

The Catholic Record

Price of subscription—\$1.50 per annum. United States & Europe—\$2.00. Publisher and Proprietor, Thomas Coffey, LL.D.

Advertisements for teachers, situations wanted, etc., 50 cents each insertion. Remittance to accompany the order. Where Catholic Record is not sold, it is required to send 10 cents to cover expenses of postage upon copies.

LONDON, SATURDAY, NOV. 29, 1919

DEMOCRACY IN INDUSTRY

Every reader of this article has heard again and again that Capital is as necessary to industry as is Labor. And this oracular assertion of this truism is often held as proving that labor movements are usually wrong.

That the relation of Labor and Capital to each other, and of both to the Community, is a problem, is the dominant problem of the age we live in, is proved by the seething unrest and unsettlement which mark the present social order with destruction.

Democracy, we might preface, is in the air we breathe, on everybody's lips, in every book or article we read; if some foolish things were not said and written, if mistakes were not made, excesses perpetrated in its name, then fallible human nature would have radically changed.

"We ought to recognize that the real struggle in which this War is only an episode, is not merely between our own country and anything so unstable and transitory as modern Germany, but between permanent and irreconcilable claimants for the Soul of Man, and that what makes the German spirit dangerous is not that it is alien, but that it is horribly congenial to almost the whole modern world.

"The German spirit is horribly congenial to almost the whole modern world." How true in many things outside of industrialism; but we may not now go so far afield as to follow its suggestions.

the free nations of the world have still before them if Freedom worthy of the name is to be attained. Industrial autocracy and political autocracy may go hand in hand, but not autocracy in industry and democracy in politics.

Management bears to Capital the same relation as the executive to the legislative functions in civil government. The distinction is clear and is not new. The claim for the Community is unanswerable: "It is the Community which provides the natural resources and powers that underlie all production.

"Investment in industry is recognized as affording a right to share in corporate control. Capital and Management receive representation on this basis. If Capital and Management are so entitled why not Labor also?

"The Community's right to representation in the control of industry, and in the shaping of industrial policies, is wholly similar to that of Labor. But for Community investment on a local, national, and international scale, Capital, Labor, and Management would be obliged to make short shrift under present day conditions of world competition.

"The exclusive attitude in the matter of control on the part of Capital and Management is all too plainly evidenced in the present form of corporate organization of industry. . . . There is no suggestion in the form of organization that the corporation is run as if the concern of those who contribute their lives, as well as those who contribute their money; or as if the concern of the public, whose contributions through taxation in its many forms may far exceed the investment of stockholders.

"This undemocratic and exclusive attitude is further reflected by forms of expression and terminology so congenial to many capitalist investors and large employers of Labor. . . . The personal possessive comes naturally to their lips. There is nothing suggestive of any real partnership with either Labor or the Community. On the contrary the existence of Labor and the Community is often wholly ignored.

the nature of industrial operations reveals that it is industry as carried on by all concerned which ultimately pays the price of the plant and equipment, pays the cost of Labor, and supplies Capital with its return in the nature of interest; that, in reality, Labor and the Community are necessary partners in production along with Capital and Management."

At another time we shall give instances of where the recognition of full partnership has been satisfactorily worked out. It must not be inferred by those who have not read his book that MacKenzie King in the representation of the four parties to industry in the Government of industry thinks he has found a simple and effective panacea for all our industrial ills.

Mr. King maintains, and shows clearly that he is right in so maintaining, that there are four parties to industry—Labor, Capital, Management, and the Community. And these four parties should be partners, should actively participate in the government of industry.

Nevertheless the wide recognition of fundamental truths will rightly direct evolution, and go far to prevent revolution. The action of the United States Government in the present coal strike, and the part it is taking in the settlement of the dispute between miners and operators, become, in the light of the foregoing principles as to partnership in industry, much clearer and more intelligible.

For the revival of this infamous Act at the present time the way was prepared by the phantom "German Plot" and further justification is looked for in alleged "Sinn Fein outrages," in the false suggestions, and largely, in the conspiracy of silence of a purchased or controlled press.

ARBITRARY WILL SUBSTITUTED FOR LAW IN IRELAND

"People who dare to protest against a regime which would not be tolerated for a moment by white people in any other part of the British Empire are ruthlessly incarcerated."

In these words Sir Horace Plunkett, Irish Protestant, former Unionist member of Parliament, and President of the Board of Agriculture, told Englishmen how Ireland is faring under the new era of liberty and democracy. The bitter irony of it all! The loathsome hypocrisy of the authors of this shameful tyranny which out Prussia Prussia at its worst while yet the air is filled with the echoes of their professions of liberty, their hatred of Prussianism, and their determination to establish everywhere the reign of freedom!

The Coercion Act of 1887 is the very antithesis of freedom; it suppresses every provision of British liberty; it subverts the elementary principles of British fair play. With grim humor it is known in Ireland as the "Jubilee Coercion Act," having been enacted the year of Queen Victoria's Golden Jubilee. That eminent democrat, Arthur Balfour, was the author. It differs from the other Coercion Acts—some four-score during the nineteenth century—in this, that all previous Coercion Acts were for specified periods; this Act is perpetual; it can be brought into force in Ireland or in any part of it by the Lord Lieutenant's proclamation.

It is absolutely in keeping with the traditional and invariable policy of the English Unionist junkers that the way was prepared for the recent proclamation by the systematic defamation of Ireland and her national leaders.

So it was when the Jubilee Coercion Act was passed. Bitterly opposed by Gladstone, leading Liberals, and the Liberal and Independent press, it was felt by the Government that public opinion must be shocked into approval. On the morning of the Second Reading The Times published a fac-simile letter purporting to be written by Parnell approving of the Phoenix Park murders. This characteristic stroke of statesmanship

secured the passage of the Jubilee Coercion Act now once more in force in the greater part of Ireland.

Later the letters were proved in open Court to be forgeries, and Richard Pigott, the hired forger and suborned perjurer, committed suicide. But the forgeries had served their purpose.

When the Bill was before Parliament Gladstone said of it: "Under this Bill . . . there is no judge, there is no jury; there is no Resident Magistrate, who may say whether the act is illegal or not. There is no control by them. There is nothing with control but the absolute authority of an absolute government of a political character and therefore necessarily partisan."

The grand old man further called the proposed legislation "A cup of poison," and pronounced it "A Bill to increase, not to diminish, crime."

Other leading statesmen were no less outspoken. LORD HALDANE—"The most unjustifiable, the most intolerable, I will even say, the most wicked step ever taken in the annals of political history."

LORD SPENCER—"It confers the most far-reaching arbitrary powers on the Lord Lieutenant."

LORD MORLEY called it "The essence of tyranny," and "A flagrant violation of all the free principles of English Government."

PARNELL said: "Under this Bill you will send to the scaffold and the convict cell many innocent persons—known to be innocent by their neighbors—in some cases known to be innocent by the authorities."

The answer to all these and a thousand other indignant protests was the publication of the Pigott forgeries. And it was an effective answer. When the whole lying plot was later exposed to public execration its purpose was accomplished.

For the revival of this infamous Act at the present time the way was prepared by the phantom "German Plot" and further justification is looked for in alleged "Sinn Fein outrages," in the false suggestions, and largely, in the conspiracy of silence of a purchased or controlled press.

How essentially tyrannical, how completely justified are the foregoing Liberal condemnations of this liberty-destroying Act, is well illustrated by the arrest and imprisonment of Father Thomas O'Donnell. In the case of the patriotic Australian Chaplain the dark secrecy of Coercion Act methods could not be maintained; but the same spirit of irresponsible tyranny prevailed. The Army Act requires that the accused must be set at liberty if the charge against him be not furnished him in writing within 48 hours. But this naturally does not hold in Ireland. It was only after fourteen days that "the tissue of infamous and diabolical lies" was given in writing to Father O'Donnell in the Tower of London.

In the meantime powerful influences intervened. Premier Hughes of Australia cabled Lord Milner asking for Father O'Donnell's release, saying that he was the most loyal and patriotic of men and had proved that by word and deed during the War.

The Tasmanian Government sent a communication to Sir Francis Newdigate as follows: "All Father O'Donnell's actions in Tasmania leave no doubt regarding his loyalty. Please cable to Imperial Government Tasmania's satisfaction at Father O'Donnell's prompt release."

The light had to be let in on Father O'Donnell's case—and that ended the case against him.

Had Father O'Donnell been simply a law-abiding and God-fearing Irishman subject not only to military law as interpreted in Ireland but also to the Jubilee Coercion Act, he might have suffered outrage and persecution in Ireland, or been compelled to consort with convicted criminals in English jails without any process of law, or even without any definite charge being brought against him.

His case will be illuminating to Australians. So also would it be to Canadians if they were allowed to know the facts; but the news agencies are controlled in the interests of Ireland's ruthless oppressors.

Well, Irishmen know how to suffer and to die for Ireland. The folly and futility of attempting to crush the national spirit by brute force will become evident. Partisan spite and malice cloaked by irresponsible authority whose arbitrary will is substituted for law, will revolt the

British conscience as it has already revolted the conscience of the world. Nevertheless a distinction must be made between the British people and the Government in their name by a parasitic faction in Ireland.

In the words of Sir Horace Plunkett: "The guilt does not lie with the British people. They do not know the facts. The truth will out, and then the Irish question, as we have known it, will cease from troubling."

NOTES AND COMMENTS

A LEGAL case recently decided in Dublin should furnish food for thought to those who in Canada and elsewhere worked themselves into a frenzy over the *Ne Temere* decree a few years ago. The case concerned the guardianship of the seven children of a Catholic father, now deceased. The mother, still living, had been a Protestant up to the time of her marriage when she embraced the religion of her husband, but on his death she reverted to Protestantism and, going to live with her father, sent those of the children who were old enough to Protestant schools.

One of them, a girl of eight, was sent to England to live with a Protestant aunt. It was the intention, of course, that all of them should be brought up in that faith.

THE CASE came before the Lord Chief Justice in Dublin, and aroused widespread interest. The Lord Chief Justice himself interviewed the oldest son, a boy of sixteen, and learned that he was a fervent and regular communicant and ardently attached to the Catholic Faith. All of the children of suitable age had up to the time of the father's death regularly attended to their religious duties. The presiding judge therefore associated the Catholic aunt of the children with the mother in their joint guardianship, and directed that the children be brought up in the religion of their father. The point worth noting on the part of those who suffered from what someone has termed "necemertis" is that the Church had nothing to do with this decision but that it was solely the act of the judicial authorities of the Crown.

THE PROJECTORS of the National United Campaign or Forward Movement of the five most considerable Protestant bodies in Canada which has just been set on foot throughout the Dominion give out as the principle object aimed at

"To reaffirm the principle that the Gospel of Christ is the only cure for the World War, and the only found ation for ensuring national stability, social welfare and individual happiness in the day of peace."

THIS OBJECT is legitimate, even praiseworthy beyond all cavil, and no portion of the population of Canada would rejoice more than Catholics to see it take on the character of something more than vague assertion and crystallized into a widespread movement towards definiteness in belief. One may be pardoned, however, for querying how the principle outlined is to be put into practice without some general agreement as to what constitutes the Gospel of Christ—some clear cut definition as to what is of faith and has been revealed by God as necessary to the inheritance of eternal life. As things are, Protestantism has resulted in nothing but division and confusion. No one of the sects even assumes to speak with authority, and the masses, left without a guide, remain "tossed about by every wind of doctrine."

A MOVEMENT on somewhat similar lines has, since the War, been carried out by the National Church in England. It took on the name of the "National Mission," and was designed, just as its Canadian counterpart is designed, to "reaffirm the principle that the Gospel of Christ is the only cure for present conditions."

According to the Christian Commonwealth this mission was a failure, and the reason given by the editor is that "it had no clear basis of belief and practice." Developing this thesis the same writer thus expresses himself:

"Let us frankly face the situation—unless and until the churches agree to a certain valuation of life, a certain code of morality, a certain standard of honesty in business, are a sine qua non for membership; until they show that Christianity stands for a definite attitude towards the religious and ethical problems of every-day life, they will not convert, because they will not even interest, the ordinary man. It is not the

disunion of Christendom that matters so much; it is the indistinctiveness of Christianity."

THE ITALICS are ours, and are intended simply to emphasize the preceding paragraph. The Christian Commonwealth editor's confusion of thought is evident in the distinction drawn between disunion and indistinctiveness, whereas the one is clearly parent of the other. The revolt of the sixteenth century by its repudiation of authority made each individual mind the measure of its belief and at the same time necessarily made "indistinctiveness" the very hall-mark of Protestantism. Until such time, therefore, that men shall again find in the "Gospel of Christ" a fixed and definite meaning and return to their allegiance, the world may expect to see many "Layman's Missionary Movements," "Business and Christianity," "Campaigns and Forward Movements" all producing the same result: the collection of a huge fund with perpetuation of that same "indistinctiveness" which lures its victims far from the King's Highway into trackless wastes leading to No-where.

ULSTER DIFFICULTY

BUYING OFF THE PRESBYTERIANS By PROFESSOR EORN MACNEILL National University of Ireland

From Lord Castlereagh's "Memoirs," it appears that, immediately after the insurrection, there was drawn up a Plan for strengthening the connection between the Government and the Presbyterian Synod of Ulster. A proposal was made on behalf of the Government, following and improving on the Maynooth scheme, to establish in Armagh a new university for the special benefit of Dissenters. This project fell through, and in its stead, as Reid relates, the propriety of adding to the Royal Bounty was freely admitted by the British Government. The Royal Bounty amounted to £6,829 a year divided among all the dissenting clergy—a miserable and ineffective allowance. Under the plan brought forward by Castlereagh, the Presbyterian clergy were divided into three classes. The ministers, as they belonged respectively to the first, second, or third class, were to receive respectively £10, £5, or £25 each, per annum. The chief agent in recommending the transaction to his fellow ministers, the Rev. Dr. Black, obtained £400 per annum.

"It would seem," says Killen, "that Government was chiefly actuated by those purely secular considerations which ordinarily have weight with prudent and calculating statesmen. Presbyterian ministers were now, to a certain extent, dependent for subsistence on the voluntary contributions of their flocks. . . . An increase of the royal grant would place them in more independent circumstances in relation to the people, so that they would be less likely to give any countenance to the spirit of faction or sedition. It was expected that the State, at the same time, would thus increase its own direct influence over the spiritual guides of an important section of the population of Ireland. In a letter written shortly before this period by a British Cabinet Minister [the Duke of Portland, 31st August, 1799] to the Lord Lieutenant, it is expressly declared that a principal object in increasing and remodeling their allowance was to make them more dependent and render them more amenable. . . . It is plain that the leading statement of the day aimed at the political subservience of the Presbyterian ministers of Ulster, and, when impartially estimated, their motives were as destitute of piety as of patriotism." Killen is at some pains to assure himself and others that the policy of these statesmen failed of its intent. He forgets that he has just admitted that dependency on the voluntary contributions of their flocks subjected the Presbyterian ministers to strong political temptations; and he would have his readers believe that those who could thus be tempted were not deeply affected by becoming dependent for their incomes on a Government allowance. Conscious pleading does not always square with what the pleader really thinks. On the same page, in a footnote, Killen writes: "The withdrawal of the Regium Donum [the Government grant to Dissenting Protestant ministers], as at present [1868] suggested by English volunaries, would give a tremendous shock as well to Protestantism as to British power in Ireland."

But we can judge of a policy by its consequences. Dr. Killen, the Presbyterian historian, is at great pains to minimize the part taken by the Ulster Presbyterians in the R-publican movement before the Union. His method of doing this is to single out the names of those R-publican leaders who were not Presbyterians and to quote a number of loose declarations on behalf of the Presbyterian clergy; which is obviously a way of proving the case against himself, and this he clearly achieves. Belfast was the intellectual and political, as well as the economic centre of the north-east. Castlereagh, in his "Memoirs," calls Derry "the counterpoise to Belfast and the rallying point for the loyalty of the North."

The important town of Belfast," writes Dr. Killen, "was the headquarters of disaffection in Ulster. . . . O'Connell made a cardinal political mistake in placing the demand for Catholic emancipation before the demand for Repeal of the Union. A whole generation thus elapsed during which the rights of the Nation were forgotten and the rights of a particular religion asserted. Friendly as the Presbyterian body had been before the Union to the Catholic cause, it was not to be expected that they would transfer to it the enthusiasm with which they had supported the cause of National independence. By the time when O'Connell raised his Repeal banner, the Leaven had worked well in eastern Ulster, and a generation had arisen under the guidance of the satisfied and grateful. Moreover, O'Connell had freely invoked the public participation of the Catholic clergy in his campaign; and in the attitude of Presbyterians towards the Catholic clergy there is something more antipathetic than the purely polemical *odium theologium*. In truth it may be said that no single one of the leaders of 'Constitutional Nationalism' from O'Connell down has shown an intelligent appreciation of the East-Ulster factor in Irish politics."

A FUSION OF INTERESTS The disestablishment of the Protestant Episcopal Church of Ireland in 1869 removed the Ascendancy from explicit recognition by the State and tended so far to reconcile the Presbyterians still more to the *de facto* Government. This measure had a still subtler influence, which, however, was no part of its design. The Government grant to the Presbyterian clergy was to a large extent commuted, and from this and other sources the trustees of the Presbyterian Church were possessed of a capital fund for investment. At that time, the rents of land in Ireland had reached almost their highest pitch. The extravagance of Irish landlords increased with their income, and there was a large market for mortgages on their estates, returning a larger interest than any other investment that offered the same apparent security. The Presbyterian Church was more freely invested in this security, and thus the clergy of a community that was based upon the tenant class became virtual creditors of the landlord class, with a definite pecuniary interest in high rents. Ten years had not passed after disestablishment when Irish tenants of land learned for the first time how to combine against the united forces of the English Government and its "faithful garrison," as the landlords boasted themselves; and a Land War began that forced a rapid retreat on the allies. The Irish Land Act of 1881 established a tribunal for the reduction of rents, and soon the margin of security that protected many mortgages began to melt away. The Presbyterian tenant-farmers had been a desire for reduction of rents as the Catholic Land Leaguers had, and were the quickest to take full advantage of the right to reduction won for them by a campaign in which they bore none of the brunt. For a brief period, a fusion of interests seemed possible. After the broadening of the franchise in 1885, the Presbyterian farmers of South Derry, in the heart of the Presbyterian North-east, joined hands with the Catholic farmers and elected the Catholic Land Leaguer and Nationalist, T. M. Healy, by a sweeping majority, to be their member of Parliament. Another Home Rule candidate, Mr. Pinkerton, was elected for the predominantly Presbyterian constituency of North Antrim. But the masters in Israel, the custodians of the imperilled investments—in them the rapid course of agrarian reform excited no enthusiasm; and before long, when Gladstone brought forward his first Home Rule proposal, all the North-east was set ringing with the watchword "Home Rule means Home rule." At the next general election, which soon followed, Mr. Healy was defeated in South Derry. The Catholic plot, which was to come into effect upon the establishment of Home Rule, has already been mentioned; the Protestants were to be deprived of their farms, which had already been "raided" for by the Catholics. It is interesting to note that this remarkable discovery was first made in Mr. Healy's constituency of South Derry. For a short time, the Presbyterians visibly wavered

Even in Belfast, however, several of the leading Presbyterians discountenanced, from the very outset, the spirit of sedition." The historian himself may be allowed to sum up the case: "In 1869, the spirit of rebellion in Ulster had been crushed; and the Grant was so liberal in amount, and was conferred upon terms on the whole so advantageous, that it was received with satisfaction and gratitude. Nor has Government ever had reason to repent that it has thus recognized the claims of Irish Presbyterianism. Ever since the passing of the Act of Union, they have been the steadfast supporters of British connection." This, by the way, is a slight exaggeration. It took some time, under the new dispensation, to make the Leaven work, and there have never been wanting Presbyterians of education and intelligence who hold fast by the principles that animated Belfast before the Union. But let Dr. Killen continue: "It has been asserted that Presbyterian ministers amply repay the State for their endowment, inasmuch as the districts under their pastoral care can be governed without the aid of military." So that Lord Castlereagh's investment was a sound one not merely politically but even financially! Let us note here the testimony of an ardent pro-British loyalist to the fact that in 1868 the English Government in Ireland was in reality a military occupation.

O'Connell made a cardinal political mistake in placing the demand for Catholic emancipation before the demand for Repeal of the Union. A whole generation thus elapsed during which the rights of the Nation were forgotten and the rights of a particular religion asserted. Friendly as the Presbyterian body had been before the Union to the Catholic cause, it was not to be expected that they would transfer to it the enthusiasm with which they had supported the cause of National independence. By the time when O'Connell raised his Repeal banner, the Leaven had worked well in eastern Ulster, and a generation had arisen under the guidance of the satisfied and grateful. Moreover, O'Connell had freely invoked the public participation of the Catholic clergy in his campaign; and in the attitude of Presbyterians towards the Catholic clergy there is something more antipathetic than the purely polemical *odium theologium*. In truth it may be said that no single one of the leaders of 'Constitutional Nationalism' from O'Connell down has shown an intelligent appreciation of the East-Ulster factor in Irish politics."

A FUSION OF INTERESTS The disestablishment of the Protestant Episcopal Church of Ireland in 1869 removed the Ascendancy from explicit recognition by the State and tended so far to reconcile the Presbyterians still more to the *de facto* Government. This measure had a still subtler influence, which, however, was no part of its design. The Government grant to the Presbyterian clergy was to a large extent commuted, and from this and other sources the trustees of the Presbyterian Church were possessed of a capital fund for investment. At that time, the rents of land in Ireland had reached almost their highest pitch. The extravagance of Irish landlords increased with their income, and there was a large market for mortgages on their estates, returning a larger interest than any other investment that offered the same apparent security. The Presbyterian Church was more freely invested in this security, and thus the clergy of a community that was based upon the tenant class became virtual creditors of the landlord class, with a definite pecuniary interest in high rents. Ten years had not passed after disestablishment when Irish tenants of land learned for the first time how to combine against the united forces of the English Government and its "faithful garrison," as the landlords boasted themselves; and a Land War began that forced a rapid retreat on the allies. The Irish Land Act of 1881 established a tribunal for the reduction of rents, and soon the margin of security that protected many mortgages began to melt away. The Presbyterian tenant-farmers had been a desire for reduction of rents as the Catholic Land Leaguers had, and were the quickest to take full advantage of the right to reduction won for them by a campaign in which they bore none of the brunt. For a brief period, a fusion of interests seemed possible. After the broadening of the franchise in 1885, the Presbyterian farmers of South Derry, in the heart of the Presbyterian North-east, joined hands with the Catholic farmers and elected the Catholic Land Leaguer and Nationalist, T. M. Healy, by a sweeping majority, to be their member of Parliament. Another Home Rule candidate, Mr. Pinkerton, was elected for the predominantly Presbyterian constituency of North Antrim. But the masters in Israel, the custodians of the imperilled investments—in them the rapid course of agrarian reform excited no enthusiasm; and before long, when Gladstone brought forward his first Home Rule proposal, all the North-east was set ringing with the watchword "Home Rule means Home rule." At the next general election, which soon followed, Mr. Healy was defeated in South Derry. The Catholic plot, which was to come into effect upon the establishment of Home Rule, has already been mentioned; the Protestants were to be deprived of their farms, which had already been "raided" for by the Catholics. It is interesting to note that this remarkable discovery was first made in Mr. Healy's constituency of South Derry. For a short time, the Presbyterians visibly wavered