

sist of wholesale plunder, robbery and massacre of prisoners and guides, extortion, looting and desecration of churches, wilful and senseless damage and destruction of ecclesiastical property, cold-blooded murder of unoffending persons (even children not being spared), and the systematic and callous infliction of torture, including whipping to death, roasting alive, and the application of the deadly agonies of the 'water-cure.' Officers, to their everlasting shame, have been the ring-leaders in those deeds of blood and plunder. Here is a sample extract from General Miles's report: 'At Colbayog, Samar, it was reported that several men in that district had been subjected to water torture. I saw three men who had been subjected to this treatment. One was the presidente of the town, Mr. Rozales, who showed me long deep scars on his arms, which he said were caused by the cords with which he was bound cutting into his flesh. The second man was named Jose Borje, and the third was Padre Jose Diaznes, who stated that he was one of the three priests who had been subjected to torture by the troops under Lieutenant Gaujot, Tenth Cavalry; that his front teeth had been knocked out, which was apparent; that he was otherwise maltreated and robbed of 300 dollars. It was stated that these priests were taken out to be killed and were only saved by the prompt action of Major Carrington (First Infantry), who sent out for them. Lieutenant Gaujot was tried, and was given the trivial sentence of three months' suspension from command, forfeiting 50 dollars per month for the same period. His pleading guilty prevented all the facts and circumstances being developed.'

We have had Geneva Conventions and codified International Laws of War since the sackings and massacres of Badajos, San Sebastian, Tripolitza, and Belgrade. But the Lord of Misrule is even still the lord of war. Scratch a Russian and you'll find a Tartar, and the demon in a man or a battalion or a regiment often works out in war-time—as it did in the Chinese crisis and in the Philippines—through the thin veneer of manners and observances that frequently pass muster for 'civilisation.' We have grave doubts that war, as conducted by Christian and civilised countries, can be called either Christian or civilised.

Nonsense About Joan of Arc.

Of the making of idle and foolish fables about the Catholic Church there is no end. The Rome and Paris offices of two prominent London dailies are steam-factories of anti-Papal fiction. Some day, perhaps, the curious investigator of sectarian eccentricities will open a museum of anti-Catholic shiflops; and in a glass case therein he will probably expose to the contempt of mankind the flaring specimen of literary venom and folly about the canonisation of Joan of Arc, which was published—apparently as a perfectly bona-fide piece of valuable information—in a recent issue of one of our large New Zealand dailies. The substance of the absurd tale is this: (1) The idea of canonising the holy and heroic maid of Orleans (who, in the fifteenth century, rescued France from its English conquerors) was 'first started during the closing years of the reign of Napoleon III,' and 'had he remained on the throne and continued to keep his troops in the Eternal City for the protection of the Papacy,' the warrior-girl would 'ere this' be in the calendar of the saints. (2) Pius IX. set the machinery of investigation for her canonisation going, but, being piqued by France's abandonment of the Papal States in the day of their need, he lost all interest in her cause, and left it to moth and rust upon the shelf. (3) When Leo XIII. came to the throne (in 1878) he 'at once' re-opened the case and set it humming along, in order to placate the French. (4) As a preliminary to business, however, he inquired of the late Queen Victoria 'whether she had any objections to offer to the canonisation of the Maid of Orleans.' (5) This inquiry was prompted by the desire of the Vatican 'to establish friendly relations' with England and not 'to do anything that might be construed at the Court of St. James's as unfriendly,' for—as the reader knows—the Maid of Orleans was put to death by the English. (6) Queen Victoria replied in the negative. (7) Thereupon, 'Joan of Arc was proclaimed "blessed," which is (9) the first step towards canonisation.' (10) But, alack! the Congregation of Rites 'about three months ago' 'an-

nounced their resolution' to deny canonisation to the heroic Maid who delivered France because (11) they 'discovered' that she was neither a heroine nor a maid!

A blind man firing a shot-gun at random round about a city will, some time or other, hit a mark—will wing a sparrow or lame a thrush or pick a neighbor's eye out. But the fibster who spun the 'painful yarn' summarised above failed to hit the target even once. His eleven statements are eleven falsehoods. Now mark how plain a tale shall put him down. (1) The idea of the canonisation of Joan of Arc was not 'first started' in the reign of Napoleon III. It was 'first started' just after her execution by fire in 1431. Pictures of the Maid were found in the churches of France very soon after her murder, and in some of them (as at Montargis) her head is encircled by a halo, a symbol which was adopted only in the case of a saint. Moreover, the idea of her formal canonisation was broached from time to time long before the third Napoleon was heard of. (2) As to the possibilities of Napoleon's influence in placing the aureole on 'the shapely head of Joan of Arc': neither he nor any other ruler had any more power in that direction than the most ragged guttersnipe in a London slum. The whole question is determined quite apart from political 'pull' or local and personal bias, and solely by the result of long, tedious, minute judicial processes or inquiries—over twenty all told, and of an extraordinarily stringent nature—into the miracles and the heroic character of the virtues of the servant of God whom it is sought to honor in our public liturgy.

Again: (3) The cause (or pontifical process) of the canonisation of Joan of Arc was not set on foot by, or during the reign of, Pius IX. (4) The present Pope did not re-open the cause. It was introduced for the first time during his pontificate, in 1894. (5) The story about the Pope, or anybody for him, inquiring of the late Queen Victoria 'whether she had any objections to offer to the canonisation of the Maid of Orleans,' is a fiction of the whole cloth. (6) It is, therefore, untrue that the alleged inquiry was dictated by a desire not 'to do anything that might be construed at the Court of St. James's as unfriendly.' Such considerations never enter into the question of canonisation. No such inquiries, for instance, were made in the case of the beatification, in 1886, of fifty-four post-Reformation Catholic martyrs who were 'put to death by the English' at a much more recent period of British history. (7) Queen Victoria did not reply, either in the negative or in the affirmative, to the question referred to above, since it was never put to her. (8) Joan of Arc has not been 'proclaimed "blessed"' by the Pope. Her cause is still under investigation by the Congregation of Rites. (9) Beatification (or proclaiming a person blessed) is not 'the first step towards canonisation.' The Church recognises three degrees of sanctity in this connection—(a) that of Venerable, (b) that of Blessed, and (c) that of Saint. (a) There are no fewer than six separate stages or processes of investigation (by bishops, Roman officials, etc.) into the virtues and miracles of the person whose beatification is sought, previous to what is called 'the introduction of the apostolic process'—that is, before the Holy See takes the case into its own hands and commissions the Congregation of Rites, by 'remissorial letters,' to try it. And this is not done until after a strict, minute, and most hostile investigation into every point of evidence adduced, both in support of and in opposition to the proposal, a Roman official (known as the 'promotor fidei,' or in popular language, 'the devil's advocate') has reported in favor of the 'beatificandus' (or person whom it is sought to beatify or declare 'blessed'). The case for beatification is then said to be 'introduced.' And then, and not till then, the 'beatificandus' is called 'venerable.' This is only the seventh of the fourteen difficult stages of beatification. And note this well, worshipful good masters: Ten years must elapse between the third stage of the inquiry (sending the acts or minutes of the first two inquiries to the Secretary of the Congregation of Rites) and 'the introduction of the apostolic process.' Many never get beyond this stage. A recent report from Rome states that the cause of Joan of Arc's beatification is making 'gratifying progress.' But it has still a long, slow road to travel.

Hancock's "BISMARCK" LAGER BEER.

NEW ZEALAND'S
NEW INDUSTRY