

The Catholic Record

Price of Subscription—\$1.50 per annum, United States & Europe—\$2.00

Approved and recommended by Archbishops Adorno and Siletti, 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.

The following agents are authorized to receive subscriptions and copies for the CATHOLIC RECORD:

General agents: M. J. Hagar, Vincent S. Cox, and Miss Jessie Doyle; resident agents: Mrs. W. E. Smith, Halifax; Miss B. Saunders, Syd. Bay; Miss L. Heringer, Winnipeg; E. R. Costello, 2256-25th Ave. West, Vancouver; R. C. S. Jones, 211 Rochester St., Ottawa; Miss Rose McKeaney, 148 D'Aiguillon St., Quebec; Mrs. George E. Smith, 255 St. Urbain, Montreal; M. J. Mervin, Montreal; B. E. O'Toole, 2341 Artye St., Regina, Sask.; and E. J. Murphy, Box 125, Saskatoon.

Obituary and marriage notices cannot be inserted except in the usual condensed form. Each insertion 50 cents.

Subscribers changing residence will please give old as well as new address.

In St. John, N. B., single copies may be purchased from Mrs. M. A. McGuire, 219 Main Street, and John Dwyer.

In Sydney, N. S., single copies may be purchased at Murphy's.

In Montreal, single copies may be purchased from J. Miller, 241 St. Catherine St., West.

LONDON, SATURDAY, APRIL 13, 1918

THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR'S "REPLY"

The Ottawa Citizen of March 27th places in parallel columns "Mr. Murphy's Attack" and "The Monitor's Reply."

So far as The Christian Science Monitor was concerned the attack consisted in Mr. Murphy's statement that in the Monitor appeared "anti-Catholic, anti-French and anti-Laurier articles which later were reproduced by the Ottawa Citizen, the Toronto dailies and other newspapers."

Whatever the pre-election articles were like—and the Monitor does not deny the accuracy of Mr. Murphy's characterization—the Reply is more recklessly and mendaciously anti-Catholic than anything that could be fished out of the troubled waters of the election campaign.

This is not the only reply of the Christian Science Monitor; it has replied and replied and will doubtless go on replying. The number of fools is infinite and the credulity of the Monitor's constituency is yet unexhausted.

We shall confine our attention to what the Citizen apparently considers the Reply Adequate. It consists of a rehash of all the accusations against the Pope and the Church set forth with reckless disregard for their repeated refutation and a sublimely impudent faith in the ignorance, prejudice and credulity of its readers.

It must be that The Christian Science Monitor has entirely convinced itself that important and notorious facts are merely the illusions of mortal mind.

The Christian Science Monitor: "One example of criticism by The Christian Science Monitor and other papers Mr. Murphy was sufficiently unwise to give. He referred to the statement that the official influence of the Roman Catholic Church had been thrown on the side of the Central Powers. It might be asked if he is still ignorant of the failure of the Vatican to protest against the violation of Belgium, and of the amazing defense of its silence by Cardinal Gasparri, the Pontifical Secretary of State, to the effect that the Pope was not bound to deliver judgment in a case which had not been submitted to him."

Elsewhere it tells us: "The Christian Science Monitor being a universal paper has its correspondents all over the world." Yet this universal paper with its correspondents all over the world and "in every capital in the world" has apparently not yet heard of the Belgian Government's reply to the Pope's Peace Note transmitted to the Holy Father by King Albert under date December 27th, 1917, and cabled from Havre Jan. 23rd, 1918, under which date it appeared in all the papers of this continent.

Busied with the affairs of the rest of the universe The Christian Science Monitor must have overlooked it. The whole text and tone of the Belgian Government's Reply and of King Albert's covering letter are refutation direct, crushing and complete of the Monitor's charges, insinuations and inferences in the passage quoted above.

It will suffice to cite without comment those passages wherein the Belgian Government gives the Christian Science Monitor the lie direct: "At the same time it desired particularly to express its lively and profound gratitude for the particular interest the Holy Father manifested in the Belgian nation, of which the document was new and precious proof."

"Already in his consistorial allocution of January 22, 1916, the Holy Father had proclaimed before the world that he reprobated injustice and he condemned to give the Belgian Government the assurance that in formulating that reprobation it was the invasion of Belgium he had directly in view."

"Honest people of all countries will rejoice with the Belgian Government that the injustice of which Belgium was the victim and the necessity for reparation have been proclaimed and that the highest moral authority of Christendom remains watchful amidst the passions of men."

The Christian Science Monitor does not rejoice, but persists in a slander that has been shamed out of existence in the reputable press of the world.

Again it must be remembered that in the framing of modern international law the nations slammed the door of the Hague Conference in the face of Leo XIII. By this exclusion the nations of the world emphatically told the Pope that in international matters he had no place which they would recognize.

With this in mind a learned and fearless English pleader stigmatized the traducers of the Holy See, who, like the Christian Science Monitor, whined of "the failure of the Vatican to protest against the violation of Belgium," in these ringing words:

"Suppose that the Holy See had been silent with regard to the violation of Belgian neutrality. What would have been the general situation? The violation of Belgian neutrality was a violation of international law, and it was the duty of those nations that had made that violation. But what happened? Did a single neutral nation raise its voice in protest? The Scandinavian countries, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Spain was silent; all the Republics of South America were silent. And the United States was silent. Even I say this: to single out the Holy See from that silent crowd—whereas the Holy See had had nothing to do with the International Law that had been violated—and to assail the Pope alone for his silence was a piece of mean and dastardly bullying."

"But what makes this attack on the Holy See more atrocious still is the fact that amongst all the neutral powers of the world the Holy See was the only one that did raise a public protest against the invasion of Belgium. For that the Holy Father was thanked by King Albert and the Belgian Government, and a party of French journalists sent an address to the Holy Father, through the Cardinal Secretary of State, thanking him for having alone, among the Powers, publicly condemned the violation of Belgian neutrality."

The Christian Science Monitor: "It might also be asked whether he (Mr. Murphy) has not yet discovered that the Pope's proposed peace was summed up in what to an Ally appears a most terrible obliquity of vision, the proposal of 'general condemnation.'"

The C. S. Monitor thus mendaciously sums up an important document. President Wilson summed up the Pope's peace proposals fairly and honestly and found no fault whatever with a single one of them; "We cannot take the word of the present rulers of Germany as a guarantee of anything that is to endure."

In the passages already quoted and more pointedly in the paragraph which follows, the Belgian Government again gives the lie to the Monitor's dastardly insinuations:

"At the outset of his message the Holy Father took pains to declare that he had forced himself to maintain perfect impartiality toward all the belligerents, which renders more significant the judgment of His Holiness when he concluded in favor of the total evacuation of Belgium and the reestablishment of its full independence, and also recognized the right of Belgium to reparation for damages and the cost of the War."

The Christian Science Monitor: "One defender of the Pope, Cardinal Bourne, was rash enough to declare that the Pope's proposed peace terms had been criticized as unfavorably by the Central Powers as by the Allies, in extraordinary oblivion of the fact that more than one German chancellor had expressed an admiration for them, whilst the Emperor of Austria had described them as 'noble-minded intervention.'"

And though it escaped the eagle eyes of the universal Monitor's correspondents in every capital in the world it is notoriously true that the pan German press was as bitter as the Monitor against the Pope in the matter of the Papal Peace Note.

Extracts from such criticisms have been published everywhere.

The Monitor: "More than one German Chancellor has expressed admiration for them (the Pope's proposed peace terms)."

The Pope proposed no peace terms; he proposed certain concrete bases on which negotiations might be initiated. No German chancellor nor any one else authorized to speak for Germany ever accepted these bases. It is the constant complaint, official and unofficial, that Germany has never given assent to the Pope's clear and unequivocal condition: "On the part of Germany the com-

plete evacuation of Belgium with the guarantee of her full political, military and economic independence."

Everyone knows that neither the Austrian nor German reply to the Pope's Peace Note went beyond platitudinous generalities. Both carefully avoided acceptance or rejection of the bases proposed for negotiation.

The Belgian Government's reply on this point evidently escaped the notice of the Monitor's all-over-the-world correspondents as well as of those in all the world's capitals. Here it is:

"Since the royal Government a year ago formulated its conditions it permits itself to recall that the Reichstag voted resolutions called peace resolutions. Chancellors and Ministers of Foreign Affairs have followed each other in the German Empire, and more recently in the central empires, and have published notes replying to the message of His Holiness, but never a word has been pronounced and never a line written clearly recognizing the indisputable rights of Belgium that His Holiness has not ceased to recognize and proclaim."

The C. S. Monitor: "The Emperor of Austria had described them (sic) as 'noble-minded intervention.'"

"Them" that is the Pope's proposed peace terms, the Emperor of Austria described "them" as "noble-minded intervention! We can not refrain from admiring what we have already called the sublimely impudent faith of the Monitor in the ignorance, prejudice and credulity of its readers. The Emperor of Austria did not, it is needless to say, describe "them" as "noble-minded intervention," any more than the President of the United States described "them" in the opening paragraph of his reply to the Pope where he uses similar language:

"Every heart that has not been blinded and hardened by this terrible War must be touched by this moving appeal of His Holiness the Pope, must feel the dignity and force of the humane and generous motives which prompted it and must fervently wish that we might take the path of peace he so persuasively points out."

Whether by the War or in spite of it the Monitor's heart is blinded and hardened to a pitiable degree.

Just one more quotation from its hodgepodge of stale and malodorous calumnies:

"Finally, there is that sleeping dog, which Mr. Murphy so unwisely stirs with his foot, and which may be named 'Italian Debacle.' Now we will not ask Mr. Murphy to accept the word of this paper, which has given proof of its statements often enough before, but to accept that of Mr. Bagot, amongst his other qualifications, has this advantage over Mr. Murphy that he happens to have resided in Italy during the war, and to have been making a collection of anti-Italian literature, during that period, with the result that he insists that the whole tone of the clerical press of Italy as may be seen from his scrapbook, has been persistently pro-German and anti-Ally. The Papal peace note, he contends, was exploited by the clerical and pro-German agencies in Italy, and extracts from it distributed to soldiers on leave and in hospitals. This literature, Mr. Bagot explains, has been distributed wholesale through the remotest districts and smallest villages."

A universal paper of course knows what goes on in "the remotest districts and smallest villages" of Italy.

But even The Christian Science Monitor with its universal sources of information and its credulous constituency could hardly hope to convince its readers that it knows its Italy better than Italy's Prime Minister, so it is prudently silent on this pronouncement of the Italian Prime Minister in the Italian Chamber of Deputies.

"I deplore the accusations of a general character made by the Hon. Signor Pirolini against high ecclesiastical personages—accusations that tend to hurt the supreme spiritual authority—against priests and against the Catholic party. Such accusations are unjust and offensive, because as the public are aware, the Italian clergy, both high and low, have given noble and beautiful proofs of Italian sentiments and the great mass of the Catholics have known how to reconcile the dictates of faith with their duties towards their country."

When it is borne in mind that this deliberate rebuke and tribute, this final and authoritative pronouncement of Italy's Prime Minister, is found in the Hansard report of Mr. Murphy's speech one may gauge the candor, the honesty, the regard for truth and decency in the Christian Science Monitor's discussion of the responsibility for the Italian debacle.

Prussian diplomats might envy the editor and Russian moujiks pity the readers of the Christian Science Monitor.

If this Win-the-War journal is not getting its share of the German gold we hear so much about it is allowing itself to be defrauded of wages no Prussian jury would refuse to award it.

GENERAL FOCH

The appointment of General Foch to the supreme and absolute command of the Allied Armies of the Western front crowns the final victory over the unscrupulous anticlerical movement in France, a movement as contemptible as it was dangerous, and it imperilled France and Western civilization.

Nine years before the outbreak of the Great War the petty anticlerical schemes which not only disgraced and degraded French political life but sapped the defences of the nation, were exposed in the Chamber of Deputies. J. E. C. Bodley, M. A., of Balliol College, Oxford, Corresponding Member of the Institute of France, and author of several works on modern French history, thus refers to that event in his article in the Encyclopaedia Britannica; a collection of unquestionably authentic documents had been brought before the Chamber:

"These papers," writes Professor Bodley, "showed that an elaborate system of espionage and delation had been organized by the freemasons throughout France for the purpose of obtaining information as to the political opinions and religious practices of the officers of the army, and that this system was worked with the connivance of certain officials of the ministry of war. Its aim appeared to be to ascertain if officers went to Mass or sent their children to convent schools or in any way were in sympathy with the Roman Catholic religion, the names of officers so secretly denounced being placed on a black-list at the War Office, whereby they were disqualified for promotion. There was no doubt about the authenticity of the documents or of the facts which they revealed. Radical ex-ministers joined with moderate Republicans and reactionaries in denouncing the system."

General André, minister of war, was so clearly implicated, with evident approval of the prime minister (Combes) that a revulsion of feeling against the policy of the anticlerical cabinet began to operate in the Chamber.

After this exposure and reaction M. Clemenceau, the present Premier, who was Prime Minister of France from 1906 to 1909, was able to some extent to consider merit in the appointment to important Army posts. Yet even today the famous War Correspondent, Charles H. Grasty, in his cabled sketch to the N. Y. Times of the new Commander in Chief writes:

"General Foch was an authority on strategy before the War. He was Director of the War School. Clemenceau put him there while Prime Minister. It was considered a pretty sporty thing for Clemenceau to do, seeing that Foch was a devoted Catholic."

When Clemenceau offered to appoint him to the Ecole de Guerre, Foch intimated to the Premier that such an appointment was a political impossibility. "Not only my wife and family practice their religion, but I myself am a practising Catholic and two brothers are Jesuit priests."

The civilized world owes a debt, perhaps its salvation, to the moral courage, good sense and patriotism of Clemenceau for making the appointment notwithstanding. In the War School Foch trained the higher officers of the French Army, so that now he knows intimately the personal and military qualifications of those who will share with him the chief responsibility of the gigantic task which Christian civilization, with unflinching faith, looks to him to accomplish.

Stephane Lauzanne, Editor in Chief of Le Matin, Paris, before the War, asked General Foch what he thought of the theories of the two schools then prominent—the theory of offensive fighting to the limit and the theory of defense to the last ditch:

The General answered in incisive tones: "There are not two theories nor two schools. There is only one. There can be only one—theory and the school of good sense. In certain cases good sense requires attack at all costs; in others, good sense demands defense to the last minute."

These words have remained engraved upon my memory for all time. I see again the man who spoke them, with his clear-cut features, clear eyes, energetic voice, and spirited gestures. Good sense, clearness, vivacity—these are the characteristic traits of General Foch, of him whom his fellow countrymen as well as his adversaries consider perhaps the greatest strategist living at the present time on the field of battle.

The same writer thus describes Foch's immortal achievement at the Marne:

"Foch—pronounced as it spelled Foch—a long, unaccented,

"So terrific was the pressure that Foch's right and left weakened. He then sent to the General Staff Headquarters, to General Joffre, this despatch destined to eternal renown:

"My right has been driven in, my left has been driven in—consequently with all that I have left in my centre, I will now attack."

"He suited the action to the word. He drew together all his exhausted divisions, all his reserves and at the very moment when the enemy thought he had routed he smashed against the Prussian guns at Fore-Champenoise and St. Gond in a violent, desperate effort. He broke into its lines and crushed it. The assailants, assailed, were, in their turn obliged to give way and retreat. The retreat became a rout. That the battle of the Marne, conceived and commanded by Joffre, was won, was because he had in that battle a genius to execute his plans, whose name was Foch."

Richard Barry in the N. Y. Times has this to say of the First Strategist in Europe:

As he has said himself in his textbook, "The Conduct of War," one of the chief modern authorities, "war is not an exact science, but is a terrific and passionate drama where man with moral and physical faculties is cast for the principal part."

Wherefore one may now look for man, the principal actor, to emerge again to the centre of the world's stage and play his titanic role, while machines, electricity, foodstuffs, poisons, explosives, transportation, distribution, and politics (both national and international) step aside and become tools or puppets in that hands of their master—man.

Foch is the sort of General that the French loved of old. He not only acts like a general; he looks like one. He not only achieves victory, but he does it with an esprit that intoxicates the popular imagination.

This may be the reason, or a chief among the reasons, why he has not previously been intrusted with supreme command.

All of this may be most incidental, may be declared at so solemn a moment of no moment at all. But who, in a republic, can ever forget politics?

Charles H. Grasty, in the article previously referred to, says:

"What is the secret of General Foch's success in this War. I have asked many people in his entourage and have boiled down the information into the following heads:

First, he submits everything to cold reason.

Second, yet his decisions are lightning-like and bold.

Third, his zeal and energy are great.

Fourth, he has an even temper.

Fifth, he inspires men and commands them.

And he concludes his cabled article from Paris with these words:

General Foch is an ardent churchman, and goes to Mass regularly. He has no politics, but is patriot to his heart's core.

In this mixture of religious devotion with audacity and a stern sense of duty Foch reminds us of Stonewall Jackson. Nothing is too difficult for him to undertake. When there is an impossible job to be done they send for Foch. With all his determination there is nothing of the Bourbon about him. Although well over 60, his mind is open on every subject. In four years he has learned the science of war all over again.

The unanimous testimony of his beloved France, purified by suffering, is that General Foch fulfils, in a pre-eminent degree, a condition he himself lays down as essential:

"A commander, then, should be, first and foremost, a man of character."

May we not regard it as a good omen that this man of character so illumined by religion, embodying in himself the highest and best qualities of his race, is at her darkest hour chosen to save his beloved France, purified by suffering and ennobled by martyrdom for her Providential mission in the work of Christian civilization.

DEFENDING THE INDEFENSIBLE

"In regard to the attack upon Mr. Rowell for his statement that members of French religious orders who had been driven out of France had poisoned the minds of the French-Canadians against France, we might say that Mr. Rowell's statement has called down upon him the bitter wrath of the hierarchy, and our Roman Catholic journals have insisted that their Church should see to it that such a man should be made either to retract his statement or resign his office as a member of the Cabinet. The trouble is that Mr. Rowell said plainly and publicly what everybody else knew to be true, and the hierarchy is determined that he shall not escape punishment for daring to voice his honest conviction."—The Christian Guardian.

Thus the Methodist religious weekly associates itself with and defends Mr. Rowell's baseless slander of gallant and heroic men who are fighting and dying on the battlefields of France for a cause which both

Mr. Rowell and The Guardian profess to hold dearer than religious prejudice. Even its favorite tall-man, "the hierarchy," will scarcely charm away the nausea of honest Methodist stomachs.

"The trouble is," says our Christian contemporary, "that Mr. Rowell said plainly and publicly what everybody else knew to be true."

What everybody else knew to be true! Mr. Rowell would be forever grateful if somebody of the everybody else would give him a single fact that would substantiate or even give a color of truth to what everybody else knew and what, relying on that general knowledge, he rashly said plainly and publicly. Unfortunately that knowledge which "everybody else" possessed is precisely of that kind that has rendered "Uncle Essek's" saying immortal:

"It isn't so much the ignorance of mankind that makes them ridiculous as knowing so many things that ain't so."

And Mr. Rowell is face to face with the alternative of an honest and honorable man's course, or, relying on his special following obstinately knowing so many things that ain't so, of shamelessly brazening it out.

We can assure the Christian Guardian that Catholics don't care a tuppenny darn which course he finally decides to take. His belated disavowal and retraction or contumacious persistence in bearing false witness is now of no interest to others than himself and his friends.

Peace to the ashes of his political ambitions.

THE PASSING OF "THE MASTER"

There are just a few of them left, those venerable old men to whom three generations had reverently referred as "the master." They were not mere school teachers; they were guides, counsellors and friends to their present and former pupils, the source of information on all manner of subjects for the people of the neighborhood, and the last court of appeal in the settling of every argument; for "the master said so," decided the case. Their authority was recognized by child and parent alike, not only by reason of their commanding personality but because the principle of parental and vice-parental authority was still maintained. They did more than merely instruct their pupils. They moulded their characters. From their hands have gone forth the men and women who constitute the best and most saving element in our Canadian national life. Their passing marks the close of a period when order and self-sacrifice and the rod of discipline developed sterling characters, schooled for the emergencies of life—and we fear their passing marks the advent of a time when a brain-cramming, molly-coddling and strapping regime is producing intellectual anaemia and weakening the moral stamina of our boys and girls.

The place of this venerable pedagogy is now held in most instances by a mere slip of a girl. For some of these young ladies teaching is merely an avocation, a stepping stone to something else, a point of vantage from which their semine artillery may effect a desirable conquest. And who can blame them? Many a bright young girl has thus become the mistress of a happy home, who might have ended her days as an old maid, not through choice but through circumstances, if she had remained among the unappreciative companions of her childhood. Among these lady teachers are many who are deserving of the greatest praise for self-sacrificing devotion to the interests of their pupils. They succeed admirably with the younger children; but, while they may instruct the older boys and girls, they are incapable of moulding their characters because nature has not fitted them for that task.

Too frequent changes of teachers is another element that militates against the effectiveness of our present-day schools. A teacher who is familiar with the locality, who knows the family history in the case of each child, and who is cognizant of the little currents and countercurrents that influence life in the section, is more likely to avoid difficulties than is a stranger, and is in a position to assist in the developing of each child according to the measure of its capacity.

Speaking of lady teachers suggests a word of encomium for those "mulieres fortes," those strong feminine characters that have devoted their whole lives to the work of Catholic education in our Parochial Schools.

They deserve to be bracketed with the venerable religious who have consecrated their lives to the same task; for, deprived of many of the spiritual consolations of the latter, they have accomplished almost equal results in the face of the hardships of pioneer days. It was our privilege to meet two of those, one in the town of Orillia and the other in the town of Galt. Both pastors and people mentioned their names with grateful affection. They were the trusted confidants of many a young man and woman, an example of genuine piety to all, and the never-failing assistant of the parish priest in the work of drilling the children in a knowledge of their religion and preparing them for the reception of the sacraments. If those who instruct others unto justice shall shine as stars for all eternity, great indeed will be the reward that these shall receive from the Great Teacher.

The foregoing references to the past bring us face to face with a problem that is to day engaging the attention of many of the Bishops of Canada, namely, the obtaining of competent English-speaking teachers for our Catholic High Schools for boys and as principals of our larger Parochial Schools. There is little hope that the secular ranks will supply them; for the number of young men in our Normal Schools and Schools of Pedagogy is becoming smaller every year. The only hope seems to be in the Christian Brothers who are already doing excellent work in the few places where they are stationed. Their organization places them at an advantage over the individual lay teacher, while their religious calling gives them added authority which makes for good discipline. It should be impressed upon our good Catholic boys that next to a vocation to the holy Priesthood there is no calling that opens up an avenue of more fruitful endeavor than that of the consecration of one's life under the rule of a community for the purpose of furthering Catholic higher education.

THE GLEANER

NOTES AND COMMENTS

IRELAND is finding some compensation for her deferred hope in the addition of two new names to her already long roll of saints and confessors. In addition to Venerable Oliver Plunkett, the last martyr to the "Elizabethan settlement," Ven. Peter Talbot, Archbishop of Dublin in the seventeenth century, takes his place by decree of His Holiness Benedict XV. among the "Blessed." The cause of his beatification was introduced in 1914. The Archbishop died a prisoner for the Faith in the dungeon of Dublin Castle in 1680. As in the case of Blessed Oliver Plunkett, the arduous newspaper correspondent attributes Blessed Talbot's incarceration to "treason and sedition." That charge was made to cover all resistance to the innovations of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

WHAT PROVED to be a remarkable corroborator of a local tradition was the outcome of recent excavations in the ruined church of Ballynowlart, King's County, Ireland. Tradition had it that while the people of the district were hearing Mass there sometime in the seventeenth century, the church was surrounded and set on fire by the English soldiery. The elevation was over; the priest with the Blessed Sacrament in his hands endeavored to escape, but was thrown back into the flames, and perished with his people in a frightful holocaust. Such has been the immemorial local tradition, and with a view of testing its truth, Rev. Edward O'Leary, the learned historian of Queen's County, sought and obtained permission to make archaeological investigations on the scene of the reputed tragedy. In October last, consequently, accompanied by a body of priests and laymen, Father O'Leary proceeded with the work entrusted to him.

THE RESULT surpassed the most sanguine hopes of the explorers. Within only a tenth or twelfth part of the inner area of the ruins, they found ten skeletons, lying irregularly, chiefly on the face, about 18 inches below the surface. A number of the bones were charred and blackened. On the floor also, and among the remains, was found a quantity of charcoal. Some of the bones were the ribs of very small children, uncharred, and in a good state of preservation, which suggested that the infants were unborn and perished with their mothers in a common catastrophe.