

The Catholic Record

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum. United States and Europe—\$2.50. Publisher & Proprietor, Thomas Coffey, L.L.D. Editors—Rev. James T. Foley, B.A. Thomas Coffey, L.L.D. Associate Editor—H. P. Mackintosh. Manager—Robert M. Burns. Address business letters to the Manager. Advertisements for teachers, situations wanted, etc., 50 cents each insertion. Remittance must accompany the order. Where Catholic Record Box address is required send 10 cents to defray expense of postage upon replies. Obituary and marriage notices cannot be inserted except in the usual condensed form. Each insertion 20 cents. The Catholic Record has been approved and recommended by Archbishops Falsonio and Sherrill, late Apostolic Delegates to Canada, the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, and St. Boniface, the Bishops of London, Hamilton, Peterborough and Oshesburg, N. Y., and the clergy throughout the Dominion. In St. John, N. B., single copies may be purchased from Mrs. M. A. McGuire, 20 Main St., and John J. Foy. In Sydney, N. S., single copies may be purchased from Murphy's Bookstore. In Montreal, single copies may be purchased from J. Milloy, 241 St. Catherine St. West. In Ottawa, single copies may be purchased from J. W. O'Brien, 141 Nicholas St. The following agents are authorized to receive subscriptions and canvass for The Catholic Record: General Agents: M. J. Hagar, Stephen V. James, Vincent S. Cox, Miss Jessie Doyle, Resident Agents: Miss Bride Saunders, 595-5th St., E. H. Looze, 225 St. Albans, West, Vancouver, B. C.; Silas Johnson, 210 Rochester St., Ottawa; Mrs. G. E. G. Macdonald, 225 St. James St., Montreal; B. F. O'Toole, LeBreton, Sask.; Miss Anne Hogan, 367 Langside Street, Winnipeg, Man.

LONDON, SATURDAY, DEC. 18, 1920

THE IRISH IMPASSE

Last week we published a despatch in which Cardinal Logue's reference to the Dublin murders was thus summarized:

"The murders in Dublin last Sunday oppressed him with a feeling of despair. He never hesitated to condemn in strongest terms deeds of blood from all sources and believes every man and woman in Ireland with a spark of Christian feeling deplores, detests and condemns the deliberate, cold-blooded murders of last Sunday morning. No object could excuse, no motive justify them. The perpetrators of such crimes were not real patriots, but enemies of the country, robbing her of just sympathy, raising obstacles to her progress and impressing a stain upon her fame."

This the venerable head of the Irish hierarchy stated in a pastoral letter which was read in all the churches of the Diocese of Armagh.

Already Eamonn de Valera had issued to the press a statement in which the killings, which the Cardinal in the name of Christain Ireland deplores, detests and condemns as cold-blooded murders, are condoned as the justifiable execution of spies.

He wrote: "No British soldier has a right to be in Ireland. Those who are there are guilty of making war, not a civilized war, but a barbarous war on people who are guilty of no act of aggression against England."

"The Irish people have learned again the old lesson that as long as the patient will suffer the cruel will kick, and having no other avenue of redress they naturally pursue the individuals of those forces who are responsible for outrages and are as enemy spies among them, rightly deserving death if any human beings deserve death, for they provide the alien Government with the knowledge and the strength to persecute and inflict endless misery upon a whole nation."

It is such utterly irreconcilable elements that make the Irish question today so difficult for many even to understand.

Last week, under the title "A Truce of God," we published a communication from the Most Rev. Dr. Cahalan, Bishop of Cork, in which he refers to a statement made by Cardinal Bourne in a letter to The Times:

"Cardinal Bourne speaks of the existence of a secret oath-bound society in Ireland as a generally admitted fact. I venture to say that it is not a generally admitted fact. Many took the erroneous view that because the elected representatives declared a Republic, Ireland is a Republic. The transition to the claim to shoot members of the army of occupation was easy. Add to that from the beginning of the trouble reprisals on policemen who exceeded their duty, and you have an explanation of the murders, without supposing the existence of an oath-bound secret society."

In a subsequent letter to The Times (See last week's CATHOLIC RECORD) Cardinal Bourne shows that he failed absolutely to understand Bishop Cahalan's explanation. And if His Eminence of Westminster, whose letters to the press indicate that he is studying the Irish problem, can fall so completely to grasp the reasonably clear statement of the Bishop of Cork, then it is not surprising that in the minds of many people the Irish question is involved in obscurity and confusion.

The basic fact of the present state of the Irish question is this: Many of the Irish people believe that they have established an Irish Republic; that the Republican Government is functioning, and possesses all the rights and duties of a sovereign governing body. The Irish Volunteers

have been converted into the Irish Republican Army, serving, and solely accountable to the Irish Republic.

Just what proportion of the Irish people, or even of the Volunteers, are convinced Republicans it would be impossible to estimate. After the Constitutional movement had been killed by Carson and his English Tory allies, there is no doubt that a very large proportion of votes were cast for Sinn Fein as the only policy left to them; not that they believed an Irish Republic possible, but in the hope that some satisfactory political solution might be evolved in this way. It is quite evident on the other hand that a section of the Irish people believes in the existence, as a matter of right and as a matter of fact, of the Irish Republic with its government, its courts, and its army.

That its courts were functioning throughout the greater part of Ireland is well known; and before the Government policy of restoring respect for British law by the present reign of terror, not only Republicans or Sinn Fein sympathizers but life-long Unionists resorted by preference to the Sinn Fein tribunals. At the time of the arrest of the late Lord Mayor MacSwiney it was found that a great English Insurance Company was amongst those seeking justice before a Sinn Fein court, a fact that made it necessary to proceed against the Mayor on other grounds than as a first intended.

Soms there are, too, who believe and proclaim that the Irish Republic is at war with the British Government, a war of self-defense against unjust aggression. This is pretty clearly intimated if not expressed in so many words in the extract quoted above from Eamonn de Valera.

But this claim is not so preposterous as at first blush it might seem to be. It is precisely the claim made by the British Government, or by that member of it chiefly and directly responsible for the government of Ireland.

This is how The Manchester Guardian comments on this very declaration made during the recent Irish debate in the British House of Commons:

"But in this crucial matter of permitted crime Sir Hamar Greenwood stands condemned out of his own mouth when he is driven to justify the lawlessness of his own soldiers and police by the plea of civil war. The suggestion is a monstrous one. If it is valid, if soldiers and police are to be permitted, in Mr. Asquith's phrase, to 'run amok' among the civil population, burning down houses, destroying cattle and crops, driving woman and children in their nightdresses in terror to the fields and the woods, then what are we to say of the counter violence, of the reprisals against these reprisals? As Mr. Lloyd George has sagely remarked, you cannot have war on one side only. If the one side is at war, then the other is at war, and murder is no longer murder, but only an incident of battle. The thing is preposterous. The very first thing which the Government has got to do, if it is to vindicate law and claim public support for the process, is itself to respect the law. Sir Hamar Greenwood pleaded weakly once more that he does not approve of reprisals, that he has tried to stop them, that some police, and, he even added (in contradiction to Mr. Churchill), some soldiers have been punished. Yet reprisals go on exactly as before, and in another part of his speech Sir Hamar Greenwood is found pleading a state of war in order to excuse himself for not stopping them. The plea is futile, and the position is utterly discreditable."

So the vicious circle of lawlessness in the name of law and "reprisals," in the name of war goes on both on the part of the British Government and on the part of the Irish Republic. For, as the Bishop of Cork points out, "many took the erroneous view that because the elected representatives declared a Republic, Ireland is a Republic," exercising sovereign rights including the right to execute traitors and spies.

Unless we grasp this basic fact it is impossible to understand many phases in the recent development of the complex Irish question. And we must remember that the representatives of the majority of the Irish people in declaring Ireland a Republic and setting up a Republican government were only doing for Ireland what Carson did for Ulster when he organized his Provisional Government with its army avowedly to defy and resist the authority of King and Parliament. Unless we remember this fact, and

the further fact that Carson in his rebellion was openly, defiantly and blatantly supported by the Tory press and the Tory politicians of England, we ignore the psychology of the Irish situation; and the recent and rapid developments of the age-long Irish struggle for liberty must remain quite unintelligible.

Quite evidently if the Irish Republic has no existence de facto or de jure the executions of its agents are legally murders no matter what the provocation may be. Not only has no other power recognized the existence of the Irish Republic but the Irish episcopate has denounced as cold-blooded murder what Irish Republicans have justified as lawful executions. Nor could it well be otherwise. The Church has not lived through all the vicissitudes of nineteen hundred years without having had to face the question of the right to rebel against tyrannical government. And one thing which the Catholic Church requires as an essential condition before any rebellion can be justified is this: The rebellion must have a reasonable chance to succeed.

This is not only good theology but good sense; for otherwise without alleviating existing oppression rebellion brings on the unfortunate people the additional horrors of a war of repression.

And to hold that Ireland in armed rebellion has a reasonable chance to succeed against the might of the British Empire is criminal folly.

The whole condition of affairs in Ireland is abnormal. And the most unlighted English statesmen as well as the self-respecting and independent portion of the press recognize that the Irish situation brings infinite discredit and humiliation on England as well as infinite suffering on Ireland.

The Manchester Guardian after saying that "crime must be punished and criminals must suffer in Ireland as everywhere else," adds:

"But to imagine that this ends the matter is folly. Horrors like these are no normal incidents of civilized society, above all in a country normally so free from ordinary crime as Ireland. They are the foul growth of evil conditions of life and government, and the business of statesmanship only begins when the causes and not merely the fruits of such desperate mischiefs are sought out."

It is this feeling of deep resentment and humiliation at the Government's brutal policy, this profound conviction on the part of informed and thinking Englishmen that the policy is fundamentally wrong and unstatesmanlike that has forced Lloyd George to make the gesture of willingness to negotiate with the representatives of the Irish people, which we are told is characterized in the lobby as an offer "with an olive branch in one hand and the bludgeon of martial law in the other."

If the insincerity is so patent to his fellow members in the House it may not be entirely hidden from those Irishmen who have with good reason completely lost faith in the honesty as well as the sincerity of English politicians.

It may be well to add here an extract or two from Arthur Henderson's report of actual conditions in Ireland. This Labor leader has just returned from Ireland where with a Labor commission he was seeking first hand information on a question deliberately obscured by Government press propaganda. He said that it was impossible for him to exaggerate the conditions prevailing there.

"Coercion is applied with such indiscriminate violence," Mr. Henderson declared, "that the people are terror-stricken. The unhappy inhabitants are reminded day and night that their country is under the heel of a ruthless military occupation."

"It is actually true to say that life was safer in Brussels during the German occupation than it is now in Cork, Dublin and Londonderry. No man is safe; even women and children run terrible risks of being shot while in the streets. The economic life of the country is coming to a standstill."

Instancing ten cases which he had investigated of highway robbery by servants of the Crown Mr. Henderson said:

"All this could not be dissociated from the Government's policy, which was reactionary in its conception, brutal in its application and destructive in its consequences. He was not saying that all the outrages were on one side, but the reprisals had struck a blow, perhaps mortal, at law and order. He could only hope

and pray that nothing would happen among the unemployed this winter to give the members of the Cabinet an excuse for applying the same methods at home."

He found, however, that conditions were favorable for a settlement of the Irish question. Everyone knows that the vast majority of the Irish people would accept Dominion Home Rule as a satisfactory and permanent settlement; or even some more explicit reservation, if required for naval defense, than is imposed on the Dominions, provided Ireland be given complete fiscal autonomy without which Home Rule would be illusory. Mr. Henderson found "a willingness more marked than anything in his experience of the Irish temper" to come to a truce and initiate negotiations for a settlement. If this spirit were not met by English statesmen, "reprisals more drastic than that Cromwell practiced by fire and sword," he declared, "would be necessary to keep Ireland enslaved and every resource the Irish people possess would be used in such circumstances to awaken the civilized world to the enormity of England's crime."

It is worthy of note that in the article from which we have already quoted The Manchester Guardian, though vigorously and indignantly denouncing the Government's criminal lawlessness and terrorism, does not mention murder as part and parcel of the Government policy. But Sir Horace Plunkett on the eve of his departure the other day for the United States made this significant declaration:

"If the people knew how many persons had been killed in Ireland we would soon have peace."

Even while ignoring the murder policy of the Government forces, either deliberately or because uninformed in the matter, the great Liberal journal, disgusted with Hamar Greenwood's insincerity and tergiversation, thus concludes:

"But no Government would dare to avow this as its policy, and Sir Hamar Greenwood naturally denied that it was the policy of the Government. Why then does the Government permit and condone it? Thereby it merely adds the reproach of hypocrisy to that of lawlessness."

CANADA FIRST FOR CANADIANS

Our readers will remember that, on a former occasion, we had reason to refer to Mr. Newton Wesley Rowell and to animadvert on his lack of honesty and moral courage in failing to withdraw a charge which, whether or not honestly preferred in the first instance, was subsequently conclusively shown to be utterly unfounded.

That lapse from straightforward and manly ideals need not blind us to a signal service he has rendered his country as one of Canada's representatives in the Assembly of the League of Nations.

A Commission of the League brought in a report recommending the establishment of three large new bureaus to deal with the following subjects: (1) economy and finance; (2) transportation and transit; (3) health. These bureaus were to be permanent and to a very great extent self-governing; and while theoretically responsible to the League they would really be accountable only to the Council. This, Mr. Rowell very vigorously and very clearly pointed out, "The big powers of the Balance control the Council, which is to have control of the bureaus which will report to it during the whole time the assembly is not sitting," and for the further reason that "States situated at a great distance from Geneva cannot send their best men as members of permanent bureaus, whereas European powers can do so."

Vigorously objecting to European control Mr. Rowell continued: "This might be all right if the League were a European League, but it is a world League. I am very sure that the people of Canada are not ready to turn over control to a European Council."

This is sound Canadianism. We confess that we expected little from Mr. Rowell as Canada's representative to the League of Nations. Nor did we expect much from the League itself. Quite evidently even if it fell in the grandiose objects for which it was ostensibly founded, it may yet have much power for harm if not for good. Mr. Rowell used to talk much of Canada's new status; but always failed when challenged to define what was meant by the term. This failure led to suspicion and distrust

now happily dispelled by his remarkably outspoken pronouncement which made a profound impression, and evoked enthusiastic applause from the Assembly.

"It is not," continued Mr. Rowell, "that we have not the greatest respect and admiration for European statesmen, but simply that they do not understand our point of view. Even the statesmen of the mother country, for whom we have the greatest respect and affection, we do not permit to settle Canadian affairs. We settle them for ourselves."

"You may say that we should have confidence in European statesmen. Perhaps we should. But it was European statesmen, European policies and European ambitions that drenched the world in blood and from which the world is suffering and will suffer for generations. Fifty thousand Canadian soldiers under the soil of France and Flanders is what Canada has paid for European statesmanship. Therefore, I submit that we have no right in this International Assembly to part with our control in these matters."

This concrete exhibition of Canadianism will be accepted in lieu of the formal definition sought of the new status of Canada.

It was getting so that every tuppenny ha'penny aspirant for office from the lowest to the highest talked as though the burden of empire were on his shoulders; and the Canadian who put Canada first was regarded with suspicion by those very loud but very shallow imperialists.

As we write we have before us another evidence of sturdy Canadianism which augurs better for our political future than many had dared to hope. It is an extract from a summary of a speech by Mr. Crerar with which we shall conclude:

"Dealing with Canada's status in the empire, Mr. Crerar said the new national policy was definitely set against the development of any centralization of imperial power, which would, he was convinced, in the end, produce nothing but unfortunate results for both Canada and the mother country."

"It is recognized that the old conception of colonial status which existed even in the minds of some Canadian and some British people prior to 1914 is no more, and the vestiges of it that yet remain must be adjusted to the new conception of Canada's place in the world. It is the business of good citizens to build up a distinctive Canadian national sentiment in their Dominion. We should stand for Canada within the empire, but Canada first for Canadians."

To be the interpreter of the British Commonwealth to the United States and thus to be an essential link in the chain of the English-speaking nations of the world Mr. Crerar considered Canada's great part on the world's stage; but

"To play this part effectively," he said, "our development must be along lines of a more complete autonomy. When we respect ourselves as a nation we will have the respect of others, and we will be on the way to perform the useful service that lies within our opportunity—of linking together in a common understanding the Anglo-Saxon peoples for the welfare not only of themselves, but of the world as well."

LOYALTY AND TREASON

By THE OBSERVER. Loyalty is defined in Stroud's Judicial Dictionary as "not only attachment to royalty, but, as the word itself imports, attachment to the law and to the constitution of the realm."

By this test the thing which Orange orators call "loyalty" is in reality the exact opposite: It is disloyalty. The whole course of Orangism has been one long-continued policy of disloyalty.

When the life of King William IV. was drawing to a close, and the Crown was about to devolve on the young Princess Victoria, there arose an Orange conspiracy to exclude the Princess, and to place on the throne, her uncle, the Duke of Cumberland, who was at that time the head of the Orange Order.

The story of this plot is to be found in the English Commons Hansard, for the years 1834, 1835 and 1836. The upshot was, that the plot being exposed, the Orange Order was ordered to be dissolved; and, by a resolution of the House of Commons, the King addressed, to the army as its Commander-in-Chief, an order

forbidding the maintenance of Orange lodges in the army, and forbidding army officers to join any lodge.

I need hardly say that the Orange Order disobeyed both the law and the King's command; gave the order a new name and went right on. Orangism has never been loyal to the law or the constitution.

And, in this disloyalty, the Orangemen have been only a little more candid, and a little less hypocritical than the general run of English public men. A few years ago, the world was astonished to see English "statesmen," such as Balfour and Bonar-Law, English jurists, such as Halsbury, and English generals, such as French and Gough, join in support of the rebellion of Carson, Smith and Campbell.

But what occasion was there for astonishment? The thing was historical; and ran true to precedent. Let me cite one case: In 1832, English politics was convulsed over the Reform Bill which made sweeping changes in the electoral franchise. Lord Melbourne was then Prime Minister; and Major General Sir Charles Napier was Commander-in-Chief of the army. On June 25th, 1832, Mr. Thomas Young, Private Secretary to Lord Melbourne, the Prime Minister, wrote to General Napier as follows:

"My dear Napier,—Sir H. Bunbury told me of your wise determination not to become 'a parliament man,' at least for the present. . . . Let us go back a moment. The display of energy and a readiness to act, on the part of the people when the Duke of Wellington was on the eve of coming in, was greater far than I expected. I speak not of the cockneys, but of the men in the North—Glasgow, Newcastle, Birmingham. Are you aware that in the event of a fight you were to be invited to take the command at Birmingham? Parkes got a frank from me for you with that view, but had no occasion to send it. Had he written, I should have tread a despatch at you with my friendly and anxious counsel and entreaty to keep you quiet and not to stir from Freshford. It is not well to enter early into revolutions—the first fall victims. What do you think would have happened? The Reformers—Plac, etc., talked big to me, and felt assured of success. The run upon the banks, and the barricading of the populous country towns, would have brought matters to a crisis; a week, they, the Reformers, thought would finish the business. They meant so to agitate here that no soldiers could have been spared from London; and the army is too small elsewhere to have put down the rebels. In Scotland, I believe, the most effectual blow would have been struck; and it seems difficult to have resisted the popular movement. The Tories, however, say the Duke would have succeeded. No doubt the discipline under which the soldiers live might have proved a stronger element than the public enthusiasm; i.e., unless the latter was universal or extensive and then it would have carried all before it. The task would have been to bring back society to its former quiet state. Thank God we have been spared the trial; but as a matter of speculation, tell me what you think would have been the result? Am I right in my conjecture that you would have refused the Birmingham invite, and kept your sword in its scabbard?"

Yours ever truly, T. Y.

Now, what cause was there for astonishment in 1914, at seeing the English army dragged into politics; at seeing treason playing its game around the steps of the throne? There was one precedent for it; and the history of English politics and the English army is full of such instances. Napier, however, was a bigger and a better man than French or Gough; and he published the letter; which has become one of the classics of English treason. And if, instead of tracing the history of treason forward from 1832, we choose to trace it backward, what a dirty maze of official treason we uncover; back to the Georges, and farther still, English statesmanship reeks with it at every stage of the story. But I have taken first the Napier incident of 1832; and that for two reasons. First, it was just at that time that the Cumberland Plot was on foot; and, second, the plotters found bad example to imitate, set them by Ministers of the Crown, as we have just shown. How history does repeat itself!

NOTES AND COMMENTS

STEPPING ASIDE for the moment from the sphere of religious comment and controversy we devote this week the space at our disposal to more mundane themes.

THE NOTES of warning that have from time to time been sounded as to the limitation of the world's resources in the matter of pulpwod has had the effect—the very desirable effect—of turning scientific attention to other possible sources of paper-making material. Canada, we were recently told, has but fifty years supply of pulpwod in sight, although vast and unexplored resources, we are further assured, lie in the Far North. These, however, are not available at the present stage of the country's development, and the difficulty, yet to be encountered, of projecting railways into those water-bound territories. But judged by past achievements in scientific discovery and engineering skill, it would seem a reasonable to set any limitations in that direction for the years to come.

THIS BEING a matter of direct concern to the newspaper reader, it may not be amiss to glance at two new sources of paper making supply put under tribute in recent years. Papyrus, which to the ancients was one of the chief writing materials, is one of these, and it is now proposed to utilize the vast areas of papyrus grass in South Africa for the manufacture of paper pulp. A company has been formed in Norway for this purpose, which has secured a concession of several hundred square miles in Zululand, and is now erecting a factory at Umfolosi, capable of turning out 6,000 tons of pulp a year. This, in proportion to the world's consumption of pulp, is an inconsiderable quantity it is true, but it is a beginning, and in a very few years will undoubtedly develop to immense proportions.

IT is estimated that it will take 40,000 tons of raw material to produce the 6,000 tons of pulp, but as the growth of the grass is perennial, and the area where it is found extensive, an abundance of raw material is assured. The papyrus has to be cut by hand in the same way as sugar cane. It is then dried, passed through a cutting machine, pressed and limewashed. Like sugar cane, too, and like cotton in the Southern States, colored labor must be depended upon, but with the practically unlimited supply of this available in South and Central Africa no misgivings are felt on that score. Canada, therefore, has to count upon this source in the near future as a formidable rival in the pulp markets of the world.

ANOTHER NEW source of paper-pulp is likely to be sea-weed. A French scientist who has made extensive investigations and experiments in this direction gives it as his opinion that sea-weed, or seawrack, possesses the desired properties for the production of a good pulp, and for this purpose offers many economical advantages. Besides furnishing an inexhaustible crop, confined to no one continent or hemisphere, it is easy to handle and to prepare. It can be dried on the spot, and, before collection, cleaned by a rudimentary shaking process. Further, for transportation it can be put up in bales, which in itself makes for economy. From all this, the reader may take heart that within measurable time he is not likely to be deprived of his morning or weekly paper. Long ere that eventually comes to pass mankind may have evolved some other means of circulating the news.

ONE RESULT of the Great War was that whereas Germany had up to that time a practical monopoly in the manufacture of aniline dyes, the shutting-off of the supply on this continent by the action of war necessarily stimulated the manufacture on this side. Hence, with the return of Peace, Germany found herself confronted with new conditions in this as in many other departments of foreign trade. Customers had become competitors in their own markets and rivals abroad, so that Germany like other countries has to adapt herself to changes which she had herself precipitated.

AS IN paper-pulp so in dyeing material new sources of supply have come out of, or rather been engendered by the great conflict. An interesting little story is being