

So numerous are the young men who came that it has been decided by the Catholic authorities to open two houses, if possible: one in each of the university towns, Oxford and Cambridge, where young men, who think they have a vocation may try that vocation without altogether losing touch with the world of affairs in which they must make their way, if they find the precious gift has been withheld. This is a promising means of recruiting the depopulated clergy.

THE REAL MEANING OF BOLSHEVISM

S. A. Balbus, in America

After having read scores of special articles, some favorable and some unfavorable to European Bolshevism, and much of the foreign correspondence concerning the political situation in Russia and in other countries where soviet government is reported to have been established, I am moved to give my interpretation of some of the kaleidoscopic phenomena, as I view them, from a distance, it is true, and in perspective, but against the light of the great historic crisis of the past.

Aristotle tells us that there are three political constitutions: kingship, or monarchy, aristocracy, and timocracy, which latter "people commonly call constitutional government." Of these, says Aristotle, "the best is monarchy, and timocracy the worst." Timocracy, he explains, "recognizes the principle of wealth."

From timocracy the transition is to democracy. Bolshevism evidently is acting on the assumption that the world has never had democracy. Bolshevism, therefore, may be defined as an attempt to overthrow timocracy and to institute democracy. Shall the world be governed as in the past, shall it be made safe for timocracy? Or shall a new political order be established and so make the world safe for democracy?

In Europe, he it remembered, all three of the forms of government of which Aristotle speaks, together with their defection, were in existence at the beginning of the war: monarchy and its defection, despotism; aristocracy, and its defection, oligarchy; and timocracy. Before our entrance into the war there was little or no talk on the part of any of the European Powers about changing the existing forms of government. The destruction of monarchy was distinctly our slogan. We spoke out in no uncertain tones: our language was plain, direct and definite; our declaration is a matter of record. Surely there is none to deny that the United States can claim the distinction of having deposed the Emperors of Germany and of Austria-Hungary. We officially approved the overthrow of the Czar of Russia (see President Wilson's message of April 2, 1917). But Kerensky was shortly replaced by Messrs. Lenin and Trotsky. These two men, together with their associates, are at the present moment, and have been for more than a year, in absolute political control of Russia. The one outstanding and significant fact is that the people of Russia themselves seem to be in accord with the present Bolshevistic leaders, Messrs. Lenin and Trotsky, whatever the rest of the world may think of them or of the soviet government. If a substantial majority of the Russian people were not favorable to their present leaders the latter could not have maintained themselves in power; and above all, they could not have propagated their doctrines in other lands, for soviet governments are established in Munich, and in many other communities, we are told. It is well to keep these things in mind while reading this article.

What, then, is Bolshevism? "The world must be made safe for democracy," declared President Wilson. Bolshevism says in effect: "Very well; Mr. Wilson; we'll help you in your endeavor to make the world safe for democracy, but before democracy can flourish, timocracy—that is, the dominant rule of wealth—must be destroyed." Bolshevism, therefore, is democracy raised to the nth power, or reduced to its lowest terms; take your choice. Jefferson's definition of democracy is not so clearly applicable to soviet government as is Carlyle's—"an impossibility, 'self-government' of a multitude by the multitude."

On one point President Wilson and Messrs. Lenin and Trotsky are agreed, namely that thrones must be toppled over; royalty must become extinct. Now that Nicholas of Russia, William of Germany, Charles of Austria, and also Peter of Serbia, Nicholas of Montenegro, Ferdinand of Bulgaria, and Constantine of Greece have been deposed, to say nothing of the Sultan of Turkey, President Wilson may consider that the job is finished, that there is no more to do. But Messrs. Lenin, Trotsky and their disciples, followers and imitators, do not share this view. They seem to think that there is still a line of the royal family living, and protected by government itself. There can be no democracy, say they in effect, until every trace and vestige of all royalty is destroyed. Until the money kings, and steel kings, and coal kings, and meat kings, and sugar kings, and wheat kings, and bread kings, and oil kings, and others are exterminated the world will not be, and cannot be made safe for democracy. That, so far as I am able to see it, seems to be their line of thought and reasoning. And I am not quite sure but that they consider the destruction of the economic

kings more important and more necessary for democracy than the deposition of merely political kings and emperors.

The thing we call Bolshevism today is nothing new; the name alone is new. It is an old-time fire that has been smoldering for years, breaking out into flame once more. Messrs. Lenin, Trotsky and others are not preaching a new gospel; it is an old doctrine, at least several centuries old. It would not require a deep searching of economic and political history to discover its twin brother, or to unearth its prototype. There is not so very great a difference between the Jacobins, Girondists, and Sansculottes, of the French Revolution, and the Bolsheviks of soviet Russia. And if we consider the leaders, Robespierre, Danton and Marat may not be in the same picture, but they are in one gallery with Kerensky, Lenin, Trotsky. In fact a comparative study of the historic phenomena of the French Revolution of 1789 and the Revolution of 1919 reveals many points of similarity. But there is one marked difference. In the French Revolution it was the economic conditions that roused the masses to action, whereas political considerations inspired the leaders. But in the present revolution both the masses and their leaders seem agreed that it is an economic and political revolution combined. Unlike the American Revolution of 1776, which was wholly political, European Bolshevism has plainly a dual character, it is economic and political.

Let no one deceive himself. Bolshevism is a definite economic philosophy, with certain well-defined ideals—I am using the word ideals in its present-day loose sense. As a system of government it is necessarily an experiment—as much of an experiment as was the American Republic in 1776, or the French Republic, whose foundations were laid amid the crumbling ruins of the French Empire. So far Bolshevism, as a system of government, has not had time to prove itself either a success or to demonstrate itself a failure. As a matter of fact our own form of government is this very day on trial, and only in the next few months, or years, shall we be able to say positively whether it is a success or a failure.

Since, therefore, Bolshevism is dual in character, it behooves us to inquire into its constituent elements. Let us briefly consider first its economic aspect. Again I say it, Bolshevism is nothing new. Those familiar with politico-economic history will be quick to see in it the fruition of the seeds planted in the first half of the nineteenth century by Proudhon in France, O'Connor in England and Marx and Engels in Germany. That the writings of these men have been effective, the various attempts to unite the working men of all nations into one international organization would seem to prove. The first meeting of workingmen of all nations was held in London, September 28, 1864.

The thing we call Bolshevism today may be called the Marxian Socialist program, made possible by the discontent of the masses. It is a combination of Socialism and Chartism. The former is probably better understood by the average man, than the latter. And yet Chartism is so to speak, at the very root of Bolshevism. Carlyle defined Chartism as

"The bitter discontent grown fierce and mad, the wrong condition, there fore, or the wrong disposition, of the working classes. . . . It is a new name for a thing which has had many names, which will yet have many. The matter of Chartism is weighty, deep-rooted, far-extending; did not begin yesterday; will by no means end this day or tomorrow. What means this bitter discontent of the working classes? Whence comes it, whither goes it? Above all, at what price, on what terms, will it probably consent to depart from us and die into rest? These are questions. To say that it is mad, incendiary, nefarious, is no answer."

In the days of which Carlyle wrote Chartism was inchoate Bolshevism, that is, it was unorganized, sporadic and endemic; today it is organized, indigenous, ubiquitous and epidemic. No! these are not merely big-sounding, meaningless words dug out of the dictionary for the purpose of pedantic pyrotechnic display; they are used here because in no other terms, in no simpler words, can I give the diagnosis of this new disease from which the world has begun to suffer. In fact it is not so much a disease as it is a symptom, and it behooves us, if we are wise, to try to determine what is the root of this latest manifestation and what is the cure.

Personally I have no patience with the unwisdom of the all-too-apparent attempt that is being made on the part of certain nations, parties and interests, to delude the public into believing that the thing we call Bolshevism is something that is not. We do not rock babies to sleep when the house is on fire. Many centuries ago Nero fiddled while Rome burned. But this year 1919, is no time for the jazz-band distraction! Let us honestly try to understand the subject; to grapple with it fearlessly; to deal with it intelligently.

There are at least two men in the world who know what Bolshevism really is: they are Woodrow Wilson and Lloyd George; and the fact that they fully comprehend the significance of the phenomenon explains many things which otherwise would be inexplicable. Lloyd George fears only one master in Great Britain, organized labor. Why do you suppose President Wilson declared twice within recent months that "the peoples are in the saddle"? Read his message of recent date to Congress and you will find that it deals principally with suggestions for Federal labor legislation. I was not surprised when today (June 9) I read in one of the Chicago papers that portion of the Peace Treaty referring to

"Labor." I expected it, and it proved my theory of an endeavor on the part of governments not only to conciliate and placate, but to control organized labor. The one force of which all governments are standing in dread today is organized labor; they realize its tremendous power, and are cognizant of its overwhelming force. Mr. Lloyd George and President Wilson are not deluding themselves. With their glasses on they have deciphered the writing on the wall.

While the Peace delegates were sitting in Versailles, International Labor Socialists held a conference in Bern. The daily press gave practically no news concerning the Bern Conference, but certain special writers managed, somehow, to send over articles which were illuminating to the student of international questions. Of the two conferences the one at Bern was by far the more significant. From the Bern reports it is clear that the Peace Treaty is not in conformity with the views of the international labor group. Since the publication of the summary of the Treaty, labor bodies—whether you call them Syndicalists, Socialists, or by some other name matters little—have voiced their protest against the severe terms, none more emphatically than those of England and France.

Richard Washburn Child, in an article in *Collier's*, May 31, 1919, states that a few days after the House of Commons in England had signed a communication to Lloyd George practically demanding that Germany be billed "with the whole cost of the War," the labor union parade marched "to Hyde Park with banners demanding that the blockade of Germany should be lifted at once." And in Italy another procession "carrying furling their red flags, with whom marched an Italian agitator who said that if the Peace Conference took too much loot for the capitalists of the world there would be mobs taking control of Milan and Rome."

But most significant, and altogether more alarming, are the manifestations in other directions—labor strikes and demonstrations. The workmen's and soldiers' associations that are already formed will probably complete their programs only after the armies are demobilized. It is disturbing to contemplate that in several of the armies and navies of Europe there have been incidents of a character not entirely reassuring.

With regard to the political aspect of Bolshevism it is my opinion that as a system of government Bolshevism is self-destructive and will not endure, either in Russia or in any other land where it seems to have gained a foothold politically. But while I think soviet government will not endure, political Bolshevism will; and unless present signs are altogether misleading, it will gather strength and a greater momentum, during the years, or months, of peace to come. Out of the thing we call Bolshevism today, will grow a new attitude of the people toward govern-



Clean to handle. Sold by all Druggists, Grocers and General Stores

ments. Bolshevism will not be the government itself, but it will rule the governments of the earth. The people, organized and powerful, will dictate, if not policies of government, then the decisions of statesmen-ministers and rulers.

"The peoples of the world are awake," said President Wilson in a recent speech, "and the peoples of the world are in the saddle. Private counsels of statesmen cannot now, and cannot hereafter, determine the destinies of nations." Of the many sayings of our President, this is by far his wisest and most profound utterance. It stamps him as a prophet of vision and a statesman of keenest insight. I can only hope that the opinions of the people and of the statesmen will always coincide in all important matters, that there will be no clash between them in any critical hour. I prefer to exempt for the present the United States from Mr. Wilson's category of "peoples," but frankly, as regards the European peoples, I scent disaster. The tremendous power their ministers and rulers have exercised in the past will be circumscribed henceforth by the more tremendous power of the people themselves. Hereafter when one government declares war against another nation the consent of the people will be necessary, and that consent, if I am reading the situation aright, is as likely to be withheld as given. Bolshevism will lift up its head! Bolshevism probably under a new name—whether Internationalism, Brotherhood of Man, or "the One Big Union," I will not pretend to say—will raise up its hand and cry out "stop!" "Why," its members will ask, "why shall we kill our brothers in Russia, or Italy or France? Why shall we reduce ourselves and families to beggary and starvation? Why condemn to misery and wretchedness the wives and children of our brother-workmen living in another State? And why profits by war? Not we! Who pays the full bill? Why do we, in life, in blood and in treasure. It is for us to say whether we will fight this war or not!"

And when governments talk of blockades to be laid against this nation and that, or of economic boycotts, both of which mean hunger and suffering for millions of women and

children of workingmen, the nations using the blockade or launching the boycott will be called to terms, not by the peoples to be blockaded and boycotted but by the people of the blockading nation.

All I have written here is in comment only on the first act of the revolutionary drama that is being played in Europe today, and on which the curtain is about to descend. There are several other acts, equally as interesting, yet to be played. What will the final climax be? Politically speaking the world is in travail. Will it bring forth a ridiculous mouse or a dragon?—Who knows?

THE BIBLE IN SPAIN

AN ENGLISH CRUSADE WHICH PROVED A FLAT FAILURE

(By "M. C. L." in Edinburgh Catholic Herald)

An Edinburgh correspondent inquires as to the truthfulness of Borrow's "Bible in Spain," which a non-Catholic acquaintance lent him.

Borrow hawked "Bibles" in the land of Ximenes; the expected conversion from Popery of that country did not follow, has not followed yet. "Culture's chill disdain did keep the vulgar Reformation out of Spain," and one of the Reformation's offspring, the sale or distribution of spurious Bibles to all and sundry for their private interpretation, was not more warmly welcomed. A Protestant writer, Captain Widdington, states that Borrow's expedition "was not only a complete and entire failure, but of such a nature as entirely to defeat any future attempt of the same kind."

Hardly any Spaniard to whom I mentioned the subject had ever heard either of the expedition or the individual. On the other hand, the reprint of the Valencia Bible which was taking place at the time of his visit, "supposed a large demand, as it is rather an expensive work." (Quoted in Marshall's "Christian Missions," Vol. I.) In his essay upon Spain, Cardinal Wiseman wrote: "When a man tells untruths he should at least make them probable. But the Gospel distributor in Spain is above such prejudice, and he never seems to trouble himself about giving with probability the pills which he compounds for his morbid admirers. The Evangelical swallow he knows is wide enough for anything anti-popish, and he gives it as marvellous a supply as Morison ever did his patients."

There are three long interviews with different people in Mr. Borrow's work, which we have the best authority, coming directly from the parties named, to declare untrue from beginning to end—mere fictions. From those remarks my correspondent can draw his own conclusions as to the accuracy of the classic mentioned. Marshall assures us that if Borrow's "Bibles" failed to attract attention in Spain, where every child is familiar with the sacred mysteries of revelation, his waves produced a certain effect in London. Our fruit dealers were surprised to find that they received for several weeks together with their

customary Spanish imports, a continual supply of mutilated Gospels and fragments of the Epistles of St. Paul. Perhaps that throws some light on the alleged eagerness of "eight poor harvest men to buy a donkey-load of Mr. Borrow's Bibles," which found their way back to England almost as soon as he did himself. To suppose that the reading of the Bible is forbidden in Spain is a clear proof of crass ignorance. Protestant, that is to say false versions of the Bible are forbidden, and justly so; why should the Church of God, the guardian of His Written Word, countenance the word of man being circulated as the Word of God? Why should she permit her children to accept a sham when the reality is at hand?

It is worth noting that the first book which ever came from the press was the Bible, and it was printed by Catholics in Germany, and Caxton, a Catholic in England, first printed the Bible in English. In the fourth century Pope Damasus commanded a new translation of the Scriptures to be circulated throughout Christendom in the then living language of the civilized world: even the infidel Gibbon praises that great sixth-century Pope, to whom the Free Church Assembly, Edinburgh, May 1894, virtually passed a vote of thanks for having sent the Bible to Britain before Protestantism was heard of. Whence it is clear that neither Spain nor any country needed to await the arrival of Mr. Borrow before the Bible could be known to it. In the wonderful Cathedrals of Spain sculpture and painting set forth the Bible story, both clearly evidencing the familiarity of the artists with the great facts of revelation, which in this manner were put before those who could not read. My correspondent's book-lending friend appears to have talked some nonsense about "all churches being liable to err." Now, there is a church which was established by Christ to preserve and teach the truths of salvation, a Church to which He promised the perpetual presence of the Spirit of Truth, to teach all things necessary to salvation; therefore that Church cannot err in essential doctrine. The institutions which our friend calls "churches" were not founded by Christ; they may (and do) teach error, and say so unblushingly; therefore, judged by the words and promise of Christ, they stand self-condemned. The Holy Ghost not being with them, all the Protestant sects are divided amongst themselves, contradict each other, and even in the same "church" two of its official divines may (and do) differ on the Resurrection, the Divinity of Our Lord, and other fundamental doctrines. But in the Catholic Church it is one faith, one Lord, one baptism, the world over; she teaches the same things everywhere. God must always be right, not man; God's Church cannot err, though it is granted at once that man-made "churches" can and do.

OAKOAL

OVER THE TOP!

The success of OAKOAL is now assured.

The result of the past four months' campaign in our stock sales has made the new plant a certainty.

When we opened this campaign we had 14 Shareholders; at the moment of writing this copy we have 247.

Bank managers, wholesale men, manufacturers, scientific men, doctors, university professors, ministers, a peer of Scotland, majors, captains, lieutenants, railway men, heads of detective agencies, directors of other companies, merchants, farmers, mechanics, housewives, and last but not least, many returned heroes who were advised to investigate thoroughly as many did—so to be perfectly satisfied that OAKOAL and its possibilities were all we claimed for it, are among the purchasers of our stock.

The new OAKOAL is a fuel that is without a competitor, excepting Anthracite. Anthracite supply is limited and will become more limited as our population increases.

OAKOAL has been investigated by high Government officials. The result of those investigations is on view in our display windows and in our literature.

The new OAKOAL is the most efficient fuel offered the public. Clinkerless and sootless, it is a perfectly clean and sanitary product.

Many interests, and ignorant persons, have sought to impede OAKOAL success, but these "knocks" and "knockers" have been "boosts" and "boosters"—for in the majority of such cases interested persons came to see for themselves—and seeing were convinced of the merits and the high endorsements of the process and product.

Demonstrations were recently given of the new product before some of the city fathers, representative medical men, and other leading citizens—and to the astonishment of all.

It was intended to give burning demonstrations in our new salesrooms, but the owners of the building objected to stove fires being operated. The proof of the burning and heating value, however, is on exhibition, and names of those who have witnessed recent burning tests are available as are those of scores who used and endorsed the inferior product last winter.

In a few short months OAKOAL will be turned out of our new automatic plant at the rate of 200 tons per day, and at the rate of only 50c. per ton profit—this will pay approximately 30 per cent. dividend on investments. This output will be increased to 400—thence to 600—on to 800—1,000—and eventually to 1,200 tons daily in Toronto alone.

Plants will also be erected in other cities in Ontario—hence shareholders will receive immense dividends when the capacity of Ontario cities is utilized. Such a stock will be worth many times the present par value. Such an investment opportunity seldom offers the public—as most projects are floated by syndicates—with watered stocks—and the little fellow—if he does get a chance—becomes "frozen out."

Not more than \$1,000 worth of stock can be purchased by any person in this company—thus no combination of interests will freeze the shareholders out, unless the shareholder yields to pressure and tempting prices for his stock.

We advise all shareholders to hold OAKOAL stock against all offers, because of the great demand for an efficient substitute, and because of the extraordinary possibilities before it.

The wise investor buys while the buying is good. OAKOAL buying is best right now. Call for proof or write at once.

Ontario Oakoal Co., Ltd. 36-38 King St., Toronto

ONTARIO OAKOAL CO., LIMITED

36-38 King St. W., Toronto, Ont.

Send me full particulars of Oakoal.

Name.....

Address.....

Province.....