

with a dial graduated in thousands of yards, and an officer will read off these distance indications just as he notes the points of the compass.' The advantage which this affords to a battleship which is provided with the apparatus is obvious. The oscillator makes it possible for a ship's officer to hear the propeller movements of an enemy's submarine while it is miles away. 'With our existing apparatus,' says Professor Fessenden, 'we can detect such propeller sounds at a distance of two miles, and we have a sound-amplifying device that will extend this distance to five miles or more.' He holds that the British cruisers which have been sunk by German submarines could unquestionably have escaped if they had carried these listening oscillators. He thus describes the course they would have followed. 'As soon as they heard the propeller noises of the attacking submarines, which would have been some time before the German torpedoes were launched, they would have changed their courses and gone ahead at full speed. That would have baffled the enemy, for submarines are slow-going craft and only dangerous when their presence is not suspected. It is even possible that the British cruisers, knowing by dial indications the approximate distance and also the direction of the submerged German vessels, could have destroyed them by launching torpedoes of their own.' The testimony of the Submarine Signal Co. is, perhaps, not altogether unbiassed, but they are quite convinced that the German raid on the east coast of England in December could never have taken place if British Dreadnoughts and super-Dreadnoughts had been equipped with listening oscillators. The oscillator, it may be added, has passed beyond the region of mere theory and academic discussion. 'We have already,' said Professor Fessenden, 'put oscillators on several American battleships, on the Wyoming, the Delaware, the Utah, the Florida, and on four of the U.S. submarines, the D1 and D2, the K1 and K2; and we are now installing them on battleships of a great foreign power.' Under all the circumstances, it may be hoped, and anticipated, that the 'great foreign power' is Britain and not Germany.

### The Pope and the War

The information conveyed in last week's cables to the effect that the Pope would studiously maintain the Vatican's attitude of strict neutrality, leaving Italian Catholics free to follow their own sentiments, is only what was to be expected. The Holy Father has millions of his spiritual children engaged in the struggle, and to a very large extent they are ranged on opposite sides. The Pope is a spiritual sovereign, ruling in the spiritual realm, and receiving the spiritual allegiance of Catholics of all nationalities—of Austrian and German Catholics as well as of Polish, English, French, and Italian Catholics. As a spiritual monarch, he owes duties to all his subjects, under whatever flag their instincts of duty and patriotism may compel them to be fighting; and he can freely and effectively discharge these duties only by maintaining an attitude of absolute and visible neutrality. Had Italy entered the arena, as she easily might—on the side of her partners in the Triple Alliance, and not on the side of the Allies, none of us, we should suppose, would have been so absurd as to expect that the Pope would also have declared himself against the Allies. The position having been reversed, it is not making too heavy a demand upon our intelligence to expect that we should see just as clearly that it is still his duty to refrain from taking the role of a partisan. From the first, the Papacy has made it clear that its attitude would be one of strict neutrality. When the Catholic Emperor of Austria thrice besought the late Holy Father Pius X. to bless his troops, his Holiness definitely and firmly refused. 'I bless peace,' was his plain and simple and, we may add, characteristic answer. From that position the Papacy has not swerved, and, we may be sure, will not swerve till the end.

Public opinion in all the belligerent countries is naturally in an inflamed and highly sensitive condition; and it is easy for excited partisans to misunderstand, and easy, also, to misrepresent, the Pope's position.

An instance of what may be presumed to have been innocent but certainly somewhat muddle-headed misunderstanding was furnished by the French Government some time ago. At the end of the year the Pope ordered public prayers for peace to be said in Catholic churches. The leaflet on which the prayer was printed was at first confiscated by the French authorities, who had got it into their heads that the prayer was part of an anti-national 'stop-the-war' agitation. The Archbishop of Paris explained in a pastoral that 'The peace which the Holy Father invites us to implore from God is the sweet and lasting peace which, according to the words of the Holy Book, is the work of justice—the peace which supposes the triumph and the reign of right'; and the order for confiscation was at once withdrawn. Here the misunderstanding was due merely to hot-headed over-sensitiveness. In some instances the misunderstanding or misrepresentation is due to partisan self-interest. This was notably the case in the so-called interview with the Holy Father published in April by one Karl von Wiegand, a pro-German American journalist, and cabled throughout the world. In this alleged interview the Pope was represented as having said to this German-American journalist:—'If your country avoids everything that might prolong this struggle of nations against nations, in which the blood of hundreds of thousands is being shed, and misery untold is being inflicted, then can America by its greatness and its influence contribute much towards the rapid ending of this terrible war.' The first sentence was capable of being interpreted—and was interpreted both in England and America—as a suggestion that the American Government should at once prohibit the exportation of arms and munitions to the Allies. The Holy Father had said and meant nothing of the kind. There had been no 'interview,' only a private audience granted as a courteous acknowledgment of the numerous introductions with which Mr. Karl von Wiegand was armed; and as that gentleman did not understand a word of what was spoken by the Pope, he had to depend throughout on the services of an interpreter for his comprehension of what was said. Partly as the result of this disability, and partly carried away by his own personal bias, he contrived to convey an entirely misleading impression as to what had passed; and when the Holy Father became aware of the words that were being attributed to him, he at once officially disclaimed and repudiated them.

In some other cases, the attempt to misrepresent the Pope's attitude is due to pure malevolence and bigotry. Fortunately these cases have been few, and entirely insignificant. Of such a kind is the article entitled 'The Vatican and the War,' contributed some time ago to the *Fortnightly Review* by Mr. Robert Dell. Mr. Dell is a noisy and assertive individual, but his name is not one that carries any weight in the world either of thought or of letters. He was, if we remember rightly, a convert from Protestantism to Catholicism, and has now abandoned Catholicism; and like most of those who have lost the faith, he writes bitterly and viciously against the religion he once fervently professed. Mr. Dell's article has been completely and deservedly ignored in the only quarters that count, but it has been taken up by some of the smaller fry of religious journalism; and one of these, the *Banner of the Covenant*, introduces Mr. Dell to its confiding readers as 'an authority on Vatican affairs.' He is about as much an authority as Michael McCarthy, or Maria Monk, or the late Pastor Chiniquy. Mr. Dell, in his *Fortnightly* article, contends that as Austria is a great Catholic Power it is to the interest of the Vatican that Germany should win, and that the sympathies of the Pope are as a matter of fact in that direction. Not an atom of proof is offered—not a single act or utterance of the Pope—and the world is impudently asked to accept Mr. Robert Dell's unsupported assertion on the subject. The entrance of Italy into the arena has completely upset Mr. Dell's argument; and even the most strenuous and stupid bigot can hardly suppose that the Pope wishes to see Rome and the Vatican share the fate