

The Catholic Record

Price of subscription—\$1.50 per annum.
United States & Europe—\$2.00.
Publisher and Proprietor, Thomas Coffey, L.L.D.
Editors (Rev. James T. Foley, B.A.
Thomas Coffey, L.L.D.
Manager—Robert M. Burns.

Advertisements for teachers, situations wanted, etc., 50 cents each insertion. Remittance to accompany the order. Where Catholic Record Box address is required send 10 cents to cover expense of postage upon replies.
Obituary and marriage notices cannot be inserted except in the usual condensed form. Each insertion 50 cents.

Approved and recommended by Archbishops Fulton and Sheil, late Apostolic Delegates to Canada, the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, and St. Boniface, the Bishops of London, Hamilton, Peterborough and Oshawa, N. Y., and the clergy throughout the Dominion.
In St. John, N. B., single copies may be purchased from Mrs. M. A. McGuire, 249 Main Street, and John J. Dwyer.
In Sydney, N. S., single copies may be purchased at Murphy's Bookstore.
In Montreal single copies may be purchased from J. Milloy, 241 St. Catherine St., West.
The following agents are authorized to receive subscriptions and canvass for the Catholic Record:
General agents: M. J. Hagarty, Vincent S. Co., and Miss Jessie Doyle; resident agents: Mrs. W. E. Smith, Halifax; Miss B. Saunders, Sydney; E. R. Costello, 2258 8th Ave., West, Vancouver, B. C.; Miss Johnson, 210 Rochester St., Ottawa; Mrs. Geo. E. Smith, 238 St. Urbain St., Montreal; M. J. Mervin, Montreal; B. F. O'Toole, Leduc; Miss Anne Hogan, 307 Lansdowne Street, Winnipeg, Man.

LONDON, SATURDAY, FEB. 21, 1920

LENTEN REGULATIONS FOR 1920

FOLLOWING ARE THE LENTEN REGULATIONS FOR THE DIOCESE OF LONDON

All days in Lent, Sundays excepted, are fast days. The law of fasting ordains that only one full meal a day be taken, but does not forbid a small amount of food in the morning and in the evening, according to the approved custom of one's locality. The full meal may be taken in the evening and the collation at noon.

Flesh meat is allowed at the principal meal on Mondays, Tuesdays, Thursdays and Saturdays, except the Saturday of Ember Week and the forenoon of Holy Saturday. The law of abstinence forbids the eating of flesh meat and of broth made of meat, but does not exclude use of eggs, milk and products of milk (namely—cheese and butter); and any seasonings of food, even those made from the fat of animals.

The prohibition to use fish and flesh at the same meal during Lent has been abolished.

The Lenten Fast and Abstinence cease at twelve o'clock noon on Holy Saturday.

Persons under 21 years of age or those who have reached their sixtieth year are not bound by the law of fasting, and all persons in ill health or engaged in hard labor or who have any other legitimate excuse, may be dispensed from both the law of fast and of abstinence.

The precept of abstinence obliges all who have completed their seventh year, even those who have passed the age of sixty.

A person dispensed from abstinence is not thereby dispensed from fasting, and vice versa, if he is allowed several meals a day, this does not mean that he need not keep the abstinence. In this, as in other cases, a dispensation obtained under false pretences is invalid.

In order, however, to safeguard conscience, the faithful should have the judgment of their pastor or confessor in all cases where they seek dispensation or feel exempted from the law of fast or abstinence. Whatever may be the obligation in the matter of fast and abstinence, Lent is for everybody a season of mortification and of penance.

From this law no one can escape, and in it no one has the right of dispensation.

Pastors are earnestly requested to preach during the holy season of Lent the necessity of penance and the obligation of Christian mortification. They will also provide special means whereby their people may advance in devotion and piety.

As in the past, two appropriate week day services will be held in each church, and the necessary permission for Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament on these occasions is hereby accorded.

A special effort should also be made to have the sacred practice of family prayer in common, and especially the recitation of the Rosary, a duty of honor and religion during this penitential time.

MICHAEL FRANCIS FALLON,
Bishop of London.

AN ILL-DEFINED INTERNATIONAL DOCTRINE

Deeply rooted in the hearts of all Americans and firmly established as a permanent, vital and inalienable part of the foreign policy of the United States, the Monroe Doctrine is nevertheless somewhat obscure and elastic, and "has undergone different applications depending upon the divers political tendencies prevailing at particular times in the United States." So the Foreign Minister of San Salvador has forwarded to the State Department at Washington a very reasonable request for "the authentic interpretation of the Monroe Doctrine as it is understood in the present historical movement and in its future application by the Government of the United States."

This request is now made public by the American Department of State and is published elsewhere in this issue of the RECORD. It is stated that other Latin American countries

are keenly interested in the answer, and are deferring decision as to joining the League of Nations until they know just what they are agreeing to if they do join—an attitude which the Senate of the United States should be the first to admit is but reasonably prudent.

Things taken quite as a matter of course as absolutely granted, unquestioned and unquestionable, are precisely those which come to be held loosely and without any really intelligent apprehension. To anyone who thinks or observes a little bit today, instances are unnecessary. Who does not remember "Freedom of Speech," "Freedom of Thought," "Freedom of Conscience," "Freedom of the Press," as the very foundation principles of modern progress and civilization? And who today may assert the practical application of any one of these principles and escape the withering and self-proving charge of—Bolshevism! The "Free Press" leading the charge!

Like other things taken for granted the Monroe Doctrine is hazy and indefinite in the minds of many who hold it as a fundamental principle of American foreign policy. The part it has already played and that which it is likely yet to play in international politics makes it opportune to examine its origin, meaning and scope—so far as its scope and meaning can be determined.

The first published draft of the Treaty of Peace embodying the League of Nations made no mention of the Monroe Doctrine. The consequent outcry compelled President Wilson to insist on its recognition, which, after strenuous effort it may be assumed, was accorded in these words:

"Nothing in this covenant shall be deemed to affect the validity of international engagements such as treaties of arbitration or regional understandings like the Monroe Doctrine, for securing the maintenance of peace."

The "brevity and lack of clearness" of this article, contends San Salvador in behalf of all Latin America, have caused "warm discussions throughout the whole American continent." Nowhere it will be admitted was the discussion warmer than in the United States. And the outcome is that it is conceded with practical unanimity that ratification of the Treaty must carry a reservation, not defining clearly its scope, but excluding peremptorily the Monroe Doctrine—whatever it may be or may become—from the competence of the League of Nations.

It seems the most natural and reasonable thing in the world that other American nations—including Canada, which now claims that rank—should demand a clear and explicit definition of the scope and limits of the Monroe Doctrine before what has hitherto been nothing more than a declaration of American policy becomes by international recognition a fundamental principle of international law.

The origin of the Monroe Doctrine may be traced to Washington's admonition that the United States should avoid entangling itself in the politics of Europe. This advice of the Father of his Country was accepted as an axiom of the settled foreign policy of the United States. The corollary or counterpart of this, that European powers should not interfere in the political affairs of America, grew more definite as the importance and influence of the United States increased. The reaction to the French Revolution and Napoleonic wars brought the European Governments so intimately together for a time that it seemed quite within the range of probability that concerted action might be taken to restore to Spain her American colonies which had declared their independence. This was feared also by England, so that Canning strongly urged James Monroe, fifth President of the United States, to make this famous declaration which has since been known as the Monroe Doctrine:

"In the wars of the European powers in matters relating to themselves we have never taken any part, nor does it comport with our policy to do so. It is only when our rights are invaded or seriously menaced that we resent injuries or make preparations for our defence. With the movements in this hemisphere we are of necessity more immediately connected, and by causes which must be obvious to all enlightened and impartial observers. The political system of the allied powers is essentially different in this respect from that of America. . . . We owe it, therefore, to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers, to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety. With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power we have not interfered and shall not interfere. But with the governments who have declared their independence and maintained it, and whose independence we have on great consideration and on just principles acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them or controlling in any other manner their destiny by any European power in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition towards the United States. . . . It is impossible that the allied powers should extend their political system to any portion of either continent without endangering our peace and happiness; nor can anyone believe that our Southern brethren, if left to themselves, would adopt it of their own accord. It is equally impossible, therefore, that we should behold such interposition in any form with indifference."

Earlier in the same message, while discussing negotiations for the settlement of the respective claims of Russia, Great Britain, and the United States, Monroe also said:

"In the discussion to which this interest has given rise and the arrangements by which they may terminate, the occasion has been judged proper for asserting as a principle in which the rights and interests of the United States are involved, that the American Continent, by the free and independent condition which they have assumed and maintain, are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European powers."

Since the time of the promulgation of this doctrine in 1823 it has frequently been enforced. Its spirit permeated the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty in 1850. It was enforced against Maximilian in Mexico as soon as the termination of the Civil War permitted free action on the part of the United States. In 1870, urging the U. S. Senate to annex San Domingo, President Grant thus specifically extended its scope:

"The Doctrine promulgated by President Monroe has been adhered to by all political parties, and I now deem it proper to assert the equally important principle that hereafter no territory on this continent shall be regarded as subject to transfer to a European Power."

In 1895, in the boundary dispute between British Guiana and Venezuela, President Cleveland proposed a commission to settle the dispute and threatened war if not accepted. Those who remember the incident will recall the scornful references to "shirt-sleeve diplomacy," but the dispute was settled by arbitration.

Theodore S. Woolsey, L.L.D., Professor of International Law at Yale University and author of "International Law" and "America's Foreign Policy," may be accepted as an expert on the Monroe Doctrine.

He writes: "Between 1823 and 1895 the development and enlargement of this policy on the part of the United States was very striking. To prevent the overthrow of an independent republic was one thing; to interfere in the settlement of a boundary dispute between two States, also on the ground of self defence, is quite another. Yet Cleveland's doctrine met with general acceptance."

Again:

"Never having been formulated as law or in exact language, the Monroe Doctrine has meant different things to different persons at different times. . . . It tends to change into the principle that every portion of the American continent must be free from European control."

Elsewhere he says:

"It has never formed a part of the body of International Law, being unilateral."

The Salvadorean Foreign Minister very properly quotes Secretary of State Root (1905-1908) to emphasize the indefiniteness of the famous doctrine or policy, and to reinforce his request for a definition of its limits. Secretary Root referred to the Monroe Doctrine "as a declaration based on the right of the people of the United States to protect itself as a nation, and which could not be transformed into a declaration, joint or common, to all the nations of America, or even to a limited number of them."

Considered as a mere declaration of policy the United States was justified in reserving to itself its interpretation, and the definition, according to the needs of the moment, of its scope and application. But now that the Peace Treaty gives the Monroe Doctrine some sort of international recognition it is easy to understand the anxiety of Latin American countries to have its meaning, scope and application reduced to definite terms.

It is not so easy to understand Canada's apathy in the premises; for

if we accept Professor Woolsey's conclusion as to its tendency Canada's status is vitally concerned.

It is reported that the American State Department, in answer to San Salvador, has refused further definition. Such refusal can mean nothing else than that the United States reserves to itself the right to extend and develop the logical content of the Monroe Doctrine as future events and circumstances may, in the private judgment of good Americans, seem to require.

THE GENTLE MR. COOTE, M. P.

"The British Government is making rebels in Ireland by its pampering and glove-hand policy."

"They should never have been allowed to meet in Dublin and declare their Irish Republic. They should have been shot down like dogs in the street."—Canadian Press despatch, Feb. 12th, reporting meeting in Massey Hall.

The despatch immediately added: "This sentiment was received with cheers."

In another column we give the court record of Mr. Coote's brutal intolerance at home in Ulster, a record which shows him incapable of appreciating or practicing the amenities of civilized life.

It was the same Mr. Coote who urgently advocated that the Irish policemen should be supplied with bombs and taught how to use them. His request was granted.

When running amuck in Thurles the other day the policeman used those bombs.

When the Ulster delegation came to America they were greeted with full page advertisements in the daily papers, headed:

"Men of Ulster You are Welcome."
"Americans believe in fair play and always desire to hear both sides of every question."

The advertisements were inserted by Protestant and Catholic Friends of Irish Freedom, and went on to state:

"The Ulster Protestant has qualities of mind and heart that are not surpassed by any other people. For adherence to principle as the principle is understood by them—for devotion to duty as they recognize their duty—they are the peers of any race. We produce the strangled form of Robert Emmet to testify that the Irish Protestant knows how to die for a principle. Great Britain sent him to the scaffold for daring to assert the principles in Ireland that Washington fought to establish in America. Wolfe Tone—Irish Protestant—was sent to his death for striving to bring freedom to his native land; his memory lives in Ireland, as an inspiration to men who dare be free. Lord Edward Fitzgerald—Irish Protestant—shot to death by a British soldier for asserting the American principle that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. For a century and a quarter the Irish Protestant showed his Catholic brother the road to freedom. Call the roll if you will: Answer Grattan; answer Davis; answer Smith O'Brien; answer Mitchell; answer Parnell. Tell these, your mistaken Ulster brethren, that there is no more fitting place for men."

The advertisement concluded with this "Practical Suggestion":

"The issues involved may be made clear to America, we respectfully urge that both sides of the Irish question be submitted from the same platform. Our committee will agree to any arrangement which suits your convenience, and will delegate one or more speakers to meet the same number of our Ulster friends at any time and before any forum of American opinion."

Everywhere they went the Ulster delegates were met with the same challenge.

Nowhere was the challenge accepted.

They confined themselves to the churches. Describing a meeting in the Moravian Church at Port Richmond, the Socialist New York Call says: "Religious intolerance stood out like a sore thumb."

Further it stated that the delegation "offered to answer questions, but withdrew the offer in confusion when men and women got up and really asked some questions."

One of the ministers, Mr. Crooks, said if Ireland becomes free he will leave it. "That's what George Washington told the Tories to do in 1776" promptly retorted some one in the audience.

In Philadelphia, the avoidance of fair and decent public discussion was carried still further. Here are some extracts from the report of the Philadelphia Public Ledger:

"The Rev. Dr. George F. Pentecost, pastor of Bethany Presbyterian Church, delivered a sharp protest against the 'secrecy' surrounding a meeting of the representatives of the Protestant churches of Ireland with

300 clergymen of this city yesterday afternoon in Witherspoon Hall. . . .

"I hope every minister will cast his eyes around, and if he spots a reporter let us know it," Doctor Lynch urged the clergymen. At that moment Doctor Lynch "spotted" a reporter himself.

"I see one sitting over there; please take notice," he announced, whereupon the reporter left the hall. "It was this incident, apparently, that displeased Doctor Pentecost. The veteran pastor of Bethany Church arose and protested against the secrecy with which the meeting was surrounded."

"Why this secrecy?" Doctor Pentecost asked. "If these gentlemen from the churches of Ireland have come to this country to tell the truth about conditions over there, why should it be kept from the newspapers? Why not take the public into our confidence?"

"Doctor Pentecost's query caused a stir and there were murmurs throughout the hall."

"May I answer that question," said Doctor Lynch, as Bishop Berry seemed about to answer it himself.

"The bishop permitted Doctor Lynch to answer."

"The women and laymen, and reporters have been excluded from this conference because the committee in charge decided it was the proper thing to do," Doctor Lynch announced.

The meeting was conducted in secret.

One thing the Ulster delegation has accomplished. They have cut the ground from under the feet of those who vehemently protested against Irish Nationalists obtruding themselves into American politics. The Washington Post states the case very clearly and succinctly:

"American opinion does count. . . . And it is proper to hear both parties, especially as both have apparently made up their minds to establish the public opinion of the United States as a sort of supreme court, whose decision, as a determining factor, each invokes in its own favor. The omission of any Catholic representative from the visiting delegation is to be regretted, because of its liable to arouse suspicion and cause prejudice."

Lord Beaverbrook's brilliant scheme to arouse the Methodists of America has absolutely petered out. Methodist-Episcopal clergymen were amongst the most outspoken in denouncing the impudent plan.

The savage cheers of Toronto Orangemen which greeted the murderous sentiment of Coote when he said that Irish Members of Parliament should be shot down like dogs in the street will be about the only consolation that the "Delegation" can take back to the Ulster lams in peril of their lives from the wolves of Sinn Féin.

A NEW PHASE OF AN OLD ERROR

BY THE OBSERVER

When the nations of Europe which broke away from the Church took for the main purpose of their existence the making of money, their influence and example were strong enough to affect those nations which still remained in the Church.

England was as dominant in war, and as successful when she was Catholic as after she became Protestant; but she was less intent on money-making. After the Reformation, as the rebellion of the 16th century is called, business and commerce became the main purpose of national existence and the main test of a nation's greatness was taken to be her commercial and industrial success.

Since the 17th century it has always been the main stock argument of Protestants that the Protestant nations were more prosperous in dollars and cents than the Catholic nations.

This ideal, set before the eyes of successive generations of people, as the only ideal worth striving for, could have but one effect; it unduly emphasized in the minds of the peoples of those countries the greatness of money; the importance of being well-off. At the same time the new social organization of the Protestant countries put the profits of this search after wealth into the hands of a small minority of the population. Social aristocracy was never a Catholic ideal. The Church was always, as she is now, the friend of the poor.

But the landed aristocracy of England became the leaders and the bulwark of Protestantism and the champions of the new philosophy of life which defined wealth. The foundation of private wealth in England—that is, of the huge private fortunes which furnished the capital for the industrial expansion that came with machinery; that foundation was laid in the robbery of the Catholic Church; whose great holdings of land and other property, which she

held in trust for the poor, were violently taken from her.

In the Church and the lands and funds she held in trust for the people at large, the private aristocrats of England had always seen a formidable obstacle to their plans for dominating the whole country. When the Church was broken down in England and in Scotland, those landed aristocrats had no longer a rival to fear or a check on their greed. All her lands and property; the slow and laborious acquisitions of nine hundred years; they took from her in four years; and thenceforward the workingmen of England were at their mercy.

Let it be well understood that the social situation, out of which the present class struggle has come, was wholly and absolutely of Protestant manufacture; and was only made possible by destroying the Catholic Church.

Then came the invention of machinery; and a new impulse to industrial expansion. Who furnished the capital? Those who alone had capital. Those who had robbed the Church and built their fortunes on her ruin. They had the money of the country; and they had a social and political influence that had always been checked and challenged by the Church when she had the power; but which was now checked and challenged by no one.

This situation went on for a long time; and then shaded off into another. A powerful middle class, half way between the aristocrats and the workingmen, came into existence; traders and manufacturers of non-aristocratic birth, who made wealth and acquired property; and shopkeepers and shipowners whose influence began to rival that of the old aristocratic order.

After this new class had sprung up, their existence seemed only to emphasize the two extremes between which they stood; their power did little for the workingman; for the reason that their ambitions, social and political, turned their eyes towards the aristocratic class and not towards the working class.

The worst oppression of the poor ever seen in England came, not from the hereditary aristocrats, but from the new-rich; and from workingmen of yesterday who were ambitious to be aristocrats to-morrow. The most intolerant members of the House of Lords have usually been men whose fathers were workingmen; and who were made peers for political services or cash payments.

For the last two hundred years the slums of the largest English cities, particularly of London, have been a disgrace to humanity, a scandal to the world, and an offence to Heaven. And those slums were made possible by the 16th century abandonment of Catholic social principles; and by the wholesale robbery from the Church of the possessions she held upon the sacred trust to prevent just such horrible conditions and which she used as a balance of social and economic power for the benefit of the whole nation.

Casual observers may suppose that now at last the wrongs are about to be righted; and that justice is at last about to prevail. Let us not forget that no wrong was ever yet righted by adding other wrongs to it; no number of wrongs can make a right.

What is the main impulse of the hour, socially and economically, in England? And let us not forget that from England have come the impulse, the social agitation, and the ideas, which have set labor in Canada seething, and in the United States as well.

Is it a sober, sensible, considered, calm return to sound Catholic principles? To go to the root of the matter is the golden calf to be pulled down, or is it merely to receive the worship of millions where it had only thousands to worship it before?

Is the false principle of the 16th century; the principle of materialism; the worship of money and property; now to be abandoned; and a new system of social economy built up on true principles?

Look and see. Listen and hear. The passion for money has seized on the nation as a whole; where formerly it swayed only thousands, it now sways millions. Money is the dream and the heart's delight of the masses today; and their leaders are telling them that that is the supreme philosophy.

To have all the money one wants, and not to work; or to work as little as possible. Here is the new phase of an old error; new at least to the majority of its new followers.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

"WILDCAT ecclesiastical campaigning" is the term a minister of prominence (Dr. Gordon, of the Old South Church, Boston) applies to the "Interdenominational Forward Movement" in the United States. He also characterizes it as "the boldest and most ruthless piece of autocracy [he] has ever known." The objective there ranges from \$40,000,000, to \$140,000,000 for each denomination. "I confess," says Dr. Gordon "that I am appalled by the magnitude of this scheme, by the secrecy in which it has been devised, by the utter disregard shown for the judgment of the ministers and laymen on whom the burden would fall, if the plan should be put into operation, by the peril to organized religion among us, if the church is looked upon mainly as the subject of enormous irresponsible taxation, and not supremely as a place of moral influence and spiritual power. All the money in the world by itself can not save a single soul."

THE KINDRED movement in Canada to which the daily papers are giving their space so liberally may or may not be amenable to Dr. Gordon's strictures, but having regard to the difference in population the objective is of scarcely less magnitude. What, it is being asked significantly by many, is to be done with all this money if forthcoming? Despite the protests of the schemes' promoters, that the financial feature is in this instance but the corollary of the spiritual and moral, the whole affair bears all the earmarks of those financial debauches with which this generation has become too familiar. Religion is no longer to look to the inward man, but, resting upon the arm of flesh, is to overcome the world by the almighty dollar. It is simply part and parcel of the great scheme devised, as the Boston man avers, by an elect few, whereby every moral and religious need of the inhabitants of this planet shall be investigated and tabulated after the manner of a mercantile agency. To the really spiritual man the contrast of the bearing of the first Christians towards the mighty Roman Empire will not fail to suggest itself.

AND WHILE Protestantism in the United States and Canada is translating its enthusiasm into dollars, with the avowed object of "winning the world for Christ," leaders of opinion in Japan are debating the "subserviency of Christianity to materialism," as illustrated by the bearing of Protestant missionaries in that far-off Kingdom. Says the Tokio Herald of Asia, which politically is regarded as a semi-official organ:

"For the first twenty or thirty years of its propaganda Christianity was highly respected. . . . When Japanese officialdom began to smile on the new religion in order to win the attention of Christendom to treaty revision, the Church too easily fell to the bait, and great attempts were made to cater to the higher classes, the church leaders fawning on officials and even backing them up in their mistakes and weaknesses. As soon as the Church began to flirt with officialdom it lost the respect of the masses. The principles of Christianity sounded like cant on the lips of men and teachers who showed a disposition to compromise their convictions; and in such easy-going lives there was a smack of insincerity. From this time the new religion began to suit its attitude to the whims of the higher classes. The missionaries built themselves fine houses and lived materially better than some of our high government officials. They did not speak the truth in regard to our sins and blunders as in the old days. The Japanese admire men with the courage of their convictions, and in religion above all things."

By "THE Church" is here meant the conglomeration of sects which without sense or reason arrogate to themselves that august title. The whole arraignment notoriously refers to Protestant missions. The Catholic Church in Japan, as in other heathen lands, has by the bearing of her missionaries won the respect of the native population. Diplomatic representatives, travellers of name, and native authorities have alike testified to this, and the result is seen in the success which has attended Catholic missionary effort as compared with that of all others professing the Christian name.

PROTESTANT MISSIONARIES, on the other hand, notwithstanding their enormous financial resources, make but little impression upon native populations for the simple reason that they not only remain as a people apart, but by their divisions, their lack of definiteness in creed, and