The Catholic Record

Price of subscription—$2.00 per annum.
United States and Europe—$2.50.
Publisher & Proprietor, Thomas Coffey, LL. D.
Editors { Rev. James T. Foley, D. D. / Thomas Coffey, LL. D.
Associate Editor—H. F. Mackintosh.
Manager—Robert M. Burns.
Address business letters to the Manager.
Classified Advertising 15 cents per line. Remittance must accompany the order. Where Catholic Record Box address is required send 10 cents to prepay expense of postage upon replies.
Obituary and marriage notices cannot be inserted except in the usual condensed form. Each insertion 50 cents.
The Editor cannot be held responsible for unsolicited manuscript. Every endeavor will be made to return rejected contributions when stamped addressed envelopes are enclosed.
The Catholic Record has been approved and recommended by Archbishops Falconio and Sbaretti, late Apostolic Delegates to Canada, the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, and St. Boniface, the Bishops of London, Hamilton, Peterborough and Ogdensburg, N. Y., and the clergy throughout the Dominion.
In St. John, N. B., single copies may be purchased from Mrs. M. A. McGuire, 249 Main St., and John J. Dwyer.
In Montreal single copies may be purchased from J. Milloy, 241 St. Catherine St. West.
In Ottawa, Ont., single copies may be purchased from J. W. O'Brien, 141 Nicholas St.
In Sydney, N. S., single copies may be purchased at Murphy's Bookstore.
The following agents are authorized to receive subscriptions and canvass for the Catholic Record.
General Agents—M. J. Hagarty, Stephen V. James, George J. Quigley. Resident Agents—Miss Bride Saunders, Sydney; H. Chamberlin, Hilson Ave., S. 348, W. Ottawa West; Mrs. Geo. E. Smith, 2263 Mance St., Montreal; Miss Anne Hogan, Hulton P. O., St. Vital, Man., John P. O'Farrell, 98 Aberdeen St., Quebec City, Miss Margaret E. Mulligan, Canora, Sask.

London, Saturday, Sept. 29, 1923

IT IS MOTIVES THAT DRIVE MEN

Many years ago, so many that most of our readers were not yet born, a venerable old priest trained to think and possessing a discriminating taste in English literature was teaching us composition. The rather unusual subject he assigned was the address of a crown attorney who was prosecuting a man accused of murder. We were entirely free to draw on our imagination for all the circumstances, all the evidence in the case. The only restriction being that the evidence was to be circumstantial, not direct. Having decided to find the supposititious unfortunate guilty of the crime we built up what we thought was a very strong case.

When the venerable teacher came to criticise he said just four words: "There is no motive;" and he looked over his spectacles at me, and then around the class. "Nobody does anything without a motive," he added. We did not need the subsequent rubbing in of that elementary truth. Many things, more important perhaps, we have forgotten; but that humiliating criticism of our ambitious effort left an ineffaceable impression on our memory. We have noted with eager interest for nearly forty years the painstaking care with which prosecuting attorneys endeavor to establish the motive. And we have sifted and analysed the evidence as to the motive, critical as to its adequacy.

A thousand and one times since, where crime and prosecuting attorneys were altogether out of the question, the lesson learned so long ago has helped us to think clearly.

The capitalistic organization of society may be sadly defective, may even be the failure that it is so often alleged to be; but there is at all events a sufficient motive to carry on. When to starve or to freeze is the alternative of working, the motive to work is adequate, impelling, compelling. Dividends are the sufficient motive for invested capital.

In the alternative socialist schemes both of these motives are absent. Theorists who would substitute the general good, the ideal of service, for private gain and personal interest may be very high minded, but they ignore the lessons of universal experience, and idealize human nature beyond anything that that experience warrants. Abolish private property, private gain, personal interest, and there is absolutely no sufficient motive to make the great majority work. Then who would do the disagreeable and dangerous kinds of work. If all have an equal right to maintenance by the socialist state why should some burrow in the earth to provide the coal, why dig sewers and feed pigs while others fill the clean and easy positions in socialist society?

Keep the fundamental fact before our eyes that nobody does anything without a motive, without a sufficient motive, and the most elaborate schemes of socialists, communists and idealists are seen to lack that absolutely essential thing in social organization—an adequate impelling motive to make *all men and women* do the work assigned to them. It goes without saying that in the new order work must be assigned; freedom must cease. The intolerable tyranny of this new equality of all citizens and the army of officials required to enforce it make another story. We are now concerned only with motives.

In England things have come to a crisis; for there is a vast number there who can not get work. They had to fight for their country whether they would or not; the country could not see them starve, so it has paid out in doles to the unemployed the incredible sum of nearly two billion dollars. The capitalistic organization of society, as it is called, is there directly attacked. If it cannot provide work for all it is doomed. Russia, as the terrible example of socialistic failure, has averted or postponed revolution in many European countries; but not even the Russian failure can save capitalism in England if work cannot be found for the people. The present situation gives to socialism great attractiveness as well as great importance.

Lloyd George knows his England; and he has a clear conception of the threatening danger. During the election campaign last year he endeavored to appeal to the common sense and conservatism of the English people against the seductive promises of the socialists. He said they claimed practically to abolish private enterprise and to substitute national for individual property. And whatever may be the permutations, variations or reservations of individual socialists or of certain schools of socialists, that is socialism—the substitution of national for private enterprise and property.

"It is a fatal thing," declared the ex-Premier, "to the energy, life and prosperity of the country. It is no use saying this is the thing that you will do in an ideal world with ideal beings. You must take human nature for what it is—a rather fine machine on the whole, it responds to great impulses when the call comes. Now, in my sixtieth year, and having seen a good deal of mankind, a good deal, perhaps, of the triumphs and much of the disappointments of life, I believe in human nature, and its impulses and its incentives are part of the motive power that drives it on to better things. Of course every impulse, every tendency, every affection, every liking and disliking, if it is abused becomes a vice. You may say that an incentive is that which makes you feel you would like to have a better, more profitable or more comfortable life.

"You may say that in its extreme it means greed, avarice, cupidity, which leads to oppression and even to theft. That does not mean the impulse is a bad one. It simply means that abuse of it is bad. The impulse after all which makes for private enterprise, for individual effort, for accumulation of property is that which drives men to frugality, to thrift, to health, to sobriety, industry, restraint and care. Why should all that be destroyed and something substituted for it which is inadequate to drive the human machine?"

And then, like the true orator and teacher that he undoubtedly is, he drives home the principle by apt and suggestive illustration:

"I will give you a simple illustration. Take the man who has saved just a little money. He is rather fond of pictures. He cannot buy a very good one, but he buys something which rather attracts him and sticks it in his house. It is not valuable. It is not artistic. If you brought critics to look at it it would shock them, outrage them, and make them ill. But there it is, something that he himself has bought of his own earnings. It took his fancy. He likes it. It gives him great joy every time he comes home tired and he just gazes at it and shows it to his friends. He sees beauties in it that nobody else has ever discovered. One day that man hears that an invaluable picture has been cut out of its frame in the National Gallery, lost, nobody knows where it is. Well as a citizen he is very sorry. He reads a paragraph in a newspaper and he says, 'What a pity. I hope some day they will get it if it is not destroyed,' and he forgets about it. It does not interfere with his appetite. He does not lose one wink of sleep, and he wakes up in the morning and looks at his own little picture.

"But supposing he came home and woke up in the morning and found the door or window open, and found that somebody had got inside and his little picture had disappeared. That is another story. What is the varnish on it which makes it so beautiful? The sweat of his brow. That is not in the National Gallery picture, the loss of which as a citizen he deplores.

"But that is the incentive of private property, and the man who tries to destroy that is destroying something which is vital to the work of the human machine."

It has frequently been noted, and it is appropriate here, that where school books are supplied free the pupils take no care of them; there is no pride, no sense of ownership; and the publishers print much larger editions to supply the demand. It is questionable whether removing all motive for caring for their books does not do more harm than the good, in certain cases, warrants. Though every individual is supposed to take pride and interest in his share of public ownership, the example given by Lloyd George illustrates the indifference of the average individual to national property. Not content with this he brings home to them another phase of the question.

"Now," he continues, "I will give you another illustration. A short time ago, I bought a little place down in Surrey. I built a little cottage there, not much of a place. In fact, it is so small that when a revolution comes no revolutionary commissary will think it worth while confiscating. Therefore I feel tolerably safe, whatever the changes may be, and as I saw there was bad weather coming I thought I would like to have a little shelter somewhere near London, and that is where I dwell. It's not much of a place, but I planted rhododendron there, and I have three or four rose-trees, and, believe me, there are no roses in the market like them! I have been striking a few bulbs down in the grass, and I will tell you what I am looking forward to. When Springtide comes I look forward to see little flowers bursting through the greensward and just looking at me and giving me a welcome, and I don't mind telling you that the little snowdrop will give me greater joy than all the splendor of the finest orchids at Kew. Why? It is something of my own. I have worked at it.

"But those who want to destroy that say you must not put your mind on these things, you must concentrate on something which is common to all. Believe me, you must take human nature as it is. I am only just a sample out of millions. We are all made like that. It is very common. But you know, there is a good deal in what President Lincoln said, that 'God loved the common people, that is why he made so many of us.' It is a false doctrine (the Socialist) they are building on something which is shifting sand. It will not bear the slightest pressure. It is a distortion of human nature. They are putting it in a strait-waistcoat."

Human nature is human nature; there is no use taking it in the abstract and idealizing it. It is just what each of us knows it to be as exemplified in individuals. Whether it is due to original sin or to the surviving ape and tiger, Christian and unbeliever must acknowledge the indisputable fact that human nature has its definite and well-known limitations. And human beings need a sufficient motive for action.

If these two truths were generally realized and remembered many schemes for the regeneration of society would be seen to be fantastic.

THE PRESTIGE OF THE COURTS OF LAW

By The Observer

There is nothing in all the provisions that men make for the safety and the proper operation of human institutions, that is of more importance than the sound constitution of courts of justice. Not even the soundness of the laws themselves is of greater importance than the prestige of the courts where justice is administered between man and man. If the people have not full confidence in those courts, it is not enough that the laws are in themselves good and just. It is impossible to be too careful in selecting men to fill the judicial offices. A country can get along better with weak or partial laws administered by judges of unquestioned integrity and merit, than with good laws administered by poor or unfit judges.

The judicial office is of such great importance because it is on the order of a judge that property is taken away from one man and given to another; that a citizen is punished with fine or imprisonment or even with the terrible penalty of death. For, though our laws do provide for taking the judgment of other laymen in some cases before a man is fined, imprisoned, or deprived of his property, and in all cases before he is put to death, yet, it is always the judge who must say whether that man has or has not broken the law; no jury properly instructed will ignore the judicial opinion on that point.

The judicial office is therefore the highest public office that can be occupied by any layman; and no other office so urgently requires for its sound and proper functioning, that the public who are affected by its decisions, should have general confidence in its occupants. The offices of Prime Minister and of other Ministers of State do not make nearly the same demands on public confidence for their proper operation and for the welfare of society. It is, comparatively, an unimportant thing that the public should feel small confidence in a premier or in a cabinet minister; great and important as their position is. Their action on the public interest is mighty; but on the individual they can act only in an indirect manner. No prime minister, however mighty, can send his sheriff to take a man and hang him, nor to take his goods and transfer them to his neighbor. It is in the execution of the laws and not in the making of them that the hand of authority is actually and personally felt by the citizen.

Public men come and go; they make laws and repeal them; they are put up and knocked down by the people at will. But the effect of laws, so far as the individual is concerned with them, is given by the initials of a judge on the corner of a piece of paper on which is written an order of court; and laws must reach that point in their administration before it is finally brought home to the citizen that his claim against his neighbor is bad or good, or that he cannot continue a course which he thought he had a perfect right to pursue. As for ordinary public men, members of Parliament and of the Legislatures, senators, city, town or county councillors, their position is comparatively a small matter; they all make laws of one kind or another; but their action is indirect as regards the individual citizen; while the action of the judge is direct, and, as regards a court of final appeal, is conclusive and final so far as this world is concerned.

It was with these considerations in mind that I wrote my comments the other day upon Lord Birkenhead's appointment to the office of Lord Chancellor of Great Britain; the highest judicial office in the Empire. I was not thinking of any chapter of Irish history; whether closed or open. What I said was just as applicable to Australia as to Canada; and if Lord Birkenhead had been appointed Chief Justice of Australia or of United South Africa, the objections I took to that appointment would have been exactly of the same force and applicability.

The question I raised was this: Should the appointing power place in the highest judicial office in the Empire, a man who was fresh from participation in a rebellion; who had just delivered a large number of speeches of a nature to press excited subjects of the King into rebellion; who was not in the least repentant so far as the public knew; and who had not said one word of regret for what he had said and done? That is my question. If it does not matter what sort of man is appointed to a judicial office, why exclude any criminal from the office of a judge? Why take any care to select a man who will command public confidence, who is known to be zealous for law and order?

If the office which was occupied by Lord Birkenhead for two years, the highest judicial office in this Empire, head of the two courts of final appeal, may be fittingly occupied by a man who is still hot from raising the King's subjects in a rebellion against him, why not throw off all pretense of excluding anyone from the office of a judge because of unfitness, and give the judicial positions to the greatest law breakers we can find?

I was speaking of the prestige of our courts. To my mind, not since the days of the Tudors, has the judicial office in England been so degraded in the public eye as when Frederick Smith was made Lord Chancellor. When our courts cease to command public respect, what other institution can fill the place in keeping up the prestige of our public for our whole constitutional and legal system?

I am well aware that there are many people in these times—and not a few of them in Canada—who attach but little importance to keeping up public respect for law and reverence for the fundamental principles of our constitutional system. I would respectfully ask what fault Lord Birkenhead could have found with them, when it was his duty to announce constitutional and legal principles in the two highest courts in the British Empire?

It would have been interesting to have heard him rebuke an anarchist or a bolshevist, or even a too-earnest labor leader. But I think I may say that his impudence would have been equal to the task. For I have noted already that the first reward he received for his offences against the Crown was, the office of Attorney General; and in that capacity he prosecuted for treason a man who was only a few paces farther in the way of treason than he was himself. I regard that as the greatest scandal that has taken place in British Courts in this generation; possibly in a much longer time; perhaps I had better say in British Courts outside of Ireland where some similar things used formerly to be seen.

With deep respect for anyone who may differ with me, I cannot see that the closing of any chapter in Irish history has any bearing on the discussion of a question of administrative propriety of the kind I have been discussing. The Empire is concerned with the constitution and the personnel of the Judicial Committee of The Privy Council, directly because we still send appeals there sometimes, and indirectly because the prestige of Courts of Imperial jurisdiction inevitably affects the prestige of our own courts at home in these dominions.

Besides, it is bad as bad can be, to offer to the sharp eyes of a restless and questioning generation the object lesson of high-placed lawbreakers getting still higher places, as the result of, or at the very least, in spite of, their defiant breach of the most important of our fundamental laws.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

The centenary of the birth of Francis Parkman, the historian of New France, which occurs this month, has been widely commented upon by the press of both the United States and Canada. Parkman's memory undoubtedly merits all the encomiums that have been heaped upon it, but there is a tendency nevertheless to magnify it at the expense of other laborers in the same field who, not perhaps possessing his gift of expression, have had even a larger share in uncovering from the accumulated dust of intervening centuries the glories of this period when the lilies of France waved proudly over almost the whole of this northern continent.

Among these John Gilmary Shea was undoubtedly preeminent. It is indeed no exaggeration to say that Dr. Shea made Parkman's achievement possible. It was he who by patient toil and genius for detail brought to light the hidden store of raw material which by various writers, not excluding himself, has been woven into narrative of surpassing interest for all time to come. Parkman himself has freely acknowledged this in more than one of his publications, and one has but to take up almost any book treating of the subject to see how largely the name of John Gilmary Shea bulks as an authority on the history of North America, whether under Spanish, French or British domain.

It would require columns to even list Dr. Shea's publications. He is of course best known by his "History of the Catholic Church in the United States," but that very fact has possibly narrowed his secular audience and limited his fame. To scholars, however, his is a familiar name. His "Discovery and Exploration of the Mississippi Valley" was the first exhaustive work on the subject and notwithstanding subsequent researches retains its place as an authority to this day. Some sixty years ago he published the Cramoisy series of reprints and translations of the Jesuit *Relations*, and his "Library of American Linguistics," a long series of volumes dealing with the Indian tribes, has a permanent place in American scholarship. We have often had occasion to lament that no adequate biography of Dr. Shea has yet been written. That may be a task reserved for the department of history in the Catholic University at Washington.

We get conflicting accounts of the Mussolini regime in Italy, most of them crude, prejudiced or ill-informed. To some the leading figure is a heaven-born statesman; to others he is but an adventurer and a demagogue. The truth probably lies between the two extremes. Meanwhile we have Dr. Thomas O'Hagan's well considered judgment to go by, and from his protracted sojourn in Italy the Doctor may be presumed to speak with some authority. "The writer of this letter," he says in a communication to the Toronto Globe, "was in Italy when Mussolini, at the head of the Fascisti, took over the reins of power. The political change was practically marked by a bloodless revolution. From the city of Florence, prior to the change of Government, I was able to watch the whole Fascisti movement. The writer was in Rome when Mussolini was summoned by the King to form a new Government. In my opinion, Mussolini saved Italy from Bolshevism. Furthermore, I think that the praise bestowed upon the Prime Minister of Italy is well deserved. I regard him as truly a remarkable man. He has all the qualities of a great statesman—courage, vision, sagacity, patriotism, honesty and that high sense of duty which ever distinguishes the statesman from the politician and adventurer. At present a 'New Renaissance' is stirring the life of Italy—politically, intellectually and socially, as in the days of the Medici. The old kingdom by the Tiber that gave laws unto the world has new dreams to fashion, and I would not be surprised to see the land of Dante and Michelangelo lead, in progress, during the next few decades, the countries of the Old World. Benito Mussolini, in my opinion, is not only a great Italian patriot, but the ablest and most enlightened statesman in Europe."

This may be taken as supplementary to the views expressed by Mgr. William Barry, (certainly one of the best informed men of the time on European affairs) some time ago. "On the whole," writes Canon Barry, "Mussolini dreams of restoring to the social system forces and elements which the pure Marxian would have swept out with his iron mudrake. He believes in the rights of the individual, and in property as among those rights. He is an 'aristocrat' by conviction, hating class-warfare, scorning the fictitious majorities, sham parties, and interminable wranglings of Parliaments as they now have become. He is the nation's true representative; what are they except a noisy section of the Stock Market, clamouring for funds from a deluded people?"

"Of his foreign policy, since brought to a crisis by the Greek embroglio," the Canon continues, "I have no room to speak; but I sketched it in outline without so much as knowing Mussolini's name, years ago, in a Dublin article entitled 'The Dalmatian Question.' I see no reason to alter my view. This, the latest of Dictators, would uphold Italy's claims in and across the Adriatic; but, unlike my brilliant friend Signor Corradini, of L'Idea Nazionale, he is not ambitious of an Italian Empire to be carved out of the East, neither does he favor any scheme of protective duties. Mussolini has said hard things about the British Government and its conduct towards Italy, especially since the Peace of Versailles. He fails to interpret the situation, thanks to his ignorance of our ways and customs in this Island, where geography is not studied and only a few correspondents of the Times know anything whatever about Italian troubles. The nation is not to blame. And so I break off at the middle chapter of Mussolini's life and adventures. What will be the end? He came in like Julius Cæsar; he rules like Rienzi. These are great names and tragic memories. May the good prevail!" Which matured deliverances go far to counterbalance the ill-considered vaporings of the average cable despatch writer.

An interesting discussion took place in the Portuguese Chamber of Deputies recently in regard to the Colonial Budget, from which the appropriation formerly granted to the Protectorate of Foreign Missions had been struck out by the Government. The Catholic deputies, although forming a small minority, stood firm for the reinstatement of the appropriation, basing their contention on the patriotic and civilizing influence of the Portuguese missionaries. Their arguments, it is satisfactory to know, proved so conclusive that the appropriation was finally restored by an overwhelming majority, but two votes being recorded against it.

Especially interesting under the circumstances was the speech of Deputy Agatone Lanca, who, while openly professing atheism, declared himself obliged to admit the truth concerning the work and beneficent influence of the missionaries. During his travels abroad, he said, he had observed that the Portuguese missionaries everywhere enjoyed the greatest respect. Even in the British colonies they are held in the highest esteem by the authorities, who always give them a place of honor among the consuls of the various countries. He also stated that the best colleges in the East were those directed by the missionaries. With equal truth this can be said of the much-maligned South American countries.

CARNEGIE PRIZE

GIVEN TO FRENCH PRIEST SCIENTIST

Paris, Sept. 6.—The Carnegie Foundation, which recently awarded a gold medal and a first prize to the radiologist Vaillant, who has had both arms amputated, has now granted its silver medal and a prize of 5,000 francs to a priest of the Sens diocese, Abbe Tauleigne, pastor of the parish of Pontigny, "as a reward for the devotion with which Abbe Tauleigne has pursued his scientific work despite the serious injuries caused by the X-rays."

Early in the War the Abbe became alarmed over the large number of deaths in the army due to the inability to discover just where shell fragments or bullets were lodged, and so he decided to use himself both as experimenter and subject for his experiments. The Abbe continued his experiments despite injuries which have seriously impaired his health. Today his right arm is completely paralyzed and his eyes also are seriously affected.

In the realm of optics Abbe Tauleigne initiated a method of color photography. The technique of moving picture projections also owes some of its notable progress to him.

It was Abbe Tauleigne who solved the problem of the reflex projection of opaque bodies. In radiology the apparatus of Abbe Tauleigne rendered inestimable services to surgery during the War. The radio stereometer made it possible to locate projectiles accurately and the autodiffusor rendered possible the exploration of the thick portions of the human body.

It was the Abbe Tauleigne, who, thanks to the electromagnetic relay installed in the parish residence at Pontigny, was the first to inscribe the messages sent out by the Eiffel Tower on an ordinary Morse tape.

Abbe Tauleigne was also the first to work out the amplification of the receiving currents and his apparatus, adopted by the French Navy, was employed with great success in 1915 and 1916 by the interception stations and was also used to locate the position of enemy submarines.

KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS VOTE $25,000 TO AID JAPANESE SUFFERERS

New York, Sept. 22.—Supreme Knight James A. Flaherty of the Knights of Columbus announced at a recent meeting of the supreme officers of the K. of C. here that the Knights would support in every practical way the work of American relief for Japan as authorized by President Coolidge.

The Knights of Columbus, Mr. Flaherty stated has appropriated $25,000 from the general fund of the Order for this purpose. In addition to their cash contribution, the Knights, through the councils of the Order everywhere, will actively support the campaign for Japanese relief. In a special appeal to the entire membership, Supreme Knight Flaherty said: