

The Catholic Record

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

Advertisement for remedied situations wanted, etc. Approved and recommended by the Archbishop of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa and St. Boniface, the Bishops of London, Hamilton, Peterborough, and Carleton Place, N. Y., and the clergy throughout the Dominion.

LONDON, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 18, 1918

SOCIALISM

"Men have been given over, isolated and defenceless, to the callousness of employers and the greed of unrestrained competition."

"To this must be added the custom of working by contract, and the concentration of so many branches of trade in the hands of a few individuals, so that a small number of very rich men have been able to lay upon the masses of the poor a yoke little better than slavery itself."

Are these extracts from Karl Marx or Bebel? No. Are they the ravings of some irresponsible socialist demagogue seeking to inflame the passions of working-men and incite them to riot and destruction of property? They are not.

They are a deliberate statement of fact; the calm and measured utterance of one conscious of his awful responsibility in face of "the momentous seriousness of the present state of things (which) just now fills every mind with painful apprehension."

Savoring of Socialistic declamation these statements may seem, they are, nevertheless, from the soberest and sanest and weightiest pronouncement ever made on the question, from the immortal encyclical of Pope Leo XIII. on The Condition of Labor.

For this disease of modern industrialism, Socialism proposes a remedy. Tens of millions believe in it. They are more or less united in a mighty movement to apply that remedy, though it involves the destruction of organized society as developed through ages of Christian civilization. We hear from time to time of the imminent danger of Germany's engaging Britain in a death-struggle for the mastery of the seas. This shadowy peril fades away in the light of the real danger disclosed by the discontent and unrest in the ranks of organized English labor.

The great strikes of recent years which paralyzed British trade and commerce, tied up her great manufacturing industries, and involved millions in sufferings and privations unequalled in times of war in ages past, show that England is in greater danger from social conditions than she is from Germany. Germany herself faces a struggle with the growing power of socialism more serious than any war which the ambition of her rulers may involve. On this continent, with its yet unfiled spaces and undeveloped resources, the danger is not so imminent, but is none the less real. Industrial conditions are little better than in the older lands, and the conflict, though probably more remote, is, nevertheless, inevitable. Indeed in a very real sense the conflict is now going on.

Nothing, therefore, could be of deeper interest or greater utility than the discussion of Socialism which Everybody's Magazine has arranged to take place in its columns. Mr. Morris Hillquit, a distinguished practising lawyer, the author of "History of Socialism in the United States" and "Socialism in Theory and Practice," will present the arguments in favor of the Socialist remedy for the acknowledged ills of modern society. "As an 'orthodox' Socialist," he says himself, "who has spent the better part of his life in active service of the

organized Socialist movement, I may without immodesty undertake to present the accepted Socialist position, and to speak for the Socialist movement with some degree of authority." Mr. Hillquit has been a delegate to the national conventions of the Socialist party since 1899, and to the international congresses and conferences at Amsterdam, Stuttgart, Copenhagen and Brussels.

Father John A. Ryan, D. D., Professor of Moral Theology and Economics in St. Paul Seminary, and also an author of recognized standing, will combat Socialism, showing that "as a social philosophy, though it reaches some glimmerings of truth, it is in the main false. As a living movement, it involves and disseminates so many and such baneful errors, social, religious and ethical, that it is a constant menace to right principles and a right order of society. As a contemplated economic-political scheme, it would bring in more and greater evils than it would abolish." Nevertheless, Father Ryan admits that the present industrial system "in many of its elements is far, very far, from satisfactory or tolerable. On the other hand, it is not bankrupt. It has in it the possibilities of immense improvement. Hence we are not compelled to continue it as it now is or to fly to Socialism. There is a third alternative, namely, the existing system greatly, even radically, amended."

In the current number of "Everybody's" the decks are cleared for action. Mr. Hillquit and Father Ryan have agreed on the subject, the method of treatment, and the limitations of the discussion. It is the principles, the philosophy, the ideals and the tendencies of Socialism, as embodied and exemplified in the actual living Socialist movement, that will form the subject of discussion. The debate will be, therefore, eminently practical and actual. The articles for and against Socialism will appear side by side in the same issue in a form available for the immediate comparison of arguments. It has been agreed that the authors should exchange manuscripts and re-exchange, each with the right to introduce revisions in the light of what the other had written, until each should be content.

The immense advantage of such full and fair discussion is at once evident. Too often the arguments against Socialism have been as intemperate, as ill-informed and as inadequate as the violent denunciations by which the street corner socialist seeks to uphold his cause. At times in condemning Socialism we are too prone to champion things as they are; to brand as socialistic and therefore condemned by the Church, measures which may or may not be economically sound, but which certainly are not condemned.

In the English coal strike the most formidable conservative argument was that the strike was unjustifiable and immoral, because the coal workers repudiated a contract that had yet some years to run. Some Catholic writers vigorously upheld this view. And yet it was Leo XIII. who made this deliberate pronouncement on this very subject:

"Let it be granted, then, that, as a rule, workman and employer should make free agreements, and in particular should freely agree as to wages; nevertheless, there is a dictate of nature more imperious and more ancient than any bargain between man and man, that the remuneration must be enough to support the wage-earner in reasonable and frugal comfort."

Whether the English miners were right or wrong does not matter now. What does matter is that Pope Leo, if quoted in favor of the miners, would probably have been branded as a Socialist by the reactionaries of that troubled time.

It is a matter of great congratulation that in Father Ryan, Socialism will find an opponent thoroughly well informed as to Catholic principles, and one, for that very reason, less likely to flinch from facing squarely the injustice of existing conditions. It is this frank recognition of what constitutes the strength of Socialism that will do much to keep the forthcoming discussion between Dr. Ryan and Mr. Hillquit within the sphere of the actual, the concrete and the useful.

We have no apology to make for this extended notice; we are quite convinced that our readers who follow the discussion will be grateful for the unique opportunity it will afford for informing themselves of the best that can be said on a subject of absorbing interest and pressing importance. The Catholic

Church is the chief bulwark against Socialism. Men eminent in both these world-wide groups," says the editor, "have lent their good-will, shared in the selection, and welcomed the conflict as one certain to be of the utmost value."

THE ANSWER

Day after day press despatches telling of war's alarms in Ulster created in the minds of some Canadians the impression that there was some foundation for believing that the British Government had reached an impasse on the Home Rule question. Lord Loreburn's suggestion of a conference, rumored consultations between leaders of both parties and the King, the silence of the Government, all seemed sufficient to confirm the impression.

It is now evident that the silence of the Government was not due to hesitation or uncertainty as to their course of action. Settlement by consent was in the air. Everyone felt that this was highly desirable, so the Government wisely allowed ample time for its discussion. This discussion enabled the people of the United Kingdom to realize that the very desirable settlement by consent was rendered impossible, not by the Government, but by Carson and Carsonism.

When this was clearly seen and the people and press were speculating as to the next development, a member of the Government, the Right Hon. Reginald McKenna, without brag or bluster, but with dignity and determination stated the Government's position firmly and unequivocally:

"The Liberal party have convictions and have the courage of their convictions. One of these convictions is that in the government of the country the will of the majority, lawfully expressed through their representatives, must prevail, and upon that conviction the Liberal party will stand. There is no possible alternative. We are not going to submit either to rule by minority or to anarchy."

"The Home Rule Bill will pass next session through the House of Commons, by authority of the representatives of the people, and it will again be rejected by the Lords if it will pass under the Parliament Act."

Commenting on Mr. McKenna's speech The Westminster Gazette said:

"What the Government cannot do, without making itself ridiculous, or undermining the whole cause of constituted authority, is to hoist the white feather to Sir Edward Carson's Provisional Government."

Contrasted with the bluster and carefully ambiguous threats of Sir Edward Carson there is a courage and quiet dignity about these utterances that will appeal to self-respecting Englishmen.

Unionist visitors to Canada have been heard during the past year, so it was fitting that the Right Hon. Herbert Samuel should make a pronouncement before leaving Canada. At the Capital before the Canadian Club Mr. Samuel discussed the Home Rule Bill in some detail. Humorously he called attention to a fact, an outstanding fact, but one which too often forgotten or ignored:

"With regard to Ulster the first thing to understand about the Ulster problem is that it is not an Ulster problem. Ulster sends 35 members to the House of Commons, who, above all, reflect the opinion of the people on Home Rule. Of these 35, 18 are in favor of Home Rule."

Another important fact to which he called attention was that, leaving out the Irish members altogether, and counting only those from England, Scotland and Wales, there is a majority of sixty members at Westminster in favor of Home Rule. The Mail and Empire report describes Mr. Samuel as a fluent and incisive speaker who was listened to throughout with the closest attention; "and while he was making his peroration with all the emphasis at his command on the Home Rule question, the stillness was almost dramatic."

"We believe," concluded Mr. Samuel, in ringing tones, "that our general policy, apart from details, commands the approval of the dominions in the Empire and the Government of the United Kingdom cannot and will not abandon its proposal for establishing self-government in Ireland."

The most absolutely plain-spoken and uncompromising declaration was made by the Right Hon. Winston Churchill, First Lord of the Admiralty, in an address to his constituents at Dundee, Scotland:

"I turn to Ireland. Our policy, under the leadership of the Premier, towards Ireland, is clear and unwavering. We intend to create and set up an Irish Parliament subordinate to the

Imperial Parliament, with a responsible Executive, for the conduct of purely Irish affairs. We are absolutely entitled to do this, and to do it now, without delays. In the lifetime of the present House of Commons we are entitled to use the machinery of the Parliament Act for that purpose, which was indeed one of the main and explicit purposes of the Parliament Act."

He held that the two elections in 1910, with the fully expressed intention of passing a Home Rule measure, gave the government the fullest authority to act; "and we intend to act on that mandate, simply, fearlessly, and to the utmost of our just power."

"From that course no abuse, no reproaches, no cajolery, no violence, ought to turn us during the next two years; that is to say, before the Home Rule Bill can be fully operative."

"I have not the slightest doubt about the power of the government to carry this policy through. I have no doubt of their intention to carry it through. I have no doubt about their right to do so. Still less have I any doubt about the power of the State, as the State, apart from Liberal and Conservative politics, to maintain its law and to put down disorder, by whomsoever it is threatened or fomented."

Then the British statesman gave the seditious Orange agitator the British Government's answer direct and unequivocal. It is wholesome reading after the columns of Orange bluster with which we have recently been regaled:

"Home Rule has been at last carried to the threshold of complete achievement, and if that is to be nullified by Orange violence and by the minority, having the lawless audacity to interpose a bully's veto, more arbitrary than the veto of the Crown which has been abolished these 300 years, then, if such things could happen, constitutional and Parliamentary action and patient and law-abiding agitation for the redress of grievances will in every part of the Empire and throughout the civilized world be discredited, and dark and furious methods of lawless violence will receive supreme and devastating vindication. Against such a peril, against such outrageous pretences, the government will be prepared to take all necessary appropriate measures."

The claim of Northeast Ulster for special consideration is a claim which if advanced with sincerity and not as a wrecking manoeuvre cannot be ignored without full consideration by any Government dependent upon the present House of Commons. The Home Rule Bill is not unalterable but must be altered by consent."

This is taken by our frantic friend Windermere to mean that the Government is willing to exclude Northeast Ulster from the scope of the Home Rule Bill. Saneley read, the paragraph means nothing of the sort. Mr. Churchill, speaking for the Government, makes it clear to the people of the United Kingdom and to the world, that the Government is entirely willing to make any reasonable concessions in order to reach a settlement by consent.

It is now Ulster's move. If Carson offers nothing but the bully's veto for consideration, then the odium of rejecting all offers of conciliation rests on him and the irreconcilables he represents.

It was a good tactical move on the part of the Government. It was good statesmanship. It was good politics. It was in no sense a betrayal of his Irish colleagues. Redmond himself said there was no concession short of abandoning the principle of the Bill that he was not prepared to make in order that Irish self-government should be made acceptable to all Irishmen. Such concessions can never include the dismemberment of Ireland. Ireland could no more consider the exclusion of Northeast Ulster and Belfast, than Canada could consider the exclusion of Quebec, with Canada's chief port of entry, Montreal.

It is now up to Mr. Carson and his Unionist sympathizers to formulate their demands, to advance with sincerity, and not as a wrecking manoeuvre, any and every reasonable claim on behalf of special consideration for Northeast Ulster. The Government and the House of Commons are willing to give them full and serious consideration with a view to settlement by consent. Settlement by consent, if possible, is ardently desired by all who are not blind partisans loath to abandon their wrecking manoeuvre. We can well believe it is the desire of the King.

If the champions of special consideration for Ulster are sincere, settlement by consent is possible. If irreconcilable wreckers, on them must rest the responsibility and odium of making settlement by consent impossible. They must now speak or forever hold their peace.

What the government will do, in the event of no sincere proposition on behalf of Ulster, is answered by His Majesty's Ministers in a tone and in terms that leave no room for misunderstanding.

DIVORCE AND RACE SUICIDE

The report of the Secretary of State for Ohio gives statistics of divorce in that State that are almost incredible.

The Kansas City Times has the following summary of the report:

"More than one out of every eight marriages in Ohio finds its sequel in the divorce court. Last year 43,357 brides vowed eternal love and obedience at the altar. To-day 5,724 of them are divorcees. And that is not the worst of it either. In addition to the six thousand divorces granted more than eight thousand more couples tried to get decrees and failed, chiefly because of refusal of courts to grant them."

"The above figures show that, while more than one divorce is granted for each eight marriages, the total number of divorces sought is one out of every three marriages."

Significant also is the fact that the number of marriages last year was only 43,357 as compared with over 46,000 in 1908.

If the United States gives the most impressive object lessons in divorce, France, decadent and dying and at war with the Church, furnishes not less eloquent statistics in the matter of race suicide. During the whole of the nineteenth century the birth rate declined every ten years with mathematical regularity. From 1800 to 1810 there were 32.3 births for every thousand inhabitants; in the second decade 31.6; in the third 30.8; in the fourth 29.9; in the fifth 27.4; in the sixth 26.2; in the seventh 26.1; in the eighth 25.5; in the ninth 23.2; in the tenth 22.2. In 1910 the number sank to 19.7 and in 1911 18.7. Dr. Bertillon pessimistically asserts that "the decreasing progression will continue until the complete extinction of the race."

In England and Wales the Registrar-General's report shows that in 1911 the birth-rate was the lowest on record. In 1876 there were 36.3 births for every thousand inhabitants; in 1911 the number had fallen to 24.4, and provisional figures for 1912 indicate a further decrease of 0.6 per thousand. The English birth-rate is, therefore, now about what the foregoing figures show for France in the decade between 1880-1890.

The decrease from 1881 to 1891 was 34 per cent. In other words, if there had been no decrease in the birth rate during the past 30 years, the number of children born in England and Wales in 1911 would have been 1,273,698 instead of 843,585.

These figures are their own comment. It will be noticed that just as France has fallen away from the Church and the practise of religion the figures show a proportionate decrease in the number of births.

Furthermore, those districts of France which remained steadfast in the faith are those which show the highest birth-rate. On the continued success of the present religious revival depends not only the fate of the Church in France, but the very existence of the French nation. An esteemed correspondent refers to a species of race suicide amongst the Irish Catholics of Canada that deserves serious attention. While it may be less repulsive than the callous selfishness, of which the appalling figures above quoted tell the sordid story, it nevertheless is sufficiently similar in results to receive careful consideration. In a subsequent issue we shall discuss the question.

THE CATHOLIC IDEAL

In the matter of education we have noted time and again that thinking men of all denominations and of none bear testimony to the wisdom of the Catholic Church. The recent Anglican Synod in Toronto, attended by an archbishop, seven bishops, sixty clerical and forty-five lay delegates, declared the following to be one of the outstanding objects of the synod:

"To emphasize the fact that children cannot be trained in public schools unless upon a foundation of morality and religion."

Our Anglican friends are generally long on resolutions and short on practical measures. However, this time they seem to have made some approach to action:

to be made the Minister of Education regarding desired changes. Archdeacon Ingles considered the present regulations inadequate and impracticable."

Mr. Blake held "that the 400,000 Public school children were entitled to the great treasure of minds stored with inspirational treats." In other words, we suppose, they should read the Bible at school.

"The trouble is," continued Mr. Blake, "that the 8,000 teachers would first have to be taught how to give religious instruction."

Note how lightly he passes from the Bible to religious instruction. He is right. You cannot teach the Bible without teaching religion. What sort of religion shall it be? Each one of the 8,000 teachers must make her own selections from the Bible; and each must put her own interpretation on the passages selected. Otherwise the Bible will be entirely different from everything else on the school curriculum; it will be read but not explained, not discussed, not taught.

You can't eat your cake and keep it. You can't have undenominational schools with denominational teachers teaching denominational religion. To teach undenominational religion is merely to instil indifference into the children.

Archdeacon Ingles considers the present regulations with regard to religious teaching inadequate and impracticable.

Mr. Blake, on the contrary, thinks the regulations give the clergy great privileges. But he sympathizes with any boy who had to remain for half an hour's religious teaching while other boys were at play.

The present regulations do give the clergy great privileges unquestionably; but how many clergymen avail themselves of these privileges? Apparently the sympathy of the clergy would go out to the minister giving half an hour's religious instruction while others were enjoying themselves elsewhere, rather than to the boys who had to forego a half hour's play for the sake of religious instruction. At any rate not one in a hundred of them have honestly tried out the present regulations. Is it just to pronounce them inadequate and impracticable without a trial?

There will be time enough, however, before they have taught the teachers how to teach, and after that the important matter of what to teach, for the average man to decide whether his sympathy will go to the boys, the clergy or the teachers.

What a change has come over the spirit of our dreams of secular education freed from all sectarianism. The biggest sect today is that which regards all sects with indifference. True they give a languid adherence to non-sectarian Christianity and a modified approval to Christian ethical standards—especially for children. Shall this sect determine the character of the non-sectarian religious teaching in the public schools?

THE STORY OF ULSTER

S. S. McClure, the owner of McClure's magazine, publishes in its October number an autobiography. We give below an extract from the introduction which will serve to throw much light on the present condition of Ireland:

"I was born in Ireland fifty-six years ago. Antrim, the north-east county of the Province of Ulster, was my native county. My mother's maiden name was Elizabeth Gaston. Her people were descended from a French Huguenot family that came to Ireland after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, and they still bore their French surname. My father's people, the McClures, were from Galloway, Scotland. The family had come across the North Channel about two hundred years ago and settled in Ulster. After the battle of the Boyne, as for hundreds of years before, it was a common thing for the Protestant kings of England to make large grants of Irish land to Protestant colonists from England and Scotland. Ulster, lying across a narrow strip of water from the Scottish coast, was given over to colonists from the Lowlands until half her population was foreign. The injustice of this system of colonization, together with the fierce retaliation of the Irish, brought about the long list of reciprocal atrocities which are at the root of the Irish question today."

It will thus be seen that for the most part the inhabitants of North East Ulster have little claim to be called Irish in the true sense. From the beginning to our day they have been but a foreign garrison in the country—the descendants of those who in the long ago by brute force robbed the real Irish people of their patrimony. For centuries the coun-

try has been governed by and for the special benefit of these foreigners.

A MANLY UTTERANCE

It would be well were more of our Canadian dailies to follow the example of the St. John Telegraph and take a manly stand upon the Ulster disturbance. Too many of them remain practically silent, afraid that an expression of honest opinion would have some effect on the political weathervane. It is unlovely and un-Canadian to permit the influence of a politico-religious organization to retard or guide expressions of opinion upon a great public question. The Telegraph says:

"The Carletonite movement, which has about captured the Unionist leaders, involves statesmen whose names at least would probably be written in water, but before it is ended it may well fulfill Gladstone's prediction and rescue some of these men from a more or less innocent historical obscurity to a disgraced pre-eminence. Mr. Gladstone anticipated for men of the Carson type not only the momentary notoriety but a sort of eternity of infamy. Mr. Law is going to speak on the platform with Sir Edward Carson in the later autumn. He hopes something will turn up from disorder, and he will venture timorously for a while in the wake of sowing sedition in the hope that later he may glean a few stray ears from this or that corner of the electoral field. He may change his mind before going the full length, for a sort of laziness of purpose hangs about the Tory policy, as if the leaders were always in a state of nervous perplexity and indecision."

LABOR UNREST—AND A PROPHECY

We have repeatedly stated in these columns, what is a self-evident fact, that after the passing of the Home Rule Bill old party lines will be obliterated in Ireland, and new forces and new movements in the body politic will give rise to new parties and new affiliations. The terms "Nationalist" and "Unionist" will cease to have any significance, as the success that is sure to crown the work of a native parliament disarms prejudice and gradually wins universal allegiance. The Ireland of the future will divide on new political issues. The thorny subject of education may, in the course of time, supply the line of demarcation, but we are inclined to think that the issue in an Irish-ruled Ireland will be mainly economic. The owners of the soil, and we look to the latest Land Act to transfer every inch of the land of Ireland to the people, will form the Conservative party. The industrial workers of the north and the other important manufacturing centres will constitute the progressive party. The farmer from Antrim and the farmer from Cork will find that their lines run parallel, whereas the Belfast factory hand will make common platform with his brother from Limerick.

The present labor trouble in Dublin gives point to our argument. Capital and Labor are as bitterly divided as Nationalist and Unionist in the early days of the Home Rule struggle. All the old landmarks are absent from the quarrel. Mr. Murphy, who is fighting the battle for the capitalists, is a Nationalist, and owner of one of the most influential Nationalist papers in Ireland. On the other side is James Larkin, also a Nationalist, but much more of a Socialist. "The future," says the Manchester Guardian, "is likely to be concerned more with what he stands for than with any of the matters about which 'guarantees' have been inserted in the Home Rule Bill. The movement that he leads cuts right across old party lines in Ireland. If a native Irish Executive were in existence to-day in Dublin, it would have to deal with Mr. Larkin and his movement, and in the present critical situation it could scarcely avoid a conflict with large numbers of the former supporters of the Nationalist party, while if it endeavored to moderate the zealotry of the lookers-out it would estrange the more conservative elements of that party and drive them to seek new affiliations. Whatever its policy, the consequence would be a dissolution of the old parties and a recrystallization, not upon religious or racial or national, but upon economic and social lines. The Dublin conditions themselves reveal the forces that will be active in the Ireland of the future, making and unmaking political parties, quite regardless of those political boundaries upon the permanent and unchangeable character of which so much Unionist prophesying is based." When a native Parliament is in being Protestant and Catholic