The blame for the British defeat near Ladysmith last week has been manfully assumed by Sir George White, Commander of the Natal forces. To his official report of the battle he adds: “I formed a plan, in the carrying out of which the disaster occurred, and I am alone responsible for the plan. There is no blame whatever to the troops, as the position was untenable.” This prompt acknowledgment of blame has earned much forbearance for Sir George White at home and abroad, even the Paris “Gaulois” saying that, like a true Englishman, he sacrifices himself to avoid discrediting the Queen’s soldiers and to avoid compromising his flag’s honor. Nevertheless, by a blunder comparable to those of Balaklava and Majuba Hill, General White allowed two regiments to become separated from his main body. These ran into an ambuscade, and from the outset were hopelessly entrapped. They were historic regiments. One was the Royal Irish Fusiliers, a regiment which first saw Cape Town in 1806, and later captured the eagles of two French regiments in Spain. The other was the Gloucestershire Regiment, a favorite of the Duke of Marlborough. It fought at Ramillies, and in 1759 was at Quebec. Later it fought at Corunna under Sir John Moore, and then throughout the Sikh and Crimean Wars and the Indian Mutiny. Its last engagement before the Natal campaign was at Tel-el-Kebir, when Arabi Pasha was overthrown. The capitulation, even while facing overwhelming odds, of such regiments is a double blow to British pride. There has been inevitable discouragement throughout the Empire. The repulse seems to some like Burgoyne’s surrender. The Boer losses at Ladysmith are unknown. The British losses, as far as reported, are three hundred killed and wounded, and five hundred missing. This does not include the Irish Fusiliers, who are supposed to be prisoners at Pretoria. The losses gravely impair Great Britain’s offensive power in South Africa.

Events in Natal Fighting at Ladysmith has continued throughout the week, the British reconnoitering being greatly facilitated by the use of a small war balloon which is held by a wire strand three thousand feet in length. The mobility and the efficient serving of the Boer artillery has caused much surprise among the British, who, in general, have underrated the military qualities of the Boers. Telegraphic communication between Ladysmith and Durban is interrupted by the Boers, who have massed along the railway as far south as Colenso. Their advance has caused general alarm. The British evacuated Colenso, which is now in possession of General Joubert, and have retreated further south. At Durban the Legislative Building has been transformed into a hospital for the British and Boer wounded, who are treated alike. At Ladysmith, in response to a request from the Boers, General White lent them an ambulance to assist in conveying their wounded, while the Boers themselves collected water and blankets for the British wounded. Indeed, on both sides the treatment of the wounded and prisoners has been marked by notable kindness and consideration. At last accounts (by pigeon post) Ladysmith was bravely holding out, the naval guns from the British cruiser Powerful having arrived just before the complete investment. It is unfortunate for the reputation of the London War Office that its official reports have, as a rule, been so optimistic. The latest list of casualties at Dundee issued by the War Office gives an additional list of eighty-two non-com-
friendship instead of indifference verging on hostility.

It must not be thought, however, that Mr. Washington, in his defense of the South, ignores the race feeling, or would abandon or even leave to others the struggle for the political rights accorded to both races on the same terms by the last amendments to the Constitution. "I fear," he says, "that some of the white people of the South may be led to feel that the way to settle the race problem is to repress the aspirations of the negro by legislation of a kind that confers certain legal or political privileges upon an ignorant and poor white man, and withholds the same privileges from a black man in a similar condition." Such legislation, he points out, retards the elevation of the whites as much as it aids the degradation of the blacks, and he appeals to the pride of Southern whites with this telling sentence: "I do not believe that, with his centuries of advantage over the negro in the opportunity to acquire property and education as prerequisites for voting, the average white man in the South desires that any special law be passed to give him further advantage."

A Significant Silence

During the past few months Roman Catholics in this country and England have been trying to prove the injustice of identifying their Church with the condemnation of Dreyfus. Cardinal Vaughan says that the whole affair from beginning to end was a matter of state, of military interests, and of treason, in which the Church had no place. This is probably the conviction of most English-speaking Catholics. On the other hand, a contrary conviction as to their Church's part is held (not to mention the Radicals) by such French Liberal Catholics as M. Hébrard, editor of the Paris "Temps," MM. de Rodays and Cornely, of the "Figaro," and M. Jonnart, formerly Minister of Public Works. The last named claims that the Dreyfus affair has been utilized by the Church to make an onslaught upon liberal institutions and ideas, and to influence Frenchmen toward a clerico-military government.

A long time ago Madame Dreyfus wrote to the Pope begging his co-operation in the rehabilitation of an innocent man. To her letter there came no reply. Instead, "La Croix" (The Cross), a Roman Catholic penny paper, increased its circulation, so it is claimed, to three hundred thousand in Paris alone, and established adjunct papers similarly named in every French province and in every important town; for instance, the "Croix d'Auvergne," the "Croix de Bordeaux," etc. All of these papers have the same general appearance; in the left-hand corner of each appears a representation of the Crucifixion, and, underneath, the motto, "Adveniat Regnum Tuum" (Thy Kingdom Come). The influence of the "Croix" is not only towards ecclesiastical aggrandizement; it is especially towards that aggrandizement among soldiers. To this end there is a special department in the paper called "Le Courrier Militaire," in which well-written articles appear on military subjects, and in which answers are given to questions from soldiers with relation to their barracks life. Thus France possesses an outward and visible sign of a clerico-military alliance, in which it may be assumed that the party of the first part proposes one day to absorb the party of the second. That gained, the Republic itself might be overawed, and clerical legislation reinstated. This in turn might lead to a renewal, at least in part, of temporal power—that unworthy ideal which has done so much to prevent the great spiritual success of a mighty Church from becoming still greater.

These facts and suppositions, together with the gratuitous distribution of "La Croix" among the soldiers, have led to the suspicion that the heads of the Catholic Church, not only at Paris but also at Rome, were, to a certain extent, directing the various "Croix" published throughout France. This impression has been strengthened by the Pope's significant silence, and by his recent reception of the editor-in-chief of the paper. Before the Rennes decision, "La Croix" declared that "the Dreyfus case has hardly anything military about it. It is a religious case." After the judgment it said: "Justice has been done. Dreyfus has been condemned. As Frenchmen we rejoice over it. As Catholics we praise God for it."

While "La Croix" appeals to anti-Semitic
Frenchmen, the Jesuit “Civiltà Cattolica” in Italy has been used to appeal to anti-Semitic there, and everywhere. This paper coolly advises that it is better not to kill or expel Jews; instead, however, they ought not to be allowed to exercise political rights or any sort of public function.

It is not surprising, therefore, that, replying to Cardinal Vaughan, “Verax,” in the London “Times,” blames those in authority in the Roman Church because they have allowed the minds of the Catholic people in Europe to be poisoned by a Catholic press. This press has itself done what Cardinal Vaughan protests against—that is, it has sought to identify the Church with the act of injustice whereby Dreyfus was condemned. The “Times” now publishes a more important letter. It is from Mr. St. George Mivart, the well-known scientist. Coming from a devout Roman Catholic, its appeal seems to us peculiarly daring. It is a remarkable event when any Catholic presumes to criticise his spiritual leaders; above all, when he presumes to criticise the Supreme Pontiff. Yet, referring to the Dreyfus affair, Mr. Mivart dares to speak of “the Pope’s amazing and appalling silence,” and to add that “to keep silence may often be to participate in the evil left undenounced. . . . How eminently, how above all, must this apply to him who stands as the supreme ruler of the Christian conduct and the direct and immediate representative on earth of the God of truth, goodness, and justice!”

It is not alone the absence of a papal pronunciamento in favor of justice to the Jew which Mr. Mivart deplores; to this sin of omission the Pope has added a sin of commission—namely, the reception, “not only without any public censure, but with positive commendation, of the Redemptionist miscreant, Bailly of ‘La Croix.’” So scandalous a circumstance all Catholics must deeply deplore; and what a lost opportunity for doing incalculable good!

To the excuse made by Leo XIII.’s apologists that the silence was due to a fear of offending France, Mr. Mivart indignantly exclaims: “Offend France! God’s vicar to refrain from telling men what their duty is for fear of consequences!” As if God could not be trusted with the consequences of any acts done in fulfillment of his behests!”

After recalling how the Pope and his Cardinals once misled the world in Galileo’s case, Mr. Mivart declares that Dreyfus is the Galileo of the nineteenth century, and that in his case the papal authority “has now misled the world with respect to morals, with the probable result that other millions of Catholics will, one by one, abandon Catholicity.”

To those who believe that Dreyfus is the victim of injustice—and nearly the whole world evidently so thinks—the Pope’s silence does seem like a lost opportunity.

Knowing God

But how do you know that there is a personal God, and how do you know where he leads? You certainly cannot know except you are told by God himself, and must you not have authority for his having imparted the knowledge? Man of himself alone can do no more than imagine a Creator and speculate about his ways; he cannot comprehend them. —New York Sun.

How did Isaac know God? he had no visions. Or Joseph? did he know Him only by dreaming about Him? Or Moses, before he met Him face to face in Sinai? did he before that time only imagine a Creator? and if so, what made him fancy that it was God who spoke to him at the burning bush? Or Samuel? was his sole knowledge derived from the mysterious Voice which called him from his bed in the Tabernacle? Or David? what made him suppose that Jehovah was his Shepherd, and led him beside still waters and in green pastures? Or the author of the Hundred and Third Psalm? how came he to know that Jehovah forgave all his iniquities, healed all his diseases, redeemed his life from destruction, and crowned him with loving-kindness and tender mercies? Or Isaiah? how did he know that they who wait upon Jehovah shall renew their strength; shall mount up with wings as eagles; shall run and not be weary, and shall walk and not faint?

The Christian knows God, and knows that God instructs, guides, forgives, redeems, strengthens, inspires the soul that trusts in him, exactly as Isaac and Moses and Samuel and David and Isaiah knew him and his helpfulness, and in no other