

## 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, D.D.,  
 Thomas Coffey, L.L.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 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 Shevill, late Apostolic Delegates to  
 Canada, the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston,  
 Ottawa, and St. Boniface, the Bishops of  
 London, Hamilton, Peterborough and Oshawa,  
 St. N., and the clergy throughout the  
 Dominion.

LONDON, SATURDAY, OCT. 11, 1924

### WHAT FASCISM HAS ACCOMPLISHED

#### III.

Reading our papers one might imagine that the Fascists bludgeoned their way into power. As a matter of fact they carried on their heroic fight against great odds. Communistic socialism held all Italy in its terroristic grip. And the Red tyranny was absolutely ruthless; it was Russian. The little groups of ardent, disciplined, ex-service men whom Mussolini was gathering together, were often outnumbered by the Communists, a hundred to one. But little by little, in village and city, the ruthless Red Guards, Red Leagues, Red Unions, Red Chambers of Labor, the whole Leninized machine functioning for the social dissolution of Italy, found opposed to them a new and indomitable force, few as yet in numbers, but of a spirit that could not be quenched. The history of those early months of Fascism is an epic of youth, of courage, of self sacrifice, fighting incredible odds. Blood was shed only in self defense, or when the murder of a Fascista had to be requited, in which case the Communist assassin paid the death penalty. For nearly two years the Fascist groups, each group numbering not more than five to twenty men, fought the prevailing forces of Communism in a determined but unequal struggle, surrounded by hostile communities.

Richard Washburn Child was the American Ambassador to Italy during the rise of Mussolini to place and power.

Those who prattle about democracy and deplore the dictatorship of Mussolini as destructive of "democracy" will at least accept this distinguished American's testimony as unbiased.

"By their fruits you shall know them." Applying this satisfactory and adequate test we get a fair idea of what Mussolini has accomplished for his native country. The American Ambassador tells us that he has made a new Italy—or, that there was a new Italy hidden in the hearts and spirit of the people, and it made Mussolini. "At the start," he writes in the Saturday Evening Post, "let us admit that there are some persons who are saying—usually from a long distance—that Mussolini is a poseur and therefore ridiculous; or that he is a swashbuckler in international affairs and therefore is dangerous; and that he is a dictator; and that, together with the philosophy of Fascism he is a stone wall in front of that thing some persons call the onward march of world democracy and internationalism. Some of this may be so; I pass it by. Endless sensational nonsense has been printed about the Italian Revolution. Other national forces in Europe, which have been accustomed to bully and wheedle a weak Italy, have not been pleased and have filled us, here at home, with anti-Mussolini propaganda. We have read hundreds of yards of disparaging editorials written often by men whose knowledge of Italy is of the illustrated post-card type. We have heard from those who are shocked by the word revolution, as if the Magna Charta of England, and the Republic of France and the American nation were not founded on revolution.

"Not long ago a great American publicist asked me with a pained voice and a sorrowful shake of his head, 'When do you hope for a restoration of democracy in Italy?' I said, 'I haven't the slightest idea in these days what the word democracy means to any other man; but if you mean by it an effective expression of the will and willingness of a people, you may be sure there is more in Italy today than there has been since the days of Crispi. Democracy is not created by the label.'"

What Ambassador Child says in the following paragraph has its application and its lesson outside of Italy and inside of Canada:

"It is only fair for me, when I write of Mussolini, to state that I believe in the least possible government consistent with the regulation of the rights of men; that I believe in decentralization; that I detest papa—and-mamma legislation—and so does Mussolini."

"But, after all, there is a fact to deal with—Italy is a new Italy. A strong national spirit? Certainly; and admirable, too, if one believes that service, courage, loyalty are worth anything. The whole aspect of life has changed. Apprehension and weariness have made way for hope and vigor. I saw Italy as she was; I saw revolution burst under my nose and into the face of a world which has not yet half understood its significance, and—there was a new Italy."

The American Ambassador says when he arrived in Italy in 1921 the State was on the edge of a breakdown. Not that there was any weakness in the monarchy. The King is an object of affection in Italy, he is a constitutional monarch, he does not furnish the slightest obstacle to representative government; he stands ready to help representative government and he does help it; and no one knows this better than Mussolini.

"The state, which I say was breaking down, was the constitutional state; the state which was going to pieces was the state of ministries and parliaments which had no such democracy that it had no leadership. It was so liberal a state that it could not maintain order; it was so benevolent that it allowed every one to come on the pay-roll."

The American Ambassador is a Roosevelt liberal. But he quotes approvingly Mussolini's answer to attacks by liberals:

"Liberalism is not the last word; it represents no final formula in the art of government. This difficult and delicate art deals with the most refractory materials, always in movement, not dead and fixed, but living. What is this liberalism? Does it mean universal indulgence? Does it mean legislative bodies in continuous session so that they may afford the indecorous spectacles which have sickened everyone? Does it mean that in the name of liberty the few are to have the freedom to kill the liberty of all the rest? If this is liberalism it is the theory and practice of humiliation and ruin? The truth apparent to all whose eyes are not blinded by dogmatism is that men are perhaps weary of liberties. They have had an excess. For youth, restless and eager, presenting itself at a new dawn of history, there are other words which move even more deeply than 'liberty'; these words are 'order,' 'organization,' 'service.'"

In the following address Ambassador Child expresses what he believes is good Americanism as well as interpreting the spirit of Fascism. And that he interpreted Fascism correctly we have Mussolini's own testimony:

"We have heard a great deal in the last few years about the menace which war brings before the face of the world. I am confident that my people and your people are willing to act together to contribute anything possible to reduce the dangers of war; but I hold the belief, and I think your Premier holds the belief, that worse menaces than war now oppose the progress of mankind. Folly and weakness and decay are worse."

"These menaces of weakness often are fostered by men of good intentions, who talk about the need to rescue mankind and about the necessity to establish the rights of mankind."

"I want to see leaders of men who, instead of teaching humanity to look outside themselves for help, will teach humanity that it has power within itself to relieve its own distress. I want to see leaders who, instead of telling men of their rights, will lead them to take a full share of their responsibilities."

"I do not doubt that the spirit of benevolence is a precious possession of mankind, but a more precious possession is the spirit which raises the strength of humanity so that benevolence itself becomes less of a necessity. He who makes himself strong and calls upon others to be strong is even more kind and loving of the world than he who

encourages men to seek dependence on forces outside themselves or upon impractical plans for new social structures. I do not doubt the good faith of many of those who put forth theories of new arrangements of social and economic and international structure, but they may all be sure that more important than any of these theories is individual responsibility, and the growth and spread of self-reliance in the home and in the nation."

"I do not doubt that we, Italians and Americans, have a full appreciation of the pity which we ought to confer upon weak or wailing groups or nations or races which clamor for help or favor; but I trust that even in the competition of peace or war I shall be the last ever to believe that weak groups or nations or races are superior or are more worthy of my affection than those who mind their own business with industry, strength and courage, and stand upon their own strong legs."

"I do not question the motives of many of those who, feeling affectionate regard for the warfare of their fellow men, hope for a structure of society in which international bodies shall hand down benefactions to individuals. I merely point out that some nations, such as yours and mine, are beginning to believe that these ideas come out of thoughts which, though easily adopted, are the offspring of a marriage of benevolence with ignorance. In any structure of society which can command our respect and our faith the current of responsibility runs the other way. The doctrine that the world's strength arises from the responsibility of the individual is a sterner doctrine. The leaders of men who insist upon it are those who will be owed an eternal debt by mankind."

"The strength of society must come from the bottom upward. The world needs now more than anything else the doctrine that the first place to develop strength is at home, the first duty is the nearest duty. A strong co-operation of nations can be made only of nations which are strong nations; a strong nation can be made only of good and strong individuals."

"When one makes the fascies, the first requirement is to find the individual rods, straight, strong and wiry, such as you have found, Mr. President, and so skillfully bound together in the strength of unity. But if they had been rotten sticks you could not have made the fascies. Unity in action would have been impossible. The rotten sticks would have fallen to pieces in your fingers."

"Mr. President, what the world needs is not better theories and dreams but better men to carry them out. The world needs a spirit which thinks first of responsibilities before it thinks of rights. I was always a nationalist before I was an internationalist, and I would go on being a nationalist, believing in the spirit of strong and upright and generous nationalism, and believing in theorizing nations or whining peoples but in those nations and peoples who develop a national spirit so finely tempered that they offer to the world an example of organization, discipline and fair play, only because they themselves are upright and strong men and therefore can contribute valuably to international co-operation."

That is good enough political philosophy for all of us.

### PECULIARITIES OF HERESY

By THE OBSERVER

Certain peculiarities have uniformly accompanied or marked every important heresy that has ever made its appearance in the Christian world. They are. First. Every leader or founder of a heresy has presumed to accuse the Catholic Church of having fallen into pernicious error. Second. Every such person has separated himself and his adherents from the Church. Third. Every one of them has taught new doctrines theretofore unknown in the Christian world, sometimes accompanied by fragments of dead and gone heresies started and abandoned before that time. Fourth. They always have named their new sect by the name of the leader, or by the name of a certain dogma, that they taught, or by the name of a country in which the heresy took its rise, or in which it received the protection of some ruler. Fifth. Not one of them could show a divine mission or lawful authority.

Christ's Apostles raised the dead, healed the sick, performed miracles

great and small; but not one of the heresiarchs ever performed a miracle great or small. No miracle was ever claimed for any heretical leader. Nor could they prove from Sacred Scripture that they had any mission to teach or to preach; nor did the results of their labors help them in that respect; for from the first of every heresy, division, uncertainty and quarrels have marked its course. Division, dissension and decay, with losses by unbelief which grew greater as the years went on, have marked the course of every heresy without exception.

Non-Catholics commonly know nothing about the history of the heresies which existed at earlier periods long before Luther and Henry the Eighth. They often take it for granted that those men were the pioneers in attempts to throw off the authority of the Church of God. But a brief attention to history would show them that the so-called Reformation was only one of many incidents in the long struggle of human wilfulness against the authority of God, and that Luther hated the heretics of times prior to his own, without, however, being able to give a single reason why the world should recognize in him an authority which he denied in Arius and Pelagius.

Some of these heresies were more widespread and more powerful than all the sects of Protestantism together, and some of them lasted longer than Protestantism has yet lasted; for there are fragments of some of them yet in remote parts of the earth, but they all died of the want of cohesion and of the want of authority. Some of these heresies were extremely intellectual, much more so than any of the present day sects ever were.

The matter of names is most interesting. It would almost seem that God had put obstacles in the way of sectarians attempting to take to themselves the name of His Church. His design to keep His Church visibly distinct is evident. Arius gave his name to the immense body which, with the support of great and powerful rulers of nations, took so many millions out of the Catholic Church; Calvin gave his name to the Calvinist denomination. The Pelagians were named for Pelagius; and the Lutherans for Luther. Nestorius gave his name to the immense body of seceders who followed his lead; English rulers gave the name of their country to the Church of England.

The Catholic Church has always remained visibly apart. No person, no country, no particular doctrine, has ever imposed its name on her. No sect has ever made a serious attempt to call itself Catholic. A few men, here and there, have thought of doing so; but only to have their proposal bitterly resented by most of their co-religionists and ignored by many more. If a traveller in any country asks where is the Catholic Church, it matters not what may be the religion of the person he inquires of, he is at once referred to the right place.

### NOTES AND COMMENTS

THE EDITOR of the Edinburgh Weekly Scotsman who, with other newspaper men visited Canada during the past summer, has, in a series of articles in his paper, been imparting to his countrymen the impressions gathered during his brief stay amongst us. That they should be interesting was to be expected from the general character of the contents of that journal; that they are informing, also, to Canadian no less than to Scottish readers careful reading will demonstrate. We do not in the limited space at our disposal propose to summarize these impressions, but in view of the conflicting accounts of the prospects before intending settlers which have been sent across the water by some who have already made the venture, the conclusions arrived at by this observant traveller are worth repeating.

THE BETTER to do this may be worth while to reproduce the letters of two Scotsman correspondents voicing divergent sentiments. Here is one of a rather depressing character: "I know from personal experience that no settler or emigrant stands an earthly chance of making a success of anything at present, and that is the reason why 200,000 people left Canada for the States last year. All visitors to

the country receive unbounded hospitality and kindness, but it is not so with the settler, towards whom they adopt a most astonishing attitude. He must 'live it down' as something ignoble, unless he comes to fill an academic condition. There is an obvious lack of good-will that makes it well-nigh impossible to get on in any way. Canadians have not sufficient faith in their own country to invest their money in it. It all goes to the United States. They expect the people of Great Britain to start industries here, and then seem to take a delight in thwarting every purpose. Canada does not want emigrants at the present time, being totally unprepared to cope with them. It requires a responsible Government under which the people already here could establish industries and create markets for natural resources and the products of the land. It would then be unnecessary to spend vast sums advertising for settlers. The people would come. There are over forty derelict farms in this district alone, deserted by their former owners, who could neither make a living nor pay their taxes as there are no markets. In due course they are re-sold by the Government to unwary emigrants. It is a wonderful country, and could be made to support many millions, but I say unhesitatingly that for the time being no emigrant should come to Canada."

BUT, as the Editor proceeds to remark, there is a brighter side to the picture. True as it may be that under prevailing conditions the way of the immigrant is not strewn with roses, nor the streets of Canadian cities paved with gold, world conditions must be taken into account, and bitterly as may be the complaint of "hard times," there can be no question that, compared with most other countries—certainly with every European country—the post-war position of Canada is enviable indeed. The stability of our currency has been maintained; the balance of trade is, as statistics given out by Government show, in our favor, and there has been little if any hardship that the ordinary channels of relief have not been able to cope with. But, for the "brighter side," as voiced by a New Brunswick man, coming originally, as we infer, from the Old Land had gone west, and had had considerable experience in Western farming.

"I DID NOT meet any of the unsuccessful would-be harvesters," says this correspondent, "but I have never seen a willing worker, no matter how inexperienced, fail to find work in Canada yet. From the British Isles come Canada's best settlers, particularly from the north. From the British Isles also come a dogmatic, conservative, 'self-opinionated' class of people, who cannot hope to succeed in a strange land. They will not heed the advice offered by people long-established in the country. They go about things in their own way, and nine times out of ten they eventually find their way back to where they came from, heart-broken and discouraged, a perpetual menace to Canadian immigration. The finest settlers I have seen are Scots and Scandinavians. Of the human race, dare I say, they are the perfect in physique, the choice in morals, and the very dignity of labor. All over Canada are to be seen fine homes built by broad-shouldered men of light complexion and tall physique. Who are they? They nearly always hail from Scotland, Norway, or Sweden. They are 90% successes—the life of Canada, and a pleasure to the world and to themselves. . . . In Canada to labor is to be dignified. Blue overalls are a mark of respect. . . . We want in Canada people of the soil for the soil, people who will make farming a scientific and dignified occupation; people who love books and education as well as they love work. . . . Canada is a land of labor. There is little room for the lazy. . . . If only the people who come would be prepared to face hardships and work!"

"THESE LETTERS represent a view of Canadian conditions from different angles," affirms the Scotsman Editor, "and it would be easy to go into Canada and collect facts to support either view." He was at the outset impressed very unfavorably by the sight in Toronto of a

demonstration of unemployed, and he had scarcely, as he assures us, been an hour in Ottawa when a journalist of repute sought him out and declared that he would be doing a disservice to the people at home if he did not advise them to keep out of Canada, at least until the coming winter is past. But, the Scotsman qualifies this by reminding the reader that as Toronto has at the present time many more unemployed in proportion to its population than any other large centre in Canada, and is, by reason of its geographical location the natural point to which failures gravitate as a stepping-off place for the United States, so conditions there cannot be adjudged a fair index of the whole Dominion. There is, however, in his judgment a certain aspect of the situation in Canada which bids him hesitate to advise the British unemployed to emigrate. Canada, as he reasonably affirms, "cannot absorb an unlimited number of people in industry," and he quotes the Premier of Ontario as saying that to increase the number of workers in the present depressed state of industry would only aggravate conditions, but that the Province can absorb all the domestics it can get and perhaps a number of laborers.

INQUIRIES at Winnipeg which the writer considers to be the key to the labor situation in the Western Provinces, elicited the information that the demand for labor was almost wholly agricultural and domestic, though railways and lumber areas might absorb labor at certain seasons of the year. This is but to state a truism. But the broad conclusion to which, in this writer's judgment the present situation in Canada points, is that the men who expect employment in industry are certain to have a trying experience, excepting always those who can turn their hand to labor in the lumbering camps, on the railways, or at road repairing. In Hamilton, the "Birmingham of Canada," as he found it regarded, the story was the same—business quiet, but a hopeful feeling prevailing that the turning point had come.

ALL THIS may have seemed very depressing, yet the Scotman's impressions of the country as a whole as a field for emigration when things right themselves, as they must soon do, is entirely favorable. In spite of its industrial depression, he concludes: "Canada is a land of present opportunities to the right class of men and women; and, given the right spirit, there are many even among the industrial unemployed at home who might turn to it with hope. The openings for workers on the land are innumerable. The rural worker naturally is best equipped by experience to profit immediately by the opportunities they offer; but men who, by physique and temperament, can adapt themselves to work on the land have every facility to gain the necessary experience and only perseverance is needed to enable a willing man to acquire and equip an eventual home and holding of his own. Among successful settlers are not a few who, having no previous experience of farming, have been content to learn, and have risen to positions of independence and a great degree of affluence. Domestic servants are in great request in every province."

"LIFE OF CHRIST" AS A MOVIE AROUSES CRITICISM  
 London, Eng.—The reported purchase by an American film company of the screen rights of Papini's "Life of Christ" is not kindly received by the Universe, which criticizes the Hollywood policy of filming "every book that achieves a third edition," thereby exploiting the publicity created by the booksellers.  
 The Universe cinema critic admits that most of the Passion plays already produced were capable of doing much good.  
 "But there must be a purpose behind them higher than the one discernable in the present instance if they are to be acceptable. Education and instruction should be the leading motives of the producer who attempts a Passion play; but here I see nothing more at work than the commercial instinct."  
 Representations of Our Lord on the screen are forbidden by the National Board of Film Censors, which operates throughout the country. Such films can be shown at special exhibitions, but their public is considerably restricted by the ban.

### LAY RETREAT

Paper read by Rev. E. J. Devine, S. J., Montreal, Que., at C. T. S. Convention

It is a great privilege to have the opportunity of addressing this distinguished assembly on a topic which is very much to the fore these days, a topic which should interest all who have at heart the spread of the Catholic religion and the influence of the Church in Canada. Although I am a rather strong advocate of the pen when there is question of spreading Catholic truth and Catholic influence and prestige, the time may come—and come soon—when a powerful auxiliary of the C. T. S. will take the field; in fact the time is ripe for its coming.

Undoubtedly printers' ink, when rightly applied, and literature, such as the Catholic Truth Society publishes, will have a great deal to do here in Canada in the future, not only merely in strengthening the faith of our own people, but also in informing the minds of our non-Catholic neighbors and in breaking down their prejudices; in a word, in letting the outside world see that it does not monopolize either brains or knowledge. But literature that appeals to the intelligence than it does to the will does not necessarily move people to action either inside or outside the fold. A writer may inform, he may counsel, urge, give reasons, and so on, but unless the good example of Catholics comes to his aid, he is only too often beating the air. Unless our own people practice what they profess their influence will not amount to much. Example is eloquent, and the example of intense Catholic life, shown by our laity who are mixing daily with non-Catholics, will—if I am not mistaken—have as much influence on these latter as our literature. What I wish to say today is that we have at our beck and call, right here in Canada, a way of training Catholics who will be able to give the example called for.

You may have remarked a Movement which has been taking root in recent years, perhaps not so much in Ontario or in the other Provinces as down our way in the good old Province of Quebec, a Movement which is drawing thousands of men, business men and professional men, lawyers, doctors, merchants, workmen of various classes—drawing them away from their homes and into silence and solitude for three days once a year. After the three days are over, they return to their families radiant and happy; their health is not impaired after the ordeal; their sanity is not affected; they are none the worse for the outing; they are enthusiastic; they are thrilled with their experience; and invariably they are determined to renew it next year and to get others to make the plunge with them. These are the people who make what are known as Lay Retreats, these are the people who are interested in the Lay Retreat Movement, the Lay Retreat Movement.

What is a Lay Retreat? The word "retreat" has various meanings. We have heard of the retreat of the Marne, and we have heard of Napoleon's retreat from Moscow; if we have not forgotten our Greek, we recall the retreat of the Ten Thousand; but in Catholic terminology, the word retreat speaks to us of something else. A Lay Retreat is a halt a man makes in his life once in a while, a setting aside of everything—business, stocks and bonds, merchandise, the pick and shovel, the hod and the trowel—to be free to apply the tape-line to his own life, to hold up the mirror to his soul, to bring himself face to face with himself, to see just how matters stand with himself. A Lay Retreat is a withdrawal for three days from the drawl and perplexities of everyday life, a turning away from things temporal to consider, in the quiet of prayer and solitude and under the eye of one's Maker, the things that are eternal. It is a time of reflection, deliberately seized upon, to weigh the relative value of things, to think a lot about the only things worth thinking about, in view of the interesting life at stake. It is a time a man gives over to the regulation of his life and actions according to the dictates of truth. It is a time of interior spiritual discipline, when he has the leisure to go down to the bedrock of his soul, to scrutinize the innermost pleats of his heart, to take his bearings in life's pilgrimages, to study purposes and motives and ideals that make for the upbuilding of Catholic life and character. A Lay Retreat is a time when a man seriously tries to see himself as God sees him, when he learns, in a novel way, what he should know, and how he should live and act. In a Lay Retreat a man has leisure to reason things out; and he has the opportunity given him to regulate his life according to the dictates of reason and the laws of God. The time given to a Lay Retreat is a time of good hard work, not merely of the mind in searching, but of the heart and will in resolving.

This rather diffuse definition gives, I think a fair idea of what a retreat is. But one may ask in what does it differ after all from a mission. It differs in this: a mission appeals to all, because all men have spiritual interests that must not be neglected; while a retreat appeals to the lesser number, because, we fear, owing to