

## The Catholic Record

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.  
United States and Europe—\$2.00.  
Publisher & Proprietor, Thomas Coffey, L.L.D.  
Editor—Rev. James T. Foley, D.D.  
Associate Editor—H. F. Mackintosh.  
Manager—Robert M. Burns.

Address business letters to the Manager.  
Classified Advertising 15 cents per line.  
Retailer 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 manuscripts. 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 Shurell, the Apostolic Delegates to Canada, the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, and St. Boniface, the Bishops of London, Hamilton, Peterborough and Oshawa, N. Y., and the clergy throughout the Dominion.

LONDON, SATURDAY, OCT. 25, 1924

### AN ENGLISH MUSSOLINI

The comment one usually reads on Mussolini's achievement for Italy illustrates the difficulty that the English mind finds in understanding the Latin temperament or the Latin mentality.

After our study of Mussolini, his spirit, his methods, his success in saving his native country from social disintegration, we think it may be interesting to recall the spirit, methods and achievements of one whom we may not inappropriately call the English Mussolini. Between Oliver Cromwell points of similarity and of contrast will stand out plainly enough without comment.

And to be quite fair we shall take our account of Cromwell from a modern English professor of history in an English university.

Professor Green thus writes of Cromwell in Ireland:

"He landed at Dublin on the 18th of August. Before his arrival the Dublin garrison had defeated Ormonde with a loss of 5,000 men, and Cromwell's work was limited to the capture of detached fortresses. On the 10th of September he stormed Drogheda, and by his order the whole of its 2,800 defenders were put to the sword without quarter. Cromwell, who was as a rule especially scrupulous in protecting non-combatants from violence, justified his severity in this case by the cruelties perpetrated by the Irish in the rebellion of 1641, and as being necessary on military and political grounds in that it 'would tend to prevent the effusion of blood for the future, which were the satisfactory grounds of such actions which otherwise cannot but work remorse and regret.' After the fall of Drogheda Cromwell sent a few troops to relieve Londonderry, and marched himself to Wexford, which he took on the 11th of October, and where similar scenes of cruelty were repeated; every captured priest, to use Cromwell's own words, being immediately 'knocked on the head,' though the story of the three hundred women slaughtered on the market-place has no foundation.

"The re-settlement of the conquered and devastated country was now organized on the Tudor and Straffordian basis of colonization from England, conversion to Protestantism, and establishment of law and order. Cromwell thoroughly approved of the enormous scheme of confiscation and colonization, causing great privations and sufferings, which was carried out. The Roman Catholic landowners lost their estates, all or part according to their degree of guilt, and these were distributed among Cromwell's soldiers and the creditors of the government; Cromwell also invited new settlers from home and from New England, two-thirds of the whole land of Ireland being thus transferred to new proprietors. The suppression of Roman Catholicism was zealously pursued by Cromwell; the priests were hunted down and imprisoned or exiled to Spain or Barbados, the Mass was everywhere forbidden, and the only liberty allowed was that of conscience, (that is really good!) the Romanist not being obliged to attend Protestant services.

"These methods, together with education, 'assiduous preaching' . . . humanity, good life, equal and honest dealing with men of different opinion," Cromwell thought, 'would convert the whole island to Protestantism.'

It may be because we are Irish but in view of Cromwell's barbarity in Ireland we are not quite able to agree with the historian when he writes:

"Cromwell's moderation and freedom from imperiousness were acknowledged even by those least friendly to his principles."

In a preface to a book recently published even Nicholas Murray Butler, President of Columbia, says that Cromwell was the best type of the moderate Englishman. Englishmen of his own day thought well of him and of his work. Professor Green writes:

"On the 12th of September, 1651, Cromwell made his triumphal entry into London at the conclusion of his victorious campaigns; and Parliament granted him Hampton Court as a residence with £4,000 a year. These triumphs, however, had all been obtained by force of arms; the more difficult task now awaited Cromwell of governing England by parliament and by law. As Milton wrote:

'Cromwell! our chief of men, who thought of war only, but detractions rude,  
Guided by faith and matchless fortitude,  
To peace and truth thy glorious way hast ploughed.  
Peace hath her victories  
No less renowned than war.'

Then the historian gives us this specimen of his 'moderation' and 'lack of imperiousness' in dealing with Parliament:

"He rose, and after alluding to the former good services of the parliament, proceeded to overwhelm the members with reproaches. Striding up and down the House in a passion, he made no attempt to control himself, and turning towards individuals as he hurled significant epithets at each, he called some 'whoremasters,' others 'drunkards, corrupt, unjust, scandalous of the profession of the Gospel.' 'Perhaps you think,' he exclaimed, 'that this is not parliamentary language; I confess it is not, neither are you to expect any such from me.' In reply to a complaint of his violence he cried, 'Come, come, I will put an end to your prating. You are no parliament, I say you are no parliament. I will put an end to your sitting.'

"By his directions Harrison then fetched in a small band of Cromwell's musketeers and compelled the speaker Lenthall to vacate the chair. Looking at the mace he said, 'What shall we do with this bauble?' and ordered a soldier to take it away. The members then trooped out, Cromwell crying after them, 'It is you that have forced me to this; for I have sought the Lord night and day that He would rather slay me than put me upon doing this work.' He then snatched the obnoxious bill from the clerk, put it under his cloak, and commanding the doors to be locked went back to Whitehall. In the afternoon he dissolved the council in spite of John Bradshaw's remonstrances, who said, 'Sir, we have heard what you did at the House this morning . . . ; but you are mistaken to think that the parliament is dissolved, for no power under heaven can dissolve them but themselves; therefore take you notice of that.' Cromwell had no patience with formal pedantry of this sort; and in point of strict legality 'The Rump' of the Long Parliament had little better title to authority than the officers who expelled it from the House. After this Cromwell had nothing left but the army with which to govern, and 'henceforth his life was a vain attempt to clothe that force in constitutional forms, and make it seem something else so that it might become something else.'

"By the dissolution of the Long Parliament Cromwell as commander-in-chief was left the sole authority in the State. He determined immediately to summon another parliament. This was the 'Little' or 'Bare-bones Parliament,' consisting of one hundred and forty persons selected by the council of officers from among those nominated by the congregations in each county, which met on the 4th of July, 1653. This assembly, however, soon showed itself impracticable and incapable, and on the 12th of December the speaker, followed by the more moderate members, marched to Whitehall and returned their powers to Cromwell, while the rest were expelled by the army."

We should not be surprised to hear some of those who call Mussolini a "dictator" canonize Cromwell as a great democrat. This is the historian's own account of one phase of Cromwell's moderation:

"Religious toleration was granted, but with the important exception that some harsh measures were enacted against Anglicans and Roman Catholics, to neither of

whom was liberty of worship accorded. The acts imposing fines for recusancy, repealed in 1650, were later executed with great severity. In 1655 a proclamation was issued for administering the laws against the priests and Jesuits, and some executions were carried out. Complete toleration in fact was only extended to Protestant non-conformists, who composed the Cromwellian established church, and who now meted out to their antagonists the same treatment which they themselves were later to receive under the Clarendon Code of Charles II."

Then follows what is a greater puzzle to any one not an "Anglo-Saxon" than an Italian or a Spaniard is to the average English man. It is a further example of Cromwell's moderation:

"Cromwell himself, however, remained throughout a staunch and constant upholder of religious toleration. 'I had rather that Mohammedanism were permitted amongst us,' he avowed, 'than that one of God's children should be persecuted.'"

Catholics, evidently, were none of "God's children" but sons of Belial. It may be said that Cromwell lived nearly three centuries ago. It is true; but his place amongst great Englishmen is given him by his compatriots of today. His statue stands at St. Stephen's entrance to Westminster, typical of the place in history given him by the people who are shocked at the "dictatorship" of Benito Mussolini.

### MARRIED HAPPINESS

By THE OBSERVER

In preparation for marriage it is necessary to pray. A good and prudent life partner is the gift of God. Marriage is not merely a ceremony, the occasion for a feast and for pretty presents; but a holy institution, which has many responsibilities, and in which one's path is not always strewn with roses. Amongst the essentials for a happy married life are, a sense of duty, forbearance with each other's weakness, a good understanding between husband and wife, willingness to give up something of one's tastes and inclinations to make the other happy, and to get along without wounding each other's feelings. The young wife ought not to be too much surprised or too sad at finding that some of the qualities that she expected in her husband are absent. She would do better to seek out the better aspects of the man she has chosen for better or for worse.

The man who seemed to her an angel in the days of the engagement is the same man; she saw him then less accurately, that is all. Too much arguing should be avoided in the home. There are times when silence is golden; and it is never more precious than when it closes a domestic quarrel, or prevents one. To preserve harmony, concessions are necessary. Neither partner can always have his or her own way. If one likes staying at home better than the other, a concession ought to be made; concessions ought to be made by each in turn.

Many of these likes and dislikes are mere matters of habit, and when concessions are made, are found to be not so essential to one's happiness after all. When a small concession is denied, it continues to look important to the one to whom it was refused, and indeed seems to become of greater importance. A man ought not to exert his authority in every case merely because he has that authority; to insist on his full rights just because he can do so, in every case, in matters of no importance. He should remember that if he thinks it natural that he should receive deference at all times from his wife, she has just as much right to expect that he will treat her with consideration and politeness as he did in the days before she had promised to marry him. At that time he was eager to show her what a very polite and considerate fellow he was; and he ought to bear in mind that his duty to treat his wife like a gentleman is not less now but greater, because the happiness of them both depends on their manner towards each other, and they have to live with each other and are bound to do all they reasonably can to make that companionship happy.

Also, a man expects his wife to keep him informed as to how the affairs of the household, which are under her management, are going;

and he ought not to forget that she has some right to know how his work and business are going. Many a man has profited greatly by taking the advice of his wife on matters of business; and when women are sensible, as so many of them are, their judgment in business matters is often very keen, and the more valuable to a man because they look at things from a different standpoint from that to which he is accustomed.

But it may be taken for granted that the home has a very poor chance to be a happy one if it is conducted with an eye only to worldly considerations. Not much happiness can be expected in a home where the thoughts of husband and wife are all on pleasure or on money or on social climbing. The home is God's great institution for the bringing up of children in His fear and love, and He will not give happiness there if men and women forget that that is His principal purpose in instituting marriage.

The family ought to be united in prayer and in the fear and the love of God, and if it is not so united there is nothing to be expected from it for good and the members of it cannot expect happiness. They may sometimes have an appearance of happiness; but it is not the real thing, and sooner or later the unreality of it will come home to them; and of all the things that can happen to men and women in this world, the most distressing thing is, to find that what they thought was happiness turns dull and tasteless, and that life has no savor.

This is not at all an uncommon experience; it is the commonest thing in the world. It is this experience that drives the devotees of pleasure on from one amusement to another, never quite satisfied. And this experience is peculiarly likely to come to those who neglect the duties which God has imposed on parents in order to have more time to give to pleasure, or in order to have more comfort or less trouble.

### NOTES AND COMMENTS

IN the little village of Great Clacton, Essex, there is an old church dedicated to St. John the Baptist. It dates from about the year 1080, the tower alone being of later construction—probably at the beginning of the sixteenth century. It is an interesting structure, as all these pre-Reformation churches are, and in its associations takes us back to those ages of faith to which England can trace all that is best in her modern development. But this church has a special interest in that one of its earliest rectors after the Reformation was a son of John Knox the Scottish "Reformer."

A TABLET on its north wall tells the tale. It reads:

To the Glory of God,  
and in pious memory of  
ELSAZAR KNOX,  
sometimes Vicar of this Church,  
Second son of  
John Knox, the Scots Reformer,  
born in exile at Geneva, Nov. 1558,  
Fellow of St. James' College, Cambridge, 1579.  
Collated to Great Clacton, 1587.  
He died at Cambridge on the eve of Pentecost, 1591.

A list of the vicars, on an oak tablet near by, gives the further information that Knox was inducted on the 15th of May, 1587, his patron being Lord Rivers.

The first reflection that arises in contemplating this little aside of history is that it was probably the first instalment of that nemesis which, through his own flesh and blood, was destined to overtake those works of sacrilege and destruction which especially characterized the career of the "Great Scottish Reformer," and causes his name to stand out in an unenviable distinction over all associates in that impious upheaval. If after the Holy See, there was anything John Knox hated with a deadly, all-consuming hatred, it was the institution of the Episcopacy itself. And here while the embers of the conflagration which he had done so much to kindle still glowed, we find his own son given over to the institution, even if an emasculated type, which his very soul abhorred. The violence with which Knox assailed the episcopal order stands unrivalled in the literature of scurrility of all time. That in this present generation a lineal descendant bearing his own very name, should, as priest and Jesuit, be a devoted son of the Church against which

his forbear revolted, may be considered as the climax of the nemesis begun in his own generation.

THAT APOSTATES from the Faith, particularly the unsavory type known as "Ex-Priests or Ex-Monks" have not changed in the course of the centuries, the exhibits of history proclaim. Looking over the Report of the Dominion Archives for 1889, we stumbled upon an instance of this. At the settling of peace, after the fall of Quebec, in 1765, it was represented to the new Government that there were a vast number of French Protestants in Canada for whose benefit it would be proper to send out from England some clergy who could preach in the French language. Accordingly, at the instance of the Bishop of London, the church Missionary Society sent out three, and these took to themselves some recruits in the way of lapsed Catholic priests. There proved, however, to be a very few French Protestants, and "not a single Protestant church in the colony."

THAT THESE recruits were no different from gentlemen of the same kidney in our day results proved. In a Report sent to the Society in England in 1762, one of them, a "reformed Jesuit," handicapped by not being able to preach in English, is reported as "very negligent in his duty," while another, a former Recollet, who had quarrelled with his superior and run away from his monastery, had gone to England, got himself "ordained," in these days of loose ordination, and returned as minister to Canada, "where he never does any duty at all." He is further described in the Report as "a very dissolute character," who was a constant source of trouble and scandal. The neglect of church duty on all hands is further reported as "most shameful." In which particular history, as is well said, repeats itself, and men do not always profit by experience.

LONDON, the metropolis of the world, and as generally regarded, the very centre of Protestantism, seems likely next year, and for the first time since Queen Mary Tudor, to come under almost exclusive Catholic government. The two present Sheriffs, Alderman Barthelemy and Mr. Harold Downer are both Catholics, and with the Lord Mayor are all powerful within the limits of the City of London, so much so that even the King when he makes his first State entry after Coronation, halts at Temple Bar for their permission before entering the city.

THE ELECTION of the Lord Mayor, which is practically automatic and has no dependence on the popular vote, takes place in November and is considered extremely probable that the mantle this year will fall on Alderman Sir Alfred Fowler, who is also a Catholic. The sheriffs are nominated on the Nativity of St. John the Baptist, preceding, though their entry upon the duties of the office does not take place until the feast of St. Michael, the Archangel—an old custom, dating back to Catholic times. Is it not about time that Canadian Orange Lodges entered a protest? The Empire surely is in danger!

### THE TASK OF RANSOMING ENGLAND IS COLOSSAL

LONDON, Eng.—So colossal is the work of ransoming England, says Cardinal Bourne, that it would terrify Catholics if they were to look at it from a purely material point of view.

"Thousands of children are being brought up in this country every year without any kind of divine religious teaching," said His Eminence. "The teachers of religion do not know how to agree upon the subjects they would teach."

The Cardinal said it was recognized that a vast number of people in England—perhaps the majority—never joined in any sort of public act of worship, and were not associated with any kind of definite religious organization.

"Who can tell," he asked, "the number of unbaptized children and unbaptized adults in England today. There are thousands of parents who attach no importance whatever to the reception by their children of the sacrament of baptism."

It follows from this that there must be hundreds of thousands of our fellow countrymen who are exposed to the slavery of sin."

Cardinal Bourne was speaking at the annual reunion, at Westminster Cathedral, of the Guild of Our Lady of Ransom, which has as its object the conversion of England.

### THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC

#### SOME CATHOLIC PRINCIPLES AND PRONOUNCEMENTS

A Sermon preached in the Blessed Sacrament Church, Ottawa, Oct. 12th, 1924, by the Rev. John J. O'Gorman, D. C. L., P. P.

The present is an appropriate time to call to mind the Catholic doctrine concerning the use and abuse of intoxicating liquor and to consider the means which revelation and experience show to be the most apt too for eradicating the vice of drunkenness. Perhaps it is just as well to begin by stating five fundamental principles which are so obvious to Catholics, that they must be taken for granted in any Catholic pronouncement on this question which does not explicitly mention them. The first of these is that the abstemious use of intoxicating liquor, whether as a medicine or as a beverage, is devoid of all blame. The second is that the religious use of wine in the Sacrifice of the Mass is as essential to the mission of the Catholic Church as is the use of water in Baptism. The third is that the excessive use of intoxicating liquor, resulting as it does in drunkenness and alcoholism, is a sin. The fourth is that voluntary abstention from alcoholic beverages, undertaken from a holy motive, is an act of virtue which is advantageous to those who do not abuse liquor, and necessary to those for whom alcohol is proximate occasion of sin. The fifth is that since drunkenness is a social evil, the civil authority has the right and the duty to enact prudent laws concerning the manufacture and sale of intoxicating drinks and to see that these laws are enforced. These principles are unquestioned and unquestionable among Catholics. To go further and determine what would be the most prudent civil law to enact in a given time and place is evidently not within the province of theology. The most that could be expected of churchmen would be to indicate the general principles which should underlie such a law. This the Catholic Bishops of Canada did in their Joint Pastoral Letter of 1909 when they wrote:

"It has above all been realized that the evil should be attacked at its source, namely that the traffic in intoxicating liquors should be suppressed or where that is not possible, at least restricted and more severely controlled, and that legislation should be enacted on the point, tending to restrain vice and render easier the task of good citizens in averting danger and putting a stop to disorder."

It is evident that from this statement that, in the considered judgment of the united Catholic Hierarchy of Canada in 1909, prohibition is the ideal liquor legislation for Canada; it is only where this is not possible that government control is suggested by the bishops as an alternative; on the other hand it follows also from the concluding phrase of this same episcopal statement that prohibition, to be also the best practical liquor legislation, must be shown to be more effective than government control in "tending to restrain vice and render easier the task of good citizens in averting danger and putting a stop to disorder." Whether or not prohibition is actually more successful than government control in effecting this purpose is a practical question which must be solved by a reference to experience. Since the bishops spoke in 1909, the provinces of Canada have done quite a little experimenting with various forms of prohibition and government control. It is not for me to attempt to sum up the results; this pulpist is no place to express personal opinions on controverted questions. Suffice it to say, that the conscientious voters, who are guided by the above mentioned Catholic principles and who are familiar with the results of the various liquor legislations which we have had in Canada, will no doubt make a prudent use of their franchise on October 23rd.

No matter what liquor law be in force in this or any other Canadian Province, there will ever remain the grave need of each one of us having his own personal liquor law, that is, determining conscientiously the attitude which he intends to observe as regards the use of intoxicating liquor as a beverage. This self-imposed personal law should be based on what revelation and reason teach concerning the nature and effects of intoxicating drinks.

Intoxicating drinks, that is, beer, wine and spirits, are so called because, when taken in sufficient quantities, they intoxicate, that is, poison. The very word intoxicate shows this, as it comes from the Greek *toxicon*, which means poison. The poison in beer, wine and spirits is alcohol. The form of poison resulting from a heavy dose of alcoholic drink or from a steady use of it, is called alcoholism. It is one of the most prevalent and harmful of all diseases. As the Fathers of the First Plenary Council of Quebec put it: "Alcohol is a poison whose awful property is to attack at the same time both soul and body, of which it paralyzes every energy and dries up every life-spring." Now drinkers of alcoholic or intoxicating drinks may be divided into four classes, the abstemious drinker, the steady drinker, the heavy drinker and the drunkard.

The abstemious drinker is he who takes alcoholic drinks in such small quantities that they do him no harm. That thoroughly innocent

enjoyment may be obtained by the abstemious use of wine and other alcoholic drinks is clear from the words of Holy Writ: "Wine was created from the beginning to make men joyful and not to make them drunk; wine drunken with moderation is a joy of the soul and heart." (Ecclesiasticus, 31, 35-36.) Besides this effect of "cheering the heart of man" (Psalm 103, 15) wine is useful as a medicine in certain ailments. The words of the Apostle St. Paul to his disciple Timothy, who was a total abstainer, are well known: "Use a little wine for thy stomach's sake and thy frequent infirmities." (1 Timothy 5, 23.) St. Jerome thus explains this much abused text: "See for what reasons the draught of wine is granted; that relief may be afforded to the aching stomach and frequent infirmity, and lest we should make an excuse of an illness he orders that a little should be taken." St. Jerome adds that this little wine should be taken only on a physician's advice. As some physicians are too ready to please patients by prescribing wine and other alcoholic drinks as a tonic (as a matter of fact when used freely they are toxic,) the Fathers of the Plenary Council of Quebec warned physicians to take care that the use of alcohol as a medicine does not sow the seeds of intemperance. As ordered by a careful and conscientious physician, alcohol is a useful drug in certain diseases. Apart from this necessary use of alcohol in certain diseases, the abstemious drinker, above reproach as he is, would perform an act of virtue by abstaining altogether. That this mortification is beneficial to himself and pleasing to God, is clear from the following Mosaic Law: "When a man or woman shall make a vow to be sanctified and will consecrate themselves to the Lord, they shall abstain from wine and from every thing that may make a man drunk." (Numbers 6, 2-3.) God required total abstinence in the Old Law from the Nazirites, that is from those who sought the perfect life. St. John the Baptist, of whom the angel foretold, "he shall drink no wine nor strong drink," was the forerunner of the countless saints of the New Law who have been total abstainers.

It has been objected in the press recently that Our Lord during His public ministry did not practice abstinence from wine or oblige His apostles to do so. Indeed He Himself calls attention to that fact (Matthew 11, 19). Neither did He fast during that period. Our Lord did not do so for two reasons: first, because the marriage feast of the Son of God with His Church was not a time for fasting and abstinence; secondly, because He wished to associate freely with all classes of people in their very banquets, to lead them gently to accept the Gospel of the Kingdom. At the same time, by His practicing and commanding self-denial and mortification, by His forty days' fast from food and wine in the desert, by His praise of the total abstinence from wine of John the Baptist, by His command that when He should be taken away His disciples should fast (Matthew 9, 15)—and total abstinence is a form of fasting—and by His promise to His disciples that if they fasted without boasting, God the Father would reward them (Matthew 6, 18). Our Lord certainly endorsed the principle that total abstinence from alcoholic drinks as a beverage from a worthy motive is a useful means of advancing in virtue; while Our Lord's command that "if thy right eye scandalize thee pluck it out," is a stern warning to all who abuse alcoholic drinks that they must cast from them this occasion of sin, no matter what the sacrifice.

The Apostle St. Paul, in his Epistle to the Romans, adds another reason which may well induce a man to abstain from wine, namely to remove from his neighbor a possible occasion of sin. It is good not to eat flesh nor to drink wine nor to do anything, whereby thy brother is offended or scandalized or made weak." (Romans 14, 21.) The peculiar circumstances which in the Apostle's day made the eating of certain classes of meat a possible source of scandal to weaker brethren, exist no longer. Experience however shows that our drinking wine may easily become an occasion of temptation to some of our neighbors. Hence to the motives of the love of God and the love of his soul, the Christian may add the third motive, the love of his neighbor, for abstaining from alcoholic beverages. To a Catholic, accustomed to the Lenten fast and Friday abstinence from meat, total abstinence from intoxicating beverages is nothing startling. The advantages which the Church ascribes to the Lenten fast can also be ascribed to total abstinence when undertaken for the same motives: By it God represses vice, elevates the mind and bestows virtue and reward through Christ Our Lord.

Thus far we have been dealing with the advantages of total abstinence in the case of the abstemious drinkers chiefly. There now remains briefly to be indicated its advantages to the steady drinker the heavy drinker and the drunkard.

By the steady drinker we here mean the one who never offends against sobriety yet who cannot be said to be abstemious in the quantity that he takes. Modern science has conclusively proven what was not generally known before, that the steady drinker slowly but surely poisons his