

and thereby lose in moral character and pure living."

"Speaking of agnostics, your excellency, are not the recent archaeological discoveries affecting the foundations of religion?"

"Yes, perhaps so, with the uninformed and superficial. At first sight it away with the need of a great God and as though the new discoveries weakened the effect of Christianity. This, however, is only with the superficial, and I have no fear of the final result. Science only changes the date. It may, for instance, put a little further back, by secondary causes, the Great Creator, but no matter how far back it goes, the Creator must be confessed. Take the question of the beginning of life upon the planet. Darwin, Haeckel and others of that kind cannot answer it. They will evolve other beings from those who preceded them, but they fail to state where life began. There is only one answer, it must have come from the supernatural.

"As to these archaeological discoveries which have led to so much biblical criticism, not one has yet been made which upsets the Bible. They may lead us to read some parts of our Bible a little differently, so far as the history is concerned. But if we have read wrongly some historical part of the Scriptures this is no indication that the Bible is wrong, and especially that it is not a true guardian and teacher of faith and morals."

"Then the Catholic church upholds the Bible in its entirety, does it not?"

"The Catholic church has absolute confidence in Christ and the Bible, and it not only fearlessly challenges all discoveries, but it aids in them to the best of its ability, sure that one truth will never contradict another, that science will never contradict faith, that nature will never contradict revelation. We are not afraid of the sciences. Take the Catholic university at Washington, I don't think you will find any more advanced thinkers anywhere than we have there. Everything upon earth is discussed there. Science at best is limited in its information: it presupposes and points out the beyond which itself cannot attain and it is far from the beyond that faith comes. But, of course, faith does not come to us as a mere dream or as a sentiment. It comes with its credentials to our reason and bases itself as Christ based it upon His miracles, upon the moral elevation of His doctrines and upon the moral elevation of that much of the world which He chose to be His."

"Do you believe in missions, your excellency?" said I.

"Yes, I do," was the reply. "I am a Christian, and Christ told us to teach all nations. My church is Catholic, which means it is bound to embrace all nations. Hence we have missions all over the globe."

"But how about those whom the missionaries do not reach? Are they all damned?" I asked.

"No, I think not," replied the archbishop. "That never was and cannot be the doctrine of the church. The heathen is judged according to the light that is in him, as St. Paul declared in his Epistle to the Romans. But it is the duty of the church to bring more light to the heathen, as it is the duty of the heathen to accept the light."

"I hear it now and then charged, your excellency, that the Catholic church wants to swallow up the American government and control the state."

"That is not true," replied the archbishop. "The church has only the spiritual realm of faith and morals to deal with. The state has charge of temporal and political interests. The

two are in altogether different spheres. The church is supreme in one, the state is supreme in the other. The church is not a temporal sovereign and never was. The pope is not a temporal sovereign, and his temporal power over the world at large has never been claimed. During the middle ages, when all nations were Catholic, the pope by general consent was looked upon as general arbiter even in temporal matters, but he did not claim it as a divine or inherent right. He does not claim anything of the kind today and does not want to hold any such position in American affairs. I doubt whether there is a more liberal man in the world today than Leo XIII. I am sure there is none who understands better the American people and loves and blesses the liberty which we have here. He has a strong admiration for a republican form of government and a very deep interest in our future as a nation. The pope is thoroughly in touch with the times and with the age of today. He believes in democracy as allied to good government and is for everything that is good, true and beautiful in modern progress."

"Nevertheless, your excellency, there seem to be many who believe differently. You remember the sermon which one of the Washington preachers delivered before a congregation of which President McKinley was a member on Thanksgiving day?"

"Yes, I do," replied the archbishop. He said, I think, that the chief dangers for America were from rum, socialism and Jesuitism. That man was an ignorant and thoroughly ill-bred. He took advantage of a day of thanksgiving, when all the country was thinking of peace, to insult ten million American voters, and in his ill-bred way tried to take advantage of the presence of the President to commit him to such a blunder. I have no patience with such small-minded men. I should say that the three great evils for America are rum, socialism and bigotry, and in this I would not place bigotry at the bottom."

FRANK G. CARPENTER.

### HYPNOTISM AND SURGERY.

The doctors have been engineering again. It is not about anything new this time. Upon some subjects doctors disagree with more facility than upon others, and hypnotism is one of those subjects. At a recent meeting of the Academy of Medicine there was a lively discussion of the merits of hypnotism as a therapeutical agent. Some of the learned gentlemen believed in the hypnotic power, for the excellent reason that they themselves possess it. So they said. Some of the learned gentlemen did not believe in this power, and their reason, apparently, was because they do not possess it, or don't know it if they do. Every learned gentleman thought that his reason was just as good as anybody else.

There was also a learned lady present, and, of course, she had her own opinion about the matter. Also, of course, her opinion was different from that of the learned gentlemen. The lady was Dr. Mary Putnam Jacobi, and she said that in her opinion women could never succeed in hypnotizing a patient. She, too, had her reasons for thinking so. She had tried it and had failed.

When a reporter called upon Dr. Jacobi to ask her something about her hypnotic experiments she declined to say anything about the matter. She said that she did not consider it a suitable subject for discussion "in secular journals." She did not deny that she had attempted hypnotism in certain cases without success, but she deplored the fact that any mention of her

remarks had been made in the daily papers.

Dr. Robert A. Gunn, who is a firm believer in hypnotism, laughed at Dr. Jacobi's remark about feminine inability to exercise the mysterious influence. He said that Miss Chandos Leigh Hunt, daughter of Leigh Hunt, is one of the most successful hypnotists in England.

"Miss Hunt is not a physician," said Dr. Gunn, "but she has been repeatedly sent for by physicians, and has placed patients under the hypnotic influence while a surgical operation was performed. I do not know personally of any woman physician who has made a professional use of hypnotism. It is not, however, because they cannot, but because they have not given the matter serious study and effort."

"Do you, yourself, use the hypnotic influence in your practice?" asked the reporter.

"Yes," said Dr. Gunn. "Occasionally I do. But not as often as I used to. It is not because I have less confidence in it, but because I have been too busy to experiment with it. I do not think that the greatest success lies in the use of the hypnotic power by the physician or surgeon himself. For instance, in the case of a surgical operation, the better arrangement would be to have a regular hypnotist place the patient under control, just as we have a doctor simply to give the chloroform or ether. Then the operating surgeon has no strain upon his nerves, and can give his entire concentrated attention to the operation."

"Is the exercise of the hypnotic power exhausting to the operator?"

"Not exactly exhausting, but it does take something from him. For instance, on one occasion I invited a number of friends to my house for the purpose of showing them some experiments in hypnotism. I spent about three hours at the work, and after they had all gone I sat down at my desk, intending to prepare an article to be sent to the printer in the morning. The subject was one with which I was perfectly familiar, and ordinarily I could have prepared the paper in a very short time. On this occasion, however, I was incapable of constructing a single sentence. I had no particular sense of exhaustion: I simply felt like remaining perfectly quiet, and I finally gave up the attempt to write that night."

"Soon after that I wanted to devote an evening to hypnotic experiments, so concluded to do my writing in the afternoon and have it out of the way before evening. I wrote for over three hours and up to within a few minutes of the time set for the experiments. Although I had the same subjects as before, all of my experiments were unsatisfactory, and some of them were total failures. I had evidently exhausted my nervous energy by close application to mental work, and there had not been a sufficient interval for recuperation."

"Could you hypnotize a person in the same room with you without making an open attempt to do so?"

"Not unless I had hypnotized the same person a number of times before. It is always more difficult to hypnotize a person the first time than it is afterward. The more frequently it is done, the more susceptible the subject becomes."

"Have you ever hypnotized a person at a distance?"

"Yes, in one case. I had been treating a woman for insomnia. I had on repeated occasions put her to sleep through hypnotic influence. One evening I said to her: 'I am not coming tomorrow night, Mrs. —, but at 10 o'clock exactly I shall try to put you to sleep just as if I were here.' The next evening I went home so that at 10 o'clock I could settle myself to a concentrated effort to hypnotize my pa-