

The Catholic Record

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum. United States and Europe—\$2.50.

Advertisements for teachers, situations wanted, etc., 50 cents each insertion.

Approved and recommended by Archbishops of Canada, the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, and St. Boniface.

The following agents are authorized to receive subscriptions and orders for The Catholic Record.

LONDON, SATURDAY, SEPT. 11, 1920

may be a great difference physically, but in morals it counts for nothing of importance.

By way of conclusion the writer says: "The evil consequences which result from hunger-strike, I find to be the maximum from every point of view."

Writing in the same journal, the Rev. P. Cleary comes forward as the champion of the hunger-striker. The arguments of his cleverly expressed presentation of the case may be briefly summarized as follows:

"Hunger-strike is abstention from food which will result in death or danger of death by starvation. That is one, an evil aspect of the act or omission. Can the act have another, a good aspect? Let us see. Prisoners who have been unjustly condemned are entitled to protest against their own condemnation—they are entitled to maintain that they are innocent of crime and that they should not be treated as criminals."

Let us first review the mental attitude of the strikers themselves. A prison-chaplain whose duties have brought him into communication with hundreds of strikers, writes of them as follows: "Though I could never see any reason to doubt that the hunger-strike was suicide, I am bound to say that I had but a very limited success in inducing the strikers to adopt my views."

"Although all the strikers and their supporters were convinced of the complete moral innocence of starving themselves to death—some even showed indignation that there should be any doubt on the point, and treated such doubt as an evidence of mental perversion—still they were not at all agreed concerning the proper defense to adopt or even concerning the nature of the strike itself."

Canon Waters, writing in the Irish Ecclesiastical Record, considers the action of hunger-striker as suicide by the unjustifiable omission of taking food. In a learned article he reviews the teaching of the Church on suicide, pointing out that it is always a mortal sin in itself and hence cannot be sustained as a means of furthering a political program.

The Canon points out that one may commit suicide not only by an act but by an omission. It is all a question of intention. The difference of positive act and omission

incurring this responsibility? In a letter still preserved in the Archives of Vercelli, the Saint tells what happened. The jailers showed their homicidal mind, for it was only after some days, when divers people were crying out against them, that they allowed one friend to enter. It was only on the sixth day, when the Saint's strength was falling, that they allowed him to come in again with food, and thus St. Eusebius came off victorious.

That the day may soon dawn when hunger-strikes will no longer be necessary is a consummation devoutly to be wished. Still, whilst England persists in spiriting away Ireland's sons and allowing them to languish in prison on the merest suspicion, there is no doubt but that Irishmen will avail themselves of the efficient political weapon of hunger-striking, in their effort to shame the Government into granting Ireland her freedom.

THE QUESTION OF REUNION

The appeal which the Lambeth Conference issued to all Christian people to reunite in one great body shows that the English-speaking world is passing through a new phase of religious sentiment. Protestants are at last beginning to see the absurdity of a multitude of warring sects and now manifest a desire to renounce the principles of division and disintegration set in motion by the so-called Reformation.

The spiritual longing for the reunion of Christendom is indeed a noble idea, which indeed strikes a sympathetic cord in the heart of all Catholics. But there is only one plan of reunion in which Catholics can participate and that involves acceptance of all the Church's teachings in matters of faith and morals—one fold under one Shepherd. No lower ideal than this can permanently solve the question; and no scheme of reunion which deliberately stops short of this can receive our support.

We Catholics, at least, are precluded by our principles, as well as by the express prohibition of the Holy See, from participation in a "round table conference," even though it be a world conference on faith and order, which is based on nothing more substantial than an amiable desire for compromise and the urgency of showing some sort of united front against the forces of irreligion.

"Human devices," says a well known Catholic writer, "for achieving an immediate but merely specious unity by the substitution of a 'working program' for an inflexible creed, of reciprocal services for a divinely ordained worship, and of a committee and chairman, for the successor of St. Peter, are an unconscionable, but not less mischievous surrender of the whole position; a weak acknowledgment of a calamity that has not yet, and can never happen, namely, the supposed frustration of Christ's ardent prayer for the unity of His Church, while the miracle of Catholicism, the biggest and most wonderful religious fact in the world, is staring us in the face."

It is obvious that reunion bears a meaning for Catholics totally different from that which it bears for the active promoters of the movement. For them it means a closer and looser federation of independent sects, each retaining its own formularies and organization, and combined only for limited objects. For us, reunion means only one thing—the recantation of the heresies of the Reformation and the return of all our separated brethren to Papal allegiance.

Speaking of the reunion movement, an English writer says: "When we witness the transparent sincerity of so many of our separated brethren; the deep spirituality of their lives; their intense devotion to the Blessed Sacrament and to the Mother of God; their fidelity to meditation and vocal prayer; their frequent use of the confessional, their austerities, and the singular purity of their lives; we cannot fail to discern the finger of God at work. No doubt God pours out His uncounted mercies; no doubt He has, at all times, drawn to Himself chosen souls even among the heathen; but this movement is on such a scale, and is associated with such a marked Romeward tendency, that the conviction grows upon us that Mary is about to recover her dowry, and St. Peter his patrimony."

In 1906, the Society of the Atonement, a religious community of Anglicans of Graymoor, New York, organized the Church Unity Octave of prayer for the reunion of Chris-

tendom, dating it by happy inspiration, from January 18th, the Feast of St. Peter's Chair, to January 25th, the Feast of the Conversion of St. Paul. Within two years the members of the Society were received corporately into the Church, the first fruits of their own intercession. Since then they have continued to propagate their special devotion, which has been blessed and indulged by the late and present Holy Father. This octave is observed in many dioceses, including that of London, Ontario.

It is ardently to be hoped that the day will at length dawn when there shall be but one flock and one shepherd, when the breach made by Luther, Henry VIII, and the others shall be healed and "all things shall be restored in Christ."

UPLIFT

BY THE OBSERVER

It is a great stroke in agitation and controversy, to get a few fine-sounding words and phrases, and to run them in everywhere, apropos of something or of nothing. If they have no particular meaning, or half better; in the one case nobody is at the trouble of saying what they mean, and in the other case everyone can interpret to suit himself.

"Reconstruction" had a great run. "Self-expression" and "uplift" were a good second and third. But the same difficulty attended all three; namely, the lack of any definite or authoritative explanation or understanding of what was meant by them. Explained or unexplained, however, these expressions have been made to serve the turn of "the world, the flesh, and the devil," as most human thoughts and ideas are sure to be when mankind tries to read its riddles by human light alone.

I wonder what idea the human mind could conceive that human weakness and vanity would not turn to an application merely worldly or material.

Many people who talk of "uplift" cannot, seemingly, rise above the idea of the merely human. They do, indeed, talk of "souls"; but the very terms they use show that they are talking about one thing and thinking about another. They are talking about the soul, but thinking about the body.

When we forget God, or have only a vague knowledge of His Divine scheme of Creation, we find ourselves right back in the wigwag so far as our religious ideas are concerned. The savage who knows nothing of God or His laws, always confuses the soul with the body; and, while he feels vaguely that there is something in him which is superior to the body, and which will not die, he draws no clear distinction between the soul and the body; and, as a consequence of that confusion, he imagines that the gratification of the low impulses of the body are expressions of his spirit; and that by bodily indulgence his soul is uplifted.

It is a far cry, in some respects, from the wigwag of three hundred years ago, to the proud twentieth-century professor, author or journalist. But let us not be too greatly surprised when we find the very same errors in the one place as in the other. Man has long ago made all the blunders he can make concerning religion; and the blunders of today are only repeating the blunders of past ages.

Moreover, there is no aristocracy of ignorance. Nothing so quickly and decisively reduces all men to a common level as ignorance. There is no occasion for astonishment when we find a twentieth-century professor or author thinking the thoughts of a red Indian of the seventeenth century as to what "uplift" means.

The savages realized vaguely the existence of something within them which was more and higher than human; yet, in their ignorance of what the soul really was, they tried to give it expression by the only means of expression they knew; and that was through their bodies.

Thus, lust and drunkenness became, to the heathens and pagans, an expression of the spirit; "self-expression"; "uplift"; though possibly they did not use these terms.

Well, how do our twentieth-century heathens talk? Some of them talk of "the soul" and of "self-expression," and of "uplift," frankly and unashamedly in terms of sensual expression; and the numbers of those who thus frankly take their passions as an expression of their soul is increasing, and increasing rapidly. The sensual appeal for greater liberty "to live one's own life," meaning to sin as freely as

one pleases, is put forward now without any disguise in a considerable portion of the literature of the day; and many people who are supposed to possess education, are so close to the wigwag that they say it is not only a man's, or a woman's, right to live according to the impulses of the flesh, but even a duty to do so.

Besides these there are many who are far on the way back to the wigwag, but who are, as yet, merely en route. They do not preach or advocate the license of the savage; but they cast a kindly glance in that direction. They do not exactly justify wicked living, but they are full of kindly apologies and excuses for those who live wickedly; and tell us that, after all, they are only seeking to express themselves, and that it is only by such expression that human beings can learn, and rise, and uplift themselves.

They fail to realize that when a man is going downhill on a toboggan, he may have the intention of going up; but he is not, at the time, doing any climbing. They fail to realize that when a man is as drunk as he can be, he is on his way to getting sober; yet that getting drunk is not a means to sobriety.

The world would be the better if we could get through with the cultivated heathens who want us to take up wigwag religion.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

THE VAGARIES of the "special correspondent" are proverbial. With regard to Catholic affairs especially his resourcefulness, (or perhaps we should say, his inventiveness) is inexhaustible. If an atom of news lacks the element of novelty it is easy, with his deft hands, to touch it up until it takes on the coloring most pleasing to that portion of the public to which he ordinarily caters. Sometimes this gift is used to the prejudice of Catholic interests—more often as a simple appeal to the sensational.

A DESPATCH which appeared in the daily papers all over the continent a few days ago had the latter characteristic. It was said with every show of assurance that "for the first time in history," a Pope, in the person of his present Holiness, had posed for the moving pictures. The statement is harmless enough, but it is not accurate. Some fifteen years ago Pope Pius X. allowed pictures of himself to be taken as he walked in the Vatican Gardens, and, what is more, these pictures were publicly exhibited in many cities of the United States and Canada. We remember the interest they created at the time, it being the first opportunity of the general run of Catholics had of seeing their spiritual father in what is the nearest approach to the flesh.

THE ACTION of the French Academy in officially adopting the English term "gentleman," and giving to it its latter-day significance, as meaning "a man who without being a noble by race has lofty sentiments, elegant manners, and does noble acts, is noteworthy. While, as the Globe points out, the word "gentleman," in its original signification, was synonymous with rank or "family," it has now taken on a wider and higher significance. It might go farther, and say that even "manners" or deportment, as ordinarily understood, are not necessarily the mark of a true gentleman. For a man may have both polish and dignity, and even a certain degree of urbanity and yet be at heart very far removed from the Christian sense of the term. On the other hand, a man may be rough in his exterior, uncouth in his speech, and awkward in his bearing and yet be in character and conduct every inch a gentleman. We have known such men, and when everything is said and done, than in him the term may be said to find no higher exemplification. Bearing and deportment, and even the less individual element of "family," are indeed possessions not to be lightly estimated, but in the final reckoning character and conduct have the first place.

THE TEXT of the order, which was issued as a general routine order from G. H. Q. today, is as follows:—

Statements appear from time to time in the press and in correspondence to the effect that, especially when search of houses and persons has been carried out, articles are found to be missing, the inference being that they have been taken by the troops. I know that such statements are to a great extent put abroad particularly for purposes of propaganda against the Government, but recognize that instances may occur with young troops not yet fully imbued with the spirit of discipline that is so essential not only for the credit and good name of the army in general and their own regiment in particular, but also to enable the army to succeed in the difficult task which it is called upon to perform in Ireland.

It has further been inferred that soldiers indulge in acts of retaliation on the civil population as a whole for acts committed against them, as distinct from defending themselves when threatened or attacked. Such action would reflect the utmost discredit on the army, and would indicate a lapse from discipline which, if committed on active service, renders the offenders liable to a death sentence. To uphold the discipline of the army and prevent discredit falling on the good name of the regiment must be a determina-

tion of all ranks. Therefore I look to all officers to ensure that there will not be the least grounds for allegations of looting or retaliation, and though confident that these orders will be rigidly adhered to, I must point out that any deviations would be met by the severest disciplinary measures.

The above remarks of the Commander-in-Chief will be read to all units on parade and kept posted on the unit and order board.—The Manchester Guardian.

PRUSSIAN AT WORST OUT-PRUSSIANED

GENERAL MACREADY PRETENDS TO DOUBT NOTORIOUS FACTS

The special correspondent of the Manchester Guardian gives the following account of the military outrages in Ireland, which General Macready is constrained to admit reflect "the utmost discredit on the army" and "if committed on active service would render the offenders liable to the death sentence." Yet with nauseating hypocrisy characteristic of the whole Irish regime he pretends to doubt "notorious facts."

Dublin, Aug. 17th.—Last night the North Tipperary town was "shot up." Soldiers and police broke loose, as it is put, and with bombs and petrol set fire to the Council offices and several shops. Street firing went on for several hours. Shops were looted. Several creameries in the Templemore district were burned during the night. This is a typical case of what is perhaps the most hopeless side of the whole terrible Irish situation. We have a new Act for the restoration of order, but the guardians of order are demoralized. The outbreak goes back a long way, but they have become much more frequent in the last two months. Indeed Sinn Fein is able to issue a list of outrages almost as grave as that which Dublin Castle daily publishes. The sacking of Lismore and Fermoy happened two months ago. Since then Tuzem, Limerick, Tralee, Cork, Thurles, and half a dozen isolated villages have been treated to similar exhibitions of terrorism. Mr. Geo. Russell ("E"), in the current "Irish Homestead," has given a painful account of the systematic wrecking of the Irish creameries on the vicious principle of "for every barracks a creamery."

It is a commonplace that everyone has long recognized that nothing feeds Sinn Fein more than this breakdown of all decency in the attempt to maintain order. Moral judgments have got a little twisted in Ireland, but there is, at least, a difference between the burning of a police barracks and the looting and burning of a street of shops. The Irish Dominion League has plainly told the Government that if the reprisals go on its valiant attempt to rally "moderate" opinion will go for naught. The telegram may have had effect, but it is a sad reflection on the standards of the Irish Administration that we have had to wait till today, for the first official expression of reprobation. At last the "severest disciplinary measures" are promised, but the terms of Sir Nevil Macready's order when he speaks of notorious facts as inferences, leave much to be desired.

GENERAL MACREADY'S ORDER

The text of the order, which was issued as a general routine order from G. H. Q. today, is as follows:—

Statements appear from time to time in the press and in correspondence to the effect that, especially when search of houses and persons has been carried out, articles are found to be missing, the inference being that they have been taken by the troops. I know that such statements are to a great extent put abroad particularly for purposes of propaganda against the Government, but recognize that instances may occur with young troops not yet fully imbued with the spirit of discipline that is so essential not only for the credit and good name of the army in general and their own regiment in particular, but also to enable the army to succeed in the difficult task which it is called upon to perform in Ireland.

It has further been inferred that soldiers indulge in acts of retaliation on the civil population as a whole for acts committed against them, as distinct from defending themselves when threatened or attacked. Such action would reflect the utmost discredit on the army, and would indicate a lapse from discipline which, if committed on active service, renders the offenders liable to a death sentence. To uphold the discipline of the army and prevent discredit falling on the good name of the regiment must be a determina-

tion of all ranks. Therefore I look to all officers to ensure that there will not be the least grounds for allegations of looting or retaliation, and though confident that these orders will be rigidly adhered to, I must point out that any deviations would be met by the severest disciplinary measures.

The above remarks of the Commander-in-Chief will be read to all units on parade and kept posted on the unit and order board.—The Manchester Guardian.

AN UNSAVORY LITTLE PAMPHLET

ENGLISH EX-OFFICER REFUTES MISREPRESENTATION

By Major Erskine Childers, D. B. O.

Belfast realizes from the report of their Chamber of Commerce, that Ireland pays annually an extortionate tribute to England. Faced with a Bill which defines and demands this tribute in terms of hard cash, they flatly refuse to pay even a third part of the sum claimed. They admit in so many words that England makes an enormous profit out of Ireland, the fact being that, if Ireland were to cut the connection tomorrow, England—or, rather, Great Britain—would incur a net loss of income in taxes alone, according to the latest figures, certified by her own Treasury officials, of nearly twenty-three millions. Actually it will soon be over thirty millions. We are a paying proposition.

America is hearing a very different story from Belfast. And I should expect to have the approval of the Chamber of Commerce in naming to the counter a lie (no gentle word is possible) now emanating from their city and circulating extensively in America upon this very point. For it is a base thing to advertise in America that Ireland is the paid pensioner of England. It would be base if it were true, for bankrupts and workhouse paupers do not glory in their degradation; doubly base when it is untrue.

I have before me a demure little pamphlet, strongly resembling a tract, signed by six Belfast clergymen and Mr. William Cooze, M. P., and entitled "Facts from Ireland for the Consideration of American Citizens." The authors describe themselves as the accredited delegates of the Protestant Churches of Ireland, representing a million and a quarter people, and in that alleged capacity have toured America disseminating these "facts."

Incidentally who "accredited" the Rev. Louis Crooks, Rector of Knockbreda Episcopal Church, Belfast, to speak, as he claims to speak, on behalf of the Episcopal Church of Ireland, with its 600,000 members? His information is that he, like the other delegates, was nominated in the first instance by the Ulster Unionist Council, a bitterly partisan political committee, and, after the event, received a letter of approval from his diocesan bishop. To represent to Americans that he was specifically empowered by the Church of Ireland to speak on its behalf was a false pretence. A majority of its laymen and clergy are, no doubt, Unionists, but, if I know them rightly, they would utterly disclaim responsibility for this unsavory little pamphlet, and, like many Presbyterians and Methodists, would repudiate with disgust the meanest passage in it (with the exception, perhaps, of a hypocritical eulogy of John Redmond, which makes one fairly shudder) where a story is told, without names, of course, or any clue to identification, for the purpose of explaining "the lack of initiative and progress in Southern and Western Ireland." The suggestion is that Protestant tradesmen are, on account of their religion, boycotted and persecuted throughout the South and West, that people will eat only "Catholic loaves," and so on. What a world we live in! A Sinn Feiner gets two years with hard labour for singing a song in praise of Ireland and her national heroes, Protestants many of them. No penalty at all for this defamation of Ireland and the mass of her population by Unionist divines!

But the "fact" to which the pamphleteers give the place of honour is the abject financial dependence of Ireland upon England, an indebtedness so great that "to cut adrift from Great Britain would be to her (Ireland) a day of disaster and financial ruin." You would have thought they would be ashamed of being a burden on their noble benefactors. Not at all. They are proud of it. On the first page I find it stated, definitely and withunction, that "Ireland indirectly receives back much more than she contributed for imperial purposes." Now, false statements like this are sometimes made in sheer ignorance, and I know, from experience, that they are often believed in America by people who have no means of testing them. But this statement was not made in ignorance. The authors had before them the Treasury Financial Return for the year 1918-19, and quote correctly from it the respective revenues and expenditures, and the respective "contributions to Imperial expenditure" of England, Scotland and Ireland in that year. Ireland's contribution is given as fifteen millions odd. It was probably a good deal more, but we will accept it as correct. This official fact had to be converted by the authors into a "fact" for the consideration of American citizens. They first proceed to explain that