined' within the strait precincts of the King's closet.

Then, there is a most singular note in the Spanish Character, partly hereditary from the mixed European and Moorish blood, partly the result of the unhappy national history.—I venture to call it the *Kismet* note. Napoleon the Great said very truly, it would have been well for him had he acted on his own maxim, that "Europe ends at the Pyrenees." Those who have lived in Spain, as I have done, will agree that not only in its physical configuration, which is that of a table-land much higher than the European level, but still more in its people's character Spain differs materially from the rest of Europe. The Don is a 'magnifico,' but he is not a common-sense person like other Europeans. He has little heed of the value of time, he is mostly above mere business transactions, he has much of the fatalism and constant introspection of the Moorish and Oriental races. When once he has fixed his mind and heart on an object, he has no regard for the feasible or even the possible in attainment. He never sits down to reckon up the chances of being able with his own ten thousand men to meet the twenty thousand that are coming against him. With fatal facility he translates his own human desires and ambitions



into the will of God, to be pursued regardless of inevitable suffering and failure. And thus for centuries past, since the healthy growth of the national life was rudely arrested by the policy of Charles V and Philip II, the Spaniard, like his own immortal Knight, de la Mancha, tilts at the mighty mills of Time and Progress, and is borne away in their sails struggling and protesting to the last.

This 'Kismet' note is especially visible in Philip II's dealings with England. He married Mary whom he did not love, and tried to crush Elizabeth whom he did not hate, because he had over-persuaded himself that such was the Divine destiny, the will of God in his regard. From this fatal twin-error of Philip II we English-speaking Catholics have suffered grievously for centuries past and will probably suffer for a long time to come. This calm deliberate distortion of mental view and perspective, so characteristic of the Spanish mind, is best seen in the history of that memorable institution which at once rises in our thoughts on the mention of the name of Spain—I mean the Spanish Inquisition. I shall now read to you an account of that institution as it is given in a well-known English Protestant Encyclopædia, the work of the great publishing firm of Chambers. I do so, first, because it illustrates that note of the Spanish character which has been fatal to national success, and secondly, because it disposes at a blow of Dr. Welldon's statement that "Spain has been and is still the most faithful daughter of the Roman Church. She, alone among European nations, reveals by her civil and ecclesiastical policy what would probably be the state of the civilised world, if again it should subject itself to the tyranny which England shook off for ever at the Reformation."

*(Extract from Chambers's Encyclopædia Article "Inquisition,"*

*Ed. 1877.)*

"It is the history of the Inquisition as it existed in Spain, Portugal and their dependencies, that has absorbed almost entirely the real interest of this painful subject. As an ordinary tribunal similar to those of other countries, it had existed in Spain from an early period. Its functions, however, in these times were little more than nominal; but early in the reign of Ferdinand and Isabella, in



consequence of the alarms created by the alleged discovery of a plot among the Jews and the Jewish converts—who had been required either to emigrate or to conform to Christianity—to overthrow the government, an application was made to the Pope, Sixtus IV, to permit its re-organisation (1478); but in reviving the tribunal, the crown assumed to itself the right of appointing the inquisitors, and, in truth, of controlling the entire action of the tribunal.

From this date forwards, Catholic writers regard the Spanish inquisition as a *state* tribunal, a character which is recognised by Ranke, Guizot, Leo and even the great anti-papal authority, Llorente; and in dissociating the Church generally, and the Roman See itself, from that state tribunal, Catholics refer to the bulls of the Pope Sixtus IV., protesting against it. Notwithstanding this protest, however, the Spanish crown maintained its assumption. Inquisitors were appointed, and in 1483, the tribunal commenced its terrible career, under Thomas de Torquemada. The popes, feeling their protest unsuccessful, were compelled, from considerations of prudence, to tolerate what they were powerless to suppress; but several papal enactments are enumerated by Catholics, the object of which was to control the arbitrary actions of the tribunal, and to mitigate the rigour and injustice of its proceedings.

Unhappily these measures were ineffective to control the fanatical activity of the local judges. The number of victims, as stated by Llorente, the popular historian of the Inquisition is positively appalling. He affirms that during the sixteen years of Torquemada's tenure of office, nearly 9,000 were condemned to the flames. The second head of the Inquisition, Deza Diego, in eight years, according to the same writer, put above 1,600 to a similar death; and so for the other successive inquisitors-general. But Catholics loudly protest against the credibility of these fearful allegations. It is impossible not to see that Llorente was a violent partisan; and it is alleged that in his work on the Basque Provinces, he had already proved himself a venal and unscrupulous fabricator. Although, therefore, he has made it impossible to disprove his accuracy by appealing to the original papers, *which he himself destroyed*, yet his Catholic critics, as Hefele in his "Life of Cardinal Ximenes", have produced from his own work many examples of contradictory and exaggerated statements; Prescott, in his "Ferdinand and Isabella" (III. 467-470), has pointed out many similar instances; Ranke does not hesitate (*Fürsten and Völker von Süd-Europa*, I, 242) to impeach his honesty; and Prescott pronounces his computations greatly exaggerated, and his estimates most improbable (III. 468). Still with all the deductions which it is possible to make, the working of the Inquisition in Spain and in its dependencies even in the New World involves an amount of cruelty which it is impossible to contemplate without horror. When it was attempted to introduce it into Naples, Pope Paul III, in 1546, exhorted the Neapolitans to resist its introduction "because it was excessively severe, and it refused to moderate its rigour by the example of the Roman tribunal." (Llorente, II, 147) Pius IV in 1563 addressed a similar exhortation on the same ground to the Milanese (*ibid* II, 237); and even the most bigoted Catholics



unanimously confess and repudiate the barbarities which dishonoured religion by assuming its semblance and its name."

There follows an account of the Roman Inquisition in the same article—note the contrast between the two.

"The inquisition in Rome and the Papal States never ceased, from the time of its establishment, to exercise a severe and watchful control over heresy, or the suspicion of heresy, which offence was punished by imprisonment and civil disabilities; but of capital sentences for heresy, the history of the Roman inquisition presents few instances, and according to Balmez ("On civilisation" p. 156) that tribunal "has never been known to order the execution of a capital sentence" for the crime of heresy. The tribunal still exists under the direction of a congregation, but its action is confined to the examination of books and the trial of ecclesiastical offences, and questions of church law, as in the recent case of the boy Mortara; and its most remarkable prisoner in recent times was an Oriental imposter, who, by means of forged credentials, succeeded in obtaining his ordination as a bishop."

From this fair and accurate account, compiled by Protestants from authentic sources, you see *first* that the usual account of the doings of the Spanish Inquisitions popularised by 'Westward Ho' and other books of that kind, is far from being supported by ascertained facts,—that it rests altogether on the calumnies of Llorente, who took good care to burn the records that would have disproved his lies. In most cases, the victims of the Inquisition were strangled before the flames touched their bodies. Their sufferings in prison were far lighter than those inflicted in the awful dungeons of the Tower and other English prisons of the period. Catholics may fairly ask for solid proof that the cruelties inflicted by Spain, in defence of the *Ancient Faith* of the Spaniards, surpass or even equalled those inflicted by England when her sovereigns and statesmen forced a *new* religion on a reluctant people.

*Secondly*, and that is the principal reason why I have inflicted such a lengthy extract upon you, Chambers' article proves that the Spanish Inquisition was a *State* and not a *Church* tribunal, and shatters Dr. Welldon's theory about Spain being the "most faithful child of the Roman Church." The Inquisition in Spain was maintained and worked as it was worked, *dead against the advice and remonstrances of Rome*. The truth



is that Spain has been and is still at times a very fractious member of the great Catholic family.

If Spain had harkened to the advice of Rome, on more than one occasion, she would have been spared many calamities, the last being her recent defeat and spoliation by the United States. Had she listened to the Popes, she would not over and over again have expelled and ruined the work of the great religious orders to which she herself gave birth, thereby inflicting the greatest possible blow on her own national interests. If Belgium stands to-day so far in front of many another people in national energy and commercial activity, that is due in no small measure to the excellent teaching of her upper and middle classes in Jesuit Colleges. I need not recall for you Lord Bacon's famous panegyric of the Jesuit system of education. The Jesuits were the only body of teachers that could have brought the Spaniards into line with modern Europe. But the mother land of Ignatius and Xavier, two of the greatest if not the very greatest Spaniards that ever lived, trampled out the Jesuit Order from the land of its birth, ruining the Spanish colonies by so doing and preparing for their ultimate revolt and separation.

As it was in the 18th century, so has it been in this. The last great *battue* of priests in any part of the world, civilised or savage, took place in Spain shortly after 1830. Some fifty Franciscans, thirteen Jesuits, many Dominicans and others, amounting in all to a round hundred or more priests and friars' were cruelly butchered by mobs led by the "*Guardia Civil*", or military police: and then the Cortes crowned the work of blood by solemnly confiscating the houses, lands and goods of all the religious orders in 1834.

When I was at San Sebastian I was shown a large building not far from the fortress, once a Dominican Convent, but used when I saw it as a storehouse for a park of artillery. Much good those same guns did for Spain in the recent war! After I had seen the building, the Spanish gentleman whose guest I was led me up to the cliffs, and pointing down to the jagged



pinnacles and reefs that rose up from the Atlantic below, described how the mob had taken the poor Friars to the spot, tied them up in their habits like sacks, and then rolled them over the precipice to be dashed in bleeding, mangled fragments on the rocks far below.

You will remember how only a few years ago, a peaceful procession of the Bleasted Sacrament, such as we had here the other day, was passing through the streets of Barcelona, when dynamite bombs were flung into its ranks, and dozens of mutilated victims testified to the diabolical hatred of God and His Church which prompted that fiendish outrage of atheistic revolutionaries. The Spaniard is a man of strong faith, none stronger; but his passions are equally strong; and when he has cast away the Faith, he has less control of his passions than any other European.

Nor, in the interests of historic truth, must I pass over the significant fact, that the sharpest rebuke ever administered by our long suffering and most forbearing Pontiff, Leo XIII, was one addressed by him a few years ago to a knot of Spanish ecclesiastics whose sectional folly and dynastic zeal were for ever thwarting the wise policy of the Pope and his Nuncio.

I think enough has been said to show that Dr. Welldon's two propositions about Spain are historically unsound.

*First*, the downfall of Spain is not due to its adherence to the Catholic Faith, but must be attributed mainly to the suppression of popular rights and representative institutions—the old Catholic '*fueros*'—by Charles V and his successors both Spanish and Bourbon. For, like the bruchus devouring what the locust had left, the Bourbons added to the narrow-minded tyranny of their predecessors that deep political corruption which has been characteristic of the Bourbon *régime* in every country ruled by that family. The bitter reply of Admiral Cervera when the American officers asked him why the Cristobal Colon had not once shown her teeth in the run from Santiago—"You must look for her guns in the pockets of the Director General of Spanish Ordnance"—throws a flood of light on the downfall of Spain.



A succession of corrupt kings and their more corrupt ministers, bent on personal aggrandisement and not on their country's good, have so divorced the Spanish people from all interest in the government of the nation, that to-day Spanish parliamentary institutions are a solemn farce, and the Spanish 'nation' is not a nation like the English and the French, but a loose bundle of discontented provinces, North hating Middle and South, and East hating all three. And that result has been achieved in defiance of the advice and exhortations of the Popes, who have striven to compose the dynastic and sectional quarrels of the Spaniards.

*Secondly*, it is historically untrue to say that "Spain has been and is still the most faithful daughter of the Roman Church." As I have already shown it may be safe to romance in that manner on a grave historical subject within the circle of an Anglican Congress, but it is not safe to publish such views broadcast in the columns of the Press.

In conclusion, we Catholics may draw one pregnant lesson from the recent misfortunes of the Spanish and other Catholic Royalties. The spoliation of Rome is due to the cowardly acquiescence of France, Austria and Spain in that greatest political crime of our century. On the very day on which Napoleon III withdrew the French garrison of Rome, the death knell of his dynasty was sounded by the German guns at Wörth. 'Felix' Austria has in our days become supremely 'Infelix' by a succession of domestic woes unparelled since the days of Louis XVI and Marie Antoinette. Spain is humbled to the dust by the rude force of the great Republic of the West. And what European sovereign wears a more thorny crown than the Spoiler himself, with his national pride stung to madness by the disasters in Abyssinia, the only serious defeat inflicted in our time on a great Christian Power by a handful of barbarians, and with revolution and national bankruptcy for ever imminent at home? Who will envy the unhappy man that must pace his weary round on the crater-lip of that moral Vesuvius, the kingdom of 'United Italy'?



The Protestant Sovereigns of Europe have not sinned against the light. Not to them was committed the safe custody of the holy place of God's Anointed. The Catholic Monarchs have paltered with their sacred trust. They are miserable, and will be miserable, so long as they do not recognise in action, as well as in principle, that the first duty of a Catholic Sovereign is to safeguard the independence of Holy See.

“Though the mills of God grind slowly, yet they grind exceeding small;  
 “Though in patience He stands waiting, with exactness grinds He all.  
 “Thou art just O Lord and Thy judgment is right.”

---

## VI.

### The True Source of England's Greatness.

“History itself suggests the remark that the unique greatness of the British Empire dates from the Reformation. The founders of the Empire were the heroes of the Reformed Faith. It was when Englishmen learnt to fear God, and Him alone, and to believe in the direct responsibility of individual souls to him, that they caught the spirit which made empire possible and permanent. The Reformation may, or may not, have been a movement of religious truth, it was undoubtedly for England a movement of imperial energy; and whoever disparages the Reformation, whether he be a good theologian or not—I do not now consider that question—is beyond all doubt a bad patriot.”—  
 (*Extract from Dr. Welldon's address.*)

I think that all those who have given a careful study to Dr. Welldon's address will agree with me in thinking that the passage I have just read is the pith and substance of his paper. The earlier part leads up to that, and what follows is but the natural conclusion from the premises herein set down. Before criticising his panegyric of the Reformation for its action upon England, I propose to speak of the conclusions which he draws in the latter part of his address.

He tells us further on that—“The Church—the Church of England—if rightly appreciated, possesses a twofold mission in relation to the Empire. She has a mission all the world over to the men and women of the English blood and the *English tongue*. To them she is their *national* and *native* Church.”

It is very kind of Dr. Welldon to offer the services of the Anglican Church to the 20,000,000 of English speaking Catholics



in the British Empire and the United States of America. But the offer comes a little too late. We prefer the Old Church, that has never changed since the days of the Apostles, to the new fangled creation of Henry VIII and Elizabeth. We would advise him to offer it—‘the native and national Church’—in all its grand ‘uniformity,’ High, Low and Broad, to the many millions of English speaking *Nonconformists* throughout the world, who far outnumber the adherents of the Anglican Establishment. It would be interesting to hear their reply to such ingenuous advances.

Dr. Welldon continues—“She (the Anglican Church) embodies in her doctrine and ritual the manifold, commingled elements of the history of the English people—their *sense of antiquity, their impatience of spiritual authority, their free enquiring habit of mind, their simple faith,* their strong and constant realisation of the presence of God.”

Now in the passage which I read at the beginning we were assured that it was only at the time of the Reformation that “Englishmen learned to fear God and Him alone, and to believe in the direct responsibility of individual souls to Him.” Shortly afterwards we are assured of their “Sense of antiquity” ! I suppose, as Dr. Welldon claims that the religious worth of Englishmen began at the Reformation, that the ‘Sense of antiquity’ he refers to was that displayed by the Reformers when they plundered the Churches and Abbeys, dressed themselves and their wives in the rich stuff of the priests’ vestments, and desecrated God’s altars throughout the land. The ‘impatience of spiritual authority,’ which I presume has taught ‘Englishmen to fear God alone,’ is evident to all and sundry from the exchange which England has made of one Pope of Rome for the hundred popelings in and out of the Establishment who have taken his place ! I know of no spectacle so pitiable among civilised mankind, there is no spiritual tyranny on earth more sordid and miserable than that of the self-appointed pontiffs of “the hundred sects battling within one Church,” according to a great English writer’s description of the Establishment.



We Catholics are saved from such petty tyranny by the great framework of Catholic law and tradition. No aspiring and meddlesome priest dare impose his whims and caprices upon us in the name of God's Church. If such an attempt were made the upstart would be quickly laid by the heels at the stern hands of his Bishop. But pious Anglicans have no such protection. They are often forced to quit the Church in which they have worshipped from childhood, when some new Vicar with novel tendencies come along 'To pull down and build up, change square for round.' It is no wonder then that Anglicans should be 'impatient of spiritual authority' under the present deplorable conditions of the Church of England. No wonder that about 70,000\* English speaking Protestants are yearly finding peace and spiritual quiet in the loving arms of their true Mother, the Catholic Church.

Dr. Welldon next proceeds to state as characteristics of English Protestantism—'A free enquiring habit of mind and simple faith'! Now if there is one thing more destructive than another of simple faith it is *the right of private judgment*, for which Dr. Welldon has found a nice euphemism in his 'free enquiring habit of mind.' Tell any one, young or old, that he is 'free to enquire,' and as a result of enquiry to believe or not as he pleases, about all the fundamental truths of the Christian Faith, and what is the result? We see it amongst English, German and American Protestants in the awful spread of Agnosticism and Infidelity. The reason why the most devout Protestant Christians turn Catholic is precisely because they feel the imperative need of the principle of spiritual authority to bar the "free enquiring habit of mind" and preserve "simple faith" in themselves and their children.

Dr. Welldon assures us further on that the Church of England—"is the conscience as it were of the nation;—is the inspiring, sanctifying principle of the State"! And before the ink is dry which wrote these words, we have a much higher

---

\* 50,000 in the United States, 20,000 in the British Empire.



authority than Dr. Welldon, and one who knows the Church of England in all her moods and tenses far better, the Archbishop of Canterbury himself, plaintively assuring all who listen to his recent charge that Anglican Bishops have no real coercive jurisdiction. I quote his exact words—

“The complaint is sometimes made against the Bishops that they do not enforce the law. *But the Bishops have no more power to enforce the law than any one else.* The one power which the Bishops possess is not a power to enforce, but *to empower other people to abstain from enforcing it*, a power which on proper occasions certainly some one ought to possess, but which does not make enforcement of the law at all easier.” And this is the description given by the Primate himself of the ‘authority’ of the Spiritual Rulers and ‘Fathers in God’ of that institution which Dr. Welldon calls ‘the conscience of the nation, the inspiring, sanctifying principle of the State’! Of what use is a conscience if it can *never* impose obedience to its commands? Why call that the ‘inspiring, sanctifying principle of the State’ which is the most obedient servant and hand-maid of the State?

No wonder that Dr. Welldon should add immediately afterwards—“The race of which we are members and representatives needs religion, *I know no race that needs it more or even so much.*” Here Dr. Welldon quite unwittingly has stumbled on a profound truth, the utter, hopeless Erastianism of the Church of England and its consequent dearth of true religion. Religion, to be real and fruitful, must be safeguarded by those who are not responsible to mere State politicians for its maintenance and guidance. There must be a spiritual authority above the reach of the secular ambition of monarchs and the insensate passions of the mob. The real meaning of the Reformation in England was that then the State usurped the rights and functions of the Church. ‘The abomination of desolation sat down in God’s holy place’ under Henry VIII, Edward VI and Elizabeth, and the best efforts of religious Anglicans ever since have so utterly failed to evict the monster, that now it only remains for those who wish to be saved to ‘flee to the mountain’—yea to the true Church ‘built upon the



hill' and Rock of Peter, to which all nations must come for light and salvation.

As far as I can catch Dr. Welldon's real meaning in this most interesting but rather obscure portion of his address, the English nation is for him the English Church and vice-versa. There is no real spiritual distinction between cleric and layman, Bishop and Baron, parson and church-warden. Apart from education, refinement, and godliness of life, so far as *spiritual* authority and coercive power are concerned, the 'man in the street' is as good as the Bench of Bishops.

We need feel no surprise then that Dr. Welldon, wrapping himself in the prophet's mantle, continues—"I seem though dimly"—(very dimly I think!)—"to discern that as the *English speaking race* pervades the earth—that race which is historically free, expansive, and Protestant—and as the *Church of the nation*"—(mark the sudden and subtle gradation from 'English speaking race' to 'Church of the nation')—"gathers more and more to her bosom whatever religious faith or energy the race exhibits, she will not need to go down on her knees, as some men would bid her,"—(poor Lord Halifax and the English Church Union!)—"before the Pope of the Roman Church, or *any other spiritual or religious authority*; it is rather she to whom they will address themselves upon conditions at least no higher than equality."

So when the millenium of the world-pervading Church of England, which Dr. Welldon dimly foresees, shall have come, that Church will be in the proud and happy position of not going down on her knees either before the Pope of Rome—God forbid!—"or *any other spiritual or religious authority*." She will then have cast off the shackles of the 'heroes of the Reformation as well as the fetters of Rome! She will go forth exultant, free, utterly Erastian, secularised, 'owning no spiritual or religious' authority,' which I take to be the equivalent of godless. This is the picture of the great missionary Church of the future, which Dr. Welldon is at pains to present in all its attractive beauty to the benighted minds of the Hindoos and other Eastern peoples!



This is the unique glory and greatness of the coming English Church which is to 'see and conquer' by the mere force of its presence, if only those naughty Englishmen and Englishwomen "between whose creed and conduct yawns the gulf of moral contrariety" (to quote Dr. Welldon's expressive but not very complimentary words) will behave better in India!

He continues—"The divisions and antagonisms of Christendom are sore hindrances to the Church's success in the world"—I should think so! especially when presented in such brilliant contrasts and high relief to the keen observation and philosophic mind of the Hindoo. But who began those divisions and antagonism? Who rent the seamless robe of Christ? Who have filled Europe and America, as far as they can, with jangling discord and religious strife? Certainly not the Catholics.

But let us hear Dr. Welldon out—"But they—(religious differences)—are hindrances not so sore as the godless and immoral lives of some who bear, by right of Baptism, the name and Cross of the Redeemer"—Very true and brave words these! But I think it would have been wiser and more modest to have waited till actual experience in India had ratified the unfavourable verdict. The knowledge which has come to me, from eight years of intimate relations with Indian Society, points to the conclusion that Christians out here, taken all in all, are quite up to the *average* of our superior brethren at home.

Dr. Welldon continues—"To me it seems evident that the Church of England is a divinely-appointed instrument for carrying the Christian Faith in its *purity and integrity* to the far places of the earth." When Anglicans, High, Low and Broad, can manage to agree as to what constitutes 'the purity and integrity of the Christian Faith,' we shall be ready to hear Dr. Welldon's arguments in favour of the Anglican Church being selected as its vehicle.

The address proceeds—"In her mission, she (the Church of England) *will be flexible and considerate rather than uniform*, she will look to points of agreement and not of difference, to essentials and not to accidents of religion"—This is really delicious!



We are told that the Anglican Church *will* be 'flexible and considerate,' as if she would carry those ancient 'notes' of her being any further than she does at present! as if it were necessary to apologise here and now for her want of 'uniformity'!

The last sentence of Dr. Welldon's address which strikes me as needing criticism is that in which he says—"We must learn to look upon the *Church of England* as the Church of the *English speaking race* and of its dependencies and colonies throughout the world." Here is the fallacy that underlies his entire argument. The Church of England is not and never will be the Church of the English speaking *races* throughout the world. The Catholic Church at the present moment is quite as much, and soon will be far more than the Anglican Establishment, the Church of English speaking races throughout the world. We have now 20,000,000 Catholics in the British Empire and the United States. We are rapidly increasing in numbers, wealth and influence. We are *One* in Faith, and that unity is winning over thousands every year to us from the Protestant ranks; whereas decay and disintegration are widening and deepening from year to year not merely amongst the rank and file, but amongst the leaders of the Protestant sects.

Who will undertake to find a spiritual 'common denominator' for the Bishop of Lincoln on the one hand and his right reverend brothers of Liverpool and Worcester on the other, unless it be the unexpected approval lately given by Dr. King, the highest of high Churchmen, to the adulterous remarriage of divorced persons? The American Episcopal Church is completely split on the same terrible question. How true it is that, when men abandon the centre of unity in Faith, they come inevitably to accept and approve of the grossest moral abuses. England was lost to Rome because Rome would not surrender the rights of one suffering, outraged woman, Catherine of Aragon. Many pure-minded Englishmen and Englishwomen are now being led back to Rome by the cowardice shown by Anglican prelates in refusing to defend the sacred rights of God and Man in the Sacrament of Matrimony.

But to return to Dr. Welldon's theory of the Church of England being the Church of the English speaking race—Outside



of England how many Anglicans are to be found? A handful in Scotland and Wales. I do not think the Irish Episcopalians would like people to call them Anglicans. In America the Episcopal Church has a very small, if very select, following. It is stronger in the British Colonies; but its total strength we shall probably never ascertain, for, with their curious national perversity in religious matters, the English, who delight in every other branch of statistics, will not have a religious census in England. The Anglicans throw the blame of this omission on the non-conformists, alleging that the latter are afraid to show their real strength or weakness. The non-conformists, I understand, retort that such a census would be unfair to them, as many who habitually worship in their Chapels would, in case of a creed declaration by law, write themselves down as Anglicans. Perhaps they dread the pressure that the squire and the parson in country districts would exert in view of such an enumeration. Whatever may be the cause, we are without accurate data for estimating the total number of adherents of the Anglican Church. I have no doubt however that if there were any possible means of counting those who earnestly believe and practise the tenets of their faith,—of Anglicans on the one hand and English speaking Catholics on the other—the latter would be found to have a considerable majority over the former.

\*  
\* \*

We have now surveyed the greater part of Dr Welldon's field of controversy, and I shall devote what remains of this lecture to considering his main proposition, namely, "that the unique greatness of the British Empire dates from the Reformation"—I thank Dr. Welldon for using the word '*dates*' instead of '*is due to.*' It is always the same old fallacy. Because the Reformation followed soon after the invention of printing and the discovery of the Cape route to the East and of America, these events have got to be so mixed up together in thoughtless minds that millions of Protestants believe either that to the Reformation belongs the credit of inventing printing



and discovering America, or else that the Reformation in some mysterious way grew out of these great discoveries! '*Post hoc, ergo propter hoc.*'—But printing was invented (like gunpowder and many other interesting things) by Catholics, and Christopher Columbus and Vasco de Gama were both excellent Catholics. When Dr. Welldon asks us to believe that "the founders of the Empire were the *heroes* of the Reformed Faith," he is, I think, asking us to believe a little too much about Drake and his brother Captains. In point of morality, justice and civilised virtue in general, it seem to me that there is little to choose between Spaniard and Englishman in those wild days when captains rode the Spanish Main, licensed to trade and fight by their respective monarchs, but unlicensed by God or Man to perpetrate the dark deeds of treachery and cruelty which we cannot read of still without shuddering.

When Dr. Welldon goes yet further and assures us that, "it was when Englishmen learnt to fear God and Him alone, and to believe in the direct responsibility of individual souls to Him, that they caught the spirit which made empire possible and permanent," he is at variance with the best and soundest of English historians. In the first place, the real expansion of the empire did not begin for two centuries after the Reformation. The real greatness of England as a world-wide power is due to Chatham and Clive, to Wolfe and Warren Hastings.

If indeed Englishmen learned only at the time of the Reformation 'to fear God and Him alone,' they showed their new-found knowledge in a very strange manner, by plundering God's houses and judicially murdering hundreds of His unoffending ministers. You can hardly take a day's journey in England even at this lapse of time, without meeting some crumbling ruin of Church or Abbey, exquisite even in its decay, which testify to the piety and devotion of the Catholic English of other days, and to the awful spirit of sacrilege and impiety which ravaged those shrines of prayer and learning at the epoch of the Reformation.



No ! the Catholic English both feared and loved God far better than their Protestant descendants. Their faith is written strong and deep in those marvellous Cathedrals and Churches which made the fair land of "Merrie England" a dream of beauty in the Middle Ages. Who can kneel to-day in Canterbury or Westminster, in York or Lincoln, in Ely or Exeter, and not feel that the men who reared these glorious temples to the One living God were amongst the truest and best Christians that the world has ever seen? And who can wander through the roofless naves and mouldering cloisters of Fountains and Furness, of Rievaulx and Melrose, and not weep for the sacrilegious vandalism which ruined the monasteries, slaughtered or dispersed the innocent monks, and thereby inflicted on England the awful curse of State Pauperism? And all this forsooth was the work and signet mark of that *true fear of God* which, according to Dr. Welldon, Englishmen learnt only at the Reformation !

England was great and glorious long before that disastrous event. Crecy and Poitiers, Agincourt and Bannockburn testify to the dauntless valour of Scot and Englishman long before Luther and Calvin began their work of unholy destruction. And the warriors who won those battles knelt, before they charged, for the blessing and absolution of the Catholic priest. The English sea-dogs who fought and conquered at Sluys in the reign of Edward III, and thereby opened an easy path across the Channel for the successive invasions of France, were of the same hardy breed as the Drakes and Frobishers, the Blakes and Rodney's of later centuries.

It was of the *Catholic* English that Shakespeare, the inspiration of whose genius is Catholic and not Protestant, so truly wrote :--

" This England never did, nor never shall  
Lie at the proud foot of a conqueror,  
But when it first did help to wound itself,  
Now these, her princes, are come home again,  
Come the three corners of the world in arms,  
And we shall stock them !"

But the greatness of England as a conquering and pacifying



power, as the most successful imitator in modern times of that greater empire of the Pagan world, whose motto was —

‘Parcere subjectis et debellare superbos’—

‘To spare the conquered and war down the proud’—

rests on a broader and nobler foundation than successful generalship and dauntless courage on land and sea alike.

It is the *character* of the English people which has given them their supremacy, and that character has been bequeathed to them as the most precious legacy of their Catholic forefathers. The greatness and expansion of England were rendered possible and certain, not by the crimes and apostasy of the Reformation, but by Magna Charta and by centuries of freedom that preceded the Reformation, owing to the power exercised by the Houses of Parliament in checking regal despotism. Both those mighty reforms, so far in advance of continental thought and policy, were the work of Catholics, inspired and supported by the great Catholic prelates of those stormy days.

When later on the work of Catholic explorers, of Columbus and Vasco de Gama, had opened the gates of East and West to the European nations, England, by reason of her long probation in Freedom’s School under Catholic teachers, was better fitted than any other nation to go forth on her mighty task of conquering and assimilating a subject world. I have shown in my last lecture how Spain, at the crisis of her destiny, was rendered unfit for the work which the wisdom of England’s Catholic Kings, and the strenuous patriotism of England’s Catholic Bishops and nobles made sure and easy for the English race.

If to-day the Englishman has more self-reliance and power of concentrated individual effort than any other man on earth; if he goes to his task, hard or easy, pleasant or painful, relying on himself alone, not waiting for the crowd to come and help him, patient in adversity, sagacious and cool in prosperity, wisely husbanding his resources till the moment for action has come, and then boldly risking all for the stake of empire which is worth all the risk, he owes that imperial instinct and conquering



power to the Bishops and Barons who forced the reluctant hand of John to sign the great Charter of Runnymede. He owes it also to the Catholic De Montfort who died for England's freedom, and to his wise conqueror Edward I,\* that strong and fervent Catholic, whatever his bickerings with Pope and Bishops may have been, who continued and improved De Montfort's work, and laid broad and deep against the storms of time and the Protestant tyranny of the Tudors the foundation of England's glorious Temple of Liberty—the House of Commons, “that Mother and Mistress of all the Parliaments of the world.”

The sense of personal freedom and equal guarantees of safety for gentle and simple alike, springing from the *Habeas Corpus*, that palladium of the individual Englishman's liberty, and the collective rights of the citizens of the nation, founded on the Commons' Power of the Purse, their authority to determine the Monarch's public action and control the Monarch's expenditure: these be the real source and origin of England's imperial force and bent of character. Those are the deep wells, dug centuries before the Reformation by Catholic patriots, ensanguined with the sacred unction of the blood of martyred Catholic nobles and Bishops, from which English heroes in every age, since the days of Langton and Thomas à Becket and De Montfort, have drawn their vital force and conquering energy.

The one great irretrievable blunder in English politics that which competes with Philip II's Invincible Armada and Napoleon's Moscow Campaign for the title of champion blunder of modern times, I mean the loss of the American Colonies, was due to those twin Protestant worthies, Lord North and George III! We Catholic subjects of the Empire are proud of the Empire's greatness no less than our Protestant fellow-citizens. But with our common pride is mingled the satisfaction, which we alone can feel, in that the verdict of history assigns to Catholic hands the true foundation of England's greatness.

\* See Professor Tout's work on Edward I (McMillan's Twelve English Statesmen Series) Chapter “Edward and the Church.”



## VII.

## Pauperism and Crime.

“Upon the whole it may be said that wherever there is a nation which is stationary or retrogressive it is Roman Catholic, wherever there is a people that is progressive and imperial it is Protestant. There is something that is essential to empire—something that Rome came to lack, and France, it seems, is coming to lack—something that makes force to be chivalrous and law to be equitable and humane—something that is as the salt of the imperial spirit, and that is character; it is the innate nobility and dignity of men whose lives are inspired by the love of God *for the service of humanity*. . . . Happy indeed shall England be if her civil power ever shadows the largest and richest territory of earth. But happier far shall she be if beneath her shadowing power the Cross of Christ shall be set up as a witness to the nations, inspiring in all men’s hearts a new ideal of honour and purity and devotion, and the love of men for the love of God, the Father of all.”—*Extracts from Dr. Welldon’s Address.*

In a previous lecture I stated that “in all the truest elements of national prosperity—in all that really makes for the welfare and happiness of the majority—the cultivation of the religious sense amongst the masses, the enforcement of moral laws by efficient moral sanctions, the even distribution of national wealth, the care of and consideration for the poor (two different things it must be remarked), the development as a national duty of art and music, with the object of brightening the lives and elevating the tastes of the toiling millions—in these and many other ways the Catholic compare most favourably with the so-called Protestant nations.”

I wished by these words to enter a protest in advance against the narrow view of national progress taken by Dr. Welldon. According to him, at least in so far as appears from his address, advance or decay is simply a matter of rapid accumulation of wealth and rapid conquest of savage lands, or a corresponding failure in both those respects. I certainly think that Christians and especially ministers of the Christian religion should take a higher ground on this question than the tradesman’s point of view—of quick profits and new markets for his goods. The lines of progress which I have just indicated seem to me more consonant at once with the spirit of the Gospel and with a rational view of civilisation, than the narrow survey of Dr. Welldon.



Reserving for my next and concluding lecture the higher question of religious culture and efficient sanctions of the moral law, I propose to deal now with the question of the distribution of wealth and pauperism ; that which will probably become the burning question of the 20th century.

There is no need of my dwelling at any length on the last of those tests which I have given for national progress or decay. Few will deny that the Reformation was the greatest disaster possible for music, architecture and art in general. Human progress in those most useful departments of national life and advance was stunted and set back for centuries amongst the nations which accepted Protestantism. They have not yet made up the 'lee-way' as sailors would term it. Years ago, when H. R. H. the Prince of Wales was opening the Royal College of Music in London, he pointedly referred to the injury done to musical culture in England by its severance at the Reformation from the Catholic world.

It would be impossible to estimate the national loss, in all the refining and ennobling elements of life, which has accrued from the great change of Faith in the 16th century. But for that, England would be to-day in point of art and architecture far ahead of most European countries, instead of being emphatically the land of city slums and grimy streets and alleys—'hell-holes' as Mathew Arnold expressively termed them.

It is a striking coincidence, and one which gives us great hopes for the future, that the Catholic revival in literature, art and religious thought, led by Walter Scott, Welby Pugin and John Henry Newman, in such widely sundered spheres of mental activity, has accompanied, and no doubt greatly helped, the growing tolerance of English Protestants, and their increasing tendency to listen fairly and favourably to the claims advanced for the Old Church of their forefathers. London especially is looking more beautiful and more Catholic from year to year, and the rage of the antiritualists is a safe gauge of the progress which our ideas and practices are making amongst Anglicans. We



shall not live to see the full results of the Catholic movement, but, if it be safe to prophesy at all in such matters, we may lie down to die, when our work is done, in the happy assurance that millions of the English race will yet return to the Faith of their Fathers.

But if art and music suffered by the Reformation the poor suffered far more. The question of Pauperism, its alleviation and gradual elimination, is for thinking Christian men the most important and vital of all those that concern a nation's progress. And what is the actual condition of England to-day in regard of this all-important question? I turn to one of the ablest and most prominent of English statesmen for the answer. Mr. Chamberlain in an article in the *Fortnightly Review* (December 1883) wrote as follows—"Never before in our history were wealth and the evidences of wealth more abundant; never before was luxurious living so general and so wanton in its display; and never before was the misery of the poor so intense, or the condition of their daily life more hopeless or more degraded"—and then he goes on to say that England has "a million of paupers and millions more are on the verge of pauperism."

The actual returns of last year, as given in the *Statesman's Year Book* for 1898, show 824,362 paupers for England and Wales, 100,914 for Scotland, and 98,882 for Ireland,—in all the United Kingdom 1,024,158. This would give about one pauper to every 37 or 38 non-paupers of the entire population of what is by far the wealthiest country in the world. No doubt the system of out door relief has done much to mitigate the harshness of the Poor-Law System; but still we cannot contemplate the terrible figures I have given without becoming painfully aware of the awful amount of human misery which they represent. The breaking up of homes however poor, the sundering of wife and husband from each other and both from their children, when once they have passed the gloomy portals of the 'House,' the brand of ignominy stamped by the very designation of pauper, the inevitable corruption and degradation of the young under the



condition of such a life,—all combine to make the state of over 1,000,000 persons in the United Kingdom one of serfdom and misery far exceeding that of the villeins of the Middle Ages.

But it was not always so. Before the Reformation the monasteries were the houses of the poor, very different from the Poorhouses of our day. Poverty at that time, inevitable as it must be in every age, was not then a necessary token of disgrace, a crime to be visited with imprisonment and separation from wife and family. If English Protestants could only realise the enormous change for the worse which the Reformation has worked in the lives of the working classes and the very poor, they would not be enamoured of that great change which they so fondly regard as the well-spring of English liberty and prosperity. As I am here treading on delicate and important ground of controversy, I prefer to be accurate if dull, rather than indulge in brilliant but inaccurate generalisation. I shall take as my authorities Father Gasquet, O. S. B., and Professor Thorold Rogers, a Catholic priest and a Protestant writer on economical questions,—who know better than any other living men the social and religious condition of England in the centuries preceding the Reformation.

Thorold Rogers' great work, "The History of Agriculture and Prices in England," is a monument of patient and accurate research, without a rival in the field. Father Gasquet's book on the destruction of the English Monasteries by Henry VIII has been termed an epoch-making work by no less an authority than the late Mr. Gladstone and other Protestant critics. In it he completely demolishes, from contemporary record, the fallacies so long prevalent with regard to the corruption and immorality of the monks. He shows that, so far from being lazy libertines, they were the best and truest friends of the poor and the working classes, the easiest landlords, the most industrious and God-fearing English gentlemen of their day, and that the charge of widespread immorality brought against them is but one more of those historic calumnies against the Church, which the open mind and keen criticism of 19th century writers have finally exploded.



Father Gasquet has recently delivered at a Catholic congress in England a most interesting address on "Christian Democracy before the Reformation"—Poverty, he says, existed before the Reformation, as it must always exist, but what did not exist was pauperism. The Church of Christ recognising the fact that the poor we have always with us, endeavours to lessen an evil which it cannot wholly eradicate. It teaches that all men are brothers, descended from the same parents originally, and that it is the duty of those blest with goods of this world to succour their more needy brethren. The odious distinction of "masses" and "classes" is unknown to Catholic doctrine. "Whoever," says Leo XIII, "has received from the divine bounty a large share of blessings . . . . has received them for the purpose of using them for the perfecting of his own nature, and at the same time, that he may employ them as the minister of God's providence, for the benefit of others." This same truth is quaintly expressed by the mediæval author of the book called "Dives et pauper": "All that the rich man hath, passing his honest living after the degree of his dispensation, it is other men's, not his, and he shall give full hard reckoning thereof at the day of doom, when God shall say to him: "Yield account of your bailywick." For rich men and lords in this world are God's bailiffs and God's reeves to ordain for the poor folk and to sustain them."

The Canon law of the Church commanded that all ecclesiastical revenues, after deducting what was necessary and proper for the decent support of the clergy, were to be used for the benefit of the poor. The result in a society, impregnated with such principles is thus summed up: Mr. Thorold Rogers, than whom no one has ever worked more fully at the economic history of England, and whom none can suspect of undue admiration of the Catholic Church, has left it on record that during the century and a half which preceded the era of the Reformation the mass of English labourers were thriving under their Guilds and Trade Unions, the peasants were gradually acquiring their lands and becoming small free-holders, the artisans rising to the position of small contractors and working with their



own hands at structures which their native genius and experience had planned. In a word, according to this high authority, the last years of undivided Catholic England formed 'the golden age' of the Englishman who was ready and willing to work.

Christian Charity, therefore, did not encourage idleness and beggary. On the contrary, "self help and self-government showed itself in popular efforts to carry out common objects as far as possible, and to secure the common good. The community possessed common interests in numberless things, had common lands, common cattle and other stock ; and, in a word, the tendency was to create a system of common property, which owed its existence largely to the people themselves." Historians who have studied the condition of the people in other countries before the Reformation, have come to similar conclusions. The working man in Catholic times was much better off than he has been ever since. God blesses, in this life even, those nations who honour His Son.

But the Reformation came, seeking not the good but the goods of the Church, and it set about the work of reform by "the dissolution of the religious corporations, the destruction of the chantries, the wholly unjustifiable confiscation of the property of the guilds, the heartless seizure of hospital and almshouses, the substitution of the well-to-do for the poor as the recipients of the benefits coming from the foundation funds of schools and colleges, even the introduction of married clergy whose wives and children had to be supported on the portion of the ecclesiastical benefices intended for the relief of poverty." This was the origin of the war between wealth and poverty now being waged so bitterly and threatening the total disruption of civil society. There is but one remedy—a return to Catholic principles.—(*End of extract from Fr. Gasquet.*)

I have given this long extract from a writer of special knowledge and undoubted eminence in this branch of English History in order to show, from authority that cannot be questioned, that pauperism as we know it at home is distinctly a Protestant



institution. You find it in Protestant but not in Catholic countries. The truth is that just as here in India relief of the poor is a caste obligation amongst the Pagan natives, so in every Catholic land the best, the most ardent and religious spirits have been led by God's inspiration to form themselves into a caste apart, into free associations of Christian men and women, who willingly surrender all that makes life naturally happy and comfortable in order to bind themselves by the triple bond of Poverty Chastity and Obedience, to the service of the poor and the welfare of Humanity.

When Dr. Welldon can succeed in inducing some thousands of Englishmen and Englishwomen to do what we have done and are doing in India, to forswear marriage, to leave father and mother, family and kindred, home and country, wealth and wordly preferment, to be poor for Christ's sake, to give up all private wealth as the early Christians did, to spend life and talent, wealth and fortune in seeking God's glory alone and the service of the neighbour, asking in return only necessary food, raiment and lodging, then he can seriously begin the conversion of India to Anglicanism. But till that happy day arrives, the keen witted Hindoo, whom instinct and tradition alike teach to readily grasp the supreme importance of the principle of asceticism, will easily distinguish between the real and the paid professional missionary.

Turn we now to Catholic countries, and what do we find? An utter absence of pauperism as it is known and locked up in England. No doubt it is highly inconvenient and disgusting for the British Paterfamilias, when he takes his family abroad for a continental tour, to be harrassed and importuned by beggars at every Church door. But is it not well to be reminded at times in that striking manner of the presence of suffering and misery in others? Are not the crowds of beggars, often seen in Catholic countries, the best possible sermon against the smug satisfaction of complacent wealth? Catholics abroad do not choose to lock up in a poor-house jail the suffering members of Christ. They are



left free. They still have their homes, miserable though they be, and they have food and nursing at the hands of the gentlest of the land, who have vowed to God to spend their lives in the service of His poor. If we look at this question in the spirit of humble followers of the poor Carpenter of Nazareth, and not as pharisaical Pecksniffs, surely the Catholic solution of this dread problem must commend itself as the only one worthy of a Christian.

To come now to hard facts as proved by the statistics of the *Statesman's Year Book*. Belgium, with its terribly congested population of close on 600 persons to the square mile and its intense manufacturing and commercial energy, the natural parents one would expect of pauperism, has *one pauper to every 1,400* of its population, as against *one to 37* in the United Kingdom. And the Belgian 'paupers' are in reality tramps and vagabonds who are locked up in the national '*dépôts de mendicité*' for the sake of public safety. They are not real paupers in the English sense of the term.

When I was in Spain, seeing the general poverty of the country as compared with England, I asked what was done with the very poor, and explained the English system of poor-houses. The Spaniards were amazed that Christians should treat the poor in such a manner. As they graphically expressed it—'everyone in Spain who can work, *has a bite*, or else emigrates.' If any are unfit for work, they are taken care of by religious Brothers and Sisters in '*case de Misericordia*,' 'Houses of Mercy.'—What a beautiful title! In fact in Catholic countries there is the same system at work which you see here in your midst in Calcutta and elsewhere, at the Catholic Male Orphanage, the Loreto Convent, Entally, the St. Vincent's Home at Kidderpore, and the Little Sisters of the Poor—the system of perfect Christian altruism, of the voluntary and total self-abnegation of Christian men and women for the service of the poor and suffering.

Take again those rather free and easy Catholics, the Austrians. How do they take care of their poor? I read from the *Statesman's Year Book*, p. 349 under the title of :



## PAUPERISM IN AUSTRIA.

“The right to poor relief is defined by an imperial statute, but the regulations for the apportionment of the cost are made by the separate provinces, and are consequently very various. The funds first available are those of the public institutions for the poor (*Armeninstitutionen*), derived from endowments, voluntary contributions, *the poor's third of the property left by intestate secular priests*, and certain percentages on the proceeds of voluntary sales. In some provinces the poor's funds are augmented from other sources *e. g.*, theatre-money (*Spektakelgelder*), hunting licences, dog certificates, and in some large towns percentages on legacies over a fixed amount. When, in any given case, these funds are exhausted, the commune of origin (*Heimartsgemeinde*) must make provisions. Those who are wholly or partially unfit for work may be provided for in such manner as the commune judges propose. Besides poor-houses and money reliefs, there exists in many provinces, by custom or by constitutional rule, the practice of *assigning the poor—in respect of board and lodging—to each of the resident householders in fixed succession.*”

Now I think the English might very well take a leaf out of the Austrians' book as to the best way of disposing of theatre receipts and 'sport' taxes. We could readily tolerate a certain amount of betting and gambling, if the proceeds and the fines went to genuine charity. And further I can well imagine what expression the British householder's face would wear, if Mr. Bumble suddenly descended to billet upon him a batch of Oliver Twists. But still the great question remains—which system, the British or the Austrian, is the more humane and Christian? Which is the more worthy of a progressive nation?

The main conclusion to be drawn from this necessarily brief survey of pauperism in Protestant and Catholic countries contrasted is that wealth is more evenly distributed in the latter than in the former, and that consequently *neither can the rich become richer nor the poor poorer so fast amongst Catholics as amongst Protestants.* The reason of this is clear. The rich Catholic must go to confession and tell his sins as well as his poorer neighbours: the employer of labour must kneel for the priest's absolution as well as the labourers on his estate or the operatives in his factory; and if he be an oppressor of the poor, a sweater of their labour, he will be refused absolution and told to reform his life and make restitution to those whom he has



wronged, before he can hope for God's mercy even at the point of death.

Nothing in the world is easier than confession of sin to God. It is quite another thing to square accounts with his accredited minister on earth. There is just the same difference between these two acts as that which exists between a safe and easy profession of allegiance to the Queen in the quiet seclusion of one's chamber, and the practical loyalty shown by paying the taxes and keeping the police regulations of one's district. Catholic Ethics recognise a distinct *right*, belonging to the poor, so far and so long as they are willing, if able, to work, a right that we Catholics hold to be both rational and scriptural, namely, *the right to live and keep their own humble roofs over their own heads*, even though 'national expansion' and the rapid accumulation of great fortunes may suffer from that right of the working classes and the poor. We further hold that the State should make good that right in law and in fact.

Before I leave this branch of the question, I venture, as a controversy is raging just now at home about confession to a priest, to suggest, as worthy of examination by the opponents of our system, the view I have just given of its manifest utility. It throws an important side-light on the question in dispute, and explains, as I shall show more fully in my concluding lecture, the savage hatred of the Church manifested by Un-christian statesmen and plutocrats in Catholic countries. *They* feel where the shoe pinches. English statesmen and plutocrats have no such strong opposition to face. It is safe to assert that if all the British Cabinet ministers had to go to confession, the question of old age pensions and the abolition of the Poorhouses in England would soon come to the front.

Closely allied to the question of Pauperism is that of Vice and Crime. I do not intend to enter on any elaborate comparison of Catholic and Protestant countries in these unsavoury matters ;— first and foremost, because you cannot reckon up national vice and crime as you do Pauperism and Commerce. God alone



knows the relative depravity of nations. A little rises to the surface and meets the eye of man, but most is hidden in the heart and life of the sinner till the great Accounting Day. In the next place, it passes the wit of man to discover a common standard by which the known and recorded vices and crimes of different nations may be judged. Drunkenness and its awful consequences are far more prevalent amongst Protestant than amongst Catholic peoples. Indeed there are those who maintain that England's greatness depends on its being a hard-drinking nation. Anyone who has witnessed great popular gatherings, bent on enjoyment, in different countries—race meetings and Bank holidays at home, and the corresponding mobs of pleasure seekers in France, Spain and Italy, must acknowledge that the Latin races are by far the more temperate and decorous in their popular amusements. On the other hand, the latter are much more prone to passion and revenge, with its terrible results, than the cooler northern races.

In what I am going to say now, I do not seek to introduce any odious and useless comparisons. I simply plead for "an arrest of judgment" on one or two specific points of morality in which it is generally taken for granted by Englishmen that they are far superior to Catholic nations.

Recent sad and unexpected disclosures in the law courts at home prove how dangerous it is for us to pride ourselves on our superior domestic morality. Baby-farming is a trade which has not many customers in Catholic countries. Those blessed institutions of Catholic charity, the *Crèche* and the Foundling Hospital, are ever open to save the poor little innocents from an untimely death. The waifs and strays of unhallowed love are there tenderly nursed and reared by 'mothers of devotion,' who for the sake of God's poorest and most abandoned children have freely renounced the joys of maternity and the family life.

Homicide and its awful concomitant of brutal assault on unoffending persons are generally assumed to be more prevalent in the South of Europe than in the North. Well, no Catholic



country has found it necessary to revive at the end of the 19th century that terrible form of legal torture, the lash, in order to deal with the latter of those two evils. But all right-minded Englishmen approve the action of strong judges, like Sir John Day, who order it freely for the backs of those hardened criminals who cannot otherwise be deterred from brutal outrages on the person.

Homicide in particular is supposed to be the pet crime of the Latin races. Is it so? Is not the amount of undetected homicide in England very large and yearly increasing, owing to the herding of millions together in the great human camps of her cities? Taking the question of homicide broadly, which is the more deplorable,—the slaying of man by man in hot blood, or the doing of children to death by actual violence or wilful starving? I shall not trust myself to generalise on this most serious question, but shall read for you the record of one year's work of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children. It was published in the English papers, and is headed :

### THE CRY OF THE CHILDREN.

*Mr. Waugh's Report.*

The annual report of the National Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to children has justly been published under the title, "The Society: Its Policy and Triumphs." Mr. Benjamin Waugh gives a most interesting account of the work of the society during the past year, and since its foundation. The report says :

During the past year 25,170 complaints have been made to the society on behalf of children by the public, the police, and the society's own officers.

The allegations in 19,146 of these were of neglect and starvation ; 3,534 were of ill treatment and assault ; 369 of abandonment ; 1,216 of exposing for begging purposes and causing to beg with suffering ; 590 were of immorality against the young ; 315 were of other wrongs not classified.

Of these 1,480 proved on investigation to be founded on mistaken information, or if correct, yet due to circumstances other than wilful, and some few to motives not creditable. This number of cases was therefore dropped. All other cases were taken in hand, and the society's ordinary methods were employed in them. In 18,779 cases it served warnings upon the offenders, which effected advances towards their purpose more or less decided. Other warnings were served which left



things much as they were. In 2,519 cases it was necessary to prosecute. The opinion of the courts—Police, Sessions, and Assizes—was almost unanimous in favour of the society's proceedings, only 3·45 cases per hundred of them being dismissed. Successful cases amounted to 96·55 in the hundred.

In 2,392 other cases various expedients were resorted to, by which the children's troubles were stopped and the society's objects were attained.

The courts inflicted in the convicted cases an aggregate of 402 years of imprisonment and £544 fines,

The number of children whose interests were involved in all these cases was 58,008. *On behalf of 204 of these the society's intervention came too late : the violence or neglect they had endured ended in death.*

In dealing with these cases it had addressed itself to 33,188 persons who were the offenders in them. Subsequently to warnings being given, and to the return of children to their parents after imprisonment, 61,413 supervision visits were paid to the children in their homes by the society's inspectors, thus making the total visits made by the society during the year upwards of 120,000, which have been made in the cities and the villages and hamlets of the land, by all of which treatment of children was made better than in former days.

The complaints investigated this year have been 2,046 more than those of the previous year. The hardened cases in which this year prosecutions were found necessary were 2,519; last year they were 2,279. The increase in supervision visits this year over last year is 9,986. The expenditure of the year has been £52,734 14s. 9d., the excess of expenditure over income on the year's working is therefore £2,723 12s. 7d.

#### FURTHER RECORD.—September 1898.

*Cruelty to Children.*—The National Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children has during the last recorded month inquired into 2,735 complaints of neglect, ill-treatment and other wrongs, of which 2,283 were dealt with and 452 are pending. The cases found true were 2,141 and involved 6,067 children and 2,879 offenders. Action was taken as follows: Warned, 1,675; prosecuted, 258 (resulting in 248 convictions); dealt with by transfer or in other ways, 208. *Twenty-four of the children died.*

These statistics, which indicate but do not comprehend the full extent of the evil, must give us pause before we rashly assume that the Catholic nations are more prone to homicide than the Protestant. Respect and tenderness for women and children are far more conspicuous in the former than in the latter. The reason of this is not far to seek. When the Reformation cast



out from those who accepted its teachings reverence and love of the Mother and her Divine Infant, it shattered for Protestants the strongest barrier that God has built on earth against the tide of man's brutal passions.

The Sacred Weakness of Mary and her Child has been in every age of the Christian era the fount of chivalry, the motive of tenderness, the true source and origin of Christian man's respect and forbearing love for woman and her babe.

---

### VIII.

#### The Papacy the centre and cause of European Civilisation.

“Spain alone among European nations reveals by her civil and ecclesiastical policy what would probably be the state of the civilised world if again it should subject itself to the tyranny which England shook off once for ever at the Reformation.

“Spain has lost her native virility. She has lost it because three centuries ago she saw the light, and might have cherished it, and turned away from it.

“Whoever disparages the Reformation is beyond all doubt a bad patriot.

“I seem, though dimly, to discern that as the English-speaking race pervades the earth,—that race which is historically free, expansive, and Protestant, and as the Church of the nation gathers more and more to her bosom whatever religious faith or energy the race exhibits, she will not need to go down on her knees, as some men would bid her, before the Pope of the Roman Church, or any other spiritual or religious authority.”—*Extracts from Dr. Welldon's address.*

I have cited these oft-quoted passages from Dr. Welldon's paper once more at the head of my last lecture, to show clearly the animus of his address. It is an attack on the Catholic Church, an attempt to belittle and disparage the Papacy. Had we not replied, had we allowed judgment to go by default, the natural conclusion would have been that we have no faith in the wisdom of the Popes who ruled the Church in the stormy days of the Middle Ages; and there would have been a corresponding weakening of Catholic confidence in the divine guidance and protection of the Papacy in every century.



I have striven in these lectures above all to instruct Catholics, to set before them the true view of religious history in its more profound and far-reaching issues, and to refute on their behalf the inaccurate statements of the Anglican Metropolitan. I have been mindful throughout of the fact that the mass of our Catholics in India are very ill-instructed on the points in dispute,—that for them England means the world, and that the great Catholic nations with their glorious history in the past, and their vigorous life in the present century, are for Anglo-Indian Catholics little more than names. Hence from the commencement I have thought principally and indeed almost exclusively of my Catholic hearers and readers, and no one has been more surprised than myself at the publicity given to these lectures by the Press of the Country, and at the interest taken by Protestants as well as Catholics in what I have had to say in defence of the Church.

My reply to Dr. Welldon has been of necessity a somewhat hasty one. I have been obliged, in order not to prolong the discussion unduly, to throw off week by week these addresses, in which a few points have been treated not as fully as I should wish, and many have been suppressed for want of space and time. Those who desire to see the subject in dispute more fully treated can turn to Balmes' great work—"European Civilisation"—the most profound ever written on this great question; to Sir H. Bellingham's reply to Emile de Lavelaye, and to the New York Paulist Father Young's "Catholic and Protestant countries compared"—though I by no means endorse every statement of the last-named writer.

I cannot help regarding the appreciative interest, mixed with a little ignorant but ingenuous criticism, shown to my lectures as an omen of the rapid spread of Catholic ideas amongst Englishmen. Thirty years ago my statements would probably have been met by an outburst of anti-Catholic bigotry, a trait of temper which now, thank God, seems to have passed away for ever from the British mind. We Catholics should remember, in dealing with our separated brethren, that we owe



this enormous advance in religious sanity to the work of the High Church and Ritualist parties.

Of all the topics raised by Dr. Welldon's address, it seems to me that the one of most abiding interest is his classification of countries as Catholic or Protestant on the old lines of a century past. The enormous changes that have taken place both amongst Catholics and Protestants during the last hundred years seem to have passed unheeded by him. In the course of my lectures I have indicated how fallacious this method of computing religious forces is for the Russians, Germans, and Americans. Within the last few weeks we have received a striking example of the truth of my assertion from the action in Palestine of the German Emperor. That shrewd and far-seeing ruler, whatever people may say about him in England, has just consecrated his own Church in Jerusalem, as befits the sincerely pious Lutheran he is, and then has handed over to the German Catholic mission one of the most sacred spots in the Holy City, kindly presented to him by his good friend the Sultan,—“*La dormition de la Sainte Vierge.*” “Our Lady's sleeping place in death,—which carries with it the right of pre-emption of the Cenacle, that far holier spot where the Blessed Eucharist was instituted and the Fire of Pentecost came down on the Apostles,—is now in Catholic hands, with every probability of its remaining so for ever.”

The spectacle of the great Protestant Emperor acting thus towards his Catholic subjects gives abundant food for reflection to thoughtful minds. The Catholics are preferred by him to his own co-religionists for the safe-keeping of a very holy shrine. No doubt he knows very well the effect his action will have on the vote of the Catholic party in the Reichstag, the Centrum, that one great, dominant, unchanging party in the medley of creeds and factions that make up the German Parliament. He doubtless knows full well that the Church, and the Church alone, can ensure the safety of his crown and throne from the assaults of socialistic anarchy. But whatever his motives may have been, his action proves the enormous strength of the Church at the



present day in the empire founded by Frederick the Great ; and we Catholics all over the world should humbly thank God for the devoted faith and unswerving loyalty to the Church of the 20,000,000 of North German Catholics.

Even in England how changed are both classes and mass alike in their attitude towards the Church. One would say that Catholicism is stealing back on England as gently and irresistibly as the summer tide ripples in upon the sands that fringe her shores. No one denies, or even attempts to disregard, the enormous progress we have made and are daily making, since the conversion of Newman and his followers, to quote a great Statesman's memorable words, "struck the Church of England a blow from which she is reeling still." The progress of conversion is much faster in America than in England, as it is natural to expect from a young, enthusiastic and unprejudiced nation. I think therefore that I have a right to enter a '*caveat*' against Dr. Welldon's classification of the Protestant forces of to-day. Nowhere in the wide world is the Catholic Church freer in her saving ministry, nowhere is she expanding more rapidly, than in Great Britain and the United States.

When we turn on the contrary to Catholic countries we find conflict and persecution the notes of the Church's life in almost every land. Why this apparent paradox of peace and protection from the Protestant, and strife and persecution from the Catholic rulers? The answer to this question touches the most fascinating problem in religion and politics of our day. I may indicate, but not go fully into it.

We are on the brink, or rather in the vortex of one of those profound secular crises in the evolution of Christian civilisation, the control and determination of which have always been the province and duty of the Catholic Church and of the Papacy, identical in this regard. As it was in the 5th and 6th, and 9th, the 13th and the 16th centuries, so has it been in the 19th, and so will it be in the 20th century. Those who wish to study this aspect of the Church's life and mission had better turn to



Dean Church's "Beginning of the Middle Ages"—the first of Longman's "Epochs of Middle History."

In pages glowing with exquisite diction and profound insight into the philosophy of history, the late Dean of St. Paul's, that truly great Anglican writer, reviews the action of the Church on the world in the wild days that followed the break up of the Roman Empire,—the give and take between the forces of Christianity and Paganism, the ceaseless striving for good on the part of the Church, its ultimate victory, and yet the deep wounds which it bore away from that, its greatest conflict for truth and civilisation. I have space for but one brief extract which shows the courageous temper and unswerving historical accuracy of the illustrious writer. Speaking of St. Dunstan p. 182, he says—"More dispassionate and better informed history has recognised in Dunstan, once the by-word for priestly arrogance and cruelty, a genuine patriot and reformer to whom amends are due, the chosen friend and counsellor of the Wessex Kings, especially Edgar."

The present crisis in the Church's history is the greatest, and will probably be the most prolonged, since her giant wrestle with the barbarian forces that overpowered the Roman Emperors. It is a conflict very similar to that, inasmuch as it has been provoked by the growth of that new Paganism, which even in Catholic countries is distinctly the result of the baleful religious and social heresies of the Reformation. Where the Catholic forces are strongest there the friction is greatest and the din of battle loudest. This explains why the contest is keenest in France.

When the able writer in the "Spectator," who recently delivered judgment in a masterly article against Dr. Welldon's contentions, spoke of France as being "the least Christian of Christian people," he showed the limitations set to the ablest Englishmen by their religious insularity. People forget that, besides the noisy faction of atheistic Frenchmen whom the dynastic dissensions of France have lifted to prominence for



the time being, there lives and grows, too slowly it may be, a great Catholic nation which is by far the strongest force in the Church at the present moment. This fact explains the present Pope's unswerving attachment to the interests of France.

We in India, and Dr. Welldon also, judging from his declared enthusiasm for foreign missions, may learn the real value of French Christianity from the simple statement of the fact that, if the French were what Protestant writers falsely describe them to be, a nation of atheists, then one-half of Christian missions to infidels, and those the most fruitful of all, would come to a sad and untimely end to-morrow. It is French Christian charity that keeps the bread and butter in the mouths of half the Catholic missionaries of the world—many of them British subjects. It is French charity that supports half the Catholic missionary schools in the world. English Catholics would do well to bear this in mind at the present moment, when such ill-timed and unjust diatribes are being levelled against the land and the race that have given to the Church Dupanloup and Lacordaire, DeMaistre and Montalembert. Bossuet and Fénelon, St. Louis, St. Francis de Sales and St. Vincent de Paul.

If a just and critical examination be made of the reasons why the Reformation failed in France, though at one time it seemed likely to succeed, and why it succeeded in England though for long its success was doubtful, I think it will be found that the different result in each case was due to the greater spiritual energy and absolute self-devotion in the cause of the Church of French clergy and bishops. English Catholics, some at least, are far too much inclined to throw the blame of England's loss of Faith on the harsh and arbitrary dealings of the Popes with regard to English benefices in the 13th and 14th centuries. No doubt the Popes did act at times in a high-handed manner. They were in terrible difficulties, political and financial, with their turbulent Italian subjects. But had they no right to support from the land on which they had conferred the benefits of Faith and Civilisation, to which they had given Augustine and Theodore, Lanfranc and Anselm? And were not the English-born clerics in far too many



cases utterly unfit for those high posts in the Church to which the bought favour of their grasping monarchs so eagerly promoted them? Did they not use their spiritual dignities in far too many cases simply as stepping stones to wealth and power in the state, neglecting their flocks, abandoning their ministry of souls and supernatural interests for the favour of their monarch and the power and pleasure of his Court? Was not the fearful enmity of those days against Rome, which culminated in the revolt of Henry VIII, excited by Rome's determination in the majority of cases to have spiritual men and scholarly divines rather than mere court favourites and secular-minded clerics, promoted to high office in the Church?

The feeling of the English Universities, the fittest to judge the pros and cons of this most contentious matter, seems to have leaned rather to the Popes than to the English Kings in the great dispute about Papal Provisions. The career of Wolsey is a case in point. Probably no man did more to help on the Reformation in England than he did, unwilling it may be, but still most effectually; and any one who reads dispassionately Professor Tout's history of Edward I's dealings with the Popes will see from that account, strongly stung with Protestant bias as it is, how unjust and irreligious that greatest of English Kings could be in moments of passion. The greater part of the leading English bishops and clergy, in the centuries preceding the Reformation, seem to have been worldly men, statesmen and barons first, and clerics a long way after. So when the great trial came under Henry VIII, the Church in England slowly crumbled to pieces because of its inherent worldliness, due to that love of wealth and comfort which has been the besetting sin of English Christianity in every age of its existence.

There is preserved at Stonyhurst College, amongst other priceless relics of old Catholic days, a cope that belonged to Henry VII's Chapel in Westminster before the Reformation, of exquisite tissue and workmanship, still bright and strong after centuries of use; it is all covered with the ensigns of the Tudor arms to the exclusion of religious emblems. A distinguished



Englishman on seeing it declared that it helped to explain to him the loss of Faith in the 16th century. The men who wore it, in the days when its full meaning and purport were evident to all, were king's liveried servants in the first place, and only after that priests of the Church.

But to return from this digression—The reason why the present crisis, in which the Church is grappling with lawless democracy as it grappled with regalism and barbarism of old, is so marked by strife and envenomed feeling in Catholic countries, is just because the Church is the only religious power on earth that can speak to the half-educated and impatient millions with authority and determination to enforce the law of God. The Pope of Rome is just now busily engaged in his old familiar task of pouring the hot new wine of the 19th century into the new bottles which he alone can manufacture. If much is spilled in the process it is not his fault, but is due to the impatience of those who will insist on ripping up the old before the new are ready. The modern sciolists and pseudo philosophers will not allow the Church the time necessary for her delicate task ; and as they have the ear of the mob, the precious wine of civilisation is freely spilled in the gutters.

But in spite of mob and demagogues, the Church is doing her heaven-appointed task, and will go on doing it through all the coming centuries till it be completed. She alone can hold the balance of social justice evenly between the classes and the masses. As both are often equally impatient and unjust, she has to bear the brunt of the attacks of both. She is the fender interposed to take the crush and strain, whilst the mighty bulk of modern Democracy is slowly warping out of dock. To drop metaphor, the Catholic Church alone of all existing religious bodies knows her own mind, and knows her Divine Master's law both explicit and implicit, and its due application from age to age. She alone has efficient sanctions wherewith to enforce that law in both the State and the family, and above all *she alone has the courage to put those sanctions in force*. This is what I meant by saying in a previous lecture that "*in the cultivation of*



*the religious sense amongst the masses, in the enforcement of the moral law by efficient moral sanctions, Catholic nations compare most favourably with Protestant."*

If there is more of religious strife in Catholic nations than in Protestant—not so easy a question to determine just at present, seeing the condition of the Church of England—it is because there is less of indifferentism—in other words, *religious dry rot*—amongst the former than amongst the latter. After all, it takes two to make a fight. If one party to a dispute is for ever yielding ground to the adversary, the issues of strife are never knit. If spiritual 'authority' be so dead in a given country and race that its accredited representatives openly declare *that they have no real authority to enforce obedience to their just commands*; if they simply take the diagonal of the *national* forces for the time being; if they blow hot or cold according to the changes of national taste; if they be nothing more than time-servers and spiritual weather-cocks, which veer from point to point, and box the compass with the current of popular prejudice;—then it is no wonder that there should be little or no friction between Church and State, whatever be the heresies and usurpations of the latter.

If the police were always taking the part of the most active members of the mob there could be no trouble about arrests, because there would be none at all! But we manage things very differently in the Catholic Church. Our bishops cannot dodge and duck with nimble alertness from one side to the other, so as always to avoid being unpleasantly jostled and squeezed in the crush of contending factions. They have to go to jail, and even get hanged or shot at times. They could never bring themselves to be now high, now low; easy here, rigid there; wavering from year to year on questions so vital to Christianity as Divorce and the Real Presence: with mitre and crozier for æsthetic Lincoln, and plain surplice and black bands for Orange Liverpool; becoming "all things to all men," but not in the spirit of Paul of Tarsus, rather in that of a dexterous and up-to-date politician.



It is when the fierce passions of man have been let loose in the great crises of political and social change, that the true Church of God is seen in all her real grandeur. She alone can and will stem the torrent. To the lust and rapacity of the rich, alike as to the corruption and lawlessness of the hungry masses, she opposes her calm unyielding assertion of Divine and human law. The "*Non Possumus*" of Pius and Leo in the 19th century is the faithful echo of the warnings and commands of Innocent III and Hildebrand in the Middle Ages, of the exhortations of the sainted Gregory and Leo at the dawn of European civilisation.

*It is because of her strength that the Church must suffer, not because of her weakness.* In that she is like unto her Divine Founder and Spouse, in that she sets herself to do His work faithfully in every age and every land, therefore she is "set for the fall and for the resurrection of many, and *for a sign that shall be contradicted*" amongst the nations. False systems, imperious monarchs, lawless peoples rise in revolt and dash against the Rock of Peter. They are broken and pass away, but the Church must bear for ever the scars of her unceasing conflict with the powers of darkness.

By her unchanging Faith, by her mighty system of ecclesiastical law, which gathers up the wisdom and experience of all her centuries of life, above all by her searching discipline of mind and heart in the confessional, she tames the pride of man, wears down his obstinate resistance to the commands of God; enforces the dictates of morality, harmonises the new order with the old, and thus fulfils her mission of being the cause and centre of European civilisation.

From the mass of testimony given by unfriendly witnesses to this feature of the Church's life and work, I turn to that of the most illustrious Anglican prelate of the day, the Bishop of Oxford. Dr. Stubbs is confessedly in the front rank of 19th century historians. His "*Constitutional History of England*" will be read and prized, when the works of his brother Bishops,



gifted as many of them are, shall have been forgotten. In his "*Early Plantagenets*," which forms one of the series of Modern History Epochs already referred to, he writes thus of the events which followed Henry II's repentance for the murder of St. Thomas à Becket. A new crime in another part of the king's dominions had drawn down from Rome a fresh interdict, just as he was being absolved from the greater one. Dr. Stubbs comments as follows on this apparent anomaly of justice :

"Now no doubt it appears strange that the Court of Rome should at this same moment be pouring out both sweet water and bitter ; that the supreme judge on earth should send forth a legation to put Henry's dominions under interdict for one act, and directly after send another to absolve him for what seems a more heinous one. It must, however, be remembered that in this the papal court was rather acting as a great tribunal of international arbitration than as the council of a Christian bishop. The Court of Rome was a great legal machine, the disadvantages of which are manifest at first sight, *but the benefit of which in a warlike age can scarcely be overrated*, although less obvious at a glance. A very severe judgment may perhaps be allowable as to the assumptions and arrogance and unrighteousness of Papacy in taking the office of international arbitration ; but judged by its results *it was for the time a great public benefit, for it stopped and hindered the constant appeals to war*. Thus viewed, the Court of Rome was as open for suitors as any simple court of justice. An applicant who wanted legal redress applied for a commission of enquiry or a legation. In so doing he brought the usual means to bear on the papal officials, who no doubt found it to their interest to keep their minds always open to hear both sides, and to keep their purses also open to receive the contributions of all sides in each suit, and thus maintain the wealth and power of the court itself. *It is not to be denied that, however arrived at, the decisions ultimately given were in most cases fair and just.*" (Extract from Dr. Stubbs' "*Early Plantaganet*," pp. 86-87.)

I do not think that I exaggerate when I characterise this passage as *epoch-making* in the judgment entertained of Rome



and Rome's doings by critical English historians. Here we have the most illustrious of them all, the man who after Lingard may be called the founder and father of the school of true critical history in England, solemnly declaring that Rome's decisions *in the gravest cases of international right and justice*—during the most important centuries of the formation of Christendom—*were in the mass fair and just*. He further tells us that we can scarcely overrate the advantages for civilisation in Europe, during the Middle Ages, resulting from the existence of that High Court in Rome for Kings and Nations.

I know of no countervailing testimony to this to dispute my assertion, that Papal Rome has always been the cause and centre of European Civilisation. We are distinctly grateful to Dr. Stubbs for his criticism of the 'arrogance' of Rome in taking it upon herself to assume the office of arbitrator and civiliser, and for his sneer at the expenses of the Papal Court. After all, he has to maintain his status as a Bishop of the Church of England. These carping words prove him to be the best of all witnesses for the defence,—an unfriendly one,—who is compelled by his honest convictions to tell the truth in favour of Rome. But the criticism it may be remarked is inaccurate, for Rome simply 'assumed' the power which the nations freely gave her for their own most evident and lasting good. If Queen Victoria had been asked to arbitrate between Spain and the U. States before the late war, and if her decision on the merits of the dispute had prevented the loss of thousands of lives and the wanton sacrifice of millions of money, would she have been accused of "assumption, arrogance and unrighteousness" for so doing?

And further, the Bishop's sneer at the expenses of the Papal Court is misleading. All High Courts of Justice must protect themselves from frivolous appeals by guarding the avenues of approach and enhancing the cost to reckless and foolish suitors. If the judges of Fort William were to lay themselves open to be pelted with every petty police-court case, their days would not be long in the land. But Rome has met the difficulty for poor claimants of justice in important issues by establishing two



different avenues of approach to her Court. There is the tribunal called '*Dataria*' for rich suitors, who can pay a very reasonable fee to meet the necessary expenses of the Curia; whilst for the poor there is the '*Poenitentiaria*,' which asks no fee at all. On the testimony of the petitioners' priest to the effect that his client is unable to pay the fee of the *Dataria*, the poor man's case is taken up and put through with equal care and diligence by the *Poenitentiaria*—for nothing.

In the clear light of this testimony given by the illustrious Anglican Bishop of Oxford to the enormous services rendered by the Popes to the cause of civilisation and peace in Europe, what becomes, I ask, of the rhapsodies of Protestant writers about the injustice and tyranny of the Popes? What in particular of the thoughtless inaccuracies of Dr. Welldon, cited at the beginning of this lecture, in which he seems to assume that Spain alone is the legitimate child of Rome?

The solid conclusion remains that Papal Rome has been at every great crisis of the modern world, not merely the Patron and Protector of Art and Literature—as few nowadays will venture to deny—but also the Saviour of Society, the centre of Civilisation, the founder and teacher to the nations of that unwritten code of Christian diplomacy and international law, which has prevented so many wars and saved so many millions of precious lives.

If the wish of Leo XIII,—who is nothing if not a wise and far seeing statesman,—could be realised, if the nations could be brought to accept the principle of arbitration instead of war in their disputes, it would simply be a return to the system founded and elaborated, as far as it lay in their power to do so, by the Popes of the Middle Ages.

In concluding this long and tedious discussion, I ask you to read and ponder on the following passages, one in prose and one in verse, which I draw from the greatest masters of the English tongue. They deal with the Papacy and the Church. They describe them better and more truly than any other writers



in any language I know of, have ever done. John Henry Newman, and John Dryden—'Glorious John' as he was fondly called by his admiring friends,—the one the greatest master of English prose in this or any other century, the other no less the greatest master of stately, reasoned verse that England has ever known,—these are my sources of true inspiration on the merits of the Papacy and the Church.

They both were born and reared in Protestantism. At about the same period of life, in middle age, in the plenitude of their powers and genius, they both turned back to the Church of their Catholic forefathers; they suffered for the change, but they were faithful until death,\* and they have left imperishable records of their loyalty to the Catholic Church, that shall be read as long as the English tongue and race endure.

If by these lectures I have established any claim on your gratitude, I would crave of you, parents and teachers, to explain fully to the young committed to your charge, and to bid them commit to memory, these passages of purest English prose and verse, as they would a favourite prayer. Those true and glowing words of our greatest English Catholic prose writer and poet will do far more than many a weary sermon and many a laboured treatise, to instil into young Catholic hearts the precious gift of loyalty and devotion to the Church.

*Extract from Cardinal Newman's*

"IDEA OF A UNIVERSITY."

After all Peter has spoken. Peter is no recluse, no abstracted student, no dreamer about the past, no doter upon the dead and gone, no projector of the visionary. Peter for eighteen hundred years has lived in the world; he has seen all fortunes,

---

\* The question of Dryden's change of religion has been ably discussed, and the conclusion that impartial examination has arrived at is that, however mistaken he may have been in his views, he was at least sincere and steadfast in his resolution. . . . The illiberality, not to say vulgarity, of Macanlay, in applying to him the term of 'illustrious renegade' and saying that "he knew little or cared little about religion," is sufficiently confuted by the sincerity and steadfastness with which he adhered to his new views. He educated his sons strictly in the Romish religion, and sent them to Rome to confirm them in it; and in two of his letters which are still in existence, 'he expresses the satisfaction he had, years after, in his faith.'—(From the Life of Dryden prefixed to the Aldine Edition of his works, p. LXVIII.)



he has encountered all adversaries, he has shaped himself for all emergencies. If there ever was a power on earth who had an eye for the times, who has confined himself to the practicable and has been happy in his anticipation, whose words have been deeds and whose commands prophecies, such is he in the history of ages who sits on from generation to generation in the Chair of the Apostles as the Vicar of Christ and Doctor of His Church.

It was said by an old philosopher, who declined to reply to an emperor's arguments, "It is not safe controverting with the master of twenty legions." What Augustus had in the material order, that, and much more, has Peter in the spiritual. Peter has spoken by Pius, and when was Peter ever unequal to the occasion? When has he not risen with the crisis? What dangers have ever daunted him? What sophistry foiled him? What uncertainties misled him? When did ever any power go to war with Peter, material or moral, civilized or savage, and got the better? When did the whole world ever band together against him solitary, and not find him too many for them?

These are not the words of rhetoric, but of history. All who take part with Peter are on the winning side. The Apostle says not in order to unsay, for he has inherited that word which is with power. From the first he has looked through the wide world, of which he has the burden, and according to the need of the day, and the inspirations of his Lord, he has set himself, now to one thing, now to another, but to all in season, and to nothing in vain. He came first upon an age of refinement and luxury like our own, and in spite of the persecutor fertile in the resources of his cruelty, he soon gathered, out of all classes of society, the slave, the soldier, the high-born lady, and the sophist, to form a people for his Master's honour. The savage hordes came down in torrents from the north, hideous even to look upon; and Peter went out with holy water and with benison, and by his very eye he sobered them and backed them in full career. They turned aside, and flooded the whole earth, *but only to be more surely civilized by him*, and to be made ten times



more his children even than the older populations they had overwhelmed. Lawless kings arose, sagacious as the Roman, passionate as the Hun, yet in him they found their match, and were shattered, and he lived on. The gates of earth were opened to the east and west, and men poured out to take possession; and he and his went with them, swept along by zeal and charity as far as they by enterprise, covetousness or ambition. Has he failed in his successes up to this hour? Did he, in our fathers' day, fail in his struggle with Joseph of Germany and his confederates, with Napoleon, a greater name, and his dependent kings, that, though in another kind of fight, he should fail in ours? "What grey hairs are on the head of Judah, whose youth is renewed like the eagle's, whose feet are like the feet of harts, and underneath the everlasting Arms?"

*Extract from Dryden's*

"THE HIND AND THE PANTHER."

A milk-white hind, *immortal and unchanged*,  
 Fed on the lawns, and in the forest ranged;  
 Without unspotted, innocent within,  
 She feared no danger for she knew no sin.  
 Yet had she oft been chased with horns and hounds,  
 And Scythian shafts; and many winged wounds  
 Aimed at her heart; was often forced to fly,  
 And doomed to death, though fated not to die.

THE END.

---



r-  
s-  
re  
d  
;  
y  
e  
s'  
r-  
t  
l  
e  
t



