

Echoes From the Late Unpleasantness

THE ACTIVITY OF SCHARF

Editorial in the Catholic Sun, Syracuse, New York:

There are some things that can not be discussed with propriety before a general election. The proprietors of this journal, the general manager of this journal and the present editorial writer all sincerely believe that a Catholic paper should never engage in partisan politics. Every man, woman and child familiar with the course of this weekly knows absolutely that it has never done so under the present management, and a knowledge of this fact certainly must have influence in leading its readers to believe that it never will. Owing solely to the fact that party politicians have a way of seizing every little straw and turning it to the advantage of some candidate or party we have kept silent several weeks about a matter which certainly deserves the attention of the Catholic press, now that the election is over, and its protest can not be mistaken for partisanism.

This matter is the pernicious activity of E. L. Scharf, who calls himself the manager of an alleged Catholic news agency at Washington. Our readers are familiar with the name of this man for this journal has used some of his matter from time to time. It would have used more of it were it not for the fact that Scharf saw proper to make his syndicate a sort of official mouthpiece of the republican party—an instrument for booming that party, if we may speak plainly. That settled him with us. Because we wished to hold this Catholic weekly to its main purpose and eschew politics we cut Scharf's communications out, tossing them into the waste basket. We have reason to believe that many other Catholic weeklies in the country did in like manner.

Nothing daunted, however, Scharf became singularly active during the recent campaign. He sent circulars over the country in the interest of the republican party, wilfully and maliciously misrepresenting Bryan in these communications. We charge this firmly, being cognizant that he had already been made aware, nearly a year ago, that his statements were baseless. He was aware of this from indisputable evidence kindly laid before him by James K. McGuire of Syracuse. His charge in a "private and confidential" letter sent to Catholic editors, was that when Mr. Bryan was in congress he was opposed to the Catholic Indian contract schools, and voted for an amendment "to inquire into and investigate the propriety of discontinuing" them. It was shown to him very plainly that known friends of the Catholic church voted for that very amendment and afterward did investigate the said schools and defend them. It is simple matter of history that the schools were destroyed by the votes of republican senators. Scharf was made very cognizant of this, yet during the recent campaign, pretending to act for the Catholic church, he circularized priests and bishops of the church, reciting that vote of the democratic candidate, although he positively knew that it was one in which such staunch friends of the church as the late Senator Vest and D. B. Hill and numerous others had concurred.

Now what we object to is this: Such political blatherskites as Scharf are doing the church a gross wrong when they attempt to draw her into partisan politics one way or another, and they should be made aware of the fact irrespective of how their feelings may be hurt. Scharf is not representing the bishops and archbishops of this country; he is covertly seeking to gain power and cash for Scharf, drawing the same from the party in office. He represents nobody except Scharf and is never likely to do so. His whole record proves this. Some years ago he began tinkering with the United States senate, claiming to represent the Catholic church. His blundering got the church criticised and then and there he was disavowed by Cardinal Gibbons. His circulars bore for awhile (as maybe they do yet) the statement that he was "late of the Catholic university." The university disavowed him, showing that he was never a member of its faculty, despite his Ph.D. In the late campaign he evidently set himself to selling the church to the republican party. The church in this country is not in the possession of Scharf. Moreover, his claim that his syndicate service is taken by more than

100 Catholic newspapers is a fraud. When he first began it was moderately popular. It certainly is not now. Scharf's own absurd and uncalled-for political activity has killed his golden-egged goose.

But if this were all even it might be tolerated, and Heaven knows it is bad enough to put the church before the American people with Scharf as its secret business agent. There is a menace in allowing such fellows to pose as custodians of the church's policy and representatives of her interests. It is this: The socialist journals of this country have been claiming for weeks that the Catholic hierarchy of America some time ago traded off the American Catholic vote to Mr. Taft in order to compensate him for his good work done in the Philippines. The infernal activity of this man who, on numerous occasions, has pretended to represent the church, actually makes capital for the socialists. Henceforth the Appeal to Reason will be citing Scharf's activity in proof that its statements were true. They are not true, but Scharf's claims will make them appear so. For this reason above all others it is time for the Catholic press and the bishops of the church to put Scharf where he belongs. The church is not in politics. Scharf is, and he means to make it pay. Such men deserve severe condemnation and, for one, we hope Scharf will receive it. Let us hear no more of him for a couple of decades.

AS A REPUBLICAN PAPER SEES IT

The following editorial is taken from the Boston Herald, a republican paper:

(From the Boston Herald, November 4.)

Another thing is clear, even at this hour. The attempt to force sectarian issues into a presidential campaign has been literally overwhelmed. Mr. Taft was bitterly attacked for his Unitarianism, and attacked by organizations within the Protestant body. The folly of this procedure was unspeakable, and it is significant that the adherents of a Christian church which is the antithesis of the one to which Mr. Taft belongs are among the most hearty supporters of the republican victor. For any one can see that Mr. Taft's handling of the church question in the Philippines has won for him a great body of Roman Catholic support. How futile then for those overzealous persons, chiefly of the middle west, to have railed against him as an un-Christian man! We take the unusual vote of Boston to mean that the Catholics here were warm in his support. Three hundred more votes would have given him the city, notwithstanding the fact that Mr. Vahey obtained here a plurality of between eleven and twelve thousand! The unusual vote of the city of New York must have a similar meaning, and other great centres of population indicate similar cause and effect. If the facts are as we suspect them to be, they must find general recognition.

"THE BANKERS VICTORY"

Following is an extract from an editorial in the American Banker:

"We can feel, therefore, that the bankers have won a victory in this campaign. The millions whom Mr. Bryan desired to save evidently do not see any need for salvation in that particular direction. They have demonstrated very forcibly their disapproval of that most dangerous thing, making of our banking problems political issues. We may feel that for some time to come, this question will not arise again in the very shallow and dangerous form which has beset us recently.

"There are other things which appeal very strongly after the counting of the votes. The laboring men voted, not as a body, but individually. It was not in the power of Mr. Gompers to swing the working classes according to his will or his prejudices, and he probably realizes now how much real force and power he has lost through his unwise stand. The majority of the working men very evidently did not care to profit by an injustice and the injunction question was ignored pointedly. It would not be at all a bad idea for the labor agitators and the outspoken friends of the work-

ing man to find out from the great mass of our sensible, sound and straightforward workers, what benefits they really require before they start to passing laws and demanding legislation for them."

MR. BRYAN AT THE UNION SCHOOL BANQUET

(Address of the Hon. William Jennings Bryan, at the Union school banquet of the Nebraska State Teachers' Association, city auditorium, Lincoln, Wednesday, November 4, 1908. Over 1,000 teachers participated in the banquet and about 1,500 teachers were in the galleries for the after dinner speeches. Mr. Bryan was given a signal ovation by every person in the auditorium rising and giving him the chautauqua salute.)

Mr. Toastmaster, Ladies and Gentlemen: I am glad to participate in this meeting even though my stay with you must be brief. I appreciate the invitation that brings me here and the companionship which I have here with the officers of your association, with Chancellor Andrews of our state university, with Governor Sheldon, and with other invited guests. Professor McBrien says that he is introducing me to the most magnificent audience I have ever addressed anywhere in the world. In introducing in those words he has precluded me from entering into a joint debate with him. I will not dispute, even after election, that this is a splendid audience. In fact, I am very proud of Nebraska's system of education and of the Nebraska teachers. I really feel more at home among teachers than you might suppose. While I have had no actual experience as a school teacher, I have from my youth had in anticipation a closer association with educational work than I have yet been able to enjoy. It is still a part of my life plan to come into more intimate contact with students and thus have a larger share in the direction of student life.

I appreciate the work of the teacher, for the teacher shares with the parent the responsibility of developing character and planting the ideals which control life. More and more does the value of the ideal grow upon me. Give a man bread and he will hunger again, give him clothes and his clothes will wear out, but give him an ideal and that ideal will be with him through every waking hour, lifting him to a higher plane in life and giving him a broader conception of his relation to his fellows. To get the child to take a firm hold of a well-rounded conception of life is the greatest work of those who deal with the young. So many lives are aimless, purposeless and without plan. A preacher once presented this thought in a sermon built upon the text, "What then?" Taking a child in school he asked the question. The child answers by describing the plans which he has for school; and what then? The college follows; and what then? The preparation for some particular work; and what then? The development of that work until it has been tried out and its results garnered in; and what then? The latter years when one enjoys the fruits of his toil and waits for the lengthening shadows; and what then? Thus did the minister pursue his questioning until he had completed the outline of a life and the preparation for eternity. And one can not follow this course of reasoning without concluding that no ideal is high enough for a noble life that is not high enough to be seen from both sides of the river that separates time from eternity.

It will be a part of your work to cultivate individual ideals, and the thought that you must constantly impress upon the child is that he must measure life, not by what he gets out of the world but by what he puts into it. I received a letter some time ago from a little boy in a western state. He said that he expected to be president some day and that his brother was going to be a justice of the supreme court. I try to answer children's letters, even when I have not time to answer the letters of grown people. For the older people know that I am busy and might excuse me for not answering, while the children would never think of that. I told this little boy that I hoped he might realize his ambition and that his brother might, also, but that before either of them was old enough to hold any high office they would both learn that it was more important that they should do something for others than that others