

# The Catholic Record.

"Christianus mihi nomen est Catholicus vero Cognomen."—(Christian is my Name, but Catholic my Surname)—St. Pacien, 4th Century

VOLUME XXXII.

LONDON, CANADA, SATURDAY, JUNE 19, 1920

2175

## The Catholic Record

LONDON, SATURDAY, JUNE 19, 1920

### AFFECTION VS. JUDGMENT

It may be questioned whether ordinarily thoughtful people of the present day have considered for themselves as sound a commonsense philosophy for dealing with the practical problems of life as their forefathers had thought out and grasped. Almost certainly they do not compare favorably in that respect with the cultivated people of the ancient world. There is an abundance of classical literature to show that the Greek and the Roman seldom found himself confronted by a practical problem in the art of wise living without he had conceived or had accepted a precept that would give him a broad hint as to how his conduct should be regulated. The world of moral government was well surveyed. Sound maxims that came easily into the memory pointed out the safest way along which a perplexed man could walk if doubt assailed him. If there was no specific oracle for making the right line of conduct clear, there were excellent general maxims that could be applied effectively. For instance, the rule of following "the golden mean" was tremendously wise.

Now we live more by chance, arrive at decisions by impulse, and often do not even recognize a difficulty that is very pressing. We may not even have thought enough about the principles of conduct to be aware that there is often a violent clash, not between good and bad in human character, but between two good tendencies. Our affection, for example, which is an excellent feature of our character, and our judgment, which is another excellent feature, may be directly at war with each other. But we do not see it, or will not admit it, or, seeing and admitting it, do not know how to ally the strife, because we have not thought sufficiently about the dangerous corners on the journey of life. We may illustrate the point by references to several situations where affection and judgment, the heart and the head, plead with us for contrary courses of conduct.

Take the earliest beginnings of family life, when young people are preparing to marry. How commonly do we find that one or other of the pair who are drawing together towards a union that if completed, must be momentous in the highest degree for both, while giving way to a liking that increases to a craving for the other, is yet suspicious that all is not as well with the engagement as passion pretends to believe! Nay, it may be more definite than that. Judgment may speak in clear tones and give disconcerting warnings. The man may feel that the woman he has chosen is a very angel in grace and chastity, and yet be aware that she has but a slight sense of responsibility, and will shine casually as an ornament rather than as a trusted co-operator in life's duties. And similarly the woman will know in her heart perhaps that her intended husband, though boldly handsome and cheerful in bearing, and regarded as a "most desirable match," is not likely to be very reliable or self-sacrificing when the stress of life comes on.

But sterner than these cases of admitted imperfection on either side are the instances where the sober judgment of parents and onlookers and of the man or woman most concerned says plainly that feeling is an unsafe guide and that lasting satisfaction cannot be counted on reasonably if the marriage takes place, and yet infatuated affection holds up its head boldly and demands that it shall rule. How can we hold the balance between affection that is more or less blind, and judgment that is inexorably clear-sighted? Of course youth will hold the balance towards the side of affection, which is its great prerogative, and greater length of years will favor the decisions of judgment, and will quote the sad proofs gleaned from experience. Our point here is that young people ought to have thought of this possible clash between affection and judgment, and to be prepared to guard themselves against the folly that so

easily besets the thoughtless lover. They ought to have formed an ideal of what judgment may properly demand before affection is allowed to have its way. Then, when marriage has been celebrated and the pair have to plan their lives together, the problem arises once more, even in the happiest of unions, how far the soft wishes of affection, so indispensable in their right place, shall be a ruling and controlling power, or calm strong judgment which traces cause and effect clearly into the coming years, and plans to make the future secure and happy, at the cost maybe of some immediate ease. A proud husband seeking to lavish all that he can afford on a happy wife is a beautiful sight up to a certain point where judgment comes to the fore and says that what looks like kindness is really becoming unkindness and accumulating troubles later on, when luxury and indulgence will take their toll from the family happiness.

Fortunately there are two in every family combination, and there is always a second chance that too fond affection will be kept in check by the good sense of the husband or wife, who is in danger of being spoiled. Happily, too, the prudent nature usually accompanies the stronger character, and so as time goes on a natural balance is established with love and wisdom, plus the grace of God, in equipoise. It is, however, when we reach the stage in family evolution at which children arrive and have to be trained that the warfare between affection and judgment becomes most apparent. How strange—nay, almost cynically tragic—it is that the love of parents for their children, which on the whole has probably been the most potent force for good throughout the long story of humanity, should so often turn into something not unlike a curse because it will not submit itself to the dictates of sound judgment! Yet that that is the case in innumerable instances is known perfectly well to every one who has had any considerable experience of the ways of parents in rearing and training their children. The worst enemies of myriads of children are the fond and foolish parents who cannot bring themselves to use firmly their own judgment or surrender their children to the kind and wise experience of practised managers of child-nature. Once more we say that what is needed is that every parent ought to be forewarned that a time may come when the rival claims of affection and judgment will have to be dealt with by them, and the children themselves cannot afford that a weak and demoralizing affection should be allowed to take the place of broad and healthy judgment.

Of course there are vast numbers of fathers and mothers who unite the tenderest affection for their children with a well-balanced and cultivated judgment which enables them to foresee how they should plan their children's education, shape and train their characters, and send them into the working world equipped to make the fullest and best use of whatever natural powers they have been endowed with. It is not to such parents that these comments are addressed. Nor yet are they addressed to the less wise fathers and mothers, but still shrewd and thoughtful observers, who early realize that somehow they have not the qualities needed in training the minds and natures of children, and who therefore pass on their children to schools for the operation of formative influences which they do not themselves wield. It is to the loving parents who persist in thinking that their children can do no wrong, must not be interfered with or crossed or corrected, must have all that they wish to have, and who busily hamper the efforts of everybody who is called upon to deal with their children—it is to these parents that the warning is everdue. They need to be told plainly that affection which is not ruled by sober judgment may be seen as a disguised form of cruelty when its full harvest of unhappiness is reaped in future years. As this is the day of impulsive youth, there is all the greater reason why it should realize that sober judgment is its supreme safeguard.

## WEEKLY IRISH REVIEW

### IRELAND SEEN THROUGH IRISH EYES

Copyright 1920 by Seumas MacManus  
AN ENGLISHMAN'S KEEN SENSE OF HUMOR

That joke which was named the Irish Home Rule Bill becomes more of a joke every day—even to those who were at first inclined to take it seriously. A Mr. Swan, member of Parliament for one of the divisions of Durham, England, has offered as the latest amendment to the joke, the following satirical clause:

"Nothing in this Act shall derogate from the undoubted right of the Ulster Unionist Council to alter or repeal any section of this Act, or to promote rebellion, import arms from Germany, to incite to mutiny in the army, sign covenants, or in any other way to signify his disapproval of this Act or any section thereof."

### A SCHISM IN THE ULSTER UNIONIST COUNCIL

The Orangemen of the three Northern counties to be left out in the cold, proposed to be excluded from Carson's—are continuing their howl, because while their luckier fellows in the Northeast are already gazing each other over the division of the swag, there sent a curb at all going to fall to them. It was mentioned here how they had torn down from their bedroom walls the once-honored picture of King Carson. Now they are trying to disrupt the Ulster Unionist Council, which used to run the anti Irish campaign for the nine counties of the province. Some twenty-five of the lords, counts, and viscounts, barons and generals have signed a requisition calling the Council to meet and consider a motion for rescinding their resolve of three months ago to accept a six-county Parliament. Consequently a schism is threatened in the Ulster Unionist ranks. The leaders of the threatened schism, the men who are now forcing the reconsideration of the Northeastern Parliament ideas, are such as the Marquis of Dufferin, the Earl of Shaftesbury, the Earl of Rothen, the Earl of Clanwilliam, the Earl of Darnley, the Earl of Leitrim, Viscount Bangor, Viscount Massena, General Sir William Adair, Sir Robert Kennedy, and a whole lot more of the same brand.

### LIMITATIONS OF LABOR SYMPATHY

The Labor Federations of Great Britain cannot make us their minds just how far they will extend practical support to Ireland in their struggle,—or rather just how far they will refrain from aiding the military repression of that country. For all they have been asked to do is to refrain from handling military ammunition that is being sent to take the lives of the Irish. They were just after agreeing to refuse to handle munitions going to Poland for shooting the Russians. But the moment it was put up to them not to help their own rulers to kill the Irish, they confessed to be in a quandary.

So long as they were only asked to pass resolutions supporting Ireland's claims, the politicians that run the British Labor Federation were right heartily willing. But the moment they were asked to do something practical they must take time to consider it, and put it before their unions. Furthermore, it was not necessary to take time to consider the question of saving the Russians from the Poles; but the question of saving the Irish from their own British countrymen is a horse of a different color. British labor is acting in this manner in the identical way that their capitalist fellows in the Government in the last few decades, acted with regard to all Irish claims—making profuse professions of being in favor of them, but when it came to a show-down, ingeniously finding plenty of excuse for not acting.

### DIRECT TRADE BETWEEN IRELAND AND AMERICA

Mr. MacCormack of the Moore MacCormack Dublin to New York Steamship Line, just visited Ireland for the purpose of getting in direct touch with Irish traders and developing the business of the line. He got a great reception in Dublin where a banquet was given him—at which were present representatives of the leading business lines in Ireland—and people of almost every shade of politics. Great enthusiasm was shown over the success of the Steamship Line. Mr. Darrell Figgis, a brilliant writer and member of the Sinn Féin party, in the course of his address at the dinner, prophesied such continued success for the direct Ireland to America line, that in the lifetime of the present generation he hoped to hear the Atlantic Ocean called the Irish American Sea. In the course of his address Mr. MacCormack said "America was prepared to purchase Irish goods and pay more for them than any other country, and America would pay more for Irish manufactured goods because they had a sympathetic interest in Ireland. His line would carry Irish goods to America for about twenty-five per cent. of what

was charged for goods brought from America to Ireland. That showed they were trying to foster the Irish trade in America (applause). Also, they would give a direct service to and from Scandinavian and Irish ports." Concluding, he said: "We are paying to Ireland in a small way a tribute for what she has done in furnishing to America Irishmen's sons who have been instrumental in making America the great country it is today."

### GUNS AND TANKS FAIL TO IMPRESS OR REPRESS THE IRISH

Despite the many new regiments of British soldiers and the shiploads of tanks, aeroplanes, machine guns, etc., with which Ireland has recently been flooded, and still is being flooded, the guerrilla warfare goes forward right merrily. Notwithstanding that the garrisons of soldiers are placed thickly over the land, the Sinn Féin raids go forward. Barracks and Government buildings are captured and burned and Government log-cabins on the coast destroyed—this latter for the purpose of hampering the progress of the ring of warships with which Ireland is encircled. The English are amazed at the amount of arms they find to be in the hands of the Irish. They realize that there has been a great deal of surreptitious gun running and despite all their ring of warships, the gun running still seems to continue. It may be noted that one of the most recent members of the British armed forces to meet death in a raid was Sergeant MacKienna who was noted for that he was one of those who arrested Roger Casement.

### THE INCONSIDERATENESS OF IRISH REBELS

One of the most vicious things about the Irish fighters and Irish agitators is that they always carry on their agitating and fighting at the wrong time. At present England has her hands full of India, Egypt, Persia and the oilfields of Armenia—so that it is no wonder that she is particularly exasperated at the Irish for holding her troops there while Soviet Russia is pushing her out of her well-merited gains in Persia, Armenia, and other such places. The Irish are too barbarously rude and impolite to nag England and tie her down at this most awkward time. If they would only accept a little of the civilization that for centuries England has been trying to thrust on them from the mouths of guns and points of bayonets, they would realize that it is very ungrateful and unchivalrous of them not to refrain from warring upon England at the wrong time. A people with even the most elementary ideas of civilization and civility would, of course, refrain from attacking English rule until the Empire had its hands and its mind free to concentrate upon crushing them. But sure the Irish were always an unpractical people.

### THE IRISH AUSTRALIAN PRELUDE

Even Archbishop Mannix of Melbourne, who is unfortunately on his way to Ireland now to help to fan the flames, there is as bad as the rest. All through the War he gave the Empire a great deal of annoyance in Australia, by constantly demanding and getting all the Irish Australians to demand "What's going to be done for Ireland?" As he could get no answer he induced Australia to throw out conscription. Since the War ended, he has been worse than ever, and through his influence the serious agitators in Australia have been demanding self-determination for Ireland—in motions such as the following, which was recently brought into the legislature of West Australia by the labor members:

"That declaring the existence of a state of martial law in Ireland, the occupation of that country on a war footing by the military forces of the Crown, the murders, outrages, and devastation resulting from such occupation, the suppression of public assemblies and of the newspaper press, the arbitrary arrest and detention without trial in foreign prisons of members of Parliament and other popular leaders, this House considers that the situation thus created is inimical to the Empire and its parts, tends to check American co-operation in restoring peace to Europe, and is in conflict with the theory that Great Britain entered the late War to vindicate and preserve the liberty of small nations. Secondly, that in view of the neglect for nearly six years of the British Government to enforce the Act of Parliament conferring self-government upon Ireland, and of the failure of that authority to otherwise satisfy the legitimate demands of the Irish nation, this House hereby directs the Australian representative in London to press the Imperial Government for self-determination for Ireland.

In fact the Archbishop has put Australia into a state only a little better than Ireland. And now that he is on his way to Ireland, there is some trepidation in London. His presence in Ireland will be the last straw on the Government's back. And it is so difficult, almost impossible either to shoot or to imprison an Archbishop—from the Antipodes, too. It would attract a

lot of embarrassing attention. He was endeavoring to get Rome to head him off. But Rome, which felt for itself during the War what English slanders and English propaganda meant,—Rome, it is believed, refused the request. So it is feared that Ireland, which is so devilishly hard to hold in hands just now, will get out of hand altogether, after Mannix lands and blesses every man who strikes a blow for freedom.

### SEUMAS MACMANUS, Of Donegal.

## "THE SUPREME BLOT"

### PSYCHOLOGY, ECONOMICS AND IRELAND AND THE GREATEST OF THESE IS IRELAND

By Desmond Shaw

The question as to what is the attitude of the United States to Britain is summed up interestingly by Desmond Shaw, in an article in the English Review. He gives three reasons, psychology, economics, and Ireland, and apparently, the greatest of these is Ireland. He definitely states too, what the world has for some time suspected, that in the matter of the peace treaty and the League of Nations the President of the United States represents only himself and by his actions has made himself the most unpopular man in America.

The British public, says Mr. Shaw, is at the moment puzzled as to whether America is a friend or merely an "ally." So much interested or sentimental nonsense of the "Hands Across the Sea" type has been written about American friendship, the League of Nations, and the economic relations of the two countries, that the actual facts have become blurred.

For a mass of informative conversation, etc., in America, I reached the conclusion that political and economic interests have combined to hide, in England, the real facts of the American outlook on things British, and decided that the truce forces constituting what we may call "the American problem" are (1) psychology, (2) economics, and (3) Ireland—in the order named.

Some of the statements in this article may prove unpalatable, but the writer believes they represent, and without pretending to commit anybody but himself, roughly, the facts. At least they are neither "official" nor "inspired."

To crystallize the American attitude to England (one had nearly written "Europe") in a few words: there is a certain official clique which, either from sincere personal regard for and belief in Anglo-American friendship or from motives of State are anxious for a closer rapprochement, and there is a bigger and more sensitive body of "Monroists" in the American mind, unimpaired sentiment, are disposed either to a policy of "watchful waiting" or one of downright opposition to any closer tie. When we come to analyze broadly the American masses today, we shall not perhaps be far wrong in saying that, as a whole and with certain minority exceptions, they are either indifferent or actively hostile to England (in the latter case especially where the tireless Sinn Féin propaganda runs). To sum up "America for the Americans" and no entanglements" represents the broad American view of the moment.

And the reasons?

The prime factor in the detached Platonism of the American view of England lies in the basically different psychologies of the two nations. Climate makes character. Despite common roots, the American character tends more and more to diverge from that of the Anglo-Saxon. The American self-confidence and assertiveness, with its contempt for tradition—so often confused with "bonafidness"—is born of youth and virility, the English reticence, and of maturity and age. The American has the receptiveness of youth, combined with an extraordinary belief in America (he is entirely sure, for example, that America won the War) and a certain contempt, mingled with a curious deference where "culture" is concerned, for the older European. Above all, the American, like the Celt, is emotional the Englishman, the thing that is its exact opposite—sentimental. With the exception of a common Anglo-Saxon belief in democracy and a genius for politics, one scarcely knows a single point shared by both. The admixture of some twenty millions of Irish and the non-Saxon millions of other races have had much to do with this.

There is no use blinking facts, though there is nothing in these facts to prevent an excellent understanding between England and America. Opposites in countries, as in marriage, often make the best unions.

Leaders of British diplomatic missions, some of whom the writer met in the States, are ignorant of these things, because they mix only and by inclination in circles carefully prepared for them, the views of which more or less coincide with their own; they meet only the "big men" and they consequently never get a line upon American opinion in

the mass. They see some American, not America. Psychology and economics are more intimately blended in the United States than in Europe because youthful America has not yet entirely segregated "feeling" from finance. Leaving, however, psychology on one side, economics are the driving force which ruthlessly determines America's orientation to England.

America's captains of finance are entirely brain-clear about three things which in their mind are the determining factors of this orientation. First, that prior to the War Europe, including England, was largely living upon America's surplus food production, and that since then Europe has become steadily more and more dependent upon America. Secondly, that England is heavily in her debt. Thirdly, that these two things give America the dominating position in the world since the war to the paper. This last may, however, have been modified by the recent American realization of trade fall through cancellation of cotton and other orders by England, demonstrating that capital has become so internationalized that possibly a creditor country cannot afford to "cut the painter" of a debtor country.

Mr. Shaw goes on to show that what the United States has lost in English trade she has picked up elsewhere and she therefore leaves her unremoved. He continues: "With the triple realization above there goes another—that the European economists and statesmen are 'drunk on words' and without policy, and a growing belief that the work of M. M. Clemenceau and Lloyd George at the Peace Conference, with special regard to 'the smashing of Germany and the dragging of England at the triumphal car of French *romanche* in fact leading to European chaos and bankruptcy."

All this serves to anneal the growing American view that the word of the statesman is but a "statesman's word" and that the British statesmen, like European statesmen generally, are suffering from the disease of age—arterio sclerosis. The only policy which could rehabilitate the pre-war belief in British statesmanship is (1) "making a clean breast" to the nation of England's desperate financial position; (2) the initiation of definite and simple international financial policy, which by restoring German industry would give the Allies, England included, a chance to reestablish maximum production; (3) steps to deflate currency; (4) the reduction of armaments (the 650,000,000 Army and Navy estimates have put the final touch to American scepticism); (5) effective taxation and proper apportionment of credits; and (6) the abolition of secret diplomacy. Hoover's original warning: "Production is perish" is, in a sentence, America's attitude. Even today I believe America, if only for her own sake, would give ample credit for raw materials, currency, etc., if England gave Europe a lead in "setting her house in order."

In all this there is no direct enmity to England. American financiers were very modest and guarded in their statements as to the possibility of New York displacing London as the world's banking centre, a possibility at least contemplated by them in view of the fact that the War has changed America from a debtor nation which has lent Europe \$9,500,000,000. In a conversation with a leading Lombard Street banker the other day, he did not deny this possibility.

With all this question of economics, of course, bound up the League of Nations and Mr. Wilson, who, for Anglo-American friendship, has been a Man of Fatality. At date, the position of the League is this: The Republicans, headed by Senator Lodge, are dead set against ratification of the Covenant as it stands and, as one thinks, to its signing under any conditions. Some of the Democratic Senators are also opposed, and few would be found to back President Wilson in his demand for its full acceptance "without the alteration of the dotting of an 'i' or the crossing of a 't.'" Upon a national referendum vote the majority of the American people would undoubtedly today vote against the signing of the Covenant in its original form—perhaps in any form. As an American tractarian magnate expressed it to me: "We don't want living America tied to dying Europe."

In all this, the position of President Wilson in a country where personality counts for everything and has a habit of becoming confused with principle is unworthy. No man has been more misrepresented by his European friends. The fact is, he is a broken man physically, and, in the eyes of the mass of his countrymen, by whom he is regarded as corrupted with ambition, belongs to the past. He has "got up the back" of the American nation. His autocracy and his complete undoing at the hands of M. M. Clemenceau and Lloyd George

CONTINUED ON PAGE FIVE

## CATHOLIC NOTES

There is a church in Hawaii built of blocks of coral hewn from the reef.

At the reopening of the American College in Louvain 18 students from the United States were enrolled.

Several thousand persons impeded traffic for blocks at Anderson, Ind., in an effort to purchase sugar advertised at 17¢ cents a pound by a local merchant.

St. Louis, May 27.—The Missouri State Convention of the Knights of Columbus voted to give \$250,000 to the endowment fund of the St. Louis University, which is now conducting a campaign to raise \$3,000,000.

London, May 28.—Sir Denis Fitzpatrick, prominent Catholic and former Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjab, died here last week. Requiem Mass was celebrated at Brompton Oratory May 25.

Hagerstown, Md., near Baltimore, has begun a war against cursing and swearing. The police chief has instructed his men to rigorously enforce the ordinance against profanity. One of the first offenders was fined \$5 for cursing on the street by a Hagerstown justice.

To commemorate the one-hundredth anniversary of the death of Blessed Clot, a Lazarist martyr of Hupé, China, Rev. Father Odoico Tcheng, a native priest, has prepared a life of Blessed Clot in the Chinese language which will be appreciated by the Christians of Hupé.

West Palm Beach, Fla., May 28.—Glencolr, Richard Croker's estate in Ireland, and a fund of \$280,000 with which to maintain it, are to go after the death of himself and his wife to the Irish Sisters of Charity, he has declared in testimony which he gave in the hearing of the suit brought against him by his son, Richard Croker, jr.

The number of vocations to the priesthood has shown a marked increase in Ireland during the past few years. At present all the Irish seminaries are overcrowded. Maynooth College, which usually has slightly over 600 students, has now over 600. The Chinese Mission Society, established two years ago from Maynooth, has received this year over 300 applications from students for its new college near Galway.

Dublin.—Father Walter MacDonnell, Prefect of the Dunboone Establishment, has just died in Maynooth University in his sixty-seventh year. The deceased priest, who was a profound scholar, was at the time of his death Librarian of Maynooth, and since 1881 Professor in the Faculty of Theology. He was the founder of the Irish Theological Quarterly, which came into existence in 1906.

London, May 31.—Monsignor Barlaesine, Latin patriarch of Jerusalem, who is now in London on the way to Rome, has had several conferences with the foreign office on matters affecting the interests of Catholics in Palestine. The patriarch recently addressed a public meeting at Westminster on the difficulties that confront Catholics in the Holy Land. While it is understood that the British office has given assurance that Catholic interests will be adequately safeguarded, there are still many important points in the matter of the future status of the holy places that must be settled.

Rome, May 31.—Solemn rites for the beatification of Anna Maria Taigi, Trinitarian Tertiary and a stigmatic of the nineteenth century, were performed at St. Peter's today. Pope Benedic! entered the cathedral amidst the veneration of a vast throng, and, despite the intense heat of the day, participated in the ceremony. Anna Maria Taigi was of humble birth, her father being a druggist in the City of Siena. Evil days came, when Anna Maria found it difficult to supply food for her family, but she managed, by manufacturing shoes, making for the first time sandals with rope soles. She also succeeded in finding enough food to lend assistance to her poverty-stricken neighbors. Before her death in 1897 several miracles were attributed to her.

London, May 24.—The reinsertion of "All Souls' Day" in the calendar of the Church of England at the recent York Convocation has aroused considerable comment among both Anglicans and Catholics. The proposal was carried by an overwhelming majority, despite the vigorous opposition of the Protestant Bishop of Liverpool. In his speech he declared his belief that it would open the door wide to Masses for the dead and other practices entirely alien to the Church of England and would therefore cause great distress among a very large number of the best and most loyal churchmen, who would be disturbed indeed if the Church of England reverted to pre-Reformation days and practices. Only eight votes were cast against the measure.