



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

ZMY
Digitized by Google
Yarborough

2736

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH CHALLENGED

IN THE DISCUSSION OF
THIRTY-TWO QUESTIONS


WITH THE
CATHOLIC LAYMEN'S ASSOCIATION
OF GEORGIA

BY
DR. C. A. YARBROUGH
MACON, GEORGIA

PUBLISHED UNDER AUSPICES
THE PATRIOTIC SOCIETIES OF MACON
MACON, GEORGIA
1920

THE
PUBLIC LIBRARY
918018

COPYRIGHT, 1920
BY C. A. YARBROUGH



"Fools Deride, Philosophers Investigate"

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Introductory	5
"About Roman Catholics"—Newspaper Advertisement.....	7
"How It Began"—The Thirty-two Questions Submitted.....	7
Copies sent to Mr. A. J. Long and Hon. A. D. Daly.....	10
Correspondence with Mr. Long.....	11
Laymen's Answers to Questions.....	14
Objections to Answers Forwarded to Association.....	18
When One Is Responsible for Sin of Another.....	43
Roman Catholics and Liquor Traffic.....	61
Immutability—Subject of, Discussed.....	69
Association Challenged to Debate.....	70
Adendum—Remarks on Marriage and Unity of Teaching.....	72
Letters from Association Answering Objections :	
Questions Furnished Helpful Index to Anti-Catholic Mind.....	74
Association Not Formed for Evangelical Purposes.....	75
Suspicion and Trust.....	76
Rules of Right Reason.....	77
Duty of Citizens.....	81
Regarding the Papal Index.....	83
If Catholics Are Satisfied.....	87
Index Does Not Hamper?.....	89
As to Bad Popes.....	95
Abridged History of Popes.....	97
Index Defended	119
"Intention"	121
Intention of Index.....	126
Papal Infallibility	131
Papal Dogmas	133
Pope Not Infallible in All Things.....	136
If Pope Should Be a Bad Man.....	138
Infallibility, Supremacy, Inspiration, Revelation.....	141
Syllabus of Errors Not Authentic?.....	142
Pope's Commands to be Respected and Obeyed Even if Not Assented to Internally.....	151
Layman's Oath	154
Baptism—Impeachment	156
Cardinal Gibbons, <i>Sunday Visitor</i> and Bishop Kelley on Baptism.....	157
Actual Baptism	159, 163
The Confessional	166
Cardinal Gibbons Asked to Furnish Copy of <i>Pontificale Romanum</i>	168
Priest's Hand-Book	169
Masonic Influence and Power.....	182
Rule of Right Reason.....	184
Subjects Consigned to Debate.....	186
Who is Representing Catholics in Georgia?.....	190
Ferrer, Spanish Modernist, Shot.....	193
Teaching of Papal Text-Book on Union of Church and State.....	32, 195
Concordats	199
Romanism and Education in the Philippines.....	201
Origin of Papal States.....	203
Syllabus of Errors—Misquoted?.....	208
Catholic the Only True Church Established by Jesus Christ.....	215
Persecution of Catholics.....	217
Subjects "Open to Investigation"?.....	218
Bedrock of Protestantism.....	220

TABLE OF CONTENTS—Continued

	PAGE
Can Laymen Accuse Priest?.....	222
Right of Catholics to Investigate.....	225
Jesuit Order.....	226, 228
Children of Church to Speak for Her.....	230
"Peculiar Constructions".....	236
Subjects for Debate.....	237
Expediency.....	242
<i>Ne Temere</i> Decree—Marriage Law.....	247, 249
Marriage Law.....	251
Priestly Celibacy.....	254
Laws of God in Force at All Times.....	256
The Divisional Difference.....	259
When is One Outside of the Church?.....	262, 264
Protestants Can Be Saved.....	264, 265
Folder, "Battle Against Freemasonry"—Object?.....	267, 271
Joint Publication.....	271
Pope Teaches Protestants Can Be Saved?.....	272
Who Are Outside the Church?.....	276
What is the Advantage of One Being a Catholic?.....	277
Heretics Universally Excommunicated.....	282
Catholics Obey Conscience.....	283
The Pope Alone Has Right to Reason.....	284
Cardinal Newman on Conscience.....	287
Heretics To Be Killed.....	291
Scottish Rite Masons and a Priest—A Parallel?.....	293
Busenbaum on Conscience.....	294
Does Pope Rule the Soul?.....	298
Authority and Obedience as Viewed by Masons.....	302
Five Charges Against Freemasonry.....	303
Holy Water, Scapular, Rosary.....	309
The Glories of Mary by Lugori.....	310
Priests to Swear Falsely.....	321
Cardinal Jacobatius on Conscience.....	321
Prohibited Books.....	327
When Human Law Is Not Law.....	327
Comments on Long Letter Concluded by Association.....	330
General Albert Pike—A Plea for Peace.....	333
The Bishop's Oath—As Printed by a Jesuit Priest.....	334
The Oath as Contained in <i>Pontificale Romanum</i> in Latin.....	336
Translated.....	337
Papal Church Dared to Meet Oath in Court—A Challenge.....	342
Oath of Bishop Makes Oath of Knights of Columbus Unnecessary.....	343
Private Judgment.....	351
Secret Societies Condemned.....	352
Who Started the War?.....	353
Correspondence on Proposed Debate.....	358
Threatening Letter to Rev. T. F. Callaway.....	370
Anonymous Letter.....	376
Letters to and from Mr. John J. McCreary on Bishop's Oath.....	375
A Hotbed of Organized Bigotry—A Folder by a Priest of Alabama.....	387
Letters of the Rev. John Wesley.....	394
Conclusion.....	402
If the Protestant World Had Its Back Against the Wall—?.....	405
Catholics Can Not Appeal to Civil Law to Stay Orders of the Pope.....	406
Retrospective.....	407
Necessity for Organizing.....	410

INTRODUCTORY

TO master any subject—whether art, science, music, language, or profession—requires several years' study and close application, and the expenditure of considerable money; for these reasons, few people undertake the task of becoming proficient in more than one. Any one, though, with the time and means, may master several branches, and some do; but it is usually only those who purpose teaching, writing, etc. The average person can, however, by a little application and at a nominal expense secure a sufficient knowledge of the arts and sciences as to understand their main principles, and have the satisfaction of knowing their value to society in general.

This is true in regard to the subject of Roman Catholicism; a knowledge of it cannot be acquired in a day, week, month. It has so many phases which affect the spiritual, physical and intellectual world that it is necessary to devote considerable time and money to it to secure even an insight into the system. That this is true is evidenced by the fact that to become a priest twelve years or more must be spent studying the various subjects necessary to qualify one for the priesthood.

Many good people have never given this question an hour's consideration, and if their attention is called to any abstract proposition relative thereto, they are apt to say they do not believe it. To inform them that *aqua pura* in Latin means "pure water" in English, and then hear them say, "I don't believe it!" represents the attitude of those to the papal system who have never given it any attention. It would be a waste of energy and foolish to try to go far enough in the discussion of the Latin tongue to prove to *their* satisfaction that *aqua pura* means "pure water"—they would have to devote months to the study of that language before they would believe.

I have spent many months in the assiduous study of Romanism; have closely read thousands of pages of literature, from non-Catholic and approved Catholic sources, yet I must confess there is more to learn. But what I have gleaned, I have endeavored to so present it in these pages as will give a clear and concise understanding of its main features, treating of certain fundamental principles of the system that should be considered seriously by every one who enjoys the blessings of Liberty provided by the Constitution of the United States, and is a compendium of reliable information that every person should possess, which cannot be secured otherwise than by following the course pursued by me.

I believe the reader will be convinced that the Roman Catholic Church is a deadly foe to the Constitution of this country, and every human right and liberty guaranteed by it.

To my Catholic friends—especially the priests who may read after me—I challenge you to meet the issues herein on the rostrum before the people. To resort to the boycott, slander or murder, as Pope Leo XIII seems to teach you should do (see discussion and comments on Question No. 13), will not strengthen the position of the Catholic church in America; and if any one should address me, answer those questions which the Catholic Laymen's Association of Georgia failed to elucidate.

I shall be glad to hear from any one who desires to take issue with me on any one of the vital questions presented herein, and promise to give them a hearing in the next edition.

In the large volume of matter passing between the Association and the author, all of which was prepared with more or less haste on the part of each, it was natural for numerous errors of various kinds to have been overlooked, as at the time there was no thought of putting it all in book form, and as far as I can do so without changing any material word or thought, I shall correct errors in the correspondence, where I am sure of the meaning which the Association wished to convey. That no alteration in any of the manuscript has been made can always be verified by reference to the originals, which are being carefully preserved.

THE AUTHOR.

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH CHALLENGED

....

HOW IT BEGAN

IN the spring of 1917, I received a pamphlet from the Catholic Laymen's Association of Georgia entitled "A Plea for Peace." At that time advertisements were running in the local papers from the Association, containing requests similar to the invitation in the pamphlet, as follows:

"ABOUT ROMAN CATHOLICS.

"Get your information first-hand. Upon request we will tell you their belief and position, their practices and obligations, their rights and duties, as they bear on civic and social relations, public questions and good citizenship.

"Write to the Catholic Laymen's Association of Georgia, 107 9th St., Augusta, Ga."

The following list of thirty-two questions was prepared and forwarded to the Association by registered mail:

Macon, Ga., May 2, 1917.

Catholic Laymen's Association,
Augusta, Ga.

Gentlemen:

I am in receipt of your pamphlet, "A Plea for Peace," and in accord with the invitation extended on last page will submit the following questions, which I trust you will answer, namely:

1. Does the Roman Catholic Church, positively or impliedly, require its members to believe any doctrine or truth that cannot be understood by the human intelligence?
2. Does your church, impliedly or otherwise, teach that its members must accept as true any assertion made by a religious superior because of his authority?
3. Is it not true that to break the seal of confession is a mortal sin? If it is, how do you know the priest does not use the immoral, obscene theology of Dens and Liguori with Catholic women in the confessional? Name date and authority for discontinuance.
4. Are you acquainted with the general text and tenor of the various encyclicals of Pope Leo XIII and others against Freemasonry, and if so, do you agree with them and feel bound to carry out their commands?
5. Are Roman Catholics taught to obey the voice of the pope as being the voice of God Almighty?
6. Are you acquainted with any directions emanating from the Vatican at Rome for Roman Catholics to take part in politics, so that constitutions and legislation and governments may be changed to conform to the principles of the Roman church, and if so, what are the "principles" referred to?

7. Does your church believe and teach that all men are free to worship God according to the dictates of their own conscience, at all times and under all circumstances?

8. Do you and your church believe in free public schools, supported by the State and free from the control of any church or religious organization, including your own?

—9. Do you and the church you represent believe in the separation of church and state?

10. If a Protestant minister and a Roman Catholic barkeeper were candidates for the same office—for mayor—which would you feel in duty bound to support? Which would generally receive the greater number of Catholic votes?

11. Should your church become dominant in America and recognized as the religion of state, would you accord freedom of opinion, of press, of speech and of worship to other denominations, even when same actively oppose the Roman Catholic church?

12. If you answer in the affirmative, please state what you would do if the pope should command that such toleration be not granted.

13. Does the Roman Catholic church, impliedly or otherwise, teach that (1) the church has the right to employ force, (2) that non-Catholics ought to be harmed either in business or in person, (3) that the church has the right to remove heretics from the earth by death?

14. Does the Roman Catholic church claim the right to control education? If so, name one country where the church has been in control for centuries in the past where the percentage of ignorance is as small as it is in any Protestant country.

15. Are Roman Catholics taught that the civil authority ought to be subordinate to the ecclesiastical authority?

16. Do you think there is any persecution of Catholics in this country, and if so, on what grounds and by whom do you think it is being carried on?

17. Do you and your church recognize any other church as "Christian"? Has any pope ever so declared?

—18. In case of conflict between the laws of your church and the laws of the state, which are you in duty bound to obey, as a matter of religious conscience?

19. If it be true that a large percentage of your fellow-citizens fear the alleged intention of the Vatican to make the Roman Catholic church dominant in the political affairs of this country; to suppress Freemasonry and secret orders generally; to control the press; to abridge freedom of speech; to prevent religious toleration of other sects, churches or creeds, and to control the public school system or destroy it, would you be willing, in order to dissipate such ideas, to declare openly, without mental reservation or equivocation, on your honor as American citizens, that if such be the intention or purpose of the Vatican or the pope, or any part of the clergy or laity of your church, to resist the execution of such designs to the uttermost and join your fellow-citizens in repudiating such attempts?

20. If you answer that you would, please state in what way or

manner such information could be brought to your careful, conscientious attention for consideration—if you could investigate such questions independently of your priest?

21. The Jesuit order was abolished in 1769 by Pope Clement XIV; it has been excluded from almost every civilized country many times; not permitted even now to enter Roman Catholic Spain, although another pope lifted the ban from the order. Please state why it (a) was abolished, (b) barred from other countries, (c) kept out of Spain now, (d) how one pope can “abolish and forever destroy the Society of Jesus” and another re-establish the order.

22. If baptism is essential to salvation and membership in your church, and if its validity depends upon whether or not the officiating priest had the right “intention” at the time of baptizing a subject of the church, how can any one know that he is a member of your church—from the pope on down? Do you require a certificate from the priest wherein he declares he had the right “intention” at the time of performing the ceremony?

23. If your priest can turn wine into the blood and body of Christ, please state why he cannot turn water into wine.

24. As your church forbids its members to discuss or study, independently of priest-censorship, any subject relating to religion, morality, ecclesiastical (church) history, etc., on what intelligent basis do you expect to see peace and harmony established between Roman Catholics and non-Catholics?

25. Is there any appreciable number of Catholics of Georgia in any manner affiliated with the American Federated Catholic Societies?

26. To what extent do you think the organizing of this society has been instrumental in arousing an anti-Catholic spirit?

27. Does your church teach, directly or impliedly, that members must not accuse the priests or bishops even though it be known to them that prelates have committed grave sins? If so, how can a man protect his home?

28. Would your association prosecute a priest if he were to wrong a member, by appealing to the laws of the land?

29. A soldier, being under command of superiors, must say and do only as he is ordered regardless of his personal opinion or wishes. Does this principle obtain in your church? If so, what can your association of *laymen* hope to accomplish?

30. Why is it a venial sin, that must be confessed, for a Catholic to attend a Protestant church service, but it is not made a sin by your church for its members to engage in the sale of intoxicating liquors?

31. If your church is the only true church, and its only aim is the salvation of souls, and Catholics are taught that there is danger of losing their souls in going to Protestant churches, why does not your church teach and command its members to keep out of the liquor business, if it does not consider entering a Protestant church worse than running a barroom?

32. The *Ne Temere* decree of your church was enforced in America in 1908; non-Catholics believe your church becomes

more insistent in its demands and efforts to enforce the decrees of the Vatican in proportion as it grows in numerical and political strength. If this is not true, please state why this decree was not ordered enforced in this country at an earlier period; say, for instance, at the time of the Revolutionary or Civil Wars?

In answering the above interrogatories, *do not state your opinion*, or what *you* may wish as individuals and citizens, but as Roman Catholics, proving your answer in each instance by citing your highest church authority, that is, popes and councils.

The above questions, I assure you, have not been formulated in a wanton spirit of levity, or antagonism; they voice a few of the many points in the fundamental differences between Roman Catholics and non-Catholics, as I see it, and on their adjustment to the American ideals of democracy depends the future.

Trusting you will favor me with an early reply, I am,
Respectfully,

C. A. YARBROUGH.

In answer to the above, the following acknowledgment was received from the Catholic Laymen's Association, on its printed stationery, as were all other letters from it:

Augusta, Ga., May 7, 1917.

Mr. C. A. Yarbrough,
American National Bank Bldg.,
Macon, Ga.

Dear Sir: Your letter of the 2d by registered mail just received. The thirty-two questions will be answered just as soon as we can get to them. A large number of inquiries, and the limited time I can give to the Laymen's work, forces me to beg your indulgence for a few days.

I appreciate the spirit that prompted your inquiry and trust that the information sent you will answer your questions fully and completely.

Very truly yours,
(Signed) J. J. FARRELL, Mgr.

Having been informed through the press that Mr. A. J. Long and Hon. Augustin D. Daly, of this city, were officers of the Laymen's Association, copies of the above questions were forwarded to them, with the following note:

Macon, Ga., May 7, 1917.

Dear Sir: Some three weeks ago I received a pamphlet from the Catholic Laymen's Association, title, "A Plea for Peace."

I understand you are a member of this body, therefore, I am sending you the enclosed letter.

Respectfully,

C. A. YARBROUGH.

Although the Hon. Gus. Daly is an attorney and ex-Recorder of the Police Court, he has never acknowledged the communication. Mr. A. J. Long, a prominent merchant, replied as follows:

Macon, Ga., May 14, 1917.

Mr. C. A. Yarbrough,
Macon, Ga.

Dear Sir: Your favor of the 7th inst. received. I also received the list of questions and impolite suggestions attached thereto.

Your letter and questions have been forwarded to Mr. J. J. Farrell, of Augusta, Ga., who will endeavor to answer them correctly.

Yours very truly,

(Signed) A. J. LONG.

The following letter was forwarded to Mr. Long:

Macon, Ga., May 22, 1917.

Mr. A. J. Long,
Macon, Ga.

Dear Sir: Your letter of the 14th inst., acknowledging receipt of mine of the 7th, to hand and, while it does not call for reply, I am at a loss to understand what you consider as being an "impolite suggestion," and would kindly ask you to advise, being more explicit in reference thereto.

If the letter contained an impolite suggestion, it was not intentional.

Yours respectfully,

C. A. YARBROUGH.

To this, Mr. Long responded:

Macon Ga., May 23, 1917.

Mr. C. A. Yarbrough,
Macon, Ga.

Dear Sir: Replying to your letter of May 22d.

The third question in the list you sent me on May 2d contains the "impolite suggestions" that I referred to in mine to you of the 14th inst.

You suggest in that question that immoral practices arise from the confessional, and you call for a defense of the confessional rather than an explanation of the same.

You may have asked the question without thinking how it sounded, at the same time a Catholic's religion is so much a part of him that he naturally takes exception to those who question his belief or practices as such.

You also imply in many of the questions that I, on account of being a Catholic (if the implication doesn't apply to me it doesn't apply to any other Catholic), am not and cannot be as good an American citizen as *you* or anybody else. This implication I resent as "impolite," because my patriotism should not be questioned by any good citizen, unless for specific reasons arising from some personal act of my own, for which I am responsible to you as a good citizen and therefore subject to your criticism and prosecution if need be.

To say that I am not a loyal American because of my religion is striking at the very foundation upon which this country so firmly stands, and the man who charges his fellow-citizen with disloyalty because of his religion is himself a bad citizen, because he is seeking to tear down the structure of American principles

which was built by the brains of men of many religious beliefs, and has been maintained by the blood of the patriots from all denominations.

If you *earnestly* desire information about the Catholic Church and the practices of Catholics, you can get it first-hand by personal investigation and observation, which every Catholic will welcome and will assist you any way you may desire; but if your inquiries are prompted by a spirit of religious intolerance and its consequent religious prejudices and ill will, I for one do not care to throw away my valuable time in exchanging correspondence when no good can come from it. Of course your mind will determine whether or not our correspondence will continue.

Yours very truly,

A. J. LONG.

I will be glad to have you as my guest at any or all the services and show you through the church from pillar to dome and render any service in my power in your investigations.

To this interesting epistle I replied:

Macon, Ga., June 5, 1917.

Mr. A. J. Long,
Macon, Ga.

Dear Sir: In relation to yours of the 23d instant—

It is the duty of every citizen to investigate all questions—civil, political or religious—that may affect himself, his family, of his neighbor. In pursuance of this necessary qualification of worthy citizenship I have mapped out such course of procedure relative to the study of Roman Catholicism as I consider best suited to secure desired information as to the faith and practices **ENJOINED BY THE SYSTEM.**

No one disputes the fact that Catholicism becomes woven into the very warp and woof of those who are born and reared under its influence and is a very part of them; that does not signify, however, that Catholicism is right or wrong, but that fact does demand that those who are not reared under its teaching should by investigation *and* observation, ascertain what are its faith and practices and their fruits, and to what extent, if any, it would or seeks to interfere with their rights, faith and practices as non-Catholics; and Catholics should know that all who are not Catholic are just as jealous, and zealous, in defense of their religion and other rights as Catholics.

Being one of the promoters of the Catholic Laymen's Association, you virtually and technically invite questions: you are presumed to know that any question, on that hypothesis, is for the purpose of eliciting information on that particular phase of *Catholicism as a system*, and the personal equation enters into it only as in that of a witness in a court of justice; and it is not germane whether the questions be such as require defense or explanation, provided the one or the other establishes what is the truth.

Without an admission, or evidence of previous misconduct, any one would be a bad citizen if he should charge another with

disloyalty, *just because* he is a Catholic; such charge, as you rightly suggest, should be based upon act and, hence, subject to *personal* criticism or legal action. These three elements (admission, evidence of past record, and overt acts) enter very largely into my plan of investigating Catholicism, using such means and applying the same rules and principles in a way that are usual in legal procedure; this may be classed as "intolerance:" it is the only reasonable basis upon which truth may be established, to the satisfaction of a reasoning mind.

With all the foregoing in view, I submitted to you a list of questions; in not answering, you exercised your prerogative, but as you turned the list over to the Catholic Laymen's Association, I shall take it for granted that answers rendered to the questions have your endorsement and are approved as such, unless I am specifically advised to the contrary.

Whether I am tolerant of, or prejudiced against, papalism, in degree, will be determined by my findings. In no event could I visit either prejudice or intolerance upon *individual* Catholics; if you would devote a little time to the study of it, you would doubtless find that the attitude of the Protestant mind to Catholics and to papalism is well illustrated by the attitude of the Government of the United States relative to the German people and the Imperial German Government.

I should have answered sooner, but have been so busy I am just now answering.

Trusting you will give this your attention at your earliest convenience, I am,

Very respectfully,

C. A. YARBROUGH.

Mr. Long has not answered this letter.

LAYMEN'S ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Augusta, Ga., May 18, 1917.

Mr. C. A. Yarbrough,
American National Bank Bldg.,
Macon, Ga.

Dear Sir: Replying now to the questions in your letter of May 2d, I give you the following answers *seriatim*. [The questions will be omitted here, presenting the answers only.—Author.]

Answer to 1: The Catholic Church does positively require its members to believe truth that cannot be understood by the human intelligence, such as, that "there are Three Persons in One God," that "the Word was made Flesh," that "this is My Body," and many others. The Catholic religion is a supernatural religion and necessarily teaches supernatural truths, which, of course, are above the comprehension of the human intelligence.

Answer to 2: No.

Answer to 3: The seal of confession does not impose any obligation on the penitent, but on the priest only. The penitent man or woman is free to say what was said in confession, either by himself or herself or by the priest. Every penitent is free to tell to any person whomsoever anything whatsoever that was said or done in the confessional. Catholics frequently talk among themselves about the admonitions and counsels given them in the confessional, the penances imposed, etc. This, of course, is a complete answer to that part of your question referring to Catholic women, unless indeed you presume to accuse them of concealing from their husbands, from their own daughters even what would be unnatural for them to conceal, and what they have every right to disclose.

Answer to 4: I am acquainted with the encyclicals you refer to and agree with their general text and tenor. They contain no commands to be carried out, but only prohibitions to be observed, which are in substance simply that Catholics should not become members of the society of Freemasonry, or in any way encourage or assist this society as such.

Answer to 5: No.

Answer to 6: No, nor is anyone else, because no such directions were ever given.

Answer to 7: Yes, so long as they are decent about it, and orderly.

Answer to 8: Yes, we help support them, without protest and willingly. For ourselves we prefer parochial schools, in order to teach our children the faith of their fathers; but we recognize the necessity of public schools and we patronize them where we can not maintain our own. And we pay our portion of taxes to support them everywhere.

Answer to 9: As applied in this country and secured under our constitution and laws we do believe in the separation of church and state.

Answer to 10: Probably neither one; and very likely. A Catholic is in bad business as a barkeeper, and if he would listen to

the voice of the church, as pronounced in the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, he would not be one. The Protestant minister is in bad business as a candidate for office. One professing to carry the message of the Gospel between God and man, be he Catholic or Protestant, can just as well keep out of politics, and his being a candidate against the barkeeper would scarcely better matters. Catholics are as much divided in politics as any other class of people in this country.

Answer to 11: Catholics have no desire whatever that their religion be recognized as the religion of state in America. We are perfectly satisfied, from the highest prelate to the lowest layman, with the rights guaranteed by our constitution. And we would oppose any change in our constitution looking to the recognition of any religion as the religion of state. It follows that we stand for that freedom of opinion, of press, of speech, of worship, to all denominations that our constitution and our laws now provide for.

Answer to 12: In the event you imagine, were it possible for it to come about, we would treat the pope's command as an usurpation of our rights as American citizens to conduct our national affairs in such manner as we might think just and right. The pope has no authority to interfere in matters of politics or in the right administration of our civic affairs, and if he should, we would pay no attention to him.

Answer to 13: (1) NO. (2) NO. (3) NO.

Answer to 14: The church has the right to teach all religious truth. She claims no other right in matters of education. The second part of the above question is based on a misconception. The church has not been in control of any country in the world, neither for centuries nor for a century, nor for any length of time. The percentage of illiteracy in countries where the majority of the people is Catholic compares favorably with that where the majority of the country is non-Catholic. As proof of this, we can begin right at home. The percentage of illiteracy in the United States is most in those states where there are fewest Catholics—North Carolina, South Carolina, Mississippi and Alabama, for example. We do not say, however, that this is because there are more Protestants than Catholics in these states. We know that there are reasons that fully explain the backwardness of those states along educational lines. Similar reasons prevail in regard to countries as in regard to states. Of course, you know that the first schools, the first colleges, the first universities on the American continent were started by Catholics. You doubtless know that the first free schools of modern times, practically every university of Europe, the very systems of education in vogue throughout the civilized world originated with Catholics.

Answer to 15: No.

Answer to 16: There can be no doubt of the fact that there is a systematic campaign of villification and slander being carried on against the Catholic Church and her people in this country. It is being conducted by two classes of persons: first, those who work it for the sake of the financial returns it brings them in the

way of subscriptions and donations, and second, those who aim to destroy all religion and are merely attacking the Catholic Church as being the oldest and most vigorous exponent of Christianity.

Answer to 17: The Catholic Church does not recognize any other church as having been founded by Christ. Christ established but one church. Our church teaches, and we Catholics believe, that the Catholic Church is that church.

Answer to 18: In case of the conflict you imagine, either the church authorities would be exceeding their just powers or the state authorities would be exceeding their just powers, and it would be the duty of every man, Catholic or not Catholic, in such a case, to determine for himself as a matter of conscience which of these authorities was the usurper and firmly to stand for the other.

Answer to 19: Yes.

Answer to 20: Those who claim to be in possession of such information must themselves find some respectful way of bringing it to the attention of others. Of course, we can investigate such questions, if at all, independently of our priest. There is no question of any sort open to investigation that we are not as free to investigate as any other persons.

Answer to 21: The Jesuit order was abolished as a matter of internal church policy. It is barred from some countries and in some countries from some dioceses, for the same reasons. Every society within the church, Jesuit, Dominican, Franciscan, etc., exists by consent of the head of the church, and can be suspended, abolished, reinstated or created anew as the Roman Pontiff may deem necessary. They may enter this diocese or that or be excluded from one or another as the bishop of the diocese may deem to the best interest of the church in that jurisdiction. In some dioceses only one or two orders are permitted charges, in others more, in some all may have charges. The whole matter is a question of internal church policy.

Answer to 22: Baptism is not essential to salvation. It is not essential to membership in the Catholic Church. Its validity does not depend upon whether the officiating priest had the right "intention" or not; its validity does not depend upon whether or not a priest officiates. Any person, Catholic, non-Catholic, Protestant, Jew, or Infidel can administer valid baptism.

Answer to 23: Christ did not direct His apostles to turn water into wine. He Himself turned water into wine, but said nothing about it. He later changed wine into His blood, said, "This is My Blood," and then directed His apostles to do what he had done in commemoration of him. To be commemorative, this act must go on to the end of time. The priest has authority to carry out His directions. But he has not the authority to turn water into wine, as you suggest.

Answer to 24: Your presumption is all wrong, for our church does not forbid her children to discuss or study independently of priest-censorship any subject relating to religion, morality, ecclesiastical (church) history, etc. You evidently have been badly misinformed on this matter.

Answer to 25: Yes.

Answer to 26: I will say to no extent worth mentioning.

Answer to 27: No, the church does not teach this, either directly or indirectly, explicitly or impliedly. A Catholic may protect his home in the same way a non-Catholic may protect his.

Answer to 28: If it were necessary to secure redress, we would.

Answer to 29: The principle of action between a soldier and his superior officers does not obtain between the church and her children. The principle of action in the Catholic church is rather that prevailing in a well-regulated, God-fearing, devoted, affectionate family.

Answer to 30: It is not necessarily a sin to attend a Protestant church service; it depends on many circumstances. It is more than likely a sin for Catholics to engage in the indiscriminate sale of intoxicating liquors, although that, too, depends upon circumstances. You should know also that what is termed a venial sin is not a matter of confession.

Answer to 31: In the Third Plenary Council the hierarchy of the church in the United States expressly enjoined upon Catholics to sever their connection with the liquor traffic.

Answer to 32: The reason that the *Ne Temere* decree was not put into effect throughout the United States until 1908 was because of the absence of a sufficient number of Catholic priests in this country to render the observance of this rule practical on the part of Catholics. The church is always solicitous not to enjoin upon her children a rule of conduct that would be generally a hardship and for this reason the rule requiring all Catholics who marry to come before a priest was delayed until the number of priests was such as to make one available in most any part of the country at most any time.

To cite authorities for each of the above questions as you here request would require space unlimited; I am sure it will be agreeable to you, and I prefer, that you will point out any answer which is not entirely satisfactory, and I shall then support that with such authority as must make it satisfactory.

If any of these answers are not satisfactory to you, I shall be glad to treat more at length such as you may indicate.

Yours very truly,

J. J. FARRELL, Chm.

Macon, Ga., May 25, 1917.

Mr. J. J. Farrell,

Catholic Laymen's Association of Georgia,

Augusta, Ga.

Dear Sir: Yours of the 18th inst. received. Press of business has prevented giving your answers more than a scansion glance. After careful perusal, will avail myself of your kind request, by taking up further with you such questions as may not be answered satisfactorily.

Thanking you for your letter, I am,

Very truly,

C. A. YARBROUGH.

Macon, Ga., Sept. 7, 1917.

Catholic Laymen's Association,
Augusta, Ga.

Gentlemen: Your answers to my questions have been carefully reviewed, and as a whole, they are not satisfactory.

I have gone into each one to some extent in order to make it clear wherein and why they are unsatisfactory, and from the various reasons advanced, you will learn the general impression made on the minds of those who study this subject at all from a standpoint of fundamentals.

The conclusions relative to each question are based on a careful analysis of such reliable information available at this time, in conjunction with the manner in which the questions have been treated by your Association.

I am devoting some thought to this matter; I deem it the duty of every citizen worthy of the name to investigate any and all questions that may affect him, his family or his neighbor, whether such questions be social, political, religious or otherwise.

I have weighed such evidence as is at this time available, direct and indirect, attaching to each such weight and importance as its source warrants, and the means of each witness for knowing what is the truth; eulogistic literature, from inside and outside sources, have no appreciable influence: as long as Catholic and pro-Catholic speakers and writers ignore the canon law of the Church of Rome, and contemporaneous acts, overt and covert, demonstrate that such Vatican laws are of full effect and force whenever expediency warrants, just that long will there be opposition to Catholics politically.

Your answers to my questions would be ample and satisfactory to one who is governed by the Index of the Roman church, but you ought to know that those who are not barred by the Index from reading the history of your church, its laws, theology, etc., require more than the mere assertion of laymen; such must be from official utterances of those who are recognized as having the right to speak for and in the name of the pope concerning what may be the "intention" of the Roman church, as non-Catholics are more concerned with this than with the questions of faith and practice, for the time being—"faith and practice" always follow the culmination of "intention."

If, in my analyses of your answers, I have not revealed the essence or genius of Roman Catholicism, I would be very glad to have you correct me.

Very truly,

C. A. YARBROUGH.

With this letter was a paper, "Reasons Why Answers to Questions Are Not Satisfactory."

To get the original questions, the Association's answers and my objections or criticisms of answers assembled in order of their individual connection, the correspondence will be collated under each question number, followed by the answer of the Association, then my criticism.

No. 1: Does the Roman Catholic church, positively or impliedly, require its members to believe any doctrine or truth that cannot be understood by the human intelligence?

Association's answer: The Catholic Church does positively require its members to believe truth that cannot be understood by the human intelligence such as, "there are Three Persons in one God," that "the Word was made Flesh," that "this is My Body," and many others. The Catholic religion is a supernatural religion, and necessarily teaches supernatural truths, which of course are above the comprehension of the human intelligence.

No. 2: Does your church, impliedly or otherwise, teach that its members must accept as true any assertion made by a religious superior because of his authority?

Answer: No.

CRITICISM OF ANSWERS BY AUTHOR

Questions Nos. 1 and 2—These two are practically one question, they being a sub-division of a single sentence from the Encyclical Letters of Pope Leo XIII against Freemasonry, i. e., "they allow no dogma of religion or truth which cannot be understood by the human intelligence, nor any teacher who ought to be believed by reason of his AUTHORITY." He very clearly implied the well-known rule of the Catholic church, that laymen **MUST** believe as true any assertion made by a religious superior, because of his authority—all bishops, priests, cardinals, popes, etc., are "religious superiors," and in answering a part of the sentence affirmatively and the other in the negative, you demonstrate that either you or your pope is in error.

Stated in a sentence, your answer to Question 2 is the position the whole non-Catholic world sustains to the papacy; if you maintain that attitude in fact, you destroy the very foundation upon which the superstructure of the Catholic church rests. In electing him pope, the cardinals delegate to him the place of God Almighty on earth, with all the AUTHORITY of God; he in turn proclaims to the cardinals, bishops, priests, etc., what he considers is truth, and vests them with AUTHORITY to teach it, and no layman has the right to question. Through this door enters all the sayings of the papal "Fathers" which laymen can not read or study, but must accept from the priest that which he has been "authorized" to proclaim, as a rule and guide for their faith and practice, regardless of whether it be from Holy Writ or the Traditions of Men.

To illustrate how far this "authority" is recognized by Catholics, you say you believe in the Real Presence in the Mass, just because priests and bishops say the pope says it is; and it seems to non-Catholics that a mind subscribing to that is willing to do anything required by the law of those in authority.

Your answers to Questions 1 and 2 reveal a general lack of knowledge of the spirit of Catholicism that is surprising, and

you presume to teach others! To those who really understand the principles of a proposition, the slightest allusion embodying them is instantly recognized, even if the verbiage is different. In this case you failed utterly to recognize, not only the basic principles underlying the questions, but also the language of one of your greatest popes.

Students discover deep mysteries concerning the Past, Present and Future, pertaining to man, which call for an exercise of faith in God and His Providence when they swing out of range of the human intelligence; at that point, Catholics and non-Catholics must separate. By reason of his "authority," the pope makes laymen rely upon him and forbids exercise of reason in all matters Past, Present and Future, demanding that what has been said, he may now proclaim, or decree in the future, must be accepted by Catholics unquestioned on pain of excommunication—a principle in its operation far exceeding the "authority" God exercises, thus erecting an insurmountable barrier between Catholics and others, as the main preoccupation of true Catholics is, to endeavor to bring all men under this authority of the pope, who become highly incensed when they discover non-Catholics industriously engaged in barricading against subjection to papal "authority."

No. 3: Is it not true, that to break the seal of confession is a mortal sin? If it is, how do you know the priest does not use the immoral, obscene theology of Dens and Liguori with Catholic women in the confessional? Name date and authority of discontinuance.

Answer: The seal of confession does not impose any obligation on the penitent, but on the priest only. The penitent man or woman is free to say what was said in confession, either by himself or herself or by the priest. Every penitent is free to tell to any person whomsoever anything whatsoever that was said or done in the confessional. Catholics frequently talk among themselves about the admonitions and counsels given them in the confessional, the penances imposed, etc. This, of course, is a complete answer to that part of your question referring to Catholic women, unless indeed, you presume to accuse them of concealing from their husbands, from their own daughters even, what would be unnatural for them to conceal and what they have every right to disclose.

CRITICISM

You say the seal of confession does not apply to penitents. Liguori, the Doctor of the whole church, says, relative to the Sacramental Seal: "The penitent is bound by nature to keep **SECRET ALL THINGS** said to him by his confessor, IF their exposure would bring damage to the *confessor* (i. e., priest) or injury and contempt on the Sacrament." VI, 647.

Prop. 1367, ques.: "Must the priest be denounced who plans

with a woman . . . that . . . she feign sickness when he comes to her house in order to act criminally with her?" Ans.: "No," with reasons assigned that every man should read.

Prop. 1370, ques.: "Must the penitent be denounced who solicits in confessional?" Ans.: "No," with reasons.

Tertullian, one of the holy fathers of the Roman church, teaches that bashfulness ought not to cause neglect of confession.

Saint Ambrose, on Confession, says: "Confess **FREELY** to the priest the **HIDDEN SECRETS** of thy soul, and **SHOW THEM**, as thou wouldst thy hidden wounds to thy physician."

On this subject a Catholic Catechism, having the imprimatur of Cardinals Wiseman and McClosky, states that confession must be "1—entire, 2—sincere, 3—clear;" entire: confess all grievous sins; sincere: conceal **NOTHING**; clear: when the priest can *understand* **EVERYTHING** well; **DISTINCTLY** name and specify different sins.

If a penitent is ashamed to make a **SINCERE** confession, this Catechism declares it "procures him neither remission of sins nor peace of conscience; but that the confession, as well as the communion which follows it, is another grievous sin—a sacrilege—and deserves eternal damnation." Deharbe, pp. 284-5-6.

From a priest's hand-book, approved by the late Archbishop Quigley of the Diocese of Chicago, under general caption of Confession, sub-topic "Adultery," we discover the Church of Rome in the nineteenth century endorsing and practicing the doctrine of Ambrose of the fourth century, as follows:

"Have you deliberately indulged or taken pleasure in impure thoughts? **HOW OFTEN?** Have you entertained impure desires? Have you committed unchaste acts when *alone*? **IS THIS A HABIT?** Have you been guilty of immodest acts with another?" p. 160.

The above proves beyond a doubt to a reasoning mind that priests of Rome **MUST** tear from women that garment of modesty which nature supplied, and probe the very secret recesses of the heart in the confessional, and lay bare to a bachelor her inmost thoughts, unless the priest is disobedient to his **SYSTEM**.

I am *not* satisfied with your answer to that part of the question relating to seal of confession. As to Catholic women—I accuse them of nothing, but in the light of the preponderance of available evidence, I **DO** accuse your system of religion as being an enemy of, and Catholic men as recreant toward, womanhood, regardless of race, color or creed! The foregoing quotations from the practices of your church stand as a challenge for real manhood to defend womanhood against one of the deepest pitfalls ever dug in the pathway of the human race.

I question this practice of your church, that seeks to tear even

the fig leaves from the race; and since you enter a denial to the fact, I will demonstrate, on your own ground, with the theory of your own church in action, that the confessional and its seal are facts. You suggest, like a heretic, that it would be "unnatural" for a woman to conceal certain things from her husband or daughter, and in doing this you vitiate, destroy and nullify your answer to No. 1. (This is one of the dogmas of your church that swings out beyond the ken of the human intelligence, requiring an unquestioning faith in the AUTHORITY of a pope to make it right.) When you take the faith and practices of the Roman church into the realm of NATURE, they at once become supernatural, unnatural, or repugnant, depending solely on the state of mind superinduced by early influence and whether or not the Index has operated to an end. There must be repentance for, before God forgives, sin; He needs no Versicle. Now, then, on p. 275 of Catechism we cite:

"Does the priest truly remit sins, or does he only declare that they are remitted?" Ans.: "The priest does really and truly remit the sins in virtue of the power given him by Christ." Here we see that the priest is ENTITLED to know and MUST ascertain exactly what sin has been committed before forgiving it, or prescribing penance therefor; and it is reasonable to infer that one who believes the priest CAN forgive sin realizes the necessity of CONFESSING any sin, and by that very fact must also believe that the priest is so close to God as to partake of His divine nature, essence and qualities, and, believing this, will naturally tell him what she would consider unnatural to tell her husband or daughter; to ascribe this power to a man carries with it all the rights and prerogatives of God.

It was at your solicitation that these questions were asked relating to the faith and practices of your church, and the burden is upon you to satisfy a reasoning mind as to what is the truth; repeating the original request: Please state date of decree and name of pope abolishing confessional; the foregoing citations from authoritative sources establish the fact of the confessional and the seal, which remain part of Catholic faith and practice till some general council or pope orders discontinuance.

In my brief research I find there are many requirements in your faith and practices, established on traditions of men, that appeal to the uninitiated as unnatural, and the confessional is one of them. Of course, I understand a great deal depends upon training; mothers have often cast their baby girls to alligators at the behest of their priests, who trained them to believe that to do so was natural and pleasing to their god. If you begin early enough with a child, and persist in a necessary oversight, you have a Chinese woman of large stature and a small foot; if you can govern what it reads or hears, and place its intellect under

the Index, when it becomes an old man he will call a roaring furnace a refrigerator, and a refrigerator a furnace, and be sincere enough to fight for it, however unnatural or supernatural it may appear to those not subject to such training.

A mind that can be so trained as to believe a man can turn a little piece of rice cake and a little glass of wine into separate and distinct bodies of Christ—the veritable blood, flesh, bones, etc.—it seems to me, is capable of believing that that man can do nor say anything incompatible with God.

If this is not a correct interpretation of the spirit of this doctrine, please set me right.

No. 4: Are you acquainted with the general text and tenor of the various encyclicals of Pope Leo XIII and others against Freemasonry, and if so, do you agree with them and feel bound to carry out their commands?

Answer: I am acquainted with the encyclicals you refer to and agree with their general text and tenor. They contain no commands to be carried out, but only prohibitions to be observed, which are in substance simply that Catholics should not become members of the society of Freemasonry or in any way encourage or assist this society as such.

CRITICISM

Your answer here is palpably inconsistent with other answers, on which I desire more light. The general text and tenor of the decrees against Freemasonry is epitomized by Pope Leo XIII, on pp. 88-106, Great Encyclical Letters. He says: "The partisans of evil seem to be combining together . . . lead on or assisted by . . . the Freemasons, . . . They are now boldly rising up against God Himself . . . utterly despoiling the nations of Christendom," and makes use of "fraud or audacity;" that it is his duty to use his "AUTHORITY to the very uttermost against so great an evil" and to bring more "into light its power for evil and to do what We can to arrest the contagion of this fatal plague." Asserts if a member is disobedient, "to submit to the direst penalties and death itself . . . punishment is inflicted on them not infrequently and with so much audacity and dexterity that the assassin very often escapes punishment for his crime . . . arms men's right hands for bloodshed after securing immunity for their crimes." Masonry "is in antagonism with justice and natural uprightness" and is "essentially opposed to natural virtue . . . that which is their ultimate purpose forces itself into view, namely, the utter overthrow of that whole religious and political order of the world which the Christian teaching has produced . . . Criminal acts . . . their very foulness strike with horror . . . *they allow no dogma of religion or truth which cannot be understood by the human intelligence, nor any teacher who ought to be believed by*

reason of his authority . . . they declare to the people that State and Church ought to be altogether disunited," and that "the rights of the church are not spared;" that Freemasonry caused the pope to be "thrust out from . . . his civil principedom;" that Masonry teaches "the multitude should be satisfied with a boundless vice." It teaches "all men have the same rights" and that "each one is naturally free . . . teaches that it is an act of violence to require men to obey any AUTHORITY other than that which is obtained from themselves," and that "power is held by the command or permission of the people." Because Freemasonry holds that all religions should occupy the same place in society, he says, "In this insane and wicked endeavor we may almost see the implacable hatred and spirit of revenge with which Satan himself is inflamed against Jesus Christ.—So also the stupendous endeavor of Freemasons to destroy the chief foundations of justice and honesty, . . . in this grave and widespread evil, it is Our duty, Venerable Brethren, to find a remedy. . . . We pray and beseech you . . . to join your efforts with Ours, and earnestly to strive for the extirpation of this foul plague . . . tear away the mask from Freemasonry . . . and by sermons and pastoral letters to instruct the people . . . as to the depravity of their opinions and the wickedness of their acts;" that "the whole principle and object of the sect lies in what is vicious and bad." Under direction of the bishop, all parents, religious instructors and priests are to "use every opportunity in their Christian teaching, of warning their children and pupils of the infamous nature of these societies. . . . The sect of Freemasons . . . excite one another to an audacity for evil things. . . . Let us take as our intercessor the Virgin Mary, Mother of God, so that she . . . may show her power over these evil sects, in which is revived the contumacious spirit of the demon, together with all his unsubdued perfidity and deceit."

On behalf of the Catholics of the State of Georgia, you say you are familiar with all the above—its general text and tenor—and AGREE with it. Is this attitude a result of a first-hand knowledge on your part of the tenets and practices of the Masonic order, and by observation you have found that Freemasonry "is in antagonism with justice and natural uprightness and is essentially opposed to natural virtue," or are Catholics in duty bound to oppose the order in obedience to the authority of religious superiors?

Leo XIII specifically orders all Catholics to "earnestly strive for the extirpation of this foul plague" and further commands "parents, religious instructors and priests . . . use every opportunity . . . of warning their children and pupils" against the order; and "by sermons and pastoral letters to instruct the

people as to the artifices used by societies of this kind in seducing and enticing men into their ranks."

You say, however, that the pope has issued no commands to be carried out by Catholics—but do agree with what he says against the order!

With a few changes in the text, Leo's encyclical against Freemasonry so thoroughly describes the Jesuit order as demonstrated by history and methods, that it would seem he used some old encyclical against the Jesuits, substituting "Freemasonry" for "Society of Jesus."

To Americans, Freemasonry, like religion, has a right to exist under the Constitution of the United States; and it is logical to presume that those who would seek its destruction, because demanded by an alien influence, are ready and eager to destroy any other right under the Constitution that cannot be subjugated to such influence; and there are many millions of people in America who are neither Masons nor church members, who take exception to any influence that would tend to destroy this provision of the Constitution; because they know if Freemasonry can be "extirpated," in like manner all religions save the Roman could be destroyed, which would ultimately result in union of Church and State, the objective of all true Catholics—especially when under the direction of the Jesuits.

Perhaps you Catholic laymen—and priests—have not considered this fact: If the Grand Masters of the various Grand Lodges of the several States had issued letters against Catholicism similar to that of Leo against Freemasonry, in connection with the powerful influence they could wield outside of the order, the Catholic church long ago would have been stripped of her faith and practices in action, so that its existence would be about as that of a Protestant church in Spain. Is not this true? Can you offer any reason why the order should not pursue this course? So far, however, it has remained practically impassive and indifferent, no Grand Lodge taking notice of papalism to my knowledge. This alone should convince a reasoning man that Leo did not adhere strictly to the truth in his letter against Freemasonry and that in causing Catholics to assume that attitude against the order, with its attendant strife, committed a grave blunder, exercised poor judgment and very little consideration for the welfare, peace and harmony of his subjects in this country, in committing his "children" to the task of "extirpating this foul plague;" and it would be comical, if it were not so tragic, for Catholics of Georgia to make a "Plea for Peace" in a State where there are twice as many men affiliated with the Masonic order as there are men, women and children in the Catholic church—a small minority pleading in one breath, "Let us have peace," yet virtually saying in the next, "We desire to extirpate you!" You agree with

Leo that this order, composed of the best men in every community in the nation, should be destroyed because of its "evil" nature!

Like a sturdy, grown man, Masonry has taken very little notice of the pope and his children up to the present; but some day "patience may cease to be a virtue," when Masons and Protestants may teach their children the history, canon law and theology and "intention" of the Roman church; teach them how an old man in Italy can force millions of American citizens to hate their fellow-citizens and would command them, if strong enough, to "extirpate" them because they refuse to let him dictate what they shall read, think or say. The existence of the Roman church depends upon the Index and the accident of birth, as is evidenced by your several answers to my questions. The law, history and theology of the Roman church—ah! they reveal the "intention" of papalism! The pope does well to maintain his Index for his own existence; but in calling on those under his authority to assist him in the processes of "extirpation" of those who refuse to be circumscribed in their investigations by such Index, he can not well expect those whom he would so subjugate to go to any great pains to place his "children" in public schools and political office where they may assist in carrying out his "intention."

No. 5: Are Roman Catholics taught to obey the voice of the pope as being the voice of God Almighty?

Answer: No.

CRITICISM

To this you answer "No." Leo, Great Encyclical Letters, p.304, declares: "We hold upon this earth the place of God Almighty." On p. 458: "We hold the place of Him who came to save that which was lost." On 380: "Obedience to the Roman Pontiff is the proof of the true faith." 194: Catholics "must allow themselves to be RULED and DIRECTED by the AUTHORITY and leadership of bishops, and above all by the Apostolic See." 193: "The supreme teacher in the church is the Roman Pontiff. Union of minds, therefore, requires, together with a perfect accord in the one faith, COMPLETE SUBMISSION and OBEDIENCE of WILL to the church and to the Roman Pontiff, as to GOD HIMSELF." 183: "It is the special charge of the Roman Pontiff to RULE with SUPREME POWER" members of the Catholic church, and (130) says that "what the Roman Pontiffs have *hitherto* taught, or shall *hereafter* teach, must be held with a firm grasp of mind." These citations from one who reigned so many years seem to indicate that Catholics are "taught to obey the voice of the pope as being the voice of God Almighty." If this is not the literal teaching of your church, words and language convey no meaning to those outside of it. Do you maintain your

answer "No" to this question? If so, support it with reasonable proof.

No. 6: Are you acquainted with any directions emanating from the Vatican at Rome, for Roman Catholics to take part in politics, so that constitutions and legislation and governments may be changed to conform to the principles of the Roman Church, and if so, what are the "principles" referred to?

Answer: No, nor is any one else, because no such directions were ever given.

CRITICISM

You answer, "No . . . no such directions were ever given." There seems to be a wide gulf between your answer and the fundamental teaching of your church, indicating either you do not understand the faith and practices of your church or that you realize they are wrong, or that you are attempting to "deny the faith." Speaking as to the "Chief Duties of Catholics as Citizens," Leo says, pp. 190-1, that "the laity should, as far as possible, be brought actively into play . . . the church . . . is to contend as an army drawn up in battle array," and that "neither can any one of its members live as he may choose, NOR ELECT THAT MODE OF FIGHTING which best pleases him." Also, 194: That "what we are bound to believe, and what we are OBLIGED TO DO, are laid down, as we have stated . . . by the Supreme Pontiff . . . the church directing her aim TO GOVERN THE MINDS OF MEN . . . a task she is wholly bent upon accomplishing." These utterances establish the essential poise of the Catholic mind, if they are real Catholics, and the following also emanating from the Vatican directs the line of action of Catholics politically: Says Leo, p. 198, "the church cannot give countenance to those whom she knows to be imbued with a spirit of hostility to her; who refuse openly to respect her rights. . . . These precepts contain the ABIDING PRINCIPLE by which EVERY Catholic should shape his conduct in regard to public life." That "it is fit and proper to give support to men of acknowledged worth, AND who PLEDGE themselves to deserve well in the Catholic cause;" that (202) "the political prudence of the Pontiff . . . is . . . to regulate the actions of Christian" (i. e., Catholic) "citizens. . . (180) It is also of great moment . . . to take a prudent part in the business of municipal administration and to endeavor above all to INTRODUCE EFFECTIVE MEASURES . . . so public provision may be made for the instruction of youth in religion" (i. e., in Romanism) ". . . it is generally fitting and salutary that Catholics extend their efforts beyond this restricted sphere, and GIVE ATTENTION TO NATIONAL POLITICS," and says that "these Our precepts are addressed to ALL nations. . . ." (181): "Catholics have just reasons for taking part in the conduct of public affairs . . .

and to use their best endeavors to INFUSE, as it were, INTO ALL THE VEINS OF THE STATE the healthy SAP AND BLOOD of Christian (papal) wisdom and virtue . . . (182) : First and foremost it is the duty of all Catholics worthy of the name . . . to endeavor to bring back ALL CIVIL SOCIETY to the form and patterns of Christianity (Catholicism) which We have described," and that where there is freedom of thought, of press, of speech, or of conscience or writing, "it is *lawful* to seek for a CHANGE OF GOVERNMENT as will bring about due liberty of action" for the Church of Rome to suppress such freedom, and apply the Index. He further says "it is not of itself wrong to prefer a democratic form of government, if only the Catholic doctrine be maintained as the origin and exercise of power." That (197) "it is *always urgent*, and indeed the MAIN PREOCCUPATION to take thought how best to consult the interests of Catholicism."

In an Encyclical, November 7, 1885, Leo says: "All Catholics must make themselves felt as active elements in daily political life in countries where they may live. All Catholics should exert their power to cause the Constitutions of States to be modeled on the principles of the true church."

Considering your answer to this question leads to the conclusion that Catholic laymen know very little of the "faith and practices" of the Roman church, and what it demands of them, or that such faith and practices teach small regard for truth.

Not only is the foregoing a command for Catholics to interfere, as such, with the politics of a land, but is their warrant to overthrow a government, if it takes that and it can be undertaken without danger to the church in the outcome.

Do you wish to revise your answer to No. 6, so dogmatically made?

No. 7: Does your church believe and teach that all men are free to worship God according to the dictates of their own conscience at all times and under all circumstances?

Answer: Yes, so long as they are decent about it, and orderly.

CRITICISM

In qualifying your answer, you make it necessary for me to restate the proposition, using different phraseology: Representing the Catholics of Georgia and speaking for them, please state who is to define whether or not they are "decent about it, and orderly"—the pope representing all his predecessors and various councils and "fathers" (Dens, Liguori, Loyola, Aquinas, etc.), or the chief of police representing the crystalized democratic will of the people? Observe well: if you answer, the pope, then your answer above is untrue, and you are a false exponent of the "faith and practices" of Catholicism; and if you say, the chief of police, it will be an admission that your church is wrong in its

faith and practices; if you attempt to plead "expediency," you would place the Eternal, Unchanging God on the same plane as a ward-healing politician, as by inference your pope, Leo, taught, saying "the weaker power yields to the one which is stronger in human resources," p. 122. In Catholic Spain, where the Catholic church has a concordat with the State, Protestants cannot have a house of worship that can be recognized as such. "Expediency!" A refuge behind which "intention" hides!

Pope Pius IX said: "The State has not the right to leave every man free to profess and embrace whatever religion he should deem true." (Prop. 15, Syllabus of Errors.)

No. 8: Do you and your church believe in free public schools, supported by the State, and free from the control of any church or religious organization, including your own?

Answer: Yes, we help support them, without protest and willingly. For ourselves we prefer parochial schools, in order to teach our children the faith of their fathers; but we recognize the necessity of public schools and we patronize them where we can not maintain our own. And we pay our portion of taxes to support them everywhere.

CRITICISM

You seem to base your affirmative answer on what you are doing, instead of what the church teaches, thus qualifying it, which may be termed expediency; otherwise I cannot understand how you can answer "yes." In "The Rights of Our Little Ones," p. 24, qu. 40, a Catechism printed by Benziger Bros, we quote:

"Does education lie within the scope of civil authority?"

Answer: "Education does not lie within the scope of civil authority, wherefore the State cannot, without violating higher and holier rights, usurp the right and discharge the duty of educating the young."

This makes your answer seem void of truth. Pius IX, Syllabus of Errors, says: "She (the church) has the right to deprive the civil authority of the entire government of the public schools." Leo XIII said Catholics should "endeavor that not only a suitable and solid method of education may flourish, but above all that this education be *wholly* in harmony with CATHOLIC FAITH in its literature and system of training . . . to provide with special care that *all* studies should accord with the CATHOLIC FAITH," p. 185. "As to public schools, it is well known to you that there is no ECCLESIASTICAL AUTHORITY left in them," p. 167. (A source of sorrow to all true "children.") Also, that "they who would break away from Christian (papal) discipline are working to corrupt family life, and to destroy it utterly," p. 206. Catholics are admonished to "strain every nerve . . . to hold exclusive authority to direct the education of their offspring." Your answer may be an honest

wish of some individual Catholics—but we are not discussing individuals, but the SYSTEM and its DEMANDS according to its *faith and practice*. In the priest hand-book, sanctioned by Archbishop Quigley, in the confessional the priest must ask the penitent: "Do you send your children to Catholic schools?"

Since the pope demands the right to control education, it may be interesting here to cite a few figures, showing what has been the uniform result of such control. The percentage of illiteracy in Roman Catholic Austria is 18, Bulgaria 65, France 14, Hungary 33, Italy 37, Portugal 58, Spain 58, Argentina 54, Bolivia 82, Brazil 85, Chile 49, Mexico 70. The percentage of illiteracy in Protestant England and Wales 0.2, Switzerland 0.3, United States 8, Australia 2. For this wonderful and important difference there is evidently a fundamental difference in the spirit and practice of Catholicism and Protestantism, not racial—and there is but one answer to this momentous question: The Roman Catholic Index; and many millions of Catholics in America, if true to their pope, would establish the principles of the Index to *all America*, in accordance with the aim of the Church of Rome, which is, as stated by Leo, to "GOVERN THE MINDS OF MEN," and if they are not true to the pope in this matter, they are not Catholics, but heretics, and are in the wrong aggregation; but as Catholics, if they accept the Index themselves, they necessarily believe it should be universal in its application, as witness the efforts to muzzle the press, by Catholic Congressmen, preventing free speech, using mob violence and resorting to assaults and murder—acts which have been frequent the past few years.

The fruit from this tree, wherever it is permitted to fructify, has ever been the same—the amount of fruit it brings forth always depends upon how strong it becomes in "human resources," which the pope construes as a "divine right" to "legislate, judge and punish"—and operate the Index.

No. 9: Do you and the church you represent believe in the separation of Church and State?

Answer: As applied in this country and secured under our constitution and laws, we do believe in the separation of Church and State.

CRITICISM

Your answer to this question is evasive and misleading. Your church teaches, and Catholics must believe, that the pope is Christ veiled in the flesh and that the Roman is the only church founded by Christ; to imply, as you do, that Christ varies His requirements, of faith and practice, to suit the times and places, would destroy His nature as Immutable God. Leo is competent authority—let him tell you what is the "intention" of the church, which is the basis upon which every question must be answered

(p. 111): "It is quite unlawful for the State . . . to hold in equal favor different kinds of religion . . . (148): Hence follows that fatal theory of the need of separation between Church and State. . . . (161): It is quite unlawful to demand, to defend, or to grant freedom of thought, of speech, of writing, or of WORSHIP." Being governed by *expediency*, your church may consider your answer valid; but "expediency" has nothing to do with what is the "INTENTION" of the church. The actuating desire and principle of your church is revealed in its intention; not by extraneous forces which it is not at present able to overcome.

No. 11: Should your church become dominant in America, and recognized as the religion of State, would you accord freedom of opinion, of press, of speech and of worship to all other denominations, even when same actively oppose the Roman Catholic church?

Answer: Catholics have no desire whatever that their religion be recognized as the religion of State in America. We are perfectly satisfied, from the highest prelate to the lowest layman, with the rights guaranteed by our Constitution. And we would oppose any change looking to the recognition of any religion as the religion of State. It follows that we stand for that freedom of opinion, of press, of speech, of worship to all denominations that our Constitution and laws now provide for.

CRITICISM

Your answer is not in harmony with your popes. Leo XIII says (p. 358): "Whosoever is separated from the (Roman) church is united to an adulteress," and that "justice forbids, and reason forbids, the State to be godless—namely, TO TREAT THE VARIOUS RELIGIONS . . . ALIKE and bestow upon them promiscuously EQUAL RIGHTS AND PRIVILEGES," therefore the rulers of the State "MUST preserve and protect" the Catholic religion. To Cardinal Gibbons, Leo wrote (p. 328): "For the Church amongst you, unopposed by the Constitution and Government of your nation, fettered by no hostile legislation, protected against violence by the common laws and the impartiality of your tribunals, is free to live and act without hindrance. Yet, though all this be true, it would be very erroneous to draw the conclusion that in America is to be sought that most desirable status of the church, or that it would be universally lawful or expedient for Church and State to be, as in America, dissevered and divorced. . . . She would bring forth more abundant fruits if, IN ADDITION TO LIBERTY, she enjoyed the FAVOR of the LAWS and the *patronage of the public authority*," p. 323. Again he says (110): "The STATE is clearly bound to . . . the public confession of religion," and that "it is a sin in the State not to care for religion." This is your infallible pope speaking on the "faith and practices" of Catholics, and you know

as well as I, and I know as well as you, that unless you had a dispensation to make such answer as you rendered, you would be excommunicated; if that be not true, and you were not authorized to answer as you did, it shows a woeful lack of knowledge on the part of those proposing to teach others what are the faith and practices of Catholics!

On the other hand, if you deny the pope the right to teach as cited above, which is in substance that the United States should enter into a concordat with the Vatican making the Roman the religion of State, as in Spain, by that very denial you are forced to admit the contention of Protestantism, that the pope is only a puny man like any other puny man; and that if he blunders in matters as important as this, everyone has the right to question any faith or practice promulgated by papalism—and to deny papal infallibility is to accept the principles of the Reformation, which throw the papal Index into the waste-basket, and the exercise of the brains God gave each individual, by which each must "work out his own salvation." *

No. 12: If you answer in the affirmative (Question 11), please state what you would do if the pope should command that such toleration be not granted.

Answer: In the event you imagine, were it possible for it to come about, we would treat the pope's command as a usurpation

* Since submitting the above Criticism to Mr. Farrell, I have secured a copy of a Roman Catholic school text-book, the "Manual of Christian Doctrine," published in Philadelphia in 1919, which is a standard text-book to be used in "classes of high schools, academies and colleges." The object of the book is stated in the Preface: "For the pupil the present volume is sufficiently complete to impart that knowledge of religion . . . that he may be able to exhort in sound doctrine, and to convince the gainsayer." It was issued according to the Rules of the Index, bearing the Imprimatur of "D. J. Dougherty, Archiepiscopus Philadelphensis." On the subject of "Union of Church and State" page 132, we find the following questions and answers:

"117. What more should the State do than respect the rights and the liberty of the Church?

"The State should also aid, protect, and defend the Church.

"119. What then is the principal obligation of heads of States?

"Their principal obligation is to practice the Catholic religion themselves, and, as they are in power, to protect and defend it.

"120. Has the State the right and the duty to proscribe schism or heresy?

"Yes, it has the right and the duty to do so for the good of the nation, and for that of the faithful themselves; . . .

("Proscribe" means to utterly destroy, extirpate, kill out.)

"122. MAY THE STATE SEPARATE ITSELF FROM THE CHURCH?

"NO, BECAUSE IT MAY NOT WITHDRAW FROM THE SUPREME RULE OF CHRIST.

"123. What name is given to the doctrine that the State has neither the right nor the duty to be united to the Church to protect it?

"This doctrine is called *Liberalism*. It is founded principally on the fact that modern society rests on liberty of conscience and of worship, on liberty of speech and of the press.

"124. Why is Liberalism to be condemned?

"1. Because it denies all subordination of the State to the Church. 2. Because it confounds liberty with right; . . ."

The difference between the teaching of the Laymen's Association and the school-book is remarkable; the Association was "teaching" a "heretic," the text-book is for the "faithful."

of our rights as American citizens to conduct our National affairs in such manner as we might think just and right. The pope has no authority to interfere in matters of politics or in the right administration of our civic affairs, and if he should, we would pay no attention to him.

COMMENT

As an answer from an individual you may have replied in all truth and sincerity, but answering as you do for the Catholics of Georgia, I question the veracity of this answer. I very clearly stated previously, answers were to be made as to what the *church* taught, and not what individuals may desire, or wish, it taught.

My comments on Answer 11 apply to this with equal force, supplemented by the following facts: All concordats between the Vatican and States provide, among other things, for the teaching of the Catholic religion to the young in the schools, by Catholic teachers exclusively, establishing the rule of the Index, which shuts out all knowledge on the part of the laymen of the laws, dogmas and history of the Roman church; its "intention," which in the course of time naturally results in having all laws of the land modeled after the laws of the Roman church, and hence, in all things political the church becomes dominant, and can then exercise her right as a "perfect society" to "legislate, judge and punish" and force all men to bow to the AUTHORITY OF THE POPE. So, while you say you would reject the pope's interference with "civic" affairs, you accept all those requirements of faith and practice which are used as means to obtain the condition Leo so ardently craved—civil domination. To illustrate: one means to this end is to make marriage a sacrament; children are then born into the church and kept there by the Index. This is proved by the fact that when priests of Rome officiate at mixed marriages, the non-Catholic party must sign an agreement to the effect that all children from that union are to be brought up in the Catholic faith without objection on the part of the non-Catholic.

You say, however, that you would not allow the pope to interfere with civil matters in America. There are something like 17,000,000 Roman Catholics in America—they allowed the pope to interfere with the civic affairs in the enforcement of the *Ne Temere* decree; acting solely on the authority of the pope, your bishop refused to obey the laws of the State of Georgia. Yet, and notwithstanding all this, you say in one instance you would pay no attention to the pope, yet in others prove your allegiance.

You know that the Roman church must have political domination before she can establish religious domination; and that either the members are absolutely ignorant of the "intention" of their church, which may be classed as a crime against them on the part of the church, or that they know such intention and

fully concur in it, which may prove a crime against mankind, if ever the church secures domination. I cite you to the history of the Inquisition and the Massacre of St. Bartholomew, to elucidate my meaning.

No. 13: Does the Roman church, impliedly or otherwise, teach that (1) the church has the right to employ force, (2) that non-Catholics ought to be harmed either in business or in person, (3) that the church has the right to remove heretics from the earth by death?

Answer: (1) NO. (2) NO. (3) NO.

CRITICISM

To the three sub-divisions of this question, you answer "NO," very emphatically. There is a wide gulf between what you laymen say, circumscribed as you are by the Index, and what the church through its popes says, in regard to this question.

I quote copiously from Leo XIII, he being a recent pope, being in the "chair" of Peter when Bishop Keiley was "consecrated."

Quoting from The Great Encyclical Letters of this pope: On p. 154, he says the church "is therefore the greatest and most reliable teacher of mankind, and in HER dwells an inviolable right to teach them . . . she has never ceased to assert her liberty of teaching. . . . It is plainly the duty of those who teach to banish error from the mind, and by SURE safeguards" (like the Index, I suppose) "to CLOSE THE ENTRY to all false convictions;" that "the Catholic church is a *society chartered as of right divine*, perfect in its nature and in its title, to possess in itself and by itself . . . all needful provision for its maintenance and action," p. 112. "The church, therefore, possesses the right to exist and to protect herself by institutions and laws in accordance with *her nature*," p. 106. That the authority of the church "is the most exalted of all authority, nor can it be looked upon as inferior to the civil power, nor in any manner *dependent* upon it. . . . Jesus gave . . . power of making laws, as also . . . the twofold right of *judging and punishing*, which flow from that power," 113, but he bewails the fact that some "despoil her of the nature and right of a PERFECT SOCIETY, and MAINTAIN that it DOES NOT belong to HER to legislate, to judge or to punish," 160.

Now, then, it is essential to its existence that a PERFECT SOCIETY have the right to LEGISLATE, JUDGE and PUNISH. These are the rights claimed and exercised by the several States of the United States, and the State, in maintaining these rights, will use FORCE, do HARM, and execute the DEATH penalty.

Considering the Roman church a "perfect society," with the same rights exercised by the State, in his Syllabus of Errors, Prop. 24, Pope Pius IX authorized the definition of Leo XIII,

declaring: "It (the State) has not the right to deny to the church the use of FORCE, or to deny to her the possession of either a direct or indirect temporal power." This nails your answer to (1) as false, and also destroys your idea that the Roman Pontiff claims to govern his "children" in spiritual matters only.

Now, for (2)—Leo XIII says: "Now truth" is the basis on which rests "morality, justice, religion . . . to allow people to go UNHARMED who violate it would be MOST IMPIOUS, MOST FOOLISH and MOST INHUMAN," p. 153. This applies to every person in America who refuses to bend the knee and intellect to papal *authority*—if this is not Catholic doctrine in America, it is not in Spain; if this is not the attitude of Catholics to non-Catholics in Georgia, it is not in Austria; if Catholics in Georgia do not subscribe to that doctrine, they cannot convince non-Catholics of sincerity as long as they remain members of an association or society or church that demands what they know to be wrong. It is as obligatory on the part of Catholics to believe this, in order to be saved, as it is to believe in papal infallibility, the Real Presence, *ad infinitum*. So this establishes the fact that in their "faith and practices" Catholics *are* taught by their church to HARM those who do not agree with that church.

As to your answer to division (3)—Leo says: "Thomas Aquinas . . . is rightly and deservedly esteemed the special bulwark of the Catholic faith. . . . Let carefully selected teachers implant the doctrine of Thomas Aquinas in the minds of students. . . . Let the academies already founded by you illustrate and defend this doctrine," p. 56. I will now let another theologian of your church tell you what, among other doctrines, "Saint" Thomas, the "Angelic Doctor," teaches. Peter Dens asks the question: "Are heretics rightly punished with death?" and answers thus: "St. Thomas (Aquinas) answers (2, 2. Ques. XI, art. 3 in corp.) Yes, because forgers of money, or other disturbers of the State, are justly punished with death; therefore also heretics, who are forgers of the faith, and experience being the witness, grievously disturb the State."

✓ In his letter to Cardinal Gibbons, Leo XIII admonished (p. 415): "Lastly, NOT TO DELAY TOO LONG, it is also maintained that the WAY and the METHOD which CATHOLICS have followed thus far for recalling those who differ from us is to be abandoned and another resorted to. In THAT matter, it suffices to advert that it is NOT prudent, Beloved Son, to NEGLECT WHAT ANTIQUITY, with its LONG EXPERIENCE, guided as it is by APOSTOLIC TEACHING, has STAMPED WITH ITS APPROVAL," p. 451.

(NOTE.—In Comments on letter of Oct. 3, 1917, will be found the "method" Gibbons means, as decreed by Pope Innocent III, which is also embodied in the bishop's oath.)

The above completely refutes your answers to the three subdivisions of Question 13, and demonstrates that Catholic laymen know nothing about the real teaching of the Roman Catholic church—at least proving that they are incompetent to enlighten inquirers as to their “faith and practices.”

No. 14: Does the Roman Catholic church claim the right to control education? If so, name one country where the church has been in control for centuries where the percentage of illiteracy is as small as it is in any Protestant country.

Answer: The church has the right to teach all religious truths. The second part of this question is based on a misconception. The church has not been in control of any country in the world neither for centuries nor for a century nor for any length of time. The percentage of illiteracy in countries where the majority of the people is Catholic compares favorably with that where the majority of the people is non-Catholic. As proof of this, we can begin right at home. The percentage of illiteracy in the United States is most in those States where there are fewest Catholics—North Carolina, South Carolina, Mississippi and Alabama, for example. We do not say, however, that this is because there are more Protestants than Catholics in these States. We know that there are several reasons that fully explain the backwardness of those States along educational lines. Similar reasons prevail in regard to countries as in regard to States. Of course, you know that the first schools, the first colleges, the first universities on the American continent were started by Catholics. You doubtless know that the first free schools of modern times, practically every university of Europe, the very systems of education in vogue throughout the civilized world, originated with Catholics.

CRITICISM

To this question, you say the church “claims no other right in matters of education,” but admit that it claims the right “to teach all religious truths.” Now, if the church has the right “to teach all religious truths,” you must concede the right to control education, otherwise the first claim is vitiated, for it would be as a king without a kingdom. But your answer is flatly contradicted by your church: Pope Pius IX, in Syllabus of Errors (Prop. 45), states the true doctrine of the Church of Rome in regard to education: “She (the church) has the right to deprive the civil authority of *the entire* government of public schools.” He was followed by Leo XIII, who commanded that “not only a suitable and solid method of EDUCATION may flourish, but ABOVE ALL that this EDUCATION be *wholly* in harmony with the Catholic faith in its LITERATURE AND SYSTEM OF TRAINING . . . the training of youth most conducive to the defense of true faith and religion . . . as for public schools . . . there is no ECCLESIASTICAL AUTHORITY in them,” p. 206. It is then incumbent upon “parents

to strain every nerve . . . to strive manfully . . . to direct the education of their offspring . . . to keep them away from schools where there is a risk of their drinking in the poison of impiety."* So, where "expediency" renders it possible, Catholic parents must send their children to Catholic schools so that the church *CAN CONTROL EDUCATION!* They must not go to public schools where they may drink in *impiety*—or learn to read Roman Catholic history, canon law, and moral theology.

As far as possible the Roman church in America is acting on the doctrine of Pius IX, depriving the State of the entire education of Catholic children, and putting it under the control of the church; to *control education* is to *control the State*; so this fact alone destroys that part of your answer denying that the church has been in control at any time, anywhere. The Roman Catholic church was the religion of State in practically all Latin countries up to about the middle of the last century, just as it is the religion of State in Spain, in Austria; Ferrer was shot a few years ago for advocating a free, progressive public school system for Spain. Is there a "public" school in Spain to-day for the education of youth where the Catholic catechism is not taught? Is there one of such "public" schools employing a Protestant teacher? Do you not know enough about your own church to know that a concordat *MUST* provide for church-control of education, as a necessary means of *MAINTAINING* a concordat? And what is Spain's record? Sixty-five per cent. illiterate, after a thousand years of church-control of education, while America's total is about eight per cent! Your church could not claim to be a "perfect society" within itself with the right to "legislate, judge and punish," and omit to control education; that omission would, first, destroy her claim of being a "perfect society," and, second, as experience has shown, prove fatal to Catholicism not to control education. In exercising her right to "legislate," the first law Rome makes, where she can, is to "legislate" *all* children into the parochial school, just as she has the Catholic children in America.

In the next part of your answer you seem to evade the issue. True, there are several Southern States in this Union where the percentage of illiteracy is greater than in others; but even in those States where there are more negroes and poor white people, the percentage is smaller to-day than that in Catholic countries where the Church of Rome is supposed to make a specialty of educating, as part of its "charter" rights; but, taking America as a whole, her illiteracy is smaller, with all her foreigners and

* *NOTE*—The kind of school and education the Roman church demands, and which Leo XIII had in mind, is the parochial school, in charge of Roman priests, where the un-American doctrines are taught such as are quoted from time to time in these pages from the "Manual of Christian Doctrine."

negroes, than any Catholic state, while the percentage of illiterates among her native-born white is about 2 per cent.

The report of ex-President William Howard Taft, chairman of the Commission appointed by President McKinley to investigate the source of trouble in the Philippine Islands, reveals, under sworn testimony, that the Roman church rule in the islands was absolute—religiously and politically—covering a period of approximately 300 years; and with over a thousand different priests of the church there, they could not boast of over 6,000 "educated" people. If a horse, dog, cat, flea, etc., can be educated to where it displays almost human-like reason, that is sufficient evidence that race nor clime is a bar to "education." If you say that the Latin races are intellectually inferior to other races as a reason for their greater illiteracy where Roman Catholicism is dominant, then you admit that Catholicism is not the only true religion of Jesus Christ; and if you do not infer that they are inferior, you must admit that the Catholic church has been recreant to her trust.

No. 15: Are Roman Catholics taught that the civil authority ought to be subordinate to ecclesiastical authority?

Answer: NO.

CRITICISM

From the various answers noted prior to this, I am not surprised to discover that in this you are also disagreeing with the teaching church. You answer "NO," while Pope Pius says the church "has the right to claim dominion in temporal things for the clergy and the pope," Prop. 27, and Leo XIII said "We . . . renew and confirm in every particular . . . those declarations and protests which Pope Pius . . . published *against* seizing of the CIVIL sovereignty and the infringement of rights belonging to the Roman church," p. 68. While Catholics in America let the church enforce the *Ne Temere* decree, in Italy, the home of the popes, Catholic Italians passed a law making it a penal offense for a priest of the church to perform a marriage ceremony! Leo says: "Marriage ought not to be regulated and administered by the will of civil rulers . . . but . . . by authority of the church; it is plainly absurd to maintain that even the very smallest fraction of such power has been transferred to the civil ruler . . . the Pontiff was thrust out . . . of his right, the civil principedom;" the authority of the church "is the most exalted of all authority," is not "inferior to the civil power, nor in any manner dependent upon it," and that the church has "true power of making laws, as also the twofold right of judging and punishing." and, hence, naturally, where this authority of the church is not accorded this eminence over civil authority, then "it is lawful to seek for a change of government as will bring about due liberty of action" to the church. He further teaches 17,000,000 Catholics in America

that "It is a high crime . . . under pretext of keeping the civil law, to ignore the rights of the church," p. 184. He is yet more emphatic, declaring: "If the laws of the State are manifestly at variance with divine law, containing enactments hurtful to the church, or conveying injunctions adverse to the duties imposed by religion, or if they violate in the person of the Supreme Pontiff the authority of Jesus Christ, *then, truly, to resist becomes a positive duty; to obey, a crime,*" 185.

No. 16: Do you think there is any persecution of Catholics in this country, and if so, on what grounds and by whom do you think it is being carried on?

Answer: There can be no doubt of the fact that there is a systematic campaign of villification and slander being carried on against the Catholic church and her people in this country. It is being conducted by two classes of persons; first, those who work it for the sake of the financial returns it brings them in the way of subscriptions and donations, and second, those who aim to destroy all religion and are merely attacking the Catholic church as being the oldest and most vigorous exponent of Christianity.

CRITICISM

The object of this question was to ascertain if you really believe, as you say in your "Plea for Peace," by inference, at least, that Catholics and non-Catholics "are of the same flesh, with the same feelings, the same nature," etc., and to ascertain, first-hand, if Catholics think the principles of Protestantism are merely academic, or if they believe such rights and principles are as vital and dear to non-Catholics as Catholicism is to Catholics. The answer you gave would be all one could expect from a person well drilled only in the Catechism; but it is not such as is expected from one who is supposed to be so well versed as to invite questions relative to faith and practices and rights of Catholics as taught by the Roman church; a broad vision would survey the whole field of controversy, and the following would be manifest:

Practically all non-Catholics know, in a general, vague way, from the decrees of the church, that the Roman church is the relentless foe of every principle of Protestantism and the Reformation and constitutional civil government; that it has and will make use of every means to gain ascendancy as expediency or safety may determine—an assertion easily verified by all who are not hampered in their investigations by the Index; that Catholicism is opposed, because some think it seeks to foist upon the human race a world-wide monarchy; opposed by others as being the anti-Christ; still others, not a few, who believe it to be a gigantic scheme to aggrandize a few at the expense of all the rest, while still many more, who believe it to be an apostate from the true faith. All this, I repeat, would be seen by a broad vision,

and the different reasons assigned would be found resting upon the history of that church.

From your answer, "ecclesiastical" history is a subject not open to investigation by Catholics; it makes no allowance for honest difference of opinion, and evidences you do not believe we are all essentially alike, but that Catholics, being flesh and blood, can strike at what the church directs and wills, while non-Catholics, being made of some India-rubber like substance, must bound away when hit.

The Roman church in America has evidently mistaken the lenience and tolerance of Protestantism for ignorance of the "intention" of the church, indifference or fear. The natural inference from your answer is, that the Roman church does not even credit non-Catholics with ordinary intelligence, if she thinks they will pursue the even tenor of their way while the Catholic forces are "mobilized" before their very eyes, under the leadership of Jesuits—natural foes of every principle they value—a force whose chief preoccupation is how best to serve the interests of Catholicism," and whose very existence as an order depends upon adherence to the principles and purposes for which it was re-chartered, that is, the "intention" of the church to destroy constitutional government and Protestantism, control education and bring the world under subjection to the Roman Pontiff, soul and body, as each member thereof is to the Jesuit General.

To those who study history, the nature of the claims of the Roman church, the "intention" of that institution, and compare all of it with sectional and international contemporaneous events, this *mustering* all Catholics into a compact body is a challenge, at present, for a test of political strength.

The summary manner in which you dismissed this question seems to indicate you realized its important bearing on the anti-papal activities.

No. 17: Do you and your church recognize any other church as "Christian"? Has any pope ever so declared?

Answer: The Catholic church does not recognize any other church as having been founded by Christ. Christ established but one church. Our church teaches, and we Catholics believe, that the Catholic church is that church.

CRITICISM

This answer is very human, in part. It is natural for one to believe what he has is the best; so long as this opinion goes no further, there is no objection. But there is ample evidence tending to show that the Roman church is not satisfied to set up a claim monopolizing only the spiritual kingdom and contend for such with the Sword of the Spirit, but, in imitation of temporal powers, wields carnal weapons, to invade and subjugate other kingdoms. It is by comparison and argument that the superi-

ority of one proposition over another is manifested to reasoning beings; and that you may understand why many people are not willing to have the church exercise her "rights" in America, I will submit here a few figures showing conditions as they were found in places where the Roman Catholic, "true" religion, has been, and is yet, in the ascendancy. The number of murders to every million inhabitants in Catholic Ireland was 19, Belgium 18, France 31, Austria 36, Bavaria 68, Sardinia 20, Lombardy 45, Tuscany 56, Sicily 90, Naples 174; while Protestant England had only 4 to the million.

Percentage of illegitimate births: In Catholic Paris 38, Brussels 35, Munich 48, Vienna 51; Protestant England 4.

Further, the percentage in Protestant cities (as compared with Catholic cities of equal population) were: Bristol and Clifton 6, Manchester and Salford 7, Plymouth 5, Bradford and Birmingham 6, Brighton 7, Cheltenham 7, Exeter 8, Liverpool 6, Portsea 5; while Catholic Austria's cities showed: Troppan 26, Zara 30, Innsbruck 22, Laibach 47, Klagenfurt 56, Gratz 65.

The Vienna, Austria, Year-Book for 1905, gives 16,867 illegitimates to 38,847 legitimates. The criminal statistics for Germany in 1914 gave Catholics about 50 per cent. above non-Catholics. It is the object of your church, according to Leo XIII, to "GOVERN THE MINDS OF MEN." The above figures give some idea what results where this has been accomplished—the inevitable fruit where the Catholic Index is supreme, and it becomes supreme wherever there are enough Catholics and priests to put it into effect.

Do not understand me as intimating, even, that there are no good people in the Catholic church; far be it from me. I believe there are, and have been, good people in jail.

No. 18: In case of conflict between the laws of your church and the laws of the State, which are you in duty bound to obey, as a matter of religious conscience?

Answer: In case of the conflict you imagine, either the church authorities would be exceeding their just powers, or the State authorities would be exceeding their just powers, and it would be the duty of every man, Catholic or not Catholic, in such a case, to determine for himself as a matter of conscience which of these authorities was the usurper and firmly to stand for the other.

CRITICISM

Your answer here is neither democratic nor Catholic, but destructive of both theories of government which, if followed to its logical conclusion, in practice, would be the reign of anarchy—every man becoming his own judge, jury and executioner. Under democracy, the power to make laws is vested in the people; and any law, therefore, generally speaking, that is endorsed by the majority of the people, is equally binding on all who elect to re-

side where this form of government obtains, although Leo XIII says this "is in contradiction of reason," p. 145. A stable government could not be established upon your theory; religious and moral questions cover every phase of human existence; all law is for the purpose of establishing a code defining what is moral, especially in our country where the power to set up a criterion is vested in the people.

Your theory destroys Catholicism, and is the bedrock of Protestantism. For one to determine for himself whether or not a law is usurpation, such person must, essentially, have an individuality of both mind and conscience unfettered, to enable him to "think" and "choose," principles which are absolutely prohibited by the Roman church, and if Catholics in America practice these principles in any degree, it is because of the presence of Protestant principles, which forces the church, as a matter of expediency, to wink at their violation for the present, just as she winked at civil marriage until 1908, and permitted Catholics to marry according to civil law.

Your church makes no provision for the individual exercise of conscience, therefore, a Catholic must be governed by AUTHORITY of the church vested in the priest, who will define what is or is not to be considered usurpation; Leo XIII, p. 189, says: "It belongs above all to the Roman Pontiff, Vicar of Jesus Christ, to teach all that pertains to morals and faith," and that "freedom of thinking and openly making known one's thoughts is not inherent in the rights of citizens," 126, but declares that "the liberty of thinking . . . is the fountain head and origin of many evils," 123.

If you think your answer is in accord with your faith and practices, support it with decrees of a pope or general church council; no other citation will be competent.

(ADDENDUM NOTE—The Protestant principle above alluded to is in the sense that Protestants think, choose and decide for themselves, and support or oppose given legislation; but after it becomes law, are obdient to it.)

No. 19: If it be true that a large percentage of your fellow-citizens fear the alleged intention of the Vatican to make the Roman Catholic church dominant in the political affairs of this country; to suppress Freemasonry and secret orders generally; to control the press; to abridge freedom of speech; to prevent religious toleration of other sects, churches or creeds, and to control the public school system or destroy it, would you be willing, in order to dissipate such ideas, to declare, openly, without mental reservation or equivocation, on your honor as American citizens, that if such be the intention or purpose of the Vatican or pope, or any part of the clergy, or laity of your church, you would resist the execution of such designs to the uttermost and join your fellow-citizens in repudiating such attempts?

Answer: Yes.

CRITICISM

To this question, you answer "Yes." I cannot make it harmonize with your answer to Question 4: Freemasonry is a living exponent of all those rights guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States, many of which are embodied in this question; it supports free speech, free press, free conscience and non-sectarian free public school system—in other words, Masonry champions everything that Jesuitism seeks to destroy—and Jesuitism exists only to work against every principle of the Constitution mentioned in this question, and if Jesuits are maintained and supported in America by Catholics, they themselves are participants of the work of Jesuits and other priestly orders, all of whom have assumed an oath of obedience to the pope, and you will not say the pope would concur in your answer to No. 19. If to Catholics the pope "Holds upon this earth the place of God Almighty," they cannot agree with him in the desire to "extirpate" Freemasonry without agreeing also with his will to destroy all those principles which Freemasonry stands for.

Are you laymen really full-fledged Catholics? Are you not taking particular pains to keep your literature out of the hands of the "faithful"? I infer you are directing your efforts exclusively among non-Catholics, as you do not use an authenticating "imprimatur" on your printed matter.

In a republic, the power to make law being vested in the people, free speech and free press are as essential to its existence as air and water to the human system. As you are supposed to be answering for Catholics of Georgia, will state that Macon is in Georgia—the Catholics of Macon, in the year 1917, exerted every effort except display of violence to prevent free speech; in Alabama and Florida, the same; also in other sections of this country, adding mob violence to their efforts of persuasion: the priesthood of the Roman church opposes free speech, because it is a violation of the law of their church—not so much for what may be said; while Catholic laymen endeavor in many ways to prevent the exercise of this right, acting solely on the AUTHORITY of the priest, because the Index prevents them from knowing whether or not speakers are telling the truth or falsifying.*

* Since submitting the above criticism I have discovered, in the Catholic Catechism, that Romanists are taught that one becomes answerable for the sins of another in NINE different ways, one of which is "BY SILENCE;" that is, if they know of a "sin" being committed, or to be committed, and are SILENT, they become as guilty as the one who commits the sin; this accounts for the efforts on the part of Catholics to close halls against lecturers, mob violence, murder, and either boycott a person's business or resort to slander, to ruin both his name and business. According to laws of the Roman church, every principle of the United States Constitution—free speech, free press, free school, free conscience, separation of Church and State, etc., are sins against god the pope and a Roman Catholic is in CONSCIENCE BOUND to use any means to prevent another from sinning against the pope's church, or himself

No. 20: If you answer that you would (referring to Question 19), please state in what way or manner such information could be brought to your careful, conscientious attention for consideration—if you could investigate such questions independently of your priest?

Answer: Those who claim to be in possession of such information must themselves find some respectful way of bringing it to the attention of others. Of course, we can investigate such questions, if at all, independently of our priest. There is no question of any sort open to investigation that we are not as free to investigate as any other persons.

CRITICISM

The first part of your answer here presents a problem, and a puzzle: according to the teaching of the church, the only way to bring any question before a Roman Catholic in a "respectful" manner is to send it through the Index via the local priest; Leo XIII positively lays down the rule by which Catholics are to be governed in such matters: "It is plainly the duty of all who teach to banish error from the mind, and by SURE SAFEGUARDS to CLOSE the ENTRY to all false convictions," p. 153, and as the Roman Pontiff is the supreme teacher of all truth, the church places the Index across the entrance to Catholic minds, which forbids them to read any book "which defends errors proscribed by the Holy See," p. 414; that "censors . . . must keep before their eyes nothing but the dogmas of holy church, and the common Catholic doctrine as contained in the decrees of General Councils, the Constitutions of Roman Pontiffs, and the unanimous teaching of the Doctors of the Church," p. 419. Under the operation of this law of your church, no production from master minds of any country or age, explaining or defending the fundamental principles of FREEDOM, which underly the Constitution of the United States, nor any other vital question based upon

be answerable for it. THIS IS A DANGEROUS DOCTRINE, and will forever remain a disturbing factor until the pope or the Constitution becomes supreme.

Observe, that to Question 19, the Association answered "Yes," which is in direct conflict with what is taught Catholics in their own schools, from textbooks duly authorized by the Roman church. From the "Manual of Christian Doctrine," a Catholic school text-book, published in Philadelphia, 1919, with the imprimatur of Archbishop D. J. Dougherty, I quote the following from page 132, under the heading, "Union of Church and State":

Question: "119. What, then, is the principal obligation of heads of States?"

Answer: "Their principal obligation is to practice the Catholic religion themselves, and, as they are in power, to protect and defend it.

"120. Has the State the right and the duty to proscribe schism or heresy?"

"Yes, it has the right and the duty to do so both for the good of the nation and for that of the faithful themselves; for religious unity is the principal foundation of social unity.

"122. May the State separate itself from the Church?"

"No, because it may not withdraw from the supreme rule of Christ."

The pope, Vatican, clergy and laity are teaching and accepting this doctrine, in America—it destroys every proposition involved in Question 19, and completely proves the answer "Yes" above to be untrue!—and Farrell knew it, at the time.

religion or morality, can be "respectfully" brought to the attention of Catholics. (This seems to account for the general decadence of Latin countries, and why Catholics as a rule take no part in civic or reform measures.)

If your Association will indicate how the Index can be "respectfully" eliminated, you will confer a favor; also explain why your Association had to get a permit or "dispensation" from the local priest or the bishop before engaging in your present work. Leo XIII says, *ex cathedra*, that ALL Catholics "are bound to submit to preliminary ecclesiastical (i. e., priest) censorship at least those books which treat of Holy Scripture, ecclesiastical history, canon law, natural theology, ethics, and other religious or moral subjects of this character; and in general ALL writings especially concerned with religion and morality," p. 419. This LAW denies Catholics the right to investigate AT ALL independently of priest-censorship any question covered by the Index—and insofar as the church and its faith and practices are concerned, any question of vital importance.

Can you eliminate the words "if at all" and "open to investigation" from this answer? If not, why not? Why such apparent effort to conceal facts relative to your faith and practices, after yourself inviting questions?

Please give the name and address of JUST ONE Catholic layman in the whole State of Georgia who possesses an uncensored history of the lives of the popes, or history of the convents; can you name five Catholic laymen in the State who know that a number of the popes were very immoral men, being fathers of children, and that an illegitimate son of a pope was himself made pope? Can Catholics investigate such questions AT ALL? Are they "open" to investigation? If not, why?

No. 21: The Jesuit order was abolished in 1769, by Pope Clement XIV; they have been excluded from almost every civilized country many times; are not permitted even now to enter Roman Catholic Spain, although another pope lifted the ban from the order. Please state why the order (a) was abolished, (b) barred from other countries, (c) kept out of Spain now, (d) how one pope can "abolish and forever destroy the Society of Jesus" and another re-establish it.

Answer: The Jesuit order was abolished as a matter of internal church policy. It is barred from some countries, and in some countries from some dioceses, for the same reason. Every society within the church, Jesuit, Dominican, Franciscan, etc., exists by consent of the Head of the Church and can be suspended, abolished, reinstated, or created anew as the Roman Pontiff may deem necessary. They may enter this diocese or that or be excluded from one or the other as the bishop of the diocese may deem to the best interest of the church in that jurisdiction. In some dioceses only one or two orders are permitted charges, in

others more, in some all may have charges. The whole matter is a question of internal church policy.

CRITICISM

Your answer to this question is a convergence of paradoxology. You say that the Jesuit order was abolished "as a matter of internal church policy;" that it was kept out of "some countries . . . and some dioceses for the same reason." Perhaps you misunderstood the question; I did not ask as to restrictions involving local internal "church" policy. Since you do not answer sub-divisions of the main question, I shall ask you to state if the following is not true:

The Jesuit order was established by Paul III, in 1540, and abolished in 1769, and more than half of this time was in open resistance to the authority of the pope and the church, and that the matter of abolishing this order was a perplexing problem for many popes.

In issuing the decree of abolishment, Clement XIV assigned in part the following reasons, eleven popes "employed, without effect, all their effort," to overcome the evils created by the order; that they were guilty of "idolatrous ceremonies" and that the kings of France, Spain, Portugal and Sicily "found themselves reduced to the necessity of expelling and driving from their states, kingdoms and provinces these very champions of Jesus" because "there remained no other remedy for so great evils," and that "this step was necessary in order to prevent the Christians from rising one against the other and massacring each other in the very bosom of our common mother, the Holy Catholic church," and that in the church there could never be "a firm and durable peace so long as the said Society subsisted," issuing an order that it be "ABSOLUTELY ABOLISHED and SUPPRESSED . . . Our will and pleasure is, that these, Our Letters should FOREVER and to ALL ETERNITY be valid, PERMANENT, and efficacious." Now, then, it is true, that the principle of "internal church policy" was involved in the abolishment of the order, and is correct as to sub-division (a) of the question, but is not correct as answering (b) and (c).

If the following facts of history are not correctly stated, please show error:

As to (b): The king of Portugal "issued a decree of banishment against the Jesuits as traitors, rebels, enemies to, and aggressors on, his person, his states, and the public peace and general good of the people." (Cormenin.) The French Parliament, composed exclusively of Catholics, decreed banishment of the Jesuits, denouncing their doctrines and practices "as perverse, destructive of every principle of religion, and even of probity; as injurious to Christian morality, pernicious to civil society, seditious, dangerous to the rights of the nation, the

nature of the royal power, and the safety of the persons of sovereigns; as fit to excite the greatest trouble in States, to form and maintain the most profound corruption in the hearts of men," and provided that "the institution of the Jesuits should forever cease to exist throughout the whole extent of the kingdom." Following Portugal and France, the King of Spain, head of one of the strongest Catholic States, banished the Jesuits from his kingdom, as also the King of the Two Sicilies, and Ferdinand, Duke of Parma and Placencia, as a matter of INTERNAL STATE POLICY.

When the order was abolished by the church, the Jesuits found refuge in Russia. There they enjoyed every freedom, and were teaching in the schools. In expelling them from that country, Alexander said they had "abused the confidence which was placed in them:" while enjoying toleration themselves "they planted a hard intolerance in the natures infatuated by them;" that "all their efforts were directed merely to secure advantages for themselves," and after making other serious charges, asks, "Where, in fact, is the State that would tolerate in its bosom those who sow in it hatred and discord?" In Russia, as elsewhere, they employed their religion as a pretext for interference with temporal and political affairs.

The popular disfavor and distrust of Jesuits by the Italian people was so great that Pope Pius IX, the predecessor of Leo XIII, expelled the order from Italy.

Under Bismarck, the Jesuits were banished from the German Empire about forty years ago, as a matter of INTERNAL STATE POLICY: they have recently, this year (1917), been admitted again by that country, also as a matter of internal state policy, at present, as there is no difference between the absolutism of Jesuit and Kaiser.*

(d): While the pope is nominally the head of the Roman Catholics of the world, with authority to abolish or create, his authority is inferior to that of the Jesuit General: this is proved by the fact that after the proclamation of abolishment, the Jesuits refuged to Russia, and refused to be abolished; from the very nature of its Constitution and principles, a Jesuit pledges his obedience to the General in terms stronger than the church requires of priests: "a Jesuit must regard his superior as Christ the Lord, and must strive to acquire perfect resignation and denial of HIS OWN WILL and judgment to that which the superior wills and judges . . . As for holy obedience, this virtue must be perfect in every point—in execution, in will, in intellect—in doing what is enjoined with all celerity, spiritual

* *Note*—While the law against the Jesuit order was repealed in 1917, they were admitted into Germany on some sort of understanding with the Kaiser about six months before the World War began!

joy, and perseverance; persuading ourselves that everything is just; suppressing every repugnant thought and judgment of one's own, in certain obedience; . . . and let everyone persuade himself that he who lives under obedience should be **Moved AND DIRECTED** under divine providence **BY HIS SUPERIOR, JUST AS IF HE WERE A CORPSE** (*perinde ac si cadaver*), which allows itself to be moved and **LEAD** in **ANY** direction." (Nicolini.) In substance, Leo XIII requires this attitude of mind and body from all Catholics: have no more will than a dead man regarding his Superior General. This, perhaps, explains why god the pope thought it best for the good of the church to abolish the order, "forever and to all eternity," while another one thought he blundered, and re-establish the order as a matter of internal church policy. Is not this a natural deduction from the facts?

God's purposes, as revealed by His laws, are immutable: yesterday, to-day and to-morrow are all an eternal NOW with Him—He would not say an organization, with fixed principles and purposes and laws should be utterly destroyed to-day, and on another, declare He had made a mistake, that it was too good to be destroyed: that is "expediency," not "immutability."

From what I can learn, it seems to be the object of the Jesuit order to bring the world under subjection to the pope, and hence, under the Jesuit General, who is, in fact, "the power behind the throne" in the Catholic church; therefore the intense hatred of Jesuitism toward any principle of **FREEDOM**, and its opposition to any one who advocates freedom of mind or body; from this known principle of the Jesuits arises the popular suspicion against the Catholic church—Jesuitism uses any means to gain an end: will use Catholic or Protestant, or will become anything, even as a *dead* man, to carry out the will and object of the church.

Though they spoke *ex cathedra*, the facts prove that several of the infallible popes were extremely fallible in dealing with the Jesuit order, which creates a reasonable doubt, in the minds of those who exercise the right to reason, as to the doctrine of infallibility—no chain is stronger than its weakest link—and the correctness of **ANY** papal decree, and the claim to a monopoly of Christianity.

If this is not a reasonable treatment of question 21, please set me right.

No. 22: If baptism is essential to salvation and membership in your church, and if its validity depends upon whether or not the officiating priest had the right "intention" at the time of baptizing a subject of the church, how can any one know he is a member of your church—from the pope on down; do you require a certificate from the priest wherein he declares he had the right "intention" at the time of performing the ceremony?

Answer: Baptism is not essential to salvation. It is not essential to membership in the Catholic church. Its validity does not depend upon whether the officiating priest had the right "intention" or not; its validity does not depend upon whether or not a priest officiates. Any person, Catholic, non-Catholic, Protestant, Jew or Infidel, can administer valid baptism.

CRITICISM

To this question you render a concatenation of self-evident contradictions: you assert that baptism is not essential to membership in the Catholic church, nor essential to salvation; if this be true—and we presume that it is the object of your association, to give true information relative to the faith and practices and rights of Catholics—then the doctrine of baptism is a negligible quality in your church, having no value; but you say "any person" can administer it: that which is of no if it be true that it is not essential to salvation and church membership, it is of no value; but in direct contradiction of this, your church seems to attach *so* much importance to it, that you say "any person can administer it:" that which is of no value can have no standing in equity or in theory, therefore under no circumstances can it obtain *validity*, or value; and if your answer is the truth—and that is what I want—you have established beyond question that "intention" has nothing to do with baptism.

Upon investigation, however, from other sources, I find there is a value attached to baptism that you Catholic laymen evidently are not aware of: the Jesuit order is the most powerful and influential in the Catholic church—it is either the true exponent of Catholicism, or Catholicism is the true exponent of Jesuitism: about the beginning of the seventeenth century, Jesuit missionaries went into India; to get an opportunity to baptize, they assumed all the oaths, forms, ceremonies and regalia of a Hindoo Sanissi, while others, like Nobili, became both Brahmins and pariahs. So cautious and secret were they, and so intent upon their purpose of saving souls by administering baptism, that one of them is quoted as saying, "Our whole attention is given to concealing from the people that we really are what they call Feringees (Europeans)." Xavier began this system and practice of "winning souls" in India—he is said to have baptized 10,000 in this way in one month. These priests would go into homes as physicians, draw a wet towel over the head and forehead of the unsuspecting sick, muttering to themselves the baptismal service; children at the point of death were baptized without the permission of parents; catechists and private Christians administered baptism under the pretext of giving medicine; one woman is said to have baptized 10,000 children who were sick, not more than two escaping death; during

the famine in 1737, 12,000 were reported as baptized and "that it was rare, . . . where there were neophytes, for a single heathen child to die unbaptized."

For about one hundred years, the Jesuits in China and India adopted the pagan religions of those countries, in defiance of every law of their church, at that time, and of God, which gave rise to a controversy between them and the popes, continuing up to the time they were abolished, which was one of the reasons of "internal church policy" causing abolishment of the order; doing all this to baptize, to make converts, "to the greater glory of God"—doing that which, you say, is not essential to salvation nor to membership in your church; in our own country in this seventeenth year of this twentieth century, we find them up to their old tricks, as witness the Cody incident—evidencing there has been no change in the principles of the order since it was founded by Loyola "for the greater glory of God," and during all these centuries have not discovered they were doing that which the church, as pronounced by the Catholic Laymen's Association of Georgia, says is not essential to salvation!

This is all circumstantial or inferential evidence, attaching a paramount quality and essence to baptism in contradiction of your statement; alone, it is sufficient to establish the fact that baptism is essential, at least, to salvation in your church, according to the faith and practices of the Jesuit fathers; but we are not restricted to inference; that baptism is essential to both salvation and membership in the Catholic church is proved by authentic documentary evidence, viz.:

In the "Manual of Prayers," heading, "Brief Statement of Catholic Doctrine," sub-caption, "Lay Baptism," we learn:

"Provided an INFANT is in danger of dying before a priest can be procured, any other person, whether man, woman or child, may baptize it in the following manner: While pouring common water on the head or face of the infant, pronounce the words, 'I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.'" For this to be VALID, evidently, the ANY OTHER PERSON must be a "lay" member of the Catholic church, and the person receiving it MUST be an INFANT. As Jews and Infidels do not believe in the Trinity, they could no more administer baptism than ice could form in boiling water. (The above is from a book bearing the imprimatur of Cardinal Gibbons.)

In a Catechism of Catholic doctrine, endorsed by Cardinals Wiseman and McClosky, prepared by a Jesuit priest, the following is taught as the faith of Catholics:

- "1. Which is the first and most necessary Sacrament?
"The first and most necessary Sacrament is Baptism.

"2. Why is Baptism the first Sacrament?"

"Because before Baptism no other Sacrament can be VALIDLY received.

"3. Why is Baptism the most necessary Sacrament?"

"Because WITHOUT Baptism NO ONE can be saved.

"4. What is Baptism?"

"Baptism is a Sacrament in which, by water and the word of God, we are cleansed from all sin, and regenerated and sanctified in Christ to life everlasting." Deharbe, p. 248.

The following question was sent to Bishop Ben. J. Keiley, Savannah, Ga., Editor of "Our Sunday Visitor," Huntington, Ind., and J. Card. Gibbons, Baltimore:

"Is baptism essential to salvation and membership in the Catholic church?"

Bishop Keiley replied: "The form of baptism, that is to say, by immersion or pouring, as practiced in different religious bodies, is not essential; but the reception of the Sacrament of Baptism is necessary for salvation. Obviously the second question is answered in the reply to the first."

The Editor of the Sunday Visitor answered, "Yes," assigning reasons.

Cardinal Gibbons authorized his secretary to say "Yes," and that the subject would be found treated at length in his book, "Faith of Our Fathers."

It is apparent that you and your bishop are somewhat at cross-purposes: he says one must "receive" the sacrament of Baptism, *i. e.*, knowingly, with the consent of the mind and understanding, in which case "Baptism is essential to salvation" and membership in your church, completely refuting your denial, and denies your contention that baptism is valid regardless of who administers it.

It is very evident that your association, in not being able to answer correctly a simple, primary question like this, which is found in every Catechism, is hardly in possession of information sufficient to warrant organizing a bureau of information to impart a knowledge of the "faith and practices" of the Roman Catholic church; for in this instance there is a disagreement between the head of the church in Georgia and the lay members, and a disagreement between you laymen and three cardinals.

I believe that I have proved to your satisfaction that you are in error as above, baptism being the first sacrament upon which the validity of all the others depend; now I will take up the doctrine of "Intention," the real basis of question 22:

"Intention" is defined as being "A stretching or bending of the mind toward an object; hence, uncommon exertion of the intellectual faculties; closeness of application; fixedness of application; earnestness." To illustrate the operation of this

principle among Catholics, Pope Pius recommended that Catholics all over the world, in the Battle Against Freemasonry, make it the general "INTENTION" of their prayers for the month of October, 1913; many small boys have escaped a deserved paddling, and many men a hangman's noose, by pleading lack of "intention;" the Jesuits in India and China pleaded "intention" in adopting all those pagan rites and ceremonies—their "intention" was, "the greater glory of God!"

According to the Manual of Prayers, a candidate for admission into the church must declare a belief in "everything . . . that has been declared by the sacred Canons and by the General Councils, and particularly by the Holy Council of Trent." Now, then: all Catholics are bound by the decrees of that Council as strongly as by any from the present pope, and it was at this Council that the doctrine of "Intention" was adopted, as follows:

"If one shall say that in ministers, while they make (or complete) and confer the Sacraments, there is not required the intention of doing at least what the church does, let him be accused." Can. XI, Sess. VII.

If this doctrine of an infallible Council has not been set aside by an infallible pope, as in the matter of abolishing and re-establishing the Jesuit order, it is as necessary for the priest to have the right "intention" in administering baptism as Cardinal Gibbons says it is for laymen to have the correct "intention" in participating in the mass; as essential as going to mass or confession; and if it has been set aside, please cite your authority; if it has not been annulled, then I ask, how may any one in the world know he is sure enough a member of the Catholic church and on his way to glory? (It also seems that a certificate should be required from the priest when he officiates at any other sacrament—marriage, for instance; for if he has not the right "intention" at that time, the marriage is invalid! If the priest who baptized your priest did not have the right "intention" your priest can perform no valid ceremony in the church! Even your pope cannot know he is a real Catholic, according to the laws of his own church!)

A comprehensive consideration of this "supernatural" or unnatural doctrine among the "faith and practices" of your church inevitably leads to the conclusion that the Roman church can guarantee nothing relative to the hereafter, and that very few Catholics know what are the doctrines they profess to believe, but must take everything for granted that a religious superior may say, because of his authority, such authority being vested in him by a man who derives his authority from the traditions of men—the Index is a wonderful institution! The beauty and simplicity of the Gospel message seems to have been

lost among the traditions of the "Fathers," and instead of being saved by believing on the Lord Jesus Christ, you must trust your salvation to the "INTENTION" of a man! Intrusting an eternal soul to a man, and he not made to give bond for its safe delivery!

Layne, the successor of Loyola as General of the Jesuits, was the pope's representative at the Council of Trent; he was there to plead for the doctrine of papal infallibility, which was adopted—300 years later. Although two church councils, Constance and Basil, denied papal infallibility, the Jesuits succeeded in getting the decree through at the Vatican Council in 1870; therefore, both those doctrines are Jesuitical: "intention," making the people completely and absolutely dependent upon the priest, and making all priests dependent upon and subject to the pope, who can no longer be forced to resign from that office, as numbers had to do before the adoption of the decree of infallibility—bringing all under the government of the General of the Jesuits. For mutual favors these two forces—pope and Jesuits—have united with but one objective, namely: the pope, operating through his priests and laymen, controls the very right of Catholics to think; the General, working through his subordinates, the sworn enemies of all popular government, has been, and is now, meddling with the political affairs of the world, endeavoring to suppress every known means by which a man may learn that he was created by and in the image of God, whom He endowed in a degree with some of His attributes—the power to reason and think, in the exercise of which he would CHOOSE the right course in all things: this gigantic combination has as its *intention* the subjugation of the earth to ONE MAN, and he made of the same clay as every other man, with no greater amount of gray matter in his head than is to be found in the heads of other men.

If this were a case in court, your answer to question 22 would cause you to be impeached, and all testimony thrown out.

Submit authority for this answer.

No. 24: As your church forbids its members to discuss or study, independently of priest-censorship, any subject relative to religion, morality, ecclesiastical (church) history, etc., on what intelligent basis do YOU expect to see peace and harmony established between Roman Catholics and non-Catholics?

Answer: Your presumption is all wrong, for our church does not forbid her children to discuss or study independently of priest-censorship any subject relating to religion, morality, ecclesiastical (church) history, etc. You evidently have been badly misinformed on this matter.

CRITICISM

Your answer to this question is amazing. Leo XIII, in his "General Decree Concerning the Censorship of Books," (See

"Great Encyclical Letters of Leo XIII," Benziger Bros., New York, 1906.) page 412, Decree 2, forbids Catholics to read "The books of apostates, heretics, schismatics, and all writers whatsoever, defending heresy or schism, or in any way attacking the foundations of religion."

Writing further on the subject, regarding the Rules of the Index, he says:

"All the faithful are bound to submit to preliminary ecclesiastical (priest) censorship at least those books which treat of Holy Scripture, sacred theology, ecclesiastical (*i. e.*, church) history, canon law, natural theology, ethics and other religious or moral subjects of this character; and in general, *all writings specially concerned with religion and morality.*" P. 419, Decree 41.

Further: "We decree that these presents and whatsoever they contain shall at no time be QUESTIONED for any FAULT of SUBREPTION, or OBREPTION, or Our INTENTION, or for any other defect whatsoever; . . . no man, therefore, may infringe or temerarily venture to contravene this document of Our Constitution, ordination, limitation, and derogation, and will. If anyone shall so presume, let him know that he will incur the wrath of Almighty God, and of the Blessed Apostles Peter and Paul." p. 421.*

You must agree that I am not *misinformed* nor *presuming* as touching this matter, and that question 24 is yet to be answered.

In connection with the above citations from the Index as stated by Leo XIII, permit the following observations: If, in issuing a decree *ex cathedra* relative to faith and morals by which Catholics are to be governed, the pope is at that time the infallible agent or Vice-Gerent of an Infallible God, why is it necessary for him to legislate against one taking advantage of FAULTS, of SUBREPTION, or OBREPTION, and forbid questioning his "INTENTION"?

Your attention is especially called to the fact that Leo recognizes the validity of the doctrine of "intention" in a certain case cited on page 396, as well as emphasizing the fact that no one is to question his "intention" relative to his decrees concerning the Index; Cardinal Gibbons also recognizes this doctrine and the validity of the decree of the Council of Trent; on page 325, Manual of Prayers, under caption "Directions for Holy Communion," he says: "DIRECTION OF THE INTENTION. I intend to assist at the Holy Sacrament of the Mass . . . according to the rite of the Holy Roman church." The priest and communicant must both have the right "intention"

* NOTE—This Constitution of the Index of Leo XIII just cited was decreed by the pope exercising his supreme legislative power, which every person swears to defend when he joins the Roman church, while others are born subject to it.

in this; if, in consecrating the wafers, he does not designate in his mind *how many* he is to use, and indicate *which*, and one is not consecrated, *all remain simple wafers* (i. e., none are turned into the Body and Blood of Christ), therefore it readily appears that no Catholic even knows that he is eating his Lord according to the requirements of the faith and practices of the Catholic church!

No. 25: Is there any appreciable number of Catholics of Georgia in any manner affiliated with the American Federated Catholic Societies?

Answer: Yes.

No. 26: To what extent do YOU think the organizing of this society has been instrumental in arousing an anti-Catholic spirit?

Answer: I would say to no extent worth mentioning.

No. 27: Does your church teach, directly or impliedly, that members must not accuse their priests or bishops even though it be known to them that prelates have committed grave sins? If so, how can a man protect his home?

Answer: No, the church does not teach this, either directly or indirectly, explicitly or impliedly. A Catholic may protect his home in the same way a non-Catholic may protect his.

No. 28: Would your association prosecute a priest, if he were to wrong a member, by appealing to the laws of the land?

Answer: If it were necessary to secure redress, we would.

CRITICISM

Your answer to this question is very positive, but it can not be made to harmonize even remotely with the Traditions of the Fathers, nor with the popes, showing conclusively that the Index is a very important feature in the Roman Catholic system of religion:

The President of the Council of Trent, Hossius, says: "Pighius is blamed, who wrote that a priest, who through infirmity of the flesh hath fallen into whoredom, sins less than if he marry. This doctrine with some is vile, but with Catholics it is most honest." Hos., Confes., c. 56.

Says Costerus: "Should a priest indulge in uncleanness, nay, keep a concubine in his own house, although he is thereby guilty of a great sacrilege. yet he sins more heinously if he marry." Cos. de Co., eb. Sacredot.

Card. Campeggio, another holy father, whose doctrine is to be given the same veneration by Catholics as the Bible, declared: "That for priests to become husbands, is by far a most grievous sin than if they should keep prostitutes in their houses." Card. Cam., op. Sleid., com. I, 4.

Mathias Aquinas: "That a man who, after vowing continency doth marry, offends more than he who, through human frailty,

goes astray with an hundred different women." Math. Aquin., Ap.

These citations from the "holy" fathers of the Church of Rome are merely to reveal the attitude of the church toward the priesthood, and what, by inference, they may teach.

We will let the pope speak *ex cathedra*, and see if there is not a unity of minds:

On the "Chief Duties of Christians (Romanists) As Citizens," Leo XIII, pp. 203-4, Encyclical Letters, says: "Among the prelates, indeed, one or other there may be affording scope to criticism either in regard to personal conduct or in reference to opinions by him entertained about points of doctrine; but NO private person may arrogate to himself the office of judge which Christ our Lord has bestowed on that one alone above whom He placed in charge of His lambs and His sheep. Let every one bear in mind that most wise teaching of Gregory the Great: 'Subjects should be admonished not rashly to judge their prelates, even if they *chance* to see them acting in a blameworthy manner, lest reproving that what is *wrong*, they be led by *pride* into greater wrong. They are to be warned against the danger of setting themselves up in audacious opposition to the SUPERIORS whose shortcomings they may notice. Should, therefore, the SUPERIORS *really have committed* GRIEVOUS SINS, their inferiors, penetrated with the fear of God, OUGHT NOT to refuse them respectful SUBMISSION. The ACTIONS of SUPERIORS should not be smitten with the sword of the word, EVEN WHEN THEY ARE RIGHTLY JUDGED TO HAVE DESERVED CENSURE.'"

In many of your answers, you display a fine sense and understanding of Jesuitical "juggling" of words in endeavoring, as it appears, to conceal rather than reveal, the faith and practices of your church—an art very conspicuous on the part of the teaching church in its dealings with the hearing church, and which is very satisfactory to those who are forbidden to question, or make a mental effort to analyze phraseology: you surely ought to know that used in your answer to No. 28, the word "necessary" is open to several peculiar constructions, neither one of which would be complimentary to the layman nor priest.

No. 29: A soldier, being under the command of superiors, must say and do only as he is ordered, regardless of his personal opinion or wishes: does this principle obtain in your church? If so, what can your association of LAYMEN hope to accomplish?

Answer: The principle of action between a soldier and his superior officers does not obtain between the church and her children. The principle of action in the church is rather that prevailing in a well-regulated, God-fearing, devoted, affectionate family.

CRITICISM

As elsewhere shown, a member of the Jesuit order must, in mind, soul and body, be as soft wax in the hands of his superior; as obedient as a corpse in the hands of an undertaker, and this attitude of mind toward the pope is a fixed principle of the Church of Rome to which every layman must be obedient. Leo XIII, p. 139, says: "Whatever the Roman Pontiffs have hitherto taught, or shall *hereafter* teach, must be held with a firm grasp of mind," and (183) "ALL shall be of one mind," that (183) "the man who has embraced the Christian (Catholic) faith, as in duty bound, is by that very fact a SUBJECT OF THE CHURCH . . . and . . . which it is the special charge of the Roman Pontiff to RULE WITH SUPREME POWER . . . (191) neither can any one of its members choose . . . (194) Union of minds . . . requires . . . SUBMISSION AND OBEDIENCE OF WILL TO THE CHURCH AND TO THE ROMAN PONTIFF, AS TO GOD HIMSELF . . . this likewise must be reckoned among the duties of Christians (papists) that they allow themselves to be RULED and DIRECTED by . . . AUTHORITY . . . of the Apostolic See." Also, "what we are bound to *believe*, and what we are *obliged to do* . . . are laid down . . . by the Supreme Pontiff . . . also . . . what it is *necessary* to do and what to *avoid* doing." That "obedience to the Roman Pontiff is the proof of the true faith," 380, and that "freedom of thinking and making known one's thoughts is not inherent in the rights of citizens." 126.

As a symbol of the power he has, the pope wears a triple crown, signifying that he is god over heaven, earth and hell, from whose decision there is no appeal, and he has the right as pope to RULE and DIRECT Catholics in *all* matters pertaining to "faith and morals," and under the head of morals is where he directs their political or civic activities. Politics is the science of government—the pope demands that governments be made to conform to his law: that they must receive their right to exist from the Church of Rome; hence it follows that the Roman church cannot separate politics and religion, neither can a Catholic say he will obey the pope in matters of "religion," and yet refuse in political or civic affairs; and if language conveys any thought at all to the mind, the above citations, defining the "rule of action" by which all true "children" of the church MUST be directed, are as inflexible as the code of Prussian Militarism, which makes machines out of human beings.

When we consider the fact that the Jesuit order was founded by a Spanish soldier, we will readily see that its actuating principle must be typical of the absolutism that obtains in an army, where the commander alone exercises the right to say

"what it is necessary to do and what to avoid doing;" and when we consider further that the popes for several hundred years have been subject to the Jesuit influence, we can realize that no other "rule of action" except absolutism is possible; the Encyclicals of Leo XIII show he was a master of Jesuit principles, and from the very nature of its "faith and practices" the Catholic church cannot permit the minutest degree of Liberalism or Freedom in the "rule of action" obtaining between it and its "children."

A deserter from an army, if apprehended, is shot: if a priest or nun leaves the church, all its powers are hurled against them; while they remain in the church, they are veritable "saints"—the instant they leave its communion, they are portrayed to the world as bats of hell, and I defy you to name one priest who has ever left the church when it did not apply this "rule of action."*

Here is an excerpt from the bishop's oath—can you conceive of a German officer assuming an oath of obedience more drastic, in supporting Kaiserism?: "I shall observe, with all *my* strength and shall *cause* to be observed *by others*, the rules of the holy fathers. . . Heretics, schismatics and rebels . I will . wage war with," and one of the greatest of the "holy" fathers was the "Angelic Doctor," "Saint" Thomas Aquinas, who taught: "Respecting heretics . . . they deserve not only to be excluded from the church by excommunication, but from the earth by death." (When and where this doctrine is to be enforced, like many others of your church, must be determined by "expediency.") The canon law of your church teaches: "To kill one who has been excommunicated is no crime in a legal sense," so we see that if one of the "children" of the church "deserts" her he is subject to dire penalties according to the "intention" of the church—and that is what the church is to be judged by: not what it does, but what it claims as a "right" and would do if she could. There is but one remote analogy in the "principle of action" between the Roman church and her "children" and that which obtains in a well-regulated family, and that is, the church considers its members as "children," to be ruled and governed and directed, but has no age-limit when they are supposed to be full-grown; the nearest approach to a "corpse" under Jesuitism, is a "child" under Romanism: absolutely helpless.

The Bible declares, "As a man thinketh in his heart, so is he" . . . "from the abundance of the heart, the mouth speaketh"—if you keep a man from *thinking*, he can not *speak*—this

* Rome used to burn them, when she had control of the State. That she would do so in America to-day, if predominant numerically or politically, will be shown before we finish this book.

gives a perfect "fighting machine" but not that type of citizen that makes for the best interests of a country; that principle will degrade any nation that submits to it.

"In a well-regulated family" there are few, if any, books in the library that are not accessible to the "children"—the Catholic church hands its "children" the Catechism, and threatens to consign them to everlasting perdition if they read any other books pertaining to their welfare, which is supposed to be laid down therein!

No. 30: Why is it a venial sin, that must be confessed, for a Catholic to attend a Protestant church service, but it is not made a sin by your church for its members to engage in the sale of intoxicating liquors?

Answer: It is not necessarily a sin to attend a Protestant church service; it depends on many circumstances. It is more than likely a sin for Catholics to engage in the indiscriminate sale of intoxicating liquors, although, that too, depends upon circumstances. You should know also, that what is termed a venial sin is not a matter of confession.

CRITICISM

While it is not obligatory to confess venial sins, yet as a matter of safety first, it is advised; not infrequently the priest is supposed to ascertain from the penitents if they have attended "false places of worship." From the nature of your answer, you seem to understand Liguori very well for a layman, who says, "we may be allowed to conceal the truth, or to disguise it under ambiguous or equivocal words or signs, for a just cause." L. 2.

I know it is not "necessarily" a sin to attend a Protestant church service—Baunev is quoted as saying, "He . . . who is a communicant among Protestants without having his heart there, but out of pure derision . . . and to accomplish his designs," etc., Sum. cap. 6, p. 73. On this theory, that "the end justifies the means," to accomplish their designs, to baptize, the Jesuits did not believe it was "necessarily" a sin for them to participate in all pagan rites of the Hindoos and Chinese, disguising themselves as pagan priests; there are no doubt many Jesuits filling Protestant pulpits, editing papers for Protestant readers—it all depends upon "intention."

A non-Catholic marvels to discover to what extent "the true church" is governed by "circumstances" and "expediency"—principles that have no foundation in the teaching of the Christ; and I fail to find any similarity in the teaching of Christ and His "Vice-Gerent," Leo XIII, who said that "the lesser power yields to the greater in *human* resources."

No. 31: If your church is the only true church, and its only aim is the salvation of souls, and Catholics are taught there is

danger of losing their souls in going to Protestant churches, why does your church not teach and command its members to keep out of the liquor business, if it does not consider entering a Protestant church worse than running a barroom?

Answer: In the Third Plenary Council the Hierarchy of the church in the United States expressly enjoined upon Catholics to sever their connection with the liquor traffic.

CRITICISM

You made no effort to answer this question. As to what the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore may have "enjoined" is not relevant. The pope and General Councils called by him alone are recognized, it seems, by Catholics in America, evidenced by the fact that they disregarded that part of the work of the Third Plenary Council relative to the sale of intoxicants, considering such Councils as being merely advisory in their functions; the Catechism is supposed to "teach" Catholics that they ought not to engage in the whiskey business—you will note that I asked why the church did not "teach" and "command" its members, etc.; it "teaches" and "commands" Catholics not to read the History of the Roman church, its laws, etc., and they are obedient; it "teaches" and "commands" Catholics not to think or make known their thoughts outside of such as may be in strict conformity with the Catechism, and Catholics are obedient; and if the Catholic church did not consider attending Protestant church services worse than running a bar room, it would keep its members out of that business by the same means it keeps them from Protestant churches; pre-natally, and from the cradle to the grave, the Catholic church makes use of every means that the human mind can devise to prevent any one from leaving its communion, and specifically points out what Catholics cannot do in the exercise of the reasoning faculties and pursuit of certain studies, completely subjugating the human will, then virtually saying to such: "You ought not to engage in the whiskey business, but we can not force you out of it—you must be governed in this by *your* own judgment; we will not try to force you to live a clean life against your will," which is equivalent to pulling the fire out of an engine but still expect her to "fly."

Where the mind of man is made subject to the will of another, whether this be accomplished by a peculiar system of religious training, or by hypnotism, the result is the same: a perversion of that natural order intended, evidenced by each being endowed with a mind and will.

From what I have been able to learn relative to the faith and practices of the Catholic church, it teaches, by inference, that all one has to do to be right in this and the world to come is, join that church; it seems to matter very little, according to

its dogmas what sort of life one may live, which destroys the free moral agency of man as regards salvation, changing "Who-soever believeth" to "Whoever is Catholic" shall be saved; if occasionally only I saw a man with a head, and all the others were like an earthworm, then there would be some natural foundation for the Catholic theory that one man has the right to control the minds of men; where such system prevails, mankind being, as it were, under an hypnotic spell, the mental and moral status of society is not on a very high intellectual plane, neither indeed can be.

It is a matter of common knowledge that whiskey is responsible for about 75 percent of all crime, disease, degradation, vice, shame, disgrace, misery and ignorance of our country; with this in mind, read the following circular, from

THE CATHOLIC PROTECTIVE ASSOCIATION
BALTIMORE, MARYLAND

H. S. MURPHEY, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

October 8, 1915.

Dear Sir: As you know, the Catholic church, itself, and the American Federation of Catholic Societies never take an interest in politics, hence our Association seeks to unite all the organizations and friends of the church for political action.

On account of our heavy financial interests, certain un-American papers and secret societies are carrying on a campaign to destroy the liquor business, which is as legitimate to all sane people as any other business.

Our people own practically 85 out of every 100 saloons and they give good employment to many thousands of OUR CHURCH people.

These business men and their friends and employees have always CONTRIBUTED LIBERALLY to the CHURCH'S needs. They have ALWAYS been a TOWER OF POLITICAL STRENGTH for our friends and interests.

Let us not, as church members, but as individuals, show our gratitude and save this legitimate investment for our friends by voting every time against prohibition. YOUR state votes November 2d.

This is the most effective way of protesting against this vicious *anti-Catholic* movement. Please speak confidentially about this to your friends.

Respectfully,

H. S. MURPHEY.

P. S. Don't forget to subscribe, or get up a club of subscribers, to the Sunday Visitor. It is a strong national paper, and merits your support.

About this time, a Knight of Columbus was heard to remark, referring to an election in Macon on the previous day, "I voted yesterday against everything that even looked like prohibition."

Leo XIII, chap. V, Decree 47, p. 420, of Encyclical Letters,

teaches and commands that Catholics must not read "the books of apostates and heretics defendig heresy; or books by any author which are by name prohibited" by the Index under pain of incurring "*ipso facto* excommunication." Any book that in any way criticizes the pope or the church or any dogma, is forbidden to Catholics—"governing the minds" of Catholics, but letting them act morally as their "judgment" may dictate!

While my study of your church has not been extensive, so far the circular and injunction of Leo seem to epitomize Catholicism throughout the ages: the "teaching church" (popes and councils) pronouncing anathema against any one who dares to use his own mind and will and God-given brains to reason and think, while the "hearing church" (the members) can do that which may damn the race of mankind; god the pope damns a soul to hell forever for reading the history and laws of the church, yet this god's children "own practically 85" per cent of the barrooms that produce 75 per cent of all human ills—verily, if a tree is to be judged by its fruit, what sort of a "tree" is this that you are pleased to say is the "only" true church established by Jesus Christ?

If a Catholic incurs excommunication for reading or even keeping a book that is heretical, it naturally follows that one who goes to hear a heretic in a Protestant church discourse on heretical themes, without a "dispensation" to go there, incurs the same penalty.

It is a good legal principle that a man is responsible for the conduct of his children until they themselves become amenable to the law: nowhere in the economy of your church do I find a recognition of the principle of personal responsibility in regard to the "faithful" its "children;" and by that very fact the Roman church the pope is rightly held responsible for the existence of the liquor traffic and all its attendant evils.

The theory of the dogma of your church, the "Works of Supererogation," seems to be illustrated and involved in this question of liquor: one division of the church, the "sisters," trying to do good in various ways, while their "brethren," in the liquor business, etc., assure them of steady employment! A sort of family affair?

The connection of Catholics with the liquor business seems to illustrate another vital, "supernatural" dogma of your church: "Our people own practically 85 out of every 100 saloons," the other 15 are owned by infidels and unbelievers; the "children" of the true church and the "children of the devil" meeting on a common level, existing on the same plane, with one objective, and that, to coin money out of human misery, exerting the same influence in the world and on society; both Catholic and infidel stretching cords across the pathway to trip man and wreck lives:

in like manner, when the pope speaks *ex cathedra*, to Catholics it is as the voice of an Infallible God, while the pope as a man, may be as vile a creature in his personal life and conduct as ever a man could be.

What the Catholic religion DOES in the world speaks so loud to those not deafened by the Index that they cannot hear what it SAYS—because ACTIONS speak louder than words. The WORDS of Christ were in the language of a God—His ACTIONS proved He was God: "By their fruits ye shall know them."

A careful survey of the above will reveal, in part, not only why Protestants, but a very large percentage of non-religionists, oppose Catholics for political place or preferment, and object to them in connection with the public school system; non-Catholics, as a rule, will not interfere with Catholics in their business relations, but do object to placing them where they can, in the course of time, probably dominate, and force their religion upon others—a line of action demanded by the popes.

In these United States there is now one Catholic to every six non-Catholics; if the Catholic element is as busy in the interest of the pope as he requires—and if they are not, they should get out of that church—and the other people are indifferent, it requires no mathematician to figure the answer: the Great World War now raging was started by trying to force the Roman Catholic religion on the Protestant non-Catholic Greeks—less than ten thousand Roman Catholics in that State, because in political control, signing a concordat with the pope to make Catholicism the religion of State, disregarding the rights and wishes of two and one-half million Greeks, the Serbians; and we find that the pope and kaiser operate on the same principle; and right here may be noted a recent event of interest: while the pope was shown every consideration by the Italian government except letting him rule civil affairs, his private secretary, von Gerlach, has been sentenced to a life-term in prison for plotting against Italy in behalf of the Kaiser, and the Imperial German Government has lifted the ban, re-admitting Jesuits.*

We find the Catholic bar keeper in America today doing just as his infidel brother-barkeeper: so the Catholic Jesuit priest in India was found doing just as his brother-Hindoo priest—neither layman or priest can read a Protestant book or attend Protestant churches, but in their life and action, doing as the heathen, and attempting, all over America, to prevent Protestants from telling each other what they believe to be the real

* It was proved that von Gerlach was instrumental in having two Italian battleships blown up, with great loss of life.

"intention" of popery in the United States, then making a plea for peace, denying everything, and promising nothing, as a basis upon which it is to be established.

After deducting the sums paid for grain, labor, salaries, taxes, etc., in the manufacture and sale of intoxicants, the liquor traffic is shown to entail a loss of billions of dollars annually in this country for drink and in taking care of the various by-products of the traffic: about 85 per cent of this liquor is sold Roman Catholics, and if every Roman Catholic woman in America should work incessantly assisting your "sisters" in trying to feed the hungry, clothe the naked, educate the ignorant, heal the diseased, care for the sick and the orphan and the degraded, and seek the general amelioration of misery, they could not by far begin to offset or repay society at large for the ills inflicted by their brethren of your "true" church, in their saloons. As only 15 percent of the saloons are operated by unbelievers, infidels, etc., out of the total of about 60,000,000 non-church members in America, it seems to indicate that the influence of the Roman Church creates a social evil and an economic waste, and that the country would be better off without the Catholic church.

If the pope, by reason of his authority, can keep people from going to "false places of worship," keep them from reading books by heretics, and even prevent them from reading the law, history and theology of their own church, yet cannot keep them out of the liquor traffic, it is reasonable to suppose his motive is not for the good of Catholics, or people in general, in endeavoring to subject their minds to his will.

If you do not believe these conclusions to be natural deductions from the above, indicate the error.

No. 32: The *Ne Temere* decree of your church was enforced in America in 1908; non-Catholics believe your church becomes more insistent in its demands and efforts to enforce the decrees of the Vatican in proportion as it grows in numerical and political strength; if that is not true, please state why this decree was not ordered enforced in this country at an earlier period—say, for instance at the time of the Revolutionary or Civil Wars?

Answer: The reason that the *Ne Temere* decree was not put into effect throughout the United States until 1908 was because of the absence of a sufficient number of Catholic priests in this country to render the observance of its rules practical on the part of Catholics. The church is always solicitous not to enjoin upon her children a rule of conduct that would be generally a hardship and for this reason the rule requiring all Catholics who marry to come before a priest, was delayed until the number of priests were such as to make one available in most any part of the country at most any time.

CRITICISM

Your answer to this question is not only a tacit admission of the point suggested, but also an admission that your church is governed largely by "expediency" in the matter of enforcing its laws relative to "faith and practices," which is entirely in harmony with Leo XIII, who says, p. 132: "First and foremost it is the duty of all Catholics worthy of the name . . . to endeavor to bring back ALL civil society to the PATTERN AND FORM of Christianity We have described. It is barely possible to lay down any *fixed* method by which such purposes are to be obtained, because the MEANS adopted must suit PLACES and TIMES. . . . Nevertheless, above all things, *unity* of aim must be preserved, and similarity must be sought after in *all* plans of action."

During the past years, "in the absence of a sufficient number of Catholic priests," Catholics seemed to learn somehow, and retain the knowledge, that it was against the law of the church to read certain books or attend certain churches; but they did not know that the *Ne Temere* decree, like many others hidden from them in the canon laws of the church, perhaps was to be enforced as "expediency" may warrant.

Hildebrand, in the fourteenth century* passed a decree that forced priests and bishops to put away their wives and children—although he kept his concubines; the law then, being enforced, did not show that the church had much regard for her "children" in enforcing such hardships on them; so in the matter of the enforcement of the *Ne Temere* decree in 1908; if all those Catholics who lived, married and died in utter ignorance of that old decree of the Council of Trent, gave your church so little concern, acting on the same principle, the church should have made the law operative as to the future, and not retroactive; in making the law retroactive, many happy homes were either broken up, or its peace and harmony forever destroyed.

Tried by the rule of logic, reason and common sense, the Roman church in action impresses one of the necessity of searching for the hidden meaning in Jesuit phraseology and the ulterior motive of every act of the church as one would seek the hidden outlines of figures in a picture-puzzle: In arbitrarily enforcing the marriage law in 1908, the church showed no consideration for its "children" nor any regard for those who were allied with them by marriage according to the law of the land; therefore non-Catholics have a legitimate reason to seek for the ulterior and real motive of the church, and this seems to be the true solution: By letting that decree lie dormant several centuries, especially in non-Catholic States, religious

* This was a stenographic error; should read eleventh century.

prejudice would eventually die out; Catholic and non-Catholic would become closely associated in business, social, civil and political life, and by this, with inter-marriage, Catholicism would be interwoven into the very life of the nation to such an extent that, like fish in a net, at the command of the pope to enforce this decree, America would be pulled into the Roman Catholic church, or would give it such power and prestige as to make that church dominant in the political and civil life of the nation—hence, at about this time we find that all the Catholics in America federated, and a slogan thrown to the winds to “Make America Dominantly Catholic.” The Catholics and non-Catholics in this country, as in Germany in the fifteenth century, were living in peace and harmony, “until a sufficient number” of Jesuit priests came upon the scene of action; at that period in Germany there was practically one Catholic only to every nine Protestants—one percent Catholic—but that number, under the direction of a “sufficient” number of Jesuit priests, was “sufficient” to tear the country asunder with a long war and reign of bloodshed, and put Protestant Germany under the Roman church; in America they have six per cent population, organized and under the direction of that same “Society of Jesus” that devastated Germany (and, as many believe, instigated the present German Kaiser in his madness) and made the pope supreme, yet you say this federation had practically nothing to do with arousing an anti-Catholic spirit in this country: if that does not prove the efficiency of the Index, it seems to indicate Catholics do not believe non-Catholics capable of reasoning from cause to effect.

When a contention arises between individuals or nations, simple justice demands that each party thoroughly understand the issues involved—what each desires—in order to establish peace. With this idea in mind, as well as having a desire to know certain things by proof, I endeavored, by submitting a series of questions, to show some of the points of difference, as you had made a “Plea for Peace,” indicating what Protestants generally believe to be the “intention” of the Roman church, and to ascertain, *by the manner in which you answered*, if this belief was founded on fact, and if so, to what extent Catholic laymen understood, and would defend such “intention.” As witnesses, the testimony of you laymen and your general manner as witnesses, in connection with the fact that in regard to certain faith and practices there is an entire disagreement with established facts, tends to discredit the sincerity of your “Plea for Peace.”

A plea for peace in the political arena will fall on deaf ears, unless it is supported by an evident desire to remove, at least,

some of the elements of disagreement—which I fail to find in your answers.

The doctrine of "Intention" as well as the *Ne Temere* Decree* was adopted at the Council of Trent in the fifteenth century: in 1908, about 386 years later, it was enforced in all the States of this Union—enforced as soon as the Roman church became numerically or politically strong enough to do so; this proves that EVERY law of the Roman church, regardless of its nature or age, is essentially and vitally a part of its faith and practice, and that any one or all of them are to be enforced—when, to be determined by conditions, times and places—when "expedient," and the pope is to be the judge; now: non-Catholics know the inveterate hatred of Jesuitism to the free schools of America, and that it is the "intention" of the Roman church to destroy or control them, and bring all education under the control of that church—securing the child as a means of holding the adult—therefore, it is natural that, as Catholics are taught by the pope public schools are "godless" and to keep their children away from them as far as possible, the presence of Catholics in public schools as teachers, and the strenuous efforts of Catholics to get on school boards, oftentimes sending their children to parochial schools after getting on such boards, arouses a suspicion as to the ulterior motive on the part of the church in permitting its members to hold such positions.

Leo XIII prefers that Catholics associate with Catholics, to safeguard their faith and morals, and, according to the opinion of the church, Catholics are in danger of having their faith and morals corrupted in the public schools, *unless they are there for a purpose*, unknown even to Catholics, as in the matter of the *Ne Temere* decree. Some think the "intention" here is far-reaching: that in the course of time practically all the public schools of America will have Catholic teachers and school boards; about this time, the Roman church will have complete control of the army and navy (the regular army now being 33 percent and the navy 40 per cent Catholic), be in control of the police and fire departments, in all public offices of trust and influence, and control the Supreme Court benches of the States and Nation, after which the pope may order ALL Catholics wherever serving to TEACH THE CATECHISM along with the other studies, and being the gun-bearers of the nation, the church will be in position to enforce this decree, cost what it may in loss of life and property and money.

The Catholic church has the same "intention" to-day as it had a thousand years ago—if it seems to forget, or fails to enforce

* Should read the "Marriage Law," instead of "*Ne Temere* decree."

any one of its decrees, it is merely biding its time; and it is as much the duty of Catholic teachers to teach the Catholic religion to pupils as for Catholics to be married by a priest of Rome! This can not be denied by any Catholic who understands the faith and practice of his church.

If this is not a correct "guess" as to the "intention" of the church, under the direction of the Jesuits, I would appreciate your explanation of the presence of Catholics in the "godless" schools as teachers; and if this is not a better analysis of question 32 than your answer, in presenting what may be the policy or "intention" of your church kindly show me where I am wrong.

On a leaflet received from you, relative to marriage of non-Catholics, you quote Cardinal Antonello, Prefect of Rome, as saying: "The idea that Catholics are taught to believe that the marriage of Protestants are invalid and their children illegitimates is a hate-breeding idea, and it is a social crime to circulate such false and malicious belief." A cardinal, although holding a high position in the pope's household, can not speak for the pope—let him speak for himself, and then say who is spreading this "hate-breeding idea:" Speaking on "The Unity of the Church," on page 358 of the Great Encyclical Letters, Leo XIII says:

"The Church of Christ, therefore, is ONE AND THE SAME FOREVER; those who leave it depart from the will and command of Christ the Lord—leaving the path of salvation they enter on that of perdition. WHOSOEVER IS SEPARATED FROM THE CHURCH IS UNITED TO AN ADULTERESS."

Of course, here he is referring to things spiritual, nevertheless just as offensive, in considering all other churches as "prostitutes;" no comment is necessary.

Now, we will let him speak concerning marriage: "The Evils Affecting Modern Society," page 18, of the Great Encyclical Letters, published by Benziger Bros., Printers to the Holy See in America, New York:

"But when IMPIOUS LAWS, setting at naught the sanctity of this great sacrament, putting it (marriage) on the same footing with mere civil contracts, the lamentable result followed, that, outraging the dignity of Christian (papal) MARTIMONY, citizens made use of LEGALIZED CONCUBINAGE."

From utterances like these, from your church, spring those "hate-breeding ideas," that the church teaches that "the marriages of Protestants are invalid and their children illegitimates." These ideas seem to be well-founded—do you not think so?

Jesuit sophistry! Certainly, your cardinal is right, in a certain sense: for it stands to reason, that if this "concubinage" is "legalized," then children are "legitimates"—but your cardinal does not attempt to brush away what the church teaches, viz:

that though married according to civil law, such marriage is "only a rite or custom," says Leo, "introduced by the civil law."

It occurs to me that a "Plea for Peace" would be more effective, instead of devoting so much space to what outsiders say regarding the church, recounting what she has done in the past and how well Catholics have served the country, if such pleas should quote the popes, and explain what they are trying to teach.

Thundering down the ages of Time, to reverberate till time is lost in Eternity, "THOU SHALT" and "THOU SHALT NOT," the Immutable Law of God was given to man—applicable and of full force AT ALL TIMES, IN ALL PLACES, AND UNDER ALL CIRCUMSTANCES, with one divisional difference: before Christ came, the LETTER of the law was sufficient; after His advent both the letter and SPIRIT of the law must be obeyed—the OVERT ACT, and the COVERT "INTENTION" being of equal weight; but it seems to me that in its faith and practices, the Roman church endeavors to set aside that great fact, and enforce these mandates as may seem EXPEDIENT at different times and places, which places Catholics in a trying predicament occasionally in an effort to make times and places gibe with "expediency," as witness the following, wherein it appears that Bishop Keiley of Savannah got truth and "error" (?) so mixed that no Protestant knows whether he is telling the truth or otherwise. In a subsequent leaflet from your association, the following was printed as an excerpt from a Pastoral Letter of the Bishop:

"They accuse us of the worship of idols . . . and believing and teaching that no Protestant can be saved. We deny both of these false statements."

Is the bishop a Jesuit? Certainly, the church does not teach that Protestants *cannot* be saved—like any other heathen, all they have to do is, join the "only true church." Simple isn't it?

When a Catholic is speaking or writing for the purpose of concealing what the church teaches, or to prevent its "intention" from being made too manifest, especially to non-Catholics, the Jesuit art of mental reservation, or evasion of mind, is very subtle and useful: in direct contradiction of what the bishop is quoted as saying, I will now quote from Deharbe's "Full Catechism of Catholic Religion," censored by Cardinals Wiseman and McClosky, page 145, sub-topic "On Salvation in the True Church of Christ Alone:"

Qu. "64. If the Catholic church is to lead all men to salvation, and has, for that purpose, received from Christ her doctrine, her means of grace, and her power, what, for his part is *everyone* obliged to do? (Emphasis mine.)

Ans. "EVERYONE is OBLIGED, UNDER PAIN OF ETERNAL DAMNATION, to become a MEMBER of the CATHOLIC CHURCH, to BELIEVE her DOCTRINE, to USE her means of grace, and to SUBMIT to HER AUTHORITY."

As this doctrine is from a duly approved Catechism of the church, presumably intended for the exclusive use of the "faithful," it MUST be correct—at least, two cardinals approved it as true doctrine; therefore, it is evident you laymen misquoted the bishop, or, that the bishop needs to study his Catechism!

In your answer to question 22, you laymen have deliberately denied the faith, are at cross-purposes with your own bishop, Cardinal Gibbons, and your Catechism, regarding baptism; you have denied the doctrine of "Intention" which was adopted by the same Council that promulgated the marriage law of the church, which is recognized as valid and binding by Cardinal Gibbons and Pope Leo XIII;

Your own bishop, if you quoted him correctly, has made an attempt to mislead the people—

THEREFORE: If you attempt to maintain the answers you have rendered, and that I have treated at some length above, it is necessary for you to name the pope or general council as your authority—no lesser authority is competent to establish the truth of any matter; and such citations must be from duly authenticated documents—such as are taught the "faithful" as true Catholicism; any one else is unworthy of belief, as is evident from the foregoing answers to questions.

In conclusion, I will test the sincerity of your Association in regard to subject-matter of questions 2, 6, 7, 8, 9 and in general 19, by inviting you to deliver, first-hand, what your church teaches as a matter of faith and practice concerning these questions, in a series of lectures, to large, interested Macon audiences—your representative to speak as many nights as desired, but to be alternated by a non-Catholic showing why and what others believe to be the doctrine and teaching of the church relative to them; I will secure a hall for the purpose and pay all reasonable expenses of your representative while here for that business, raising the money, probably, by charging a nominal admission fee.

If you believe in free speech—and you say you do—this is your chance to prove it: to people who believe in the Constitution, any question that can not be discussed from every angle is viewed with distrust and considered unsafe.

If, by the exercise of his authority, the pope can estop you from responding to the innate promptings of manhood to accept this challenge to debate the questions, why should not non-Catholics

believe you would be obedient to your church in all things "that have already been taught, or that may hereafter be taught?"

I think you must agree with me, if I say your Association is a very unreliable source from which to secure information, and that it is even unsafe to put too much faith in what Bishop Keiley may say: all this, however, does not appear so strange, considering that the highest authority of your church, a pope, gets tangled while making *ex cathedra* utterances, viz: Leo XIII says: "A State is nothing but a multitude . . . which is its own master," p. 120, and that "Justice, therefore, forbids, and reason forbids, the State to be godless—namely, to treat the various religions (as they call them) alike, and bestow upon them promiscuously equal rights and privileges. Since, then, the profession of ONE religion is necessary in the *State*, THAT religion must be professed which ALONE is true," p. 260, supporting that "truth" with the further assertion that "the Catholic religion . . . is alone the TRUE religion," p. 200, and to prove the truth of his contention, cites from the Syllabus of Errors of Pope Pius IX, which teach that it is an error to say that "The Church must be separated from the State, and the State from the Church."

From the foregoing it is evident that this is a "godless" nation, because it will not sign an agreement with the pope to banish all others and make Roman Catholicism the religion of State—as a "godless" nation, it has been in existence long enough to be considered a "government," yet Leo contradicts himself, saying: "Whatsoever the form of government, the authority is from God!" A "godless" nation, receiving its authority from "God"! If popes, cardinals, bishops and laymen can not make the faith and practices of the church harmonize, how can they teach others the doctrine of the church?

Leo XIII further asserts that "Whosoever is separated from the church is united to an adulteress;" now, according to him—the highest authority in the church—Roman Catholics are taught that, because America has not signed a concordat with the Vatican excluding all other religions and secret orders, and placing all education in the hands of priests and nuns, our American civilization "is nothing but a WORTHLESS IMITATION and a meaningless name," p. 12; it is nothing but a "multitude" and "godless," being "united to an adulteress"—a nation whose wives and mothers are "legalized" *concubines*—yet, and notwithstanding all this, it gets its authority from God! p. 315. He is as self-contradictory as some of his "children" are with each other and with the church, as shown in the foregoing pages; contradictions and chaos, from laymen to pope!

Well and truly does the pope look upon Catholics as "children" and the "faithful," for it requires an abounding "faith"

to accept whatsoever your church proposes, and believe it merely by reason of the authority of religious superiors, who exact it.

ADDENDUM

REMARKS ON MARRIAGE AND UNITY OF TEACHING

According to one's judgment, in matters that pertain to the accomplishing of an object—which in itself is right—he may be governed by "expediency;" to illustrate the point: If I should have an urgent professional call to Atlanta, I would first consider when the next train left; if there were no trains in several hours, I would consider the condition of the highway for automobile travel; I would deem it "expedient" to wait for the next train, or go by auto, as the case may be, in answer to the call—but professional ethics would prevent me from deciding the matter of answering the call by resorting to "expediency."

The Great God has issued a call to Man through His Son, saying: "Come unto me:" how to answer the call, is laid down in His Word; expediency may govern an individual's movements—how best to respond to the call, but it can have no modifying influence upon the call.

The papal church claims to be Christian; if it is, the "call" it makes to the outsider must be as the call of Christ, UNIFORM, and unswervingly true to the Word wherever preached or declared: now, let us see if we can find the mark of UNIFORMITY in the Roman church, and if the "expediency" to which it resorts tends to establish the claim of being the only true church established by Jesus Christ:

In America and elsewhere, when non-Catholics are in the majority, they are usually referred to as "our separated brethren," and men like Mr. Farrell send out slips, without an imprimatur, saying that "The idea that Catholics are taught to believe that marriages of Protestants are invalid and their children illegitimate is a hate-breeding idea, and it is a social crime to circulate such false and malicious belief." In this connection, I will quote from "Dr. Dozier's Reply to Mr. (priest) Coyle":

"In the appendix of Ripalda's Catechism, published at Barcelona, Spain, November 10, 1910, bearing the imprimatur of the Vicar General, Jose Palmorola, the following is set forth for the papist youth to learn:

"Question: What is the matrimony which is called civil?

"Answer: That which is celebrated by a civil authority without any ecclesiastical intervention whatever.

"Question: Is civil matrimony true matrimony?

"Answer: No, but base concubinage.

"Question: Why?

"Answer: Because true matrimony should be celebrated by

the ecclesiastical authority, fulfilling likewise all which has been ordained by Jesus Christ and our Holy Mother Church!'"

That this is true Catholic doctrine as to matrimony will be proved by referring to the Canon Law on the subject cited elsewhere. The Roman church, through Jesuitical casuistry, like a weather-cock, adjusts itself, apparently, to conditions over which it has no control; but to know what is the *truth* relative to any phase of Catholicism, *go to the law which makes Catholics*—read the doctrine it commands them to believe; a priest or layman is permitted to make such answer in any case as will best serve the church, but *no one* can gainsay the *law* on the subject.

2

LAYMEN'S REPIES TO CRITICISMS

WITH THE

AUTHOR'S COMMENTS

The Catholic Laymen's Association of Georgia acknowledged receipt of my objections to their answers presented in the foregoing pages, as follows:

Augusta, Ga., Sept. 20, 1917.

Mr. C. A. Yarbrough,
American National Bank Bldg.,
Macon, Ga.

Dear Sir: Your letter of September 7th with your objections to my answers to your previous questions, is noted.

While most all you say has been argued to us in much the same way by other correspondents, none of them have assembled so many assertions, denials, assumptions, challenges, in one communication. You have thus presented the anti-Catholic contention in a way that furnishes a rather helpful index to the anti-Catholic mind.

On the basis of what you say, our "Plea for Peace" can be renewed, and every answer formerly made can be reaffirmed with confidence and truth. Because, since we now understand you better, there is some hope of our being able to make you understand us, not saying however, that you will agree with us, which is not at all necessary for "peace."

You will no doubt consent to my discussing your paper in installments, writing you each day or two as opportunity affords consideration, apart from other matters, of what you have to say.

Anticipating no dissent from you on this score, allow me to hope that you will not take anything I say amiss, nor set up a barrier to our better understanding of one another, until the conclusion.

I shall write again tomorrow.

Very truly yours,

JJF/MOC

J. J. FARRELL, Mgr.

COMMENT BY AUTHOR

Having "furnished a rather helpful index to the anti-Catholic mind," I have a right to expect clear, true, authoritative answers and explanations concerning the questions discussed. That the letters from Mr. Farrell, who acts in an official capacity for the Roman Catholic church, will "furnish a rather helpful index" to the nature and spirit of Catholicism, I firmly believe.

Of the Thrity-Two Questions, fully twenty-five vitally concern every American citizen.

This official association says that "agreement" is not necessary to "peace." I do not believe peace can be established on any other basis; there are certain questions, like No. 13, for instance,

which **MUST** be answered and some sort of agreement reached relative thereto on the part of the Catholic church, *and these questions must be understood by Americans.*

Whether or not the series of letters from the Laymen's Association offer such explanations of dogmas and laws sufficiently to permit of that understanding necessary to establish peace between the different forces will be left for the intelligent reader to determine for himself.

For brevity and to conserve space, I will omit my name and address in quoting the letters received from the Association, and begin them by using the date lines; I may also use the word "association" or "Farrell" interchangeably in place of the full name of the association.

Immaterial errors which crept into the correspondence of all parties will be corrected, if it can be done without interfering with the sense of the text, or where I am reasonably sure of what was intended to be said, as this is a discussion of principles instead of a contest in grammar or rhetoric.

Augusta, Ga., Sept. 21, 1917.

Dear Sir: Before approaching the matter of your letter in serial order, if you will permit me some general observations it will probably assist in the premises.

Our association was not formed for evangelical purposes. We are not trying to convert the non-Catholics of Georgia to our faith. We wish them to understand what we believe, but do not expect them to believe as we do, though, of course, we could not be very earnest in our faith and not be glad when anyone agrees with us; only,—agreement is not necessary to understanding.

I hope you will accept this as a frank and true statement of our aims. I can gain nothing by deceiving you, and you nothing by suspecting me of deceit. Suspicion has no place in our interchanges; it is a shield for ignorance, a sign of fear, uncertainty and doubt. It is the root of more misunderstandings in the world perhaps than any other one thing. And I abjure it.

So you can take my word for it, man to man; we plead not for agreement, much less for surrender or compromise; but only that you understand us.

JJF/MOC

Yours very truly,

J. J. FARRELL, Mgr.

COMMENT

While it may be impossible for non-Catholics and Roman Catholics to agree on matters of religious dogma to the extent that one may be willing to embrace the faith of the other, it goes without saying, that the questions submitted to the association were not for the purpose, primarily, of ascertaining what Catholics believe, from a theological standpoint, but rather, to what extent that church requires its members to strive to bring about conditions favorable to the Roman church, which would be detri-

mental to the welfare of those who are not of that faith, and if they are in conscience bound to follow the teaching of the church where its "faith and practices" conflict with the Constitution of the United States.

If a Roman Catholic is taught, by the priesthood on the authority of the pope, that a glass of wine and a plate of bread can be turned—every separate drop, and crumb—into the Body of the Living Christ, and that he must eat it to be saved, I am sure a non-Catholic would not object to that dogma; but if there is reason to believe, from the history and laws of the church, and the general attitude of Catholics to-day, that they are expected to exert themselves, and use such means as their superiors may designate, to force others to accept their faith, then it becomes necessary for Catholics to answer a question on that phase of the subject, and prove that such is not the case; and, for it to be a *true* answer, it must be founded upon the utterances of the one who had the *power and authority* to decree laws requiring this attitude on the part of the "faithful," that is, a pope or council of the church.

Augusta, Ga., Sept. 24, 1917.

Dear Sir: Having put by suspicion, we take up trust,—the practice, the habit, the necessity of trust.

Trust is a distinctive mark of higher civilization, as suspicion is a mark of savagery. Its practice extends with intelligence, the habit grows with peace, the necessity presses with the multiplication of social relations. Trust is the soul of the social body.

You may trust one person, I another; you one faith, I another. But we both trust somebody, is the point, and because you do not trust what I trust should not cause one of us to think that the other is either crooked or crazy. And since none can live in society without trust, and it being contrary to the nature of things to *compel* TRUST, fellow-citizens must either respect each other or despise each other, and let it go at that.

Of course, respect for each other, where it is possible, is much more sensible, comfortable, gentlemanlike, much more civilized, if you please, than the contrary sentiment, and we ought to cultivate it as much as we can, with due respect for ourselves.

The bearing of these commonplace thoughts, where not obvious now, will appear later; in the meantime do not think I am trying to be pendantic.

Very truly yours,

JJF/MOC

J. J. FARRELL, Mgr.

COMMENT

"Trust" is where one places confidence in the integrity, veracity, justice, and friendship of another; so, before you can exercise this noble sentiment, it is necessary to learn the past record—history—of the party or institution, the regard shown for veracity, intention, and objective of the one desiring to win "trust"—it must rest on merit.

Do people distrust the Roman Catholic church and its members? (The Roman church is composed of two factors, (1) the "Teaching Church" or Pope, and (2) the "Hearing Church" or laymen.) The Hearing Church is directed and governed by the Teaching Church, and if distrust attaches to a member thereof, it is because of his relation to the "Teacher"—the "Teacher" being responsible for the distrust, if it cannot be removed; yet the "Hearer" can not be blameless, *unless it can be shown that he is not a party to the intention of the teacher in spirit or in deed.*

If Roman Catholics are distrusted, is it merely because they are Catholics, or because they are a necessary part of a system whose written LAW, history, and declared objective render them unworthy of trust?

Granting that the Roman church is viewed with suspicion—that its seeming friendliness toward the American democratic form of government and the free institutions and customs erected on the rights guaranteed by the supreme law of the land—then, it is logical to expect those supporting that system of religion to show, as far as they can, that such suspicion is not founded on fact and answer a fair question without equivocation, as a primary basis for meriting "trust."

A cursory scansion of history's pages shows a black picture drawn years ago when the Roman church was the religion of State in France, "The Massacre on St. Bartholomew's Day," when the Huguenots—French Protestants—"trusted" the Catholics; how was it repaid? Thousands of men, women and children slain in cold blood—all defenceless, unarmed!

John Huss put his "trust" in the guarantee of a Catholic King's safe pass-port to attend the Council of Constance, which council passed a decree to the effect that Catholics were to "Keep no faith with heretics"—which has never been repealed—and Huss was burnt at the stake by the church, to the everlasting shame and disgrace of Emperor Sigmund, because he, Huss, would not subscribe to all that the "Teaching" church "proposed for belief."

The massacre of the Huguenots so pleased the pope of Rome that he had a special medal made in commemoration of the event—the German Kaiser also had a medal struck to perpetuate the glorious (?) deed of his subjects in sinking the Lusitania!

Augusta, Ga., Sept. 25, 1917.

Dear Sir: Now, a bit of logic.

It sins against the law of correct thinking to argue from particular cases to a general principle; to say, for example, that because Catholics are obedient in a few things, therefore, they must be obedient in everything; or that because the pope is infallible in some things, therefore he must be infallible in all things.

It offends logic also, to judge truth by error. Error is judged by truth. The examination and rejection of many errors may leave one still far from the truth of a question. The examination and acceptance of the truth closes the matter and makes unnecessary the examination of errors in connection.

Having accepted the Bible story of Creation as true, for instance, that dispenses with the necessity of reading the Book of the East, the Vedas, the Zenda Vesta, and many other mystical or fanciful accounts of the beginning of the world, to learn the truth about creation. Truth is one, exclusive, inexorable.

We shall presently have use for these inflexible rules of right reason,

Very truly yours,

JJF/MOC

J. J. FARRELL, Mgr.
M. O. C.

COMMENT

By the consideration of "particular cases" we determine whether a general principle is good or bad, or, establish a fact; to illustrate: we argue, from particular cases, that the general principle of the liquor traffic is bad; to Newton, the falling of the apple was a particular case, from which he argued the existence of a fixed principle; observing the particular case of steam issuing from the coffee-pot, Watts argued a general principle, which gave us our steam-cars. Were it not for particular cases demonstrating an hitherto unknown fact, we would forever remain ignorant of the "general principle."

Mr. Farrell implies that Catholics are not obedient to the pope in all things, and that the pope is not supposed to be infallible in all things; *if not obedient, they do not "trust" the pope*, and should not object that non-Catholics distrust him in *all* things; but it can not be proved that Catholics are not required to be as obedient to the pope's *fallible directing power*—from which they get their *law*—as they are to his *infallible definitive prerogative*—from which they derive their *faith*: in the exercise of either power, he can require Catholics to do that which would cause resistance on the part of others, the invasion of their Constitutional rights, for instance—which is arguing from a particular case to a general principle.

It is only by the closest examination, oftentimes, that truth may be distinguished from error, both in physical and spiritual things; otherwise, it would be impossible for the devil to appear as an angel of light and deceive the very elect of God—and this is arguing from a particular case to a general principle. The Biblical injunction is, "try" or "examine" all things, and to "hold fast that which is good;" if error or things false did not exist, all would be correct or true, in which case there would be no necessity for an examination; for instance, an Indian, ignorant of relative values, would part with his wares for a piece of cut-

glass, or a negro relieved of his hard-earned money; and it is the unsophisticated only who would consider it unnecessary to examine a glittering, shimmering stone before investing in it; the thinking, studious, reasoning being knows there are false and true stones, so the "diamond" is put to the "test," and if the *natural law* does not convince his reason, he will not be duped into purchasing a worthless stone.

If we accept the Bible story of Creation, we must necessarily believe that the Creator endowed Adam's race with reason; without that, man would be only as an animal in the world, indifferent alike to the fact of creation, and its purpose, and he could in no manner be held responsible for his eternal destiny—no honest minded person will deny this proposition: we acknowledge the presence of sin in the world, and know that Truth and Error confront man at every step, which can be distinguished only by the exercise of reason and a knowledge of the Word of God.

On the other hand, if one asserts that he is in possession of the Truth, and such assertion is questioned, a refusal to be examined or to examine implies a doubt (1) that he is not sure he has the Truth, or (2) that while he believes God gave him the Truth, he is not certain that he was endowed with sufficient reason and intelligence to distinguish between error and Truth, and prefers to go along with what he has—it matters not if the stone is cut-glass, he is satisfied, so why worry? Moses furnished a logical example illustrative of this point: He was positive his was the only true God, but if he had failed to throw down his rod, which became a snake and swallowed the rods of the Egyptian Magicians, he could have argued with Paraoth until this day, and not have impressed him with unproved assertions. "Prove all things" demands the Bible of Reason. This is also arguing from a particular case to establish a general principle, and does not sin against the law of correct thinking—unless we agree with Leo XIII, who taught, by inference, that God did not endow man with the power or right to THINK and REASON.

Elijah was sure he possessed the true religion, and did not hesitate to put it to the "test" before reasoning beings—in the *examination*, the pagan priests and people were overcome by Truth; David believed he had the true religion, and did not hesitate to attack Goliath with a sling and a little stone. Darkness can never destroy light, neither can error prevail against Truth; were this not true, Christ would not have come into the world, because the devil would have vanquished Him; but, because the devil was in the world, He came to overcome him and teach man how to do likewise.

The pope of Rome says he possesses the Truth—in fact, is holding the place of God Almighty on earth as Christ's Vice-Gerent,

yet he dares any one of his cardinals, archbishops, bishops, priests or laymen to imitate Moses, Elijah, or David, and will not himself imitate the Christ!

"The examination," says Mr. Farrell, "and acceptance of the truth closes the matter and makes unnecessary the examination of errors in connection. Having accepted the Bible story of creation, as true, for instance, that dispenses with the necessity of reading the Book of the East, the Vedas, the Zenda Vesta—"

To a Catholic, that is good logic; it closes the matter to those who live and act under "authority" of superiors, but it means nothing to me, when I know Roman priests are *supposed* to be trained to preach Christ, yet spend six years more or less memorizing pagan literature: Homer, Socrates, Lyncurgus, Alexander, Lucretia, Regulus, Virgil, Horace, Cicero, Tacitus, Caesar, Xenophon, Demosthenes, Brutus, Jupiter, Minerva, Mars, Diana and the like, which INDELLIBLY impress paganistic principles on the mind, then devote about six years wrestling with the "writings of the holy fathers,"—whom they can not reconcile with each other—and then at ordination swear "I will never interpret Holy Scripture except according to the *unanimous* (!) consent of the holy fathers,"* which oath effectually renders the Bible a "closed" book to both priest and people; it is in reality a "closed" book to Catholics, which cannot be opened or examined except as directed by the pope; closed also by having to spend their time with the "fathers" and ancient paganism instead of the Bible. Do they find Christ in that literature, or Roman Catholicism in embryo?

Do Protestants read this ancient literature? Certainly; but they also study the Bible: with the cut-glass placed beside the diamond, its scintillating beauty is proved, and its value demonstrated to the discerning mind by the comparison.

The story of the Cross can not be learned from ancient paganism, but from the Bible, a book apparently read less than any other in a priest's preparation to tell that "Story."

Who makes the "examination" that "closes" a question to Catholics? The pope. If Roman Catholicism did not claim the right and try to enforce this principle relative to non-Catholics, there would be no grounds for friction; but that church teaches its members that they sin against "holy mother church" if they do not resent any discussion of questions pronounced "closed" by their pope, and time was, and the church now teaches in its law, that offenders should be haled before priestly tribunals and tortured. They can not now, in America, burn people at the stake

* *"Item sacram Scripturam iuxta eum sensum, quem tenuit et tenet sancta mater Ecclesia, cujus est iudicare de vero sensu et interpretatione sacrarum Scripturarum, admitto; nec etiam unquam nisi iuxta unanimum consensum Patrum accipiam et interpretabor."*

for "opening" a matter "closed" by the pope, but they show the *same spirit of their fathers in the faith*—not by meeting the issues in debate, but by boycott, slander, etc. I know of instances where these methods have been resorted to. Who is responsible for this? Priests of Rome, whose minds are submerged—owl-like in a forest—in the dense blackness of a "faith and practice" foisted on the world when the pope was supreme. Left to themselves, Catholic laymen would be true friends, loyal citizens, and an asset to a country: *America must reckon with the papal church.*

Augusta, Ga., Set. 26, 1917.

Dear Sir: You say in the letter transmitting your paper that you "deem it the duty of every citizen, to investigate all questions that may affect him, his family, or his neighbor, whether social, political, religious or otherwise."

This statement means that you consider every citizen bound to examine into all matters, religious or otherwise, that affect his neighbor, which would seem to run counter to what might be termed the American principle of everybody minding his own business.

I probably would not have caught this broad meaning, as you probably did not intend to say so much, had not your paper rather emphasized it in many places where you treat matters that touch Catholics only and have not even an indirect bearing on those outside the fold.

Of which more later, this being merely to call your attention to the American rule that says, "Don't butt in."

Very truly,

JJF/MOC

J. J. FARRELL, Mgr.
M. O. C.

COMMENT

During the period of the world's darkest days, which, though, was the glorious noontide of the Roman church, it probably meant certain death for any person—from the king who held his throne and subjects by the grace of the pope—to investigate any question quoted from my letter in the first paragraph. During the Dark Ages, rulers were little better than vassals of the pope; ruling as by "right divine," the pope considered it his prerogative to take care of all such matters, hence, neither king nor pope ever bothered himself in a broad sense with the question, "Am I my brother's keeper?"

I cannot concur in the association's interpretation of what constitutes the "American principle." This being a democracy—where the people shape their own destiny, make their own laws which define where the rights of the one stop and the other's begin—no person is fit for citizenship, nor should it be granted, unless he uses his franchise, and also strives, for the advancement of the common interests of the country. This is the dis-

tinguishing characteristic of freemen; it differentiates the condition always obtaining where the absolutism of "divine right" ruling popes and kaisers prevails, and if one is not interested in all those things which affect him and his neighbor, he may fit well into the scheme of papalism, but not into the plan of American democracy.

No doubt the able writer for the association, being trained in parochial schools, believes he announced the correct American principle; but in the free schools of the State, pupils are taught that the destiny of the nation will be committed into their keeping; that each one is to become an integral part of the future governmental structure and, to be true to the best interests of themselves and the nation, they **MUST** understand and be interested in every question that would affect society. Those not appreciating this doctrine, are as emery dust in the wheels of progress—they are as dumb brutes, to be driven hither and thither according to the will of a master; under such conditions, it becomes a crime to think, or to make known one's thoughts.

My paper was addressed to the Catholic Laymen's Association on its published invitation—an association that was organized, ostensibly, for the purpose of diffusing information, first-hand, as to what Catholics believe, their rights, etc.; no other sect or secret order maintains a bureau of this kind; they do not need it; so why should my paper not have a "broad" meaning, and treat of matters relative to Catholics only? No other people claiming to be citizens in America owe allegiance to a foreigner, who demands, as a matter of faith and practice, that they must strive to destroy the Constitution of the United States and supplant it with papal law; I know of no "church" except the Roman that would restrict those Constitutional rights or attempt to exert an influence to force the minds of citizens through the narrow groove carved by the will of a foreigner, who presumes to have the "divine right" to rule and govern the people of the universe; and his followers on this continent need not be surprised that questions are raised that relate to them exclusively as a sect, but which concern all other citizens.

The association has defined certain "correct rules" of logic and thinking (see letter Sept. 25); it also invited, through the press and mails, questions on what Catholics believe; but it seems that if a question is propounded that is not found in the Catechism—although in the *Corpus Juris* (the official code of the church)—he violates the "American rule" which is, "Don't butt in." This may illustrate the "broad" papal principle, that you should not ask questions, even if the pope's church seems to invite them; evidently it is the duty of Romanists to leave all questions concerning their welfare in the hands of the "holy fathers," who prepare *questions and their answers for the faith-*

ful. Correct papal "logic" and "thinking" as I understand the proposition.

The thirty-two questions asked the Catholic Lawmen's Association were for the purpose of learning, if possible, the attitude of the papal church and its members to the principles of Americanism as defined by the Constitution; that the association has utterly failed to answer any important question correctly, according to evidence secured from other sources, will be apparent from a perusal of the letters. In a way, however, the whole list is inadvertantly answered, by inference, in the second paragraph of Farrell's letter; the church teaches, and Catholics must believe, that it is fundamentally wrong and presumptuous for one to consider any question arising under faith and morals—which cover social, political, economic and religious matters—as they are questions which the pope "examines" for all the world, and then legislates for the purpose of enforcing his findings.

I hold it to be self-evident that a person who does not feel and manifest a *personal* interest in all those questions is temperamentally, if not mentally, incapacitated to properly discharge the duties devolving upon American citizens, especially if it can be proved that such person is DIRECTED by a FOREIGNER who claims *temporal or spiritual* jurisdiction over him, as there is bound to be a conflict sooner or later between the requirements of the Constitution and the will of the foreigner. I believe it will be conclusively shown herein that one owing a dual allegiance is incompetent to sit on juries, or in any manner assist in making or administering the laws of a democratic country. This, I know, is a "broad" assertion; but not more so than the above inference demands.

If, in the course of time, owing to the indifference of those whose duty it is to defend them, the public schools of this country should be controlled by the papal church, everyone would be trained in the papal idea as to what constitutes "correct" thinking and "right" rules of logic, which would indeed be an ideal condition for the Church of Rome. Can it be true that the Roman Catholic schools in America are thus training millions of children, who are to have a voice in the affairs of this nation? We shall see, as we progress with these letters.

Augusta, Ga., Sept. 29, 1917.

Dear Sir: Regarding the Index—

You seem to imagine that Catholics read the Index every morning; that they all have pocket editions which they must consult every time they see a newsboy coming.

Had you ever thought how much simpler it would be for the church, if her "intention" were what you seem to think, instead

of pointing out to her children what alone they should NOT read, for her to specify what alone they should read?

When one wishes to CONTROL a person, and not leave that person free, one does not say "Don't do this, or this, or this;" but "DO that, or that, or that." When one wishes to direct a person, however, yet leave that person free, one pursues exactly the opposite course, specifying just what is not to be done and leaving all matters not specified open to the choice of the individual. This latter is the way the Index works. Catholics are free to read anything not specified in its 'rules' and prohibited. Before you can condemn the Index, therefore, as being opposed to knowledge, you must know that the particular matter it specifies is necessary to knowledge.

If the converse were true; if Catholics were not allowed to read anything unless it be found on the Index, you might condemn it off-hand, as we condemn Mohammed for burning the Alexandrian library on the theory: "If the books contain the truth, it is in the Koran, and they are useless; if not the truth, they are worse than useless."

Now, with these obviously correct principles in mind, will you be good enough to point out a single book on the Index that is necessary to the full knowledge of any useful subject?

If you cannot do this, your condemnation of the Index is without reason.

Very truly.

J. J. FARRELL, Mgr.

COMMENT

The pope of Rome declares he is the supreme teacher of all that pertains to "FAITH AND MORALS." Everything that is worth while in life pertains to faith and morals; to have and hold a vice-like grip on his subjects, throughout the whole world, and to enable him to DIRECT, CONTROL and DETERMINE their faith and morals, the pope established the Index; from early infancy on through life the principle of the Index is impressed upon the mind and conscience of a Catholic by priest and parochial school teacher, which forbids reading any book or periodical treating of any question relative to faith and morals, and, consequently, a newsboy, or a book dealer, will never make a sale to a Catholic if the paper or book discusses any question involving faith and morals; certainly, a Catholic will not buy it, if therein a non-Catholic discusses the religion of the pope.

Not only has the pope specifically indicated what Catholics "should NOT read," but he has also indicated what they may read. The *Index Librorum Prohibitorum* contains the list of books which Catholics can NOT read, while the *Index Expurgatorius* is a list of books which may be read in expurgated editions only, that is "trimmed" to suit what the pope conceives to be for the best interest of Catholic faith and morals; the most objectionable feature of the Index, however, is to be found in

the Canon Law on the subject, which absolutely forbids Catholics to have in their possession or read publications of any character that treat on any phase of faith and morals without first submitting such to the censorship demanded by the RULES of the Index; to make sure Catholics have permission to read any given publication, the imprimatur of a designated church authority must be displayed therein, which indicates to Catholics that they may read it. If this does not make the church say "DO that, or that, or that," I admit a misunderstanding of the "intention" of the Index; Leo taught: "What we are bound to DO, and what we are NOT to do," are laid down by the pope.

The papal church condemned as heretical and unscriptural the Copernican theory of astronomy—after the world had accepted the teaching of scholars for two hundred years, the Roman church withdrew its condemnation, and that theory was then "open" for Catholic investigation! Copernicus, Kepler, Foscarini and Galileo knew more than the pope, which was unfortunate for them, but it took that church two hundred years to acknowledge it. Joan of Arc was burnt as a heretic, but later made a saint by the church that put her to death!

The commands of God say, "DO THIS," and "DON'T DO THAT." Having created and endowed man with Reason—giving him a mind to think, and a will to do, which makes him a free moral agent—God indicates what course a man must follow to please Him; unlike the pope, however, He has never attempted to FORCE or COERCE His creature; man must accept or reject.

I can see no essential difference between the Mohammedan reason for burning the Alexandrian library and the papal reason for the Index; and, instead of pointing out "a single book on the Index," *I point out the Index itself*. At the beginning of the Dark Ages a library of priceless literature was destroyed by the pope, after which Reason was locked in human hearts, and it was death to let the pope know the mind contemplated anything save what he desired.

God made man in His own image, endowing him with Reason and the five senses to enable him to make a successful pilgrimage on earth and safeguard the destiny of his never-dying soul; therefore, man is rightly termed the masterpiece of God's handiwork. The Index presumes either to improve on God's work, or to complete what He had improperly left unfinished: an animal is DIRECTED by a blind-bridle, not by Reason; by the bridle, it is turned or driven in any direction to suit the *purpose* of the driver, the blind being to prevent it from becoming frightened at harmless objects which it cannot understand, as well as to prevent it from becoming interested in things that do not interest its DRIVER; the INDEX is the BLIND-BRIDLE the pope of

Rome places on the intellect, and his decrees are the lines by which he *directs* his subjects.

The papal Index fetters man's reasoning and intellectual faculties; it seeks to defeat the very purpose for which Reason was given. To me, it appears as if the pope has attempted to build an impenetrable wall around the Intellect to prevent man from knowing both good and evil, which necessarily destroys individual, personal responsibility—or free moral agency—which renders man objectively nothing more in the sight of God than a stone or a tree or an animal. God recognized the principle of free moral agency in the Garden of Eden, when He let Adam and Eve decide for themselves whether they would obey Him or the devil; and if God made an error in establishing this particular principle, I am sure an Italian pope cannot reverse it after the lapse of five thousand years. In choosing to obey the devil rather than God, Adam separated the Creature from his Creator; to bridge the chasm was the purpose of the Christ on Golgotha: the Index appears to be a substitute for the Cross and Hill of Skulls.

A marked characteristic of paganism is, it seeks to destroy that which is not of it, and those who refuse submission to its code. In the "General Decrees Concerning the Prohibition of Books," the Constitution of Pope Leo XIII, c. 3, dec. 8, I find the following as to reading:

"All versions of the Holy Bible, in any vernacular language, made by non-Catholics, are prohibited." (39): "Censors . . . should put away all attachment to their particular country, family, school, or institute . . . they must keep nothing before their eyes but the Dogmas of Holy Church, and the common Catholic doctrine as contained in the decrees of General Councils, the Constitutions of the Roman Pontiffs, and the unanimous teaching of the Doctors of the Church."

According to this Constitution, defining the "rules" of the Index, that governs every Catholic writer or censor, the pope attempts to close—and may as well burn, so far as Romanists are concerned—every book in the world, except those written or censored according to this decree; so vital is this censorship, that even a newspaper will be boycotted if it permits a discussion of faith and morals in its columns—especially if it be from a comparative viewpoint.

At ordination a priest swears to interpret Holy Scripture according to the "unanimous" consent of the holy fathers—hence to him the Bible is a "closed" book; to the person who depends upon the priest for spiritual direction and forgiveness of sin, the Bible has no meaning; so in truth, as is taught by the "holy" fathers, the Roman church may dispense with the Bible altogether yet be Christian by following the "Traditions of Men,"

which have been elevated to the same plane for veneration as the Word of God—the Bible! the *one book* on the Index “that is necessary to the full knowledge of any useful subject” in life, a knowledge of which Catholics can not have except as it is sifted through papal censorship.

Augusta, Ga., Oct. 1, 1917.

Dear Sir: If Catholics are satisfied with their belief and practices, you ought to be satisfied without them.

Except, of course, insofar as they affect you in your social relations and rights, which is not the case in such matters as confession, convents, celibacy of priests, and others that you treat.

We use the confessional; you are not asked to use it. Our daughters enter the convents, yours are not asked to enter them. The priests minister to our spiritual wants, not yours. If we are not displeased with these things, you ought not to be worried. If you are content without them, pray let us be content with them.

Where our belief and practices touch matters common to all citizens, all have an interest and a duty, as you say.

And we are ready to stand up and be counted.

Very truly yours,

JJF/MOC

J. J. FARRELL, Mgr.

COMMENT

The association does not consider such matters as the confessional, convents, priestly celibacy, etc., as questions that affect society in common, which is equivalent to saying that, as long as my family and my neighbor are not in the immediate zone of, or suffering from, some malignant disease, which may become epidemic if not restricted, I should be satisfied. Mr. Farrell has advanced that idea before, as being the American principle which says, “Don’t butt in.”

If the Roman church could, she would force all people in America to make use of those “means of grace” above mentioned, and, with our children in parochial schools, in less than a century this republic would be a candidate for bottom place against Roman Catholic Austria, Spain, Bulgaria, Mexico, Cuba, Ireland, and other countries where the pope presumes to DIRECT the minds of men.

No person can come out of the confessional as free as before entering it; no one can come out of it, according to priests who quit that church, as pure as when they went in, for the very simple reason, among others, that no form of idolatry can aid in the advancement of faith and morals: “Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them or serve them” was heard above the thunders of Mount Sinai; Rome forces her devotees to bow down and confess to a creature, while in doing penance they are serving that creature, thus vitiating the Atoning Blood of Christ; however, I make no special point on these questions of Catholic faith

and practices; if Catholics do not object to these things, so far so good; but history and the condition of other peoples to-day show the evil nature of these matters on society as a whole, where they know more about the pope than they do of God, and I and my fellow-citizens are concerned with the fact that the same authority that enjoins these dogmas and decrees also declares it has the right to force me and mine to submit to and observe them, under pain of eternal damnation, as well as removal from the earth by death.

It is a strange fatality that a consumptive resents the suggestion that he is suffering with a disintegrating malady, and that he can spread it! Others recognize it by its *history* and its *results*, and know it is *deadly and contagious*.

The confessional, convents and celibacy are among the strongest links forged in the chain that binds subjects to the papal propaganda for a world-wide supremacy. Every Roman Catholic is committed to this papal ideal and its consummation; therefore I unhesitatingly state that I believe the Roman church to be a menace to civil and religious freedom in America, which is the foundation of my opposition to those articles of faith and practice, for, if the pope decrees their observance, Catholics must obey; if they believe they are right, they are bound to strive for their propagation; and in this, they become and forever remain a disturbing element in the political and civil affairs of the nation.

"We are ready to stand up and be counted," said Mr. Farrell; very well, stand up, Mr. Farrell; and, as you seem to be at the head of the class, I will ask you to turn to the "Thirty-Second Edition" of the "Manual of Christian Doctrine" "Comprising Dogma, Moral, and Worship, Authorized English Edition, 'Revised in Accordance with the Code of 1918,'" and read aloud so that all Americans can hear you, what your pope requires you to "stand" for, as found on page 132. Hear him, my fellow-countrymen: "Question 120: Has the State the right and the duty to proscribe schism and heresy?" and the answer is: "Yes, it has the right and the duty to do so both for the good of the nation and for that of the faithful themselves; for religious unity is the principal foundation of social unity."

Very clearly read and stated, Mr. Farrell; while you are up, turn to the word "Proscribe" in the dictionary and give its definition, so that all America can hear you: "*To condemn, as to death; to put out of the protection of the law; to outlaw; to denounce and condemn; to interdict; to prohibit.*" Who is it that is to be put out of the protection of the law—to be outlawed? Any one who refuses to believe in the confessional, convents, priestly celibacy, etc., or any other law or dogma of the church,

in the interest of all which the association declares "we are ready to stand up and be counted." So Catholics say, so the pope teaches, so I believe.

These issues will receive further consideration as we progress.

Augusta, Ga., Oct. 3, 1917.

Dear Sir: You intimate in your letter of transmission that Catholics are "barred by the Index from reading the history of your (our) church, its laws, theology, etc."

How could you entertain such an idea? It is such an obvious, striking error that I cannot think you could pass it as even an approach to the truth. Books containing what some enemy declares to be Catholic theology or Canon Law or Church History, may be prohibited to Catholics; but, my dear sir, that is only barring us from reading what is NOT the history, laws and theology of the church.

Or do you imagine that the authorities of the church do not know her history, laws and theology? You do not think they try to conceal them, for how, then, could her enemies secure them? And who could conceal history, or how could laws be law if not published? Not in respect to a handful of ignorant men and for a few years merely, but in regard to hundreds of millions among whom are the most brilliant in the world or in history, and for century after century now for nearly two thousand years? Why, the notion is wild.

No, my friend, you haven't got the idea of the Index at all. You are not acquainted with its purpose, its content or its use. And to Catholics who are familiar with all these, the labored argument based on mere suspicion and running like a poisoned stream through your paper, sounds like a child describing a bugaboo.

More on this subject to-morrow.

Very truly yours,

JJF/MC

J. J. FARRELL, Mgr.
M. O. C.

COMMENT

The above letter treats of the Index; I have previously given it some attention, and will do so from time to time; an understanding of its principle in action will make answers to questions in this letter clear. Here, therefore, I will offer a few suggestions only in passing.

"Books containing what some enemy declares to be Catholic Theology or Canon Law or Church History," says Farrell, but that "is NOT—" then asks "Do you think they (the 'authorities') try to conceal *them*, for how then, could her enemies secure THEM?" It is enlightening to note that he first says such "IS NOT" Catholic history, etc., and then acknowledges it is by asking "Do you think they try to conceal them, for how, then, could her enemies secure *them*?"

When I refer to "Catholics" any one knows I am alluding to the "Hearing Church"—lay members, not the pope and his hierarchy which constitute the "AUTHORITY" of that church; and the crux of the main contention lies right here: that what the church "authorities" know is one thing, what is made known to laymen another; laymen do not know what the church can require of them, as found in her authenticated law substantiated by Catholic historians; like the system of *authority* that obtained in Europe before the Great War among various kaisers, who KNEW what they intended to do, while their SUBJECTS were kept in ignorance. Yet they had to respond to the wills of their "divine right" rulers. Had the peoples been given an opportunity to express themselves after thoroughly investigating the issues involved, there is little doubt in my mind but that there would have been a few "divine right" rulers hung and millions of homes made glad because of the peace that that would have assured the world.

As typical of "history" written for Roman Catholics by the church "authorities," I submit the following, from the "Short History of Religion," forming a part of Jesuit Deharbe's "Full Catechism of the Catholic Religion:"

"Several heretical and schismatical doctrines had already been broached at different times and in different places; they had, however, soon disappeared. But now, BY GOD'S PERMISSION, some new heretics arose, and gained many followers by CUNNING AND FRAUD. They impudently left the church, and formed separate and vast communions or sects, which were mostly named after their founders; as the Arians, Nestorians, Eutychians, Pelagians, etc. These heretics often succeeded in gaining the favor of princes and emperors. . . . In the same way as the Apostles assembled in order to settle . . . such differences as had arisen in matters of religion . . . the bishops of the church, assembled under the presidency of the pope, or of his legates, consulted about the heretical doctrines, and then condemned them. Such an assembly of bishops is called a *General Council*; and the decisions of such a council in matters of faith, when confirmed by the pope, are infallible, because they proceed from the Church. . . . One of the most famous councils is that of Nice . . . held in 325. Three hundred and eighteen bishops were assembled there. . . . They unanimously condemned the impious doctrine of Arius. . . . Although this sect, called Arians, was at that time very powerful, the Church, by her solemn decision, had set the seal of reprobation on it, and consequently it was gradually to VANISH FROM THE FACE OF THE EARTH. The SAME sentence of condemnation was passed on all the other heresies that sprung up in subsequent ages; and however hard the conflicts were in which the Church had to engage, she has always come off victorious."

To Catholics, THAT is Catholic "history;" the "enemies" of the "church" go into detail and explain all the crimes and butcheries of non-Catholics ordered by that church, and show how the various sects, although "powerful" and hence numerous, were caused to VANISH FROM THE FACE OF THE EARTH, according to the teaching of the "holy fathers"; such is NOT history to Catholics, not being censored by "authority" of the church; the average Romanist learns, from "Catholic" history that by some fortuitous concurrence of atoms, heretics disappeared from the earth, and are satisfied; and with the INDEX, the Roman Catholic AUTHORITIES prevent laymen from learning the CRIMINAL record of the Italian Institution covering almost two thousand years. Like subjects of the German Kaiser, it is theirs to do, not to question.

I assert, and believe I can prove, that the authorities of the Italian church are guilty of concealing from laymen what they have a natural right to know. We have just read that decrees issued by a council composed of bishops, or the pope, are infallible, binding a Catholic in conscience; now, everything that has ever been decreed or defined by the popes and councils is epitomized in the BISHOP'S Oath; it contains the warrant for everything that the papal church has or will ever require of laymen; this OATH is found in the "*Pontificale Romanum*," one of the principal Liturgical books of the Italian church, which book is in the hands of EVERYONE in AUTHORITY in the Roman church throughout the world; it explains what the church requires of Catholics along certain lines, which "authorities" must know; but because it is kept out of the hands of laymen, being *true* Catholic teaching though "prohibited" to laymen they will never know what they are expected to do in the name of "religion" until like the Germans *the command to act is sounded by their Italian head*—and those "bound in conscience" to "divine right" leaders never fail to respond: the German and Austrian subjects, for instance, as also the papal subjects, the Catholic Irish of Ireland. Of course, there have always been traitors to every cause; so, in a conflict with the papal church in America, should the time ever come for the pope to exact the requirements of the bishop's oath, there may be some members of the papal church who would be true to the country instead of the pope; that, however, is mere speculation.

I present, in the Appendix, my correspondence with a Roman Catholic of Macon, Ga., relative to the bishop's oath. Not to repeat too often, I suggest that that correspondence be referred to at this time; it proves the point at issue: that by the operation of the Index in conjunction with the exercise of "authority" by *superiors*, the Catholic priesthood under the pope DOES CON-

CEAL from laymen questions vitally connected with the tenets of their faith, and also the fact that if a TRUE Romanist secures knowledge that the pope wishes to conceal, it is almost impossible to get him to acknowledge it. I refer to the correspondence with Mr. John J. McCreary; in attempting to extricate himself from an "unlawful" situation, his antics were pitiful, indeed. That incident, wherein he was "called" in to render "expert" testimony as a witness, illustrates how faithful a Catholic is to his pope, and if Catholics attempt to conceal facts, as Mr. McCreary evidently did, the presumption is logical that they approve of what the church requires, which presumption remains with them as long as they are subject to the bishop's oath, and they are subject to it as long as they are members of the Pope's church. This "particular case" is sufficient to establish a "general rule;" but it is not standing alone: the Catholic Laymen's Association of Georgia furnished another example showing what is meant by being "bound in conscience" to obey the decrees, mandates, etc., of the pope; he decreed excommunication against those taking part in debates, and that Association would not debate, yet never revealed the fact that it COULD NOT, which fact I established from information secured elsewhere, without its assistance.

I believe I have made it clear that the pope prevents Catholics from reading on any subject mentioned in Farrell's letter unless such book or treatise has first been censored by the church superiors; and who is it that presumes to pass "supreme judgment upon all our concerns? An Italian! Who revises every important detail of ecclesiastical policy? An Italian! Who is to legislate for all our social needs? An Italian! Who is to define what we must believe to be saved? An Italian!" Has the effect of Italian popery on the world been such success as warrants all nations to yield pre-eminence to him? How does his suppression of free inquiry affect the world? "Listen! Pope Pius granted, on petition of the General of the Dominican order, an indulgence of forty thousand five hundred years, ONCE A YEAR, to such as merely carry the rosary beads in their pockets!" High honors are paid to "twenty different bodies of John the Baptist, eighteen of St. Paul, six heads of Ignatius Martyr, sixty fingers of St. Jerome, forty holy shrouds, and seven hundred thorns from the sacred crown." This catalogue of facts and "sacred relics" could be greatly lengthened, but what's the use? All those things are *true* to Catholics: they have "true" histories teaching that they *are* true, because they were written according to the RULES of the Index, and no member of the church will read what an "enemy" writes refuting those *truths*, because to Catholics it "is NOT" history, having been written contrary to said "rules"!

That there have been, and are, many brilliant minds in the

Catholic church, I admit; but am rather inclined to the opinion that they were so despite the church instead of because of it.

Pope Innocent III, in the Fourth Lateran Ecumenical Council, legislated as follows:

"Let Secular rulers be warned, and if necessary compelled by ecclesiastical censure, to take public oath to do all in their power to exterminate from their territory all manner of heretics—(*universos haereticos exterminare*)—who shall have been so designated by the church. This oath every man shall be obliged to take who enters upon any office of civil power. . . . And if a secular ruler, after due warning by the church, neglects to purge his territory from the filth of heresy (*ab haeretica foeditate*), let him be excommunicated by the metropolitan archbishop of the province. If thereafter he fails to come to a better mind, let this within the space of one year be told to the pope, to the end that the Supreme Pontiff may declare that ruler's subjects absolved from their allegiance, and his territory open to seizure by Catholics, who shall possess it absolutely once they have destroyed the heresy there existing. . . . Catholics who engage in a crusade for the extermination of heretics shall be granted that indulgence and that holy privilege which are bestowed upon Crusaders to the Holy Land."

That decree throws some light on Deharbe's "Short History of Religion," solves the mystery surrounding the admonition of Leo XIII to Cardinal Gibbons, not to adopt any method of reclaiming heretics save that which ANTIQUITY had STAMPED WITH ITS APPROVAL, and endorsed BY THE CHURCH, and makes his meaning clear where he alludes to those who destroy "Papal" truth: that it would be INHUMAN to let them go UNHARMED—all of which is provided for in the bishop's oath, that I tried to get McCreary to verify.

If "suspicion," like a "poisoned stream," is "running through my paper," as Mr. Farrell says, is not that "poisoned stream" flowing from a real source? And can it be termed "suspicion?"

A heretic is one who does not believe the pope has a special commission from God to rule and direct the world; a heretic is one who would, in a word, rather look into the matter of so many "true" heads, etc., before venerating one; a heretic is one who does not believe carrying the scapular tied around the neck, or the rosary beads in the pocket, will keep off evil spirits in this life and release a soul from thousands of years of purgatorial fires after death.

Is my "notion" so very "wild" in view of the above few facts, which are predicates of the papal Index and its "rules"?

Do Catholic laymen know that, as members of the Italian church, they are committed to the oath of the bishop which reads, in part: "Heretics, schismatics, and rebels to our Lord the Pope,

or his aforesaid successors, I will, to the utmost of my power, *persecute and make war on?*" If they know, they are taught by the church to believe that it is God's will, and that where the church has carried out this oath in the past, it has been in retaliation for attacks and persecutions of Catholics by non-Catholics or Protestants. That this teaching of the church is false to the core, is proved by the fact that there is not a Christian sect in the world that has ever legislated as has the papal church, neither can any document be produced wherein the inhuman line of action is required as found in the "*Pontificale Romanum*" containing the bishop's oath. Some who are ignorant of natural forces and laws say that if Protestants were in absolute control, they would also persecute; if they did, they would cease to be Christian; on the other hand, the premise is wrong: a field completely covered with fig trees would never produce thorns—that would be contrary to NATURE and her fixed law; a field literally covered with briars will be filled with thorns; you may devote unlimited time and effort trimming the thorns off—with enough help you could make that a field of thornless briars—but you CAN NOT change the NATURAL law: if you let it alone, the thorns will come back.

The powerful influence of Protestantism has "trimmed" the papal institution of some of her NATURAL THORNS, but Protestantism can not change the NATURE of that institution as revealed by its laws, history, dogmas, theology and the bishop's oath.

Where plants of different natures are placed in a field, one will have to be removed before the other will fulfill its purpose; the contest between the papal institution and Protestantism is just now claiming the attention of an enlightened age—and one must be destroyed, so far as America is concerned.

It would be interesting to know how many Roman Catholic fathers, mothers, husbands, wives and sweethearts have a *popular* edition of the Roman Catholic theology by Liguori, wherein he admits that his obscene doctrine for the confessional has caused many priests to lose both God and their souls! How many know that popes Gregory XV and Benedict XIV endeavored to correct the horrible conditions brought about by the confessional? How many Catholic families have histories telling how Bishops Keating, Doyle and others concurred with St. Thomas of Villanova, who said the effect of the confessional on many priests was to "send themselves and sinners down careless into hell?" As to sacred theology, how many Catholics have carefully studied the effect of Liguori's "Glories of Mary" on human conduct? How many laymen have a copy of the "*Pontificale Romanum*?"

If any reader thinks, with the association, that my "notion"

of the Index is "wild," go to a Catholic laymen and ask to see a copy of the *Pontificale*. Ask any Roman priest, or superior of a convent, or dean of a Catholic college; try to borrow a copy! In writing off-hand, to Catholic book-dealers for a copy, one informed me he was out of them, while another stated he did not have any on hand and, as they were printed in *Germany*, he would not be able to get a supply until after the war!

I can not do more than offer suggestions, that, like straws, point which way the wind blows; to attempt to treat at length every question concerning Catholicism would require many volumes, but I think the general "intention" of the papal church will be sufficiently discussed as to warrant the opinion that no American citizen can become allied with such an institution that pledges its votaries to persecute those who will not see things through the pope's eyes.

Angusta, Ga., Oct. 4, 1917.

Dear Sir: You imagine, for instance, that Catholics do not know that certain popes were immoral men, "very immoral" if you like; that the confessional and convent life have been abused by wicked men and women; and such things.

But we do; only there is not near so much of that as the professional bigot claims, if that is material here. You will find in the Catholic Encyclopedia, for example, which is in probably a hundred thousand Catholic homes in this country, and in numerous public libraries, and which is available and free to all, that Alexander VI was a wicked man, and John XIII "a coarse, immoral man, whose life was such that the Lateran was spoken of as a brothel, and the moral corruption in Rome became the subject of general odium." (See Vol. VIII, p. 426, Cath. Ency.)

We do not make a specialty of bad popes, however, nor of all the purient details of their lives; but prefer wholesome things, for who handles pitch will become defiled. It is enough for us to know that any pope *can* sin, any priest can, any nun can, and some have. If we knew of any place in this world where men and women cannot sin, or do not, we would shut up shop and flock there.

In the light of human nature and considering human history through the long sweep of time, have you any suggestions on this score?

Very truly,

JJF/MC.

J. J. FARRELL, Mgr.
M. O. C.

COMMENT

Perhaps it may be well for me to say right here that I have had no special desire to discuss Roman Catholicism from a theological standpoint; but, since it is practically impossible to separate the political nature of the papal church from its spiritual claims—its determination to dominate in temporal and civil affairs as well as in spiritual—it behooves one to consider what has been

the effect of Romanism on those who are committed to it; because, to understand its religious effect should be the determining factor of one's attitude to the system.

It is immaterial to me and to the issue, regarding what Catholics may know concerning their popes; but one fact is material: if a priest concludes he can not serve God and his country in that capacity, leaves the church, and attempts to explain why to the people; or, if any other person takes the evidence of such witnesses before the public, Roman Catholics actively oppose it, classing them "bigots" and bad men, scatter falsehoods against them, as was done in Macon when Rev. E. A. Jordan delivered his series of lectures on Catholicism; a defamatory pamphlet was circulated against him—but no layman nor priest was man enough to defy the pope's decree, and meet him in debate, to substantiate the charges against him, and discuss the questions he presented. This is not an isolated case; the Knights of Columbus would not meet Wm. Black on the platform before the people of Marshall, Texas; but they could go to his hotel room and do him to death. Not making a "specialty of purient facts," the Roman church had Black killed so he could not disseminate them. That case illustrates also how the priesthood writes "history" for the "faithful." They kill everything of a damaging nature, and then place the Index between Romanists and the facts.

A tree is known by its fruit; if its source be muddy, the stream will be muddy; if it can be proved that a large percentage of the popes were considered bad men by Catholic historians; if the religion of the Roman Catholic church did not have the desired moral effect upon its head, the pope, so that, like Paul, he could say, "Follow me even as I follow Christ," then the world should not want to be DIRECTED by him—Americans, at least, will object.

There were many Catholic historians and priests who loved their church, but were not blind to the defects of those who decreed its religion or abused it; some of those men tried to reform it from within, and died in the church and were not condemned by it, while others realized that there was no hope to redeem it, and quit; they are now called "enemies" of the church.

For my own satisfaction, I have given attention to the lives of the popes; I find they do not accord with my idea of what one should be who claims to hold upon this earth the place of God Almighty; and I did not get my information from the "enemies" of the church, but from such historians as Cardinal Baronius, de Cormenin, Platina, Belarmine, and others. From these historians was prepared the following condensed summary of the lives of the popes. In this abbreviated history no mention is made of the popes who made no special "record." Beginning after St.

Peter, whom the papal church can not prove was ever in Rome or acted as pope, this is the record:

ABRIDGED HISTORY OF THE POPES

Pontian, A. D. 233: Banished, brought back and put to death.

Anterus, 238: Put to death under Emperor Maximine.

Fabian, 240: Put to death by Emperor Decius.

Cornelius, 254: Put to death by Emperor Decius.

Lucius I, 255: Put to death by Emperor Valerinus.

Sixtus II, 260: Put to death by Emperor Valerian.

Marcellinus, 296: Abjured the Christian religion.

Marcellus I, 304: Made to groom horses; died at this work.

Eusebius, 309: Banished by Maxentius.

(Period of the Constantine Forgeries.)

Liberius, 352: Exiled by Constans.

Liberius and Felix II denied Deity of Christ; are now "saints."

In 360 the partisans of Damascus and Ursin each elected a pope; a bloody fight ensued resulting in the death of 137 people; Damascus triumphed, being elevated to the chair of Peter by violence.

Innocent I, 402: Granted permission to offer sacrifice to ancient idols; fled in terror from Rome.

Sixtus III, 432: Hypocrite; morally unclean.

Leo I (The Great), 440: Persecuted the Manicheans, who originated the "heresy" of "half communion," now practiced as "true" religion by the papal church.

Anastasius II, 496: Died suddenly; said to have been poisoned by priests.

Symmachus, 498:

Lawrence, 498: Two men consecrated pope the same day; King Theodoric decided in favor of Symmachus.

John I, 523: Charged with treason; died in prison.

Silverius, 536: Banished; starved; strangled to death.

Vigilius, 538: Charged with killing a child with a club for resisting his "caresses"; Empress Theodora had him flogged; died from poison; is now a saint.

Pelagius I, 555: Accused of poisoning Vigilius to secure for himself the "Chair" of Peter.

Gregory I (The Great), 590: He wrote: "I am bold to say that, whoever accepts, or affects the title of universal bishop has the pride and character of anti-Christ . . . arrogates to himself a distinguished superiority, and arises, as it were, upon the ruins of the rest."

Sabinianus, 604: Avaricious; cruel to poor; assassinated by band of priests.

BONIFACE III, 606: This is the FIRST POPE, or Universal Bishop, as the term is now understood; this title was conferred by the bloody-handed monster and murderer, Emperor Phocas.

Adeodatus, 615: Under this pope it is claimed the documents

known as the "Isidorean Decretals" first appeared; these were spurious decrees said to have originated with Bishop Isidore of Seville, Spain; they were increased from time to time, forging a powerful chain over the priesthood and laity which culminated in establishing the supremacy of the pope in the church. So it appears that the title of pope was conferred by a murderer and retained by forgeries!

Honorius I, 625: Decreed adoption of Monotheletic heresy, which was condemned by the Sixth General Council in 680. In this, we see an "infallible" pope being reversed by and "infallible" council.

Martin I, 649: Banished; died in exile.

Sergius, 687: A very bad man.

Zacharias I, 741: Up to this time a pope's election had to be confirmed by the emperor; now, however, the church began to assert and exert "authority" over kings.

Paul I, 757: Noted as a great hunter of dead bones for "relics."

Constantine II: Was driven into monastery; Philip, a monk, chosen pope, but was, on the next day, driven into a convent.

Stephen IV, 768: A "holy terror;" assisted in the torture of his enemies and pointed out new victims.

Leo III, 795: Priests attempted to kill him; cut out part of his tongue and greatly damaged his eyes.

Paschal I, 817: Instigated murder.

Gregory IV, 827: Caused a rebellion against a king; a very bad man.

Sergius II, 844: It is said that his name was "Os Porco," meaning "Hog Snout," which he changed after being made God's substitute on earth; some say this gave rise to the custom of changing the name when elected pope.

Joan, Popess, 855: The Roman church now denies that a woman served as pope one year in disguise; however, Platina, a Catholic historian of the fifteenth century, being Librarian of the Vatican, had access to all its records; he wrote the history of the popess, calling her John VIII.

Benedict III, 855: Was ousted by Priest Anastasius with troops; being successful, he declared himself pope. He was in turn dethroned by Benedict. It may be of incidental interest to state that this was about the second century of the Dark Ages.

Nicholas I (The Great), 858: The Bishop of Cologne wrote him: "Rome is the residence of demons, and thou, pope, art its satan."

Adrian II, 867: Married; had a beautiful daughter; the son of Bishop Arsenes ran away with her. Being persecuted, he killed the pope's wife and the girl.

John VIII, 872: Political intriguer; seated and unseated temporal rulers; a Roman lady had him killed.

Marinus I, 882: Died from effects of nameless disease.

Adrian III, 884: At this period, any crime would be committed to serve, or secure, the "chair" of Peter, or to control temporal affairs.

Formosus I, 891: During his five-year reign as pope, used his guards to kill out half of the people of Rome.

Stephen VII, 897: Abrogated the decrees of Formosus I; had his body exhumed and ordered two fingers cut from his right hand; buried him as a layman. Stephen is said to have been strangled to death.

Romanus, 898: Disavowed and abrogated all acts and decrees of Stephen.

Theodorus II, 898: Rescinded and abrogated acts and decrees of his predecessors.

John IX, 898: He "damns all Stephen did, and restored decrees of Formosus," causing riots; had to flee the city. Between 896 and 898 there were no less than five different popes—Peter's chair was not very healthy!

Leo V, 908: Was cast in prison by Christophorus, his rival, where he died.

At this period, history says: "We see in Rome nothing but debauchery, dissolution, drunkenness, and impurity; the houses of the priests have become the shameful retreats of prostitutes, jugglers and sodomites; they gamble by night and day in the residence of the pope."

Christophorus, 908: Was himself deposed and shut up in a monastery.

Sergius III, 904: Had Christophorus removed from monastery and put in prison; rescinded all the decrees of Formosus; died from excessive licentiousness.

All historians say that this pope had children by his concubine, Marozia, who became popes; *that they continued incest with her for three generations.*

John X, 914: The son of a nun and priest; Theodora, the mother of Marozia, one of the mistresses of Pope Sergius, became the mistress of Pope John X, who secured his "elevation" to Peter's "chair" through her influence; Marozia left her husband in favor of this pope; she became jealous of his intercourse with her mother and sister; had her husband force entrance into the Lateran palace, murder the pope's brother, put the pope in prison and strangled him to death between mattresses. (This pope "held the place of God (?) Almighty on earth" sixteen years.)

John XI, 936: The infamous Marozia now ruled things, civil and ecclesiastical, in Rome; she caused her son, begotten by Pope Sergius, to be made Pope John XI; she poisoned her husband, Guy, ruler of Rome, *and became the mistress of her own son, Pope John XI!* She married Hugh, half brother of Guy, and made him governor of Rome; her illegitimate son, Alberic, wrested the city from his stepfather Hugh, *became his own mother's paramour, imprisoned his pope brother, John XI, where he died.*

Forget not, dear reader, that all and singular decrees issued by these fellows are, and must ever be, obeyed by the "faithful," which bind them in conscience to the end of time; that he who exposes these things is a bigot, while those who refuse to submit

to their teaching are heretics—and the church has the right to remove heretics from the earth by death!

Stephen IX, 939: In a riot taking place shortly after his election, Stephen's face was so badly disfigured that he remained in seclusion.

John XII, 956: This Vice-Gerent of Christ (?) was a son of Marozia, AND HIS OWN BROTHER, ALBEREC, WAS HIS FATHER! Marozia had him made pope while he was between 12 and 18 years old. Under his reign, the Lateran palace became a brothel; he caused wives, widows and virgins to be carried off from the steps of the altar. (A Roman priest in Massachusetts, along in 1912, did this also, which case is on records of the court.)

This pope reigned eight years as the supreme legislator, judge and executive for all the "faithful," and deposed.

Leo VIII, 964: Because of the wrangle between Benedict V and Leo VIII, King Otho decided he would thereafter appoint the popes, deciding here in favor of Leo; this pope was imprisoned, but released.

Benedict VI, 972: Bad man; strangled by citizens.

Boniface VII: A notorious character; seized the papal chair; was driven from Rome; stole the consecrated vessels.

Benedict VII, 975: Gave an entertainment at the Vatican palace; had sixty of the invited guests lead out and pitilessly massacred by soldiers; said to have been assassinated.

John XIV, 984: Was seized and put in prison by ex-Pope Boniface and starved to death.

Boniface VII was the murderer of John; was driven from Rome; died in a debauch.

John XV, 985: Son of a priest, Leo; hated by the people; driven from Rome; appealed to the king, people withdrew opposition.

Gregory V, 996: Deposed by the civil power.

John XVI, 996: The deposed pope, Gregory V, came into power, had John's eyes put out, his nose and ears cut off, from the effects of which he died.

Sylvester II, 999: Platina, a Catholic historian, says that this pope made a deliberate sale of himself to the devil, and had frequent conversations with him.

Sergius IV, 1009: The son of a priest.

Benedict VIII, 1012: Was unseated by one faction; rallied his forces and regained the chair; accused Jews of being responsible for earthquake and had many of them put to death.

John XIX, 1024: Was hated by the people, who tried to assassinate him; was driven from Rome, taking refuge in Germany; reinstated by Emperor of Germany.

Benedict IX, 1038: Made pope at age of 12 years; bad in every respect; deposed at age of 18; reinstated by Emperor Conrad; again deposed by the people at age of 23, because of gross immorality and cruelty.

Sylvester III, 1044: Served forty-nine days and driven from city; Benedict returned, occupied the chair a short time, sold it

to John for 15,000 pounds, duly "consecrating" him Christ's Vice-Gerent!

John XX, 1044: After spending the money received from the sale of the office to John, Benedict returned and took Peter's chair away from him.

At this time there were *three popes*, each one claiming to be the "Infallible" head of the "only" true church established by Christ—one at St. Peter's, one at Lateran, and one at St. Majora, and—Rome was filled with adultery and murder!

Gregory VI, 1044: He purchased the throne from the three anti-popes, which gave this true church FOUR living heads; he had many wealthy citizens put to death and confiscated their property; was deposed by an army under Emperor Henry.

Clement II, 1046: The Emperor called a church council to select a pope; not a priest could be found fit to hold the chair, so he appointed Sudiger. Platina says he was subsequently poisoned by Benedict, who had been deposed three times.

Damascus II, 1048: Following Clement, for the fourth time Benedict reseated himself in the papal chair, to be again driven out by the people, after which Damascus was made pope; Benedict poisoned Damascus and for the fifth time reigned as pope, to be again driven out by the people.

Benedict X was declared illegally elected by Archdeacon Hildebrand (later known as Gregory VII), and deposed.

Alexander II, 1061: Made pope by Hildebrand; King Henry of Germany called a church council and made the Bishop of Parma pope; becoming frightened, Alexander fled from Rome.

Gregory VII, 1073: We are now to consider a man who is said by many to have been the greatest, and perhaps the most infamous, of all the popes—Hildebrand, as Gregory VII; he declared that "marriage attaches the clergy to the State, and estranges them from the church" (i. e., from the pope); excommunicated King Henry of Germany; was charged with having poisoned seven popes, and attempted the lives of several temporal rulers; in the Council of Worms he was declared to be "an apostate monk, who adulterates the Bible, suits the books of the fathers to the wants of his execrable ambition, pollutes justice by becoming at once accuser, witness and judge. . . . Endeavors to oblige kings and bishops to pay the papal court for their diadems and mitres." He was deposed by this council. (An infallible pope being deposed by an infallible council; the church of Rome teaches that the doctrine of infallibility applies to every pope and to every council!)

Hildebrand cursed and excommunicated King Henry and absolved all his subjects from their allegiance to him; the bishops and intelligent element supported the king for a while, but eventually went over to the pope.

Henry's mother, Empress Agnes, his aunt, the Duchess Beatrice, and cousin, Matilda, daughter of Beatrice, were at that time living at the palace with the pope. Beatrice owned large estates in Italy, while Matilda, as the wife of Godfrey the

Hunchback, was more powerful. These two women renounced Henry in favor of Hildebrand, Matilda being publicly recognized as the pope's mistress at this time; being a friend of the king, her husband was feared, and Matilda was instrumental in having him killed on the night of February 20, 1076.

As a mark of gratitude rendered by Matilda, and not to be bothered by this woman's mother, he enticed Beatrice to spend the night with him, having her murdered in the morning. Matilda now established herself in the Lateran palace as the inseparable companion of Gregory, meeting in consultations with cardinals, and sharing the rooms of the pope.

Being as cunning as satan, by threats and otherwise, Hildebrand caused King Henry to be deserted by the nobility, ecclesiastics and common people, which forced the king to yield to every demand of the pope, and go to Rome to see him. Taking alarm at the demeanor of Henry's friends, however, Hildebrand, accompanied by Matilda, fled to Augsburg, and shut himself up in the Castle Canossa, which belonged to Matilda. When King Henry arrived at the pope's retreat, he had to divest himself of all ensigns of royalty and clothe himself in sackcloth as an acknowledgement of his unworthiness to reign, in order to gain an audience; in this predicament, scantily clad, he was exposed for three days and nights to the severe cold of a European winter. Having compassion on him, his cousin, Matilda, arranged an audience for him with "his holiness."

At the Provincial Synod held in Lombardy, the bishops again excommunicated Hildebrand and, because of the debasing cowardice of Henry, selected Rudolph for king; Henry raised an army to fight Gregory, and was excommunicated; the pope also declared Rudolph king, the decree ending with these words: "We declare Rudolph lawful king of the Teutonic States, and We grant to all who shall betray Henry absolution from all their sins and the blessings of Christ in this world and the next."

Defeating Rudolph, Henry was again proclaimed Emperor of Germany; he called a council at Brixen, had Hildebrand deposed, and the Bishop of Ravenna made pope, known as Clement III.

After three years' siege of Rome, Henry entered the city and seated Clement in Peter's "chair," who, in turn, crowned Henry "Emperor of the West."

Learning that Henry performed his devotions at a certain church, Hildebrand won over the cardinal-priest in charge, who attempted to kill the king at the altar; the plans miscarried, however, and the priest was cut into pieces by Henry's guards, dragged through the streets and thrown into sewers.

Henry had to return to Germany to defend his interests against Matilda; in the meantime, Guiscard captured Rome, restored Hildebrand, who again excommunicated Henry as well as Clement III, after which he retired to a distant retreat and died from fever brought on by the victorious return of Henry—died curs-

ing his brother "divine right" ruler the king, and his brother-god, Clement III!

This so-called "Christ-veiled-in-the-flesh;" this "Vice-Gerent of Christ;" this holder of "the place of God Almighty" on earth, whose decree so binds priests in conscience that they believe it is better for them to go wrong with a hundred different women than to marry one, is now on the Roman Calendar as a "Saint" to be invoked by all the "faithful" for all time!

Victor III, 1086: Was chosen pope by the dying Hildebrand; he reigned a few months and—died!

Urban II, 1088: He succeeded Victor III, and pronounced anew Hildebrand's excommunication against King Henry.

Matilda married Duke Guelph of Bavaria; with connivance of the pope, she was intriguing against Henry, who invaded her territory, enforced peace, went to Rome and unseated Urban and put Clement in as pope. Urban induced Henry's son, Conrad, to instigate a rebellion against his father, which was successful, and Urban was again placed in the papal chair.

Paschal II, 1099: Successor to Urban; made war on King Henry; the anti-pope Clement was poisoned, while the others—Albert, Theodoric and Maguinuiph—were imprisoned or exiled. Paschal also excommunicated Henry.

In memory of her paramour, Hildebrand, Matilda cut off all her natural relatives, and bequeathed her vast wealth to the papacy.

Paschal and Matilda continued plotting against Henry, and caused his son Henry to take up arms against him; the king was captured, imprisoned and cruelly treated; he escaped and fled to Belgium. Enraged at his escape, Paschal ordered the lords, princes and bishops of France, Germany, Bavaria, Suabia and Saxony and the clergy at Liege to "Pursue everywhere . . . Henry . . . exterminate that infamous king! . . . We order you and your vassals to put him to death in the most cruel tortures, and if you faithfully execute Our will, We grant to you remission of your sins, and an arrival after death at the heavenly Jerusalem."

Some of the ecclesiastics were disgusted with this order to commit murder, even if it did come from the one who held "the place of God Almighty" on the earth. (They were safe, though, because they remained in the "true" fold!)

King Henry was poisoned, dying in exile; his son carried out, as far as he could, the pope's infamous decree: cut the body into pieces and over his tomb inscribed: "*Here Lies the Enemy of Rome,*" which remained five centuries a monument to the pope's honor!

Gelasius II, 1118: This pope was not without troubles; he was knocked down and trampled upon in the church where "consecrated," dragged out by his hair; although rescued from his "children," he learned that Henry V of Germany was coming to dethrone him—he fled and refused to return.

Honorius II, 1124: He was one of two contemporaneous

popes; one faction elected Thebald, another Lambert; the first yielded in favor of the latter. Honorius kept up continual warfare with Roger of Sicily.

Innocent II, 1130: One faction selected Innocent, another an anti-pope, Anaclet, grandson of a converted Jew. Innocent went to war against Roger of Sicily, was defeated and imprisoned with three cardinals; after his release, returned to Rome, and was driven out of the country by the anti-pope. Thousands were killed in the two years' war between the two popes. Anaclet was poisoned in 1138.

Lucius II, 1144: This pope is said to have personally participated in war, was hit on the head with a rock and died instantly.

Eugenius III, 1145: The first pope to experience real trouble arising from a Protestant Reformer: Arnold of Brescia attacked the terrible, gross immorality of the clergy; the people arose against their despoilers, which caused the pope to take refuge in France, where he remained four years.

Adrian IV, 1154: This Vice-Gerent of Christ ordered Frederick I of Germany to surrender Arnold of Brescia; commanded him to be burnt, and his ashes thrown into the Tiber.

The Emperor of Germany severed connection with the papacy.

Adrian was the pope who sold Ireland to England, King Henry agreeing to pay the pope one penny a year for each household in Ireland. Henry was himself a rank Romanist.

The so-called "Irish question" always has been, and will continue to be, a papal question; all the suffering endured by those of the Emerald Isle was and is due to the papacy, yet Irish Catholics the world over will lick the hand that sold and betrayed them in the first place—they never resent that power which sold them, but never cease to berate the other, which bought them. Mark this: the pope will never permit the Irish question to be settled on any other basis than the one which will accord the Roman church all the rights that it enjoys in Austria and Spain; and that means literal extermination of the large number of Protestant Irish of Ulster. The first Protestant to die for *heresy* was under the reign of King Henry, directed by papal ecclesiastics.

If the pope of Rome cannot find better means, he will, through his priests, use the Irish question to bring on war between England and America; nothing since the Massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day would cause more rejoicing in the Vatican and papal circles than for the two great Protestant nations—England and America—to become involved in war.

According to the prediction of Cardinal Newman, the pope expected the Great War to restore the papacy's ancient power. The failure of the Central Powers did not stop the intrigue of the Roman church, and it will bring on wars between the great powers of the world until the pope again becomes supreme or his power in the earth completely destroyed.

The "courtly intrigue" of Jesuitism can be relied upon to devise a plausible cause; and at present, the Irish question gives

promise. While it should be a penitentiary offense for a so-called citizen of this country to do anything that would tend to disrupt the friendly relations of this government with another, the papal Irish are given the right, it seems, to perfect organizations throughout the land, ostensibly in the interest of Ireland; but as all such societies are directly under the auspices of ROMAN CATHOLICS, that would indicate it as being a CHURCH movement to try and create sentiment in favor of having our Government aid in securing "Irish Freedom," even to the extent of war. Much is said about "Irish Freedom" by loud-mouthed hyphenates, but not a word is uttered in behalf of the one-third Irish who prefer to remain under the laws of England; they fought for England and democracy in the Great War, while the Catholic Irish were sworn to resist, the oath being administered by the bishops, therefore, it would appear from these circumstances that the minority of Protestant Irish should have the protection they demand, and not be forced to submit to papal rule under "Home Rule" or "Irish Freedom."

Suppose the United States and other nations should persuade England to declare Ireland a free republic? It would be an insult for any nation to assume this attitude, while on the other hand, "Irish Freedom" would mean civil war between the Catholic and Protestant Irish—a religious war that could easily involve the whole world in a war that would far surpass that which has just devastated the nations, for it would array Catholic and Protestant against each other within their own borders, and the world would be wrecked indeed. This is a suggestion only; that it can materialize, the existence of Jesuitism and the World War prove.

Americans must frown down any effort seeking to interfere with the internal affairs of another nation; those who cannot abide by this principle should be deported; they are unworthy citizens of a free nation.

All officers of the local Sinn Fein association are Roman Catholics.

Alexander III, 1159:

Victor IV, 1159: Two factions in the church chose each a pope—Octavian and Roland; in a fight, Octavian drew blood from Roland by striking him on the nose; the dispute was settled by referring the matter to Frederick I; he selected Octavian, who was subjected to the "pierced chair" test, to safeguard against another popes.

A war ensued between the pope and Barbarossa, Emperor of Germany; the Kings of England and France recognized Alexander; Germany, Victor. Upon the death of Victor, Alexander became pope; under him began the bloody persecutions of the non-Catholics known as Waldenses. A cardinal lead the troops against these Protestants; thousands of old men, women and children were hung, drawn and quartered, broken on the wheel, or burnt alive, their property being confiscated for the benefit of the pope.

Lucius III, 1181: This pope was driven from Rome by the

people because of his avarice; he issued a bull against heretics, declaring: "Any cleric favoring heretics, to be deprived of his office and pay, and be turned over to secular justice. If laymen, We order that they suffer the most horrid tortures, be proved by fire and sword, torn by stripes and burnt alive." Those who hesitate to inform on another "shall be immediately put to torture." Under the direction of bishops all "counts, barons, rectors and consuls of cities and other places" were to "engage by oath to persecute heretics . . . to excite with all their power" all that the pope commands "in regard to the crimes of heresy" under pain of being deprived of all rights as citizens, and excommunicated. "The cities which shall neglect to pursue heretics shall be excluded from commerce—the boycott is of papal origin—with other cities . . . and citizens shall be excommunicated, and . . . declared unfit to fill any public or ecclesiastical function. All the faithful shall have the right to kill them, seize their goods and reduce them to slavery." Note the perfect accord of the bishop's oath to-day with that decree!

Italian popery boasts that it *never changes*; its *spirit* is always the same, biding its time, and no one but fool non-Catholics say otherwise.

Urban III, 1185: Quarreled with Barbarossa; fearing the emperor, fled to Venice.

Clement III, 1187: He was consecrated pope at Pisa; the people of Rome did not want the seat of the papal government there again, but a subsequent treaty finally admitted its return.

Celestine III, 1190: Henry of Germany was crowned by this pope; while in a kneeling posture, the crown was placed on his head and kicked off by the pope, signifying that he had the right to make and unmake rulers.

Innocent III, 1198: Matthews Paris, a monk, has the following to say relative to conditions at this time under popery: "The little faith . . . under the last popes . . . was extinguished; . . . religion is dead . . . the holy city has become an infamous prostitute" while the people were despoiled by the monks brandishing papal bulls. Under the reign of Innocent III popery produced one of the most blood-thirsty "saints" to be found on the Roman Calendar, St. Dominic; he, with Count de Montfort, lead an army against the City of Beziers (France) where thousands of non-Catholics (the Albigenses) were assembled; the city was besieged; Count de Beziers pleaded with Dominic to spare, at least, the Romanists who were in the majority in the city; Dominic replied that he had orders from the pope to destroy the city and put all the people to the sword—that after the butchery God would know His friends, and sixty thousand men, women and children perished by will of the pope of Rome.

Honorius III, 1216: The persecution of "heretics" was continued under this "Vice-Gerent" (?) of Christ.

King Louis VIII, under orders from the pope, took up where "Saint" Dominic left off; the Albigenses left France, going to Lombardy—that is, those who could escape the death-embrace of the minions of the only "true" religion!

Gregory IX, 1227: The quarrel between the papacy and Emperor Frederick of Germany continued; upon being excommunicated by the pope, Frederick wrote him: ". . . the Roman church not only swallows up, in its orgies, the wealth which it snatches from the . . . faithful, but even despoils sovereigns . . . every one knows the popes are insatiate blood-suckers. . . . The priests affirm that the church is our mother, our nurse; it is . . . an infamous step-mother, which devours those whom its hypocritical voice calls children. . . . In its hands the morality of Christ has become a terrible arm, which permits it to murder men in order to ravish them of their treasures."

Celestine IV, 1241: Reigned eighteen days—died from poison.

Innocent IV, 1243: Learning that Emperor Frederick was marching toward Rome, fled to Genoa; from there he sent letters to France, England and Spain, asking permission to set up papal thrones; each country absolutely refused permission; he then took up his residence in Lyons. Innocent attempted to poison Frederick, employing the king's physician, counselor and confidant.

Alexander IV, 1254: Succeeded Innocent IV; lived in Rome a short while—the people ran him out. At this time appeared the fanatical Romanists known as "Flagellantes"—men, women and children who marched through the streets entirely naked, beating themselves as they marched.

Urban IV, 1261: Spent three years quarreling with secular rulers.

Gregory X, 1271: Compelled to live away from Rome, residing at Orvieto, Florence and Piacenza, respectively; was driven out of Florence—in leaving he pronounced a curse against the people: "I devote thee to eternal damnation."

Innocent V, 1276: He served six months only. It would seem that the saying, "The good die young," must have originated with the way the popes held Peter's chair; those who appear to have been good men did not live long after "consecration." Innocent was poisoned.

Adrian V, 1276: Said to have been poisoned.

John XXI, 1276: At the council called to convene at Viterba to elect a pope, the College of Cardinals could not come to an agreement as to who should hold the place of God on earth; the citizenry captured the "sacred college" and put the cardinals in prison; after the threat to murder the whole lot unless they selected a pope, they elected John XXI.

Nicholas III, 1277: He originated the fiendish massacre known as "The Sicilian Vespers;" the scheme was to put the whole of Italy under papal domination by murdering the French in Sicily; this pope died, but his plot survived.

Martin IV, 1281: Carried out the plot of Nicholas III: "On Easter Day, March 20, 1282, at the hour of Vespers, the Sicilians fell upon the French, killing them on the streets, in their homes, and even at the foot of the altars." Eight thousand were murdered by DIRECTION of this "Christ-veiled-in-the-flesh" in less than two hours!

Honorius IV, 1285: Pope Martin had excommunicated the Spanish King, Peter of Aragon; Honorius induced France to invade Spain and punish Peter; in this crusade, the soldiers committed every crime known to depraved soldiery against unprepared, helpless victims—the pope sending one family of the “faithful” to destroy his “children” elsewhere!

Nicholas IV, 1288: Instituted the first Tribunals of the “Holy” Inquisition in Venice and Avignon—that terrible machinery for the extermination of heretics, which was placed in charge of his Dominican priests; he authorized them to pursue heretics with fire and sword, confiscate their property and destroy all the houses used by them. By a bull, Nicholas ordered the civil rulers and authorities to aid his murderous crew with force.

Celestine V, 1294: Seems to have been an honest-minded man; he said: “I believe it impossible to shun eternal damnation if I remain pope, so I resign.”

Boniface VIII, 1294: Threatened all the kings of Europe—caused ruptures among them, inciting to wars; to replenish his coffers, instituted “Jubilees,” now called “Pilgrimages to Rome”—where the simple-minded went for the purpose of buying indulgences and—empty their purses. This pope issued a bull, declaring himself absolute sovereign of France, whereupon King Philip called a Council to depose him; among other things charged against him at this Council was that he preached being infallible, he could commit incest, robbery and murder without being criminal—that it would be heresy to say the pope sinned; that the sums of money which the fables of Christ produced to the priests was incalculable; that it was no greater sin to abandon one’s self to pleasure with a young girl than to rub one’s hands together.

Benedict II, 1303: Poisoned by a priest.

Clement V, 1305: In a fight with his cardinals at a banquet given by him, his brother was killed; he and King Philip of France began a war of extermination against heretics and Knights Templars; by trickery he induced DeMolay, Grand Master of the Knights Templars, to leave Palestine and bring all the treasures of the order with him; unsuspectingly, DeMolay and many other members of the order obeyed the request—they were murdered and the loot divided between pope and king. He ranks as one among many bad popes.

John XXII, 1316: As a consequence of a faction existing between the cardinals, God had no substitute on earth for two years. Peter’s chair was vacant; not being able to agree on a supreme ruler of the universe, they asked Cardinal d’Ossa to choose the worthiest among them—he immediately placed the tiara upon his own head. In this manner the papal church secured a Vice-Gerent of Christ, known as John XXII! This pope was not satisfied with the great stream of wealth flowing in through the channels of the “Holy Inquisition,” so the monster prepared a “fee-list,” selling absolution for the crimes of parricide, murder, robbery, incest, sodomy, bestiality; it included every crime a depraved mind could crave, and the “tax” was

small: the heaviest penalty being for striking a priest. He added the third crown ("third story") to the papal tiara, which it is said signified that he was ruler over heaven, earth and hell. All classes had to pay tribute to him in some manner—kings, priests, and really poor monks; he had many of the "faithful" of his own fold murdered when they refused to pay tribute, making use of the "Holy Inquisition" for that purpose.

The following is one item on the fee-list: "Priests who shall wish to obtain authority to live in concubinage with their relatives shall pay sixteen francs, one sou."

Two Franciscan monks appealed to King Louis of Bavaria against the pope alleging that "The throne of the church has been occupied by wretches who arrogate to themselves the name of Christ, the right to commit every crime with impunity, of despoiling kings and peoples of their wealth, and of putting to death . . . men who reject their audacious pretensions to INFALLIBILITY. We entreat you . . . to overthrow from the Pontifical chair this disgrace to humanity. . . . No longer suffer these thieves, sodomites, assassins to enchain the nation."

King Louis called a great Council in Rome and had Pope John XXII deposed because of his crimes; as the pope was residing in France, the death penalty could not be inflicted; a monk, Peter Rainillucci, was made pope—Nicholas V; now God has TWO substitutes in the world—both equally infallible—one in France, the other in Italy. At his death, John was in possession of 18,000,000 florins and jewelry valued at 7,000,000.

Nicholas V, 1328: An anti-pope—that is, one of two or more men who were duly elected and consecrated to sit in Peter's chair; was dethroned by John XXII, imprisoned three years and strangled; said to have been a good man.

Benedict XII, 1333: Quarreled continuously with kings and princes; a corrupt man.

Clement VI, 1342: Gloried in his shameful conduct as a cardinal—as pope, no better. At this time the people of Rome were sorely oppressed by the nobility; Rienzi declared Rome a republic, but papal gold and intrigue forced him to flee for his life.

The day before the death of Clement, he is said to have received the following letter from the Bishop of Milan: "Beelzebub, Prince of Darkness, to Pope Clement, his vicar: Your mother, Pride, salutes you; your sisters, Knavery, Avarice and Shamelessness; and your brothers, Incest, Robbery and Murder, thank you for having caused them to prosper. Given from the center of hell, amid acclamations of a troupe of demons; and in the presence of two hundred damned popes, who wait your presence with impatience."

Innocent VI, 1352: Endeavored to co-operate with Rienzi, who had returned to Rome; Innocent assassinated by a monk.

Charles IV of Germany desired to be crowned by the pope; journeyed to Rome as a barefooted pilgrim, debasing himself before the pope. Petrarch, a poet of Italy, to indicate to Charles what kind of creature he had submitted to, addressed him: ". . .

in a word, the salvation of the human family lies in gold; it is gold alone that can appease the monster, chain him, make him smile; with gold you may deflower your sister, murder your father; with gold you can open heaven, buy the saints, the angels, the virgins, the Holy Spirit, Jesus Christ and the Eternal Father Himself—the pope will sell you everything for gold except his tiara.” Rather scathing indictment of the supreme ruler of the universe. Innocent VI, however, appears to have been a better man than many of the popes.

Gregory XI, 1370: The papal treasury was about exhausted; in order to replenish it, Gregory ordered Charles V to extirpate the heretics in his realm, to excite the courage of the Inquisitors. The papal court was at Avignon, where it was established twenty years previously; a delegation was sent from Rome to the pope, informing him that, as he claimed dominion over the city, he would either have to surrender title, or remove the court to Rome—so he established himself in Rome.

The British Isles were Catholic, but opposition to papal domination was becoming pronounced; Wycliffe sought to free the country of papal power; Gregory ordered the Bishop of London to arrest Wycliffe, put him to the torture, and forward to him any confession the victim may make.

Urban VI, 1378, at Rome:

Clement VII, 1378, at Avignon: Again the papal church is a two-headed institution, which split Europe into factions, each claiming its man to be God's superintendent of this mundane sphere. As each and every pope was “infallible,” the fact of two popes existing at the same time was a problem for that church, concerning which, the Jesuit historian, Maimburg, declared: “An universal Council, which had the infallible assistance of the Holy Spirit, could not decide this grave question.” This divided Europe into two hostile camps: Germany, England, Hungary, Poland, Bohemia, Denmark, Sweden, Prussia, Norway, Holland, Tuscany, Lombardy and Milan favored Urban; Charles of France, Savoy, Lorraine, Navarre, Scotland, Aragon and Castile were for Clement. Anathemas, interdicts, depositions and maledictions were hurled from one pope to the other, culminating in a bloody war among the nations: “Everywhere hamlets and villages exhibited only ruins; dead bodies of thousands of men and women lay unburied on the fields; flocks wandered without resting places.”

No pen can describe the horrors of those times—nor any war brought on by the “divine right” parasites of Europe—when every means of torture and slow death were employed.

Urban died in 1389; Clement, 1398.

Boniface IX, at Rome:

Benedict XIII, at Avignon: Boniface succeeded Urban, while Clement was still living at Avignon: two more popes at one time. England separated herself from the papacy; France, being tired of “two popes to fatten,” endeavored to end the schism. Benedict died.

Innocent VII, 1404: At Rome; spent the greater part of his four years trying to overcome the plots of his brother man-god, Boniface, at Avignon.

Gregory XII, 1406: At Rome; succeeded Innocent VII; he continues at Avignon. Theodoric of Neim describes the times, saying that "the Christian world is abandoned to frightful calamities; . . . all the virtues have been banished among men, great and small, from king to serf. . . . There is nothing sound or whole in the universal church; all its body is cursed with impure leprosy, from the sole of the feet to the crown of the head."

Gregory was making preparations to torture his "sacred college" of cardinals; becoming frightened, they fled—and now we have the spectacle of a pope and a college of cardinals anathematizing each other; and both are "infallible!" Benedict was driven from France; a joint college of cardinals was called, which ordered both popes to appear before that tribunal; they ignored the summons, whereupon the Patriarch of Alexander proceeded to pronounce sentence upon those "two infamous men" from the pulpit. This council deposed both popes, and selected Alexander V.

Alexander V, 1409: At Rome; the only "true" church is still triple-headed. Alexander died very suddenly.

John XXIII, 1410: At Rome; still tri-headed. As a bishop, John was bad enough; worse as pope. He licensed wickedness, and executed all who opposed him; eventually driven from Rome; was deposed by the Council of Constance and imprisoned; he signed his own resignation. At this Council was declared the truth-destroying decree, "Keep no faith with heretics." The first victim to be condemned under this legislation was John Huss, who was cited to appear before that council to be tried for heresy (was a heretic for disagreeing with what the popes decreed), although the Emperor, Sigmund, had granted him safe-conduct; Huss was found guilty of heresy and burnt at the stake; Jerome of Prague, his disciple, suffered the same fate.

Martin V, 1417: Martin was chosen, although Benedict claimed title—his career was soon ended by a monk administering a dose of poison, for which he was hanged and cut into pieces. The King of Aragon convened a council of the church and elected another pope, Clement VIII, which left that institution with only two heads. Pope Martin sent an army against the Bohemians—Huss followers—which received a whipping. He persuaded Clement to resign, leaving him sole head of the church and occupant of the chair of "Peter." For a period of approximately FIFTY YEARS this "only" true church of Christ (?) had two or more heads, each one being duly "consecrated!"

Eugenius IV, 1431: He is said to have been the son of Gregory XII and a nun—a result of Hildebrand's legislation. Quarreled with everybody; deposed at council of Basil.

Felix V, 1439: Successor of Eugenius; although claiming to be God's substitute, he abdicated.

Nicholas V, 1471: Is alleged to have been one of the "best bad popes."

Paul II, 1464: A cruel man.

Sixtus IV, 1471: Cormanin, the historian, styles him "the vilest of men;" the father of several illegitimate children; decreed that nephews and children of popes should be Roman princes; was party to the plot to murder Julius and Lawrence Medici, arranging for assassinations to take place at a signal, which was to be the elevation of the Mass. Julius was killed; Lawrence, though wounded, called for help; for this, two priests and two deacons were hanged. The bishop saved his life by turning State's witness against the pope, whose order he was attempting to obey. Roderick Borgia was, at this time, legate from the papal court to Spain, where he was displaying great power; attempted to dethrone King Henry and put Isabella, the king's sister, on the throne with her husband Ferdinand; was successful after death of Henry.

We now consider a character that will never be forgotten as long as history is truthfully written—Thomas of Torquemada, head of the Dominican priesthood. To him, Christ's (?) Vice-Gerent committed the work of exterminating all heretics and Jews of Spain; he succeeded in filling the prisons of the "holy" office of the Inquisition eleven times in nine months; the sight of wasting bodies, emaciated cheeks, quivering limbs torn from living trunks, broken bones, and the writhing of victims undergoing every torture that the brains of man, assisted by the devil, could devise only served to render those human tigers more ferocious. A decree was issued by the Roman Catholic king, pledging safety to such heretics as would voluntarily return as prisoners to the "holy" Inquisition, promising not only freedom, but also the restoration of confiscated property; large numbers put their "trust" in the word of a Catholic king, and—they were burnt alive! Was the decree of the Council of Constance, "Keep no faith with heretics," valid? So reads the *record*.

Having exhausted the visible supply of heretics, the Catholic Inquisition resorted to what was known as "Informers." Be it observed, that in countries predominantly non-Catholic, the canon law of the pope's church says this law need not be enforced! Like all other laws of that institution, it is to be enforced only as the pope may deem it safe to try it—and he will try it then, even though it should depopulate the earth of all those "Baptized" but not acknowledging the pope as THEIR BISHOP. An "informer" had to report the name of every person suspected of heresy, or favoring heretics. This netted the "holy" fathers nineteen thousand additional victims in less than six months! It was the duty of a Roman Catholic to "inform" on his own father, mother, sister, brother, friend—Pope Leo XIII wrote Cardinal Gibbons not to "neglect what antiquity," and the "Apostolic" teaching required in "reclaiming" heretics! Those horrors staged against man by Italian popery chill the blood—those death-requiring decrees of that institution are as much a part of the laws of that

institution to-day as they were then; nevertheless, Farrell speaks of "suspicion" and "trust!"

Sixtus IV granted bulls establishing the Inquisition by Torquemada; Ferinand was a tool of Borgia's, Borgia being a tool of Sixtus, and he a tool of hell. Roderick Borgia was only qualifying to later become "Christ-veiled-in-the-flesh" under the name of Alexander VI.

Innocent VIII, 1484: Another bloody-handed monster claiming to be the Vice-Gerent of Christ; he sent Archdeacon Albert into France to exterminate the Vaudois—French Proestants—who secured permission from the Catholic French king to carry out the will of the pope. Proceeding with a band of fierce papal soldiers, to execute the command of the pope, they found that the poor people had fled with their children to the mountains; when discovered hiding in a cave, the soldiers closed the entrance with wood and straw and applied the torch; where tinder was not available for the purpose, caves were sealed up with stones. Upon re-opening some of those hiding places, more than eight hundred young children were found dead either in the arms of their mothers or in cradles. The greater number, who did not fall into the clutches of "holy mother church," committed suicide rather than be at the mercy of those whose "main pre-occupation" was serving the "interests" of "Catholicism" as required and defined by the "Holy Father, His Holiness," Pope Innocent VIII. Of six thousand Vaudois, about six hundred only escaped that "loving" embrace of "holy mother church."

Alexander VI, 1491: This is Roderick Borgia, formerly legate of Sixtus IV to Spain.

An interesting era of the world's history now begins; a year after Alexander's election, America was discovered; the Protestant Reformation began to rift the dark cloud of papalism that had enveloped the civilized nations like smoke from the infernal regions.

As a cardinal in Spain, Alexander lived with a Spanish woman—another result of Hildebrand's legislation—and became the father of five children, including Caesar and Lucretia, characters not unknown to historians.

The city of Rome was now at the zenith of papal glory—a seething cauldron, as it were, of crime; assassins ruled; fifty thousand prostitutes walked her streets!

Portugal and Spain were discovering new worlds—and quarreling over ownership. Being chosen abitrator, the pope drew a line from pole to pole, through the Azores, giving all west of that, including America, to Spain, all east to Portugal.

Alexander was so bad that the emperor of Germany, kings of England, France, Castile and Portugal demanded his reform, under pain of being deposed. This Vice-Gerent came to his end by drinking a cup he had prepared for one of his cardinals—by mistake, of course!

Savonarola, the monk, was, by order of Alexander, burnt at the stake, on May 23, 1489, for delivering sermons in which he indicted the corrupt papal court.

Pius III, 1503: Said to have been a good man; served only twenty-six days—poisoned.

Julius II, 1503: Known as the "Warrior Pope." His entire pontificate was spent in making war in every direction.

Leo X, 1513: This pope sent Dominican monks throughout Europe, peddling indulgencies—indulgencies for remission of temporal punishment for breaking any of the Ten Commandments of God; the infamous Tetzl was on this mission in Germany, which aroused the monk, Martin Luther, to action, from which sprang the great Protestant Reformation—and the Church of Rome was forced also to call a great council and attempt to reform itself; Spain was subjugating the New World with fire and sword, while the people of some of the Latin countries, tried beyond endurance, were putting Catholic priests to death.

Martin Luther: A MAN! It took little less than a GOD to STAND ALONE and defy papalism: if one will observe the cowardly, spineless excuses for men in many so-called Protestant pulpits and elsewhere, who will not mention the word "Catholic" except in a cringing, apologetic manner, they will understand what sort of man Luther was. Rome is just as active to-day against peoples and governments and the principles of the Reformation as in Luther's day, but she is attempting to accomplish her objective now mostly through political intrigue and channels of education; she adopts means "to suit places and times"—expediency.

Clement VII, 1523: The British Empire, under the reign of King Henry VIII, severed all connection with the papal court.

Paul III, 1534: The Spanish Ambassador to Rome, himself a Roman Catholic, says this of Paul: "He was shod backwards, so that one might imagine he was going on, while he was turning back." Paul's efforts to crush the Reformation were futile; issued a bull against Henry VIII of England, declaring all his subjects absolved from their allegiance, proclaiming the throne forfeited in favor of the first enemy to occupy it, prohibited other nations having intercourse with England; pronounced all Henry's children bastards, permitting the "faithful" of the church to fall upon him and his.

Calvin, Servetus and Melancthon now appear upon the scene; they differed somewhat in their tenets, but were all agreed concerning papalism, attacking it as a corrupt institution.

At this age was formed that notorious order known as the "Society of Jesus"—Jesuits, by Ignatius Loyola, a broken-down Spanish soldier, who was made a "saint."

Julius III, 1549: He was as vile and degenerate as was the city over which he ruled; made a cardinal of a 16-year-old boy, who was a keeper of monkeys. Queen Mary being on the throne, the Jesuits were admitted again in England, while Protestants were being persecuted. Protestantism made the religion of State in Germany.

Marcellus II, 1555: Highly esteemed—died within twenty-one days.

Paul IV, 1555: To enrich his relatives, had the Caraffa family killed and property confiscated. Spain the only nation murdering non-Catholics.

Pius V, 1556: Endeavored to destroy Queen Elizabeth of England; issued a bull against her, declaring her to be a heretic and favorer of heretics, depriving her of her "pretended title" of queen, absolving all subjects from their allegiance to her, demanding that they refuse to obey her commands or laws.

Before being elected to "hold upon this earth the place of God Almighty," Pius V was an Inquisitor; as pope, he used those instruments for human torture he had become so familiar with: it is charged a young woman was accused of being a follower of Calvin; although she gave birth to a child on the day of her arrest, the pope had her tortured on the rack, with fire and pincers, and water pumped down her throat—she died; the charge was afterward proved untrue. Ordered King Philip of Spain to invade the Netherlands and "make these wretches swim in a sea of blood; fire and sword must transform these plains and cities into deserts." Tens of thousands of Hollanders were massacred by Spanish soldiers.

Pius V was perfecting a plot to exterminate all the Protestants of Europe when he died; was one of the most blood-thirsty monsters on record.

Gregory XIII, 1572: Under the reign of this pope, and with his sanction, Catherine de Medici and her son, Charles IX of France, staged the most cruel and colossal crime and betrayal of "trust" that stains the pages of profane history. The French Protestant Huguenots were lulled into a false sense of security by the Siren song of "peace"; with honeyed words and petty favors the Catholic king and his mother tricked the Huguenots into going to Paris unarmed, to celebrate a "Peace Pact" in the form of a marriage. Catharine proposed that Queen Jane of Navarre—Protestant—marry her son Prince Henry to Margaret of Valois—Catholic—daughter of Catherine, sister of Charles IX. Having laid down "suspicion" with their arms, the Protestants flocked into Paris, and, when the signal was given, on St. Bartholomew's Day, at 1 o'clock, thirty thousand men, women, children and babies were murdered on that and the following day, while seventy to ninety thousand were slain, it is said, within three months in other parts of the country. This was part of the scheme of Pius V.

To perpetuate the memory of this ferocious butchery, Pope Gregory XIII ordered medals struck depicting the event, and had artists paint the bloody scenes in the Vatican halls.

Sixtus V, 1585: Appointed a commission to investigate nunneries of Europe; Aldebranden reported: "Without exception, houses of prostitution." He appointed another commission to revise the Bible, declaring that the edition then in use contained five thousand errors, he himself making many changes in the original text; his edition was, at a later date, suppressed—known as the "Sistine." While pretending to be the friend of Elizabeth,

was secretly intriguing with the Spanish king for her assassination, the purpose being to enthrone Bloody Mary, Queen of Scots. He used the Jesuits where he could, but was their enemy; they are said to have poisoned him August 27, 1590.

Urban VII: Evidently a good man, as he lived twelve days after "elevation" to Peter's chair!

Gregory XIV, 1590: Reigned one year.

Innocent IX: Served eleven months; Cormanin says that Sixtus V, Urban VII, Gregory XIV, and Innocent IX were poisoned by the Jesuits.

Clement VIII, 1592: Tried to dethrone Henry of Navarre; Jesuits endeavored to kill Henry; on evidence the order was expelled from France. Clement also, it is alleged, was poisoned by Jesuits.

Leo XI, 1605: Lived only twenty-six days thereafter!

Paul V, 1605: The plot to blow up the English Parliament, known as the "Guy Fawkes" or "Gunpowder Plot," was hatched under the reign of this pope; thirty barrels of gunpowder were used for the purpose; was foiled by discovery; this occasioned King James I to require all his subjects to swear allegiance to him as supreme in the realm against any foreign pope or potentate.

Gregory XV, 1621: Bitter persecutions of Protestants indulged in; the Jesuits overrun the Americas, China, Japan and India.

Urban VIII, 1623: Horrible wars going on; the pope playing both ends against the middle; Galileo, the astronomer, persecuted for teaching that the earth revolved while the sun remained stationary—declared false and heretical by the papal church. (Centuries after the world had accepted the teaching of Galileo, the Roman church did so!)

Innocent X, 1644: A shameless debauch. Thirty Years' War at an end and Protestantism firmly established in Europe.

Clement XI, 1700: To destroy Protestantism and prevent enlightenment of the "faithful," Clement issued his famous (?) bull, "Unigenitus," condemning for all time reading of the Bible by laymen. (A special permit must be secured, especially in Catholic countries, to read the Bible to-day. Why should they read it? Does not the pope interpret it for them?)

Clement XII, 1730: The most brilliant intellects of France were fulminating against popes and priests. A powerful secret influence was militating against the pope in France and, as Clement could not discover who his enemies were, hurled anathema against the Freemasons, forbidding any person, under pain of death, joining the order. This attack offered a suggestion to other nations—a great light shone in papal darkness—lodges sprang up all over Europe. Clement canonized the bloody Vincent de Paul, who had rendered signal service to the church in helping to kill those who would not bend the knee and will to the Papal Tiger—many churches and papal societies are named in honor of this "saint" to-day! The Italians say this pope was really elected through the instrumentality of bedbugs: when Benedict XIII

went to purgatory, the cardinals prepared, as usual, to elect his successor; many aspirants caused delay; suddenly the cells where the cardinals were became infested with millions of bedbugs, and they hastened to choose a "Vice-Gerent" of Christ!

Benedict XIV, 1740: He was an enigma—forbade the Jesuits to continue practice of conforming to religious laws and customs of heathen lands.

Because of fraudulent business transactions, the constitution of the Jesuits was unearthed before the Catholic Parliament of France, in what is known as the Lavalette Case; the dangerous doctrines of the order as there revealed caused it to be expelled from France—doctrines reversing the natural code as to simony, blasphemy, magic, withcraft, astrology, irreligion, idolatry, impurity, false witness, adultery, incest, sodomy, robbery, suicide, murder, parricide, regicide, etc. At this time they were expelled from Catholic Spain, having already been expelled from Catholic Portugal and Pagan China.

The pope, in attempting to protect the Jesuits, aroused the enmity of all Catholic countries; expediency caused him to turn against them; prepared a bull to suppress the order; poisoned before it was published.

Clement XIV, 1769: Is said to have been the best pope for a thousand years; ordered suppression of the Jesuit order—and was poisoned; as he signed the decree of abolishment, he stated: "I am signing my death-warrant."

Pius VI, 1774: Has a record of twenty-five years of crime and wickedness. Napoleon appears upon the scene; ordered the mandog in Peter's chair to "retract, disavow and annul all decrees, bulls, sentences, censures, edicts, mandamuses, and generally all writings emanating from the papal court since commencement of the Revolution; that he should abolish the Inquisition in all Roman Catholic countries, and suppress the barbarous practice of castration on children (boys) destined to chant in churches." Pius died in a French prison.

Pius VII, 1779: Many clashes between the pope and Napoleon; Pius re-established Jesuit order, which added great impetus to papalism throughout Europe.

Leo XII, 1823: Issued decree against Bible societies, saying that they were "In opposition to the celebrated decree of the Council of Trent, which prohibits the Scriptures from being made common, it (the Bible society) publishes translations of them in all the languages of the world."

Gregory XVI, 1831: Issued a bull condemning free conscience, free press, free opinion; he also issued a bull against the New York Bible Society.

Pius IX, 1846: This pope added the dogmas of the Immaculate Conception and Papal Infallibility to the creed—questions which had been raised and denied many, many years. Historians say that at the time the decree of the first dogma was proclaimed, a cardinal approached the pope's throne and asked if it could be taught, and that the pope replied he did not know; this was re-

peated three times, the pope each time making the answer that had been made for ages, "I do not know," when, lo, the third time, he answered, "Yes!"

While the church dignitaries were struggling with the problem of Mary's immaculate conception—creating a new "dogma" for the "faithful," the moral condition of the "Holy (?) City" was, as stated by W. J. Steelman, United States Consul at Rome, quoted in the *New York Tribune*, January 9, 1871: "It is a proverb among the Romans that 'if one would go to a house of ill-fame he must go by day; at night the priests had all the places,' and another: 'All married women were seduced by the priests'."

Leo XIII, 1878-1903: How well this pope understood the system, and its laws, over which he was the head will be shown by many quotations from his Encyclical Letters in the pages to follow; every utterance of this pope was based upon some law or decree of the church issued by a pope or council.

Pius X, 1903-1914: It seems strange that, as the Great War began, according to the prophecy of Cardinal Newman, Pope Pius X died—and the Black Pope, the General of the Jesuits, is said to have died within the same hour. Was that a coincidence, or Jesuitism in action, to put politicians at the head of the church? Romanism always makes and uses war to divert the human mind from other things, hoping thereby to advance the interests of the papacy—and it has always been successful in a large measure—and always will be; wars will never cease among men until the papacy has been reduced to the natural status in human society as that occupied by other sects. The German emperor nominated the present Jesuit General—and he admitted that order into Germany, abolishing the decree of banishment soon after the war began.

Benedict XV, 1914 (present incumbent of Peter's chair): Pro-German, Austrian and Turk to the core during the Great War; his private secretary, von Gerlach, was in the plot which destroyed two Italian battleships, killing a number of marines; he fled to Switzerland to escape the penalty pronounced by the Italian government against him; Benedict disclaims all knowledge of the deed, of course.

Shortly after this "elevation," Benedict, in addressing his college of cardinals, alluded to Protestant preachers of Italy as "emissaries of satan," that ought to be "destroyed." Of course, he spoke from the heart; that sentiment has characterized the papacy from the sixth century—it is in the oath of the bishops to-day; to "persecute" and make "war" is the distinguishing characteristic of papalism, and will continue to find expression as long as men are swayed by the will of an autocrat—the greatest of whom sits in the Vatican in Italy.

There were 273 "claimants" for Peter's "chair"; now, referring to the third paragraph of the letter preceding this abbreviated history of the popes: If he "who handles pitch will become defiled," what shall we say of a SYSTEM OF RELIGION claiming

to be the only "true" religion of Jesus Christ, that gave the world the Ages Dark as Pitch, and leaders or heads as the above record depicts? What kind of *stream* can flow from *that* fountain? Unchecked, it would defile the world!

In view of *human nature and history of nearly two thousand years*, the association wants to know if I have any suggestions to offer—Yes: I suggest turning to Christ, who died to set the captives free and to overcome the works of the devil, thereby getting just as far away from the influence of Italian papalism as possible.

Comparisons are said to be odious; but I most respectfully ask that the popes of Rome be compared with the Protestant or non-Catholic men who have been President of the United States, and also compare them with the men who have been Grand Masters of the Masonic Lodges in America; I believe these men, taken man for man, will compare favorably with those who claimed to be God's substitute on earth—and the average Protestant and Mason will compare favorably with the average member of the Catholic church!

"A tree is known by its *fruit*." What sort of "tree" is it that gave the world the popes?

Augusta, Ga., Oct. 8, 1917.

Dear Sir: Have you any children? A little, soft-eyed girl, perhaps? a manly, clean little boy? I hope you have, they are the joy and crown of life. (1.)

(2) But would you invite them to read immoral books, scurrilous books, books that attack your character, that condemn your views of right and wrong, that undermine your authority, your place in your own family? Would you? No, of course not; but—

(3) No "but" about it, sir: when you say No, as an honorable man must, you endorse the principle of the Index. The father that feels no responsibility toward his children and no self-respect, will likely condemn many salutary principles, including that of the Index, which a true father holds, but most people would hardly consider such a man a safe guide to follow.

(4) Of course, you may not agree that the church has any responsibility toward her children; but you need not agree to it; that her children agree to it is quite sufficient. You can understand the matter, however, and I feel sure that you must understand now that the Index, in principle at least, is a just, a wise, a considerate thing.

(5) Governments have an Index, too, if you will think a minute; it is practically a universal institution in the civilized world, which would not be long civilized without it.

Very truly yours,

JJF/MOC

J. J. FARRELL, Mgr.
M. O. C.

COMMENT

In the above letter, as in those to follow, figures have been used at the beginning of paragraphs, and occasionally elsewhere; they refer to the paragraph which comments upon that particular part of letter.

(1) Who robs priests and nuns of the *legal* right to enjoy this "joy and crown of life," God, or the pope through his Index?

(2) No man would care to have his children read attacks made upon him, whether true or false; that point argues nothing; on the other hand, an honest man would invite his children to investigate if they did not honor him with their confidence—certainly he would not be considered a worthy father if he should mutilate, maim, deform and murder his children, as did the Roman church, to prevent them from exercising their own minds; he would not employ fire and sword against them when they reached an age of maturity and attempted to exercise their own reason and judgment. The trouble with the Catholic church is, that it takes the wrong view of everything; a principle may be good if judiciously applied, but carried to the extreme, becomes wrong; for instance, Christ spoke of other sheep, which *must* be brought into the fold: the papal institution interprets that as meaning that God has given an Italian pope the right to force the "other" sheep into the papal fold, or *destroy them*. Rome misinterprets and misapplies every principle of reason, justice and Christianity.

The papal church makes no provision for the exercise of reason and private judgment; the Index has been in conflict with these natural rights of man since its adoption, which has kept the world in strife ever since—and will so continue—for, to be in conflict with nature's law means a penalty must be paid.

The papal Index is but a modification of the hatred of the priesthood against free inquiry and research and "innovation" that began with the earliest Egyptian civilization—which has destroyed almost every ancient civilization, and will do that for any tolerating it.

As long as the devil is in the world, spiritual dangers will surround the human soul, from the cradle to the grave; as long as finite man inhabits the earth he will be beset with physical dangers from his first to last breath—there is no place without danger, save in the grave, and if the Index places a person out of "danger," it has sealed him up in an intellectual tomb.

In paragraphs 2, 3, 4, Mr. Farrell tries to defend the Index; he says that "her children agree to it"—no, they don't! They get every phase of their religion as they get their name—it was ready-made for them when they were born; they had nothing to do with making it, cannot change it without *considerable* trouble, so they "agree" to it!

The Blood of Christ bridges the chasm made between man and his God; the papal Index is an effort to span that chasm, as it were, by making it physically and mentally impossible for man to go astray by attempting to prevent a knowledge of good and evil. According to this, it is a pity there wasn't a pope dealing with Adam and Eve, instead of the Great I am—the pope would have destroyed the tree and removed it from their sight! The Index considers everything evil that does not come from the pope—because it is itself a child of the pope's brain—and the history of the popes is sufficient to show what it leads to.

(5) As to government Index: Where the principle is applied, the command emanates *from the people*, who vary it to suit emergencies, and remove it at will; the papal Index, like the Roman church, is an instrument or principle in the hands of ONE MAN—and he the worst type of autocracy—from whose decrees his “children” have no appeal, being themselves created by the same authority that issues regulations which keep them subject to his will. There is not a Catholic layman in the wide world who can be heard in regard to the enactment of any law by which he is to live. To stifle research is to destroy ambition, which offers a fertile field for mental and moral decay. By the way! Catholic laymen are not allowed to possess the Roman Pontificale, etc. WHY?

As a preventive of crime, if the record of papists in America and other countries be taken as a criterion, the Index has been a failure; though it has been a wonderful safeguard of papal interests.

Augusta, Ga., Oct. 9, 1917.

Dear Sir: You have much to say in regard to the “Intention” of the church, the gist of which seems to be that she is a gigantic conspiracy kept secret by means of the Index while operating in virtue of the claim to infallibility. (1)

(2) You adduce a few isolated circumstances and couple them with a few detached utterances of popes or bishops and consider your case is made, notwithstanding the conclusion must extend over many centuries and apply to many millions of persons in order to be even passibly true. Thus you offend logic in using particular cases to establish a general rule, although you do yourself the justice of saying your conclusion is a “guess.”

(3) You break another well recognized rule in the process; the rule that circumstantial evidence is not sufficient for conviction unless it excludes every reasonable hypothesis except that of guilt. Any lawyer will tell you this is a fundamental rule of practice in the administration of justice.

(4) There is no objection, of course, to your offering circumstantial evidence to show that the church is a conspiracy; but it must be subject to this rule, as on reflection you will surely agree.

You will also, no doubt, agree, particularly as you yourself designate it as a “guess,” that your conclusion does not rest on

such evidence as excludes every other reasonable hypothesis.

Therefore, it is merely a suspicion, and as such simply a shield.

Very truly yours,

JJF/MOC

J. J. FARRELL, Mgr.
M. O. C.

COMMENT

We ought to be impressed with the amount of space the association has devoted to defining correct rules of logic, etc.; its general platitudes, obscuring the issues involved is also very marked.

(1) Either Roman Catholicism or Protestantism is a gigantic conspiracy—the anti-Christ; *judge these two trees by their fruits*; that rule was given by the Master. That the popes were true fruit of the papal system, one will hardly deny—and such fruit!

(2) Farrell says I “offend logic in using particular cases to establish a general rule;” let us see: Every case tried in the courts of the several States of the Union involving the questions of life, liberty and property, is determined largely by “using particular cases” to “establish a general rule” of law, termed “precedent,” which is invoked by every competent attorney in his argument, and also used by the judge in formulating his rulings and charge to the jury; thousands of years ago, God handed down His Law through Moses—the Ten Commandments (which the popes have mutilated in part beyond recognition); the spirit and letter of those Commandments will confront every son of Adam’s race before the Great Throne—yet they are somewhat “isolated.” The Christ condensed the sense of the whole Law into one sentence, when He said to Nicodemus, “Ye must be born again.” To a Romanist, it may be against the correct rules of logic to use this “particular case to establish a general rule”: that all mankind must be born again before they can see God; but it makes no difference how many centuries pass, nor how many teeming millions of people come and go with them, the “general rule” established by this “particular case” can never be “isolated.” (Romanism substitutes baptism for the new birth; salvation is sought through good works and purgatorial fire: if the atoning Blood of Christ does not cleanse from *all* sin, a soul may burn in the fires of purgatory until God abdicates His throne in favor of the devil and that soul will continue to burn.)

Mr. Farrell says I “break another recognized rule in the process”; it will be seen throughout these pages that I do not rely on “circumstantial” evidence; but where I do, it will be apparent to the “jury,” who are at liberty to give it such weight in arriving at the truth in the case as they deem wise.

Guilt can be established by direct, indirect and circumstantial evidence—direct being the most conclusive. Now, I indict the Roman Catholic church, called the papacy, with high crime

against the human race in that it conspires, secretly and otherwise, to separate man from his Creator, from temporal rulers not Catholic, and subjugating man to the papal religion which is in reality a gigantic political conspiracy against the peace and happiness of the world, consigning to purgatory for disobedience—all of which is contrary to the laws of God, common sense, and reason.

Just a word in passing as to "guessing": when a fact can not be established by positive, direct evidence, it is then legitimate to "guess" or surmise as to the facts in the case, which may be developed by "circumstantial evidence;" for instance, for approximately fifty years, beginning in 1878, there were two or more popes all the time—each duly "elevated"—and the "holy fathers," who make tradition, were not able to "guess" nor prove, even with the aid (?) of the Holy Spirit, which one was the real head of the Italian church; again, I read in the Manual of Christian Doctrine that laymen cannot have a copy of the Pontificale Romanum, Breviary, Ritual, etc., and in correspondence with an officer of a Catholic society, Mr. John J. McCreary, lawyer, I discovered that he is either without one of those books, or if having access thereto, *attempts to conceal* the "gigantic" conspiracy of the papal church as shown by the direct evidence contained in the bishop's oath; these circumstances are sufficient to convict, although the conclusion is a "guess" based upon such circumstances.

The truth of a proposition may be established to the satisfaction of a reasoning mind by Confession, Documentary Evidence, Direct Evidence, Circumstantial Evidence. Documentary Evidence may be a written statement by one in possession of the facts; Direct Evidence, when facts are revealed by one who was a party to, or present at, the commission of a crime; Circumstantial, where all the circumstances surrounding a case, based upon human experience, proves the existence of a fact to a reasonable certainty; also, there is State's Evidence—where one was a party to a crime, but turned State's Evidence, incriminating himself along with others implicated.

Confession: Where a person acknowledges before proper officials that he did the deed; this determines, judicially, the issue to which it relates.

Admission of guilt obviates the necessity of proof.

Documentary Evidence: Written or printed statements concerning a crime, either by one who did the deed or saw it committed.

Direct Evidence: Where one or more people saw a crime committed; this establishes the fact to be proved.

Circumstantial Evidence: Where a person was known to have been at the place at the time a crime was committed; tends to prove a fact.

"Suspicion" is that element which attaches to a person arising from his personal appearance, manner and general reputation (i. e., his "history"). Suspicion, alone, is not sufficient to convict; but it may lead to the apprehension of the criminal, or cause his withdrawal from a community, which may be preventive of crime.

Keep these rules of evidence in mind; they will apply in some manner to every charge made against the papacy; the "jury" will please disregard any charge in the indictment that is not supported by said rules of evidence.

To appreciate the weight and importance to be attached to evidence, it is necessary to know what opportunity the witness had to learn the facts, *as well as his relation to the parties* being tried.

In the investigation of my charges against the SYSTEM, it is necessary to use every sort of evidence that is admissible in a court of justice, and know the relation each witness sustains to that institution, his means of knowing what is the truth of a question, and his interest in concealing the truth and facts in the case.

The Roman church is divided into two branches: the "Teaching Church," which is the pope, and the "Hearing Church," consisting of laymen; the "Hearing Church" could fall away, yet the Catholic church would remain; but if the "Teaching Church," the pope, should fall away, there would be no Catholic church. The pope appoints the cardinals, they elect the pope; all priests are directly under authority of bishops who are consecrated by the pope or his legate, while laymen are under the authority of the bishop through the priest—they are as newborn babes in a home, who are powerless to resist, and consequently must take anything given them without protest; they have no voice in creating new dogmas or laws; they are as children, who are taught that the pope can command nothing wrong; they are indifferent to the secret teaching of the pope in those books which they cannot possess or read, *though authenticated by papal authority*; if the pope commands the execution of all the requirements contained in the oath of their bishop, as "faithful" children *they must obey*. THIS constitutes, in part, the charge that the papal church is a secret, gigantic conspiracy: it always has perfectly arranged machinery by which it can hurl men at each other's throats, if the pope should see fit to "press the button."

The pope of Rome, being the sole head and authority, calls himself Christ's Vice-Gerent, having himself declared Infallible at the Vatican Council; Catholic writers have very little to say about this decree; it is said that, when it was up for action, 150 of the 692 members present withdrew, being opposed to the adoption of the decree that the Jesuit order had struggled to get

enacted century after century—a dogma that had been rejected by other *infallible* councils. This decree acknowledges that all popes and councils were equally infallible. Bishop Strosmyer denounced it on the Vatican floor, saying that history proved there were frequent conflicts between popes and councils and between popes and popes; the bishops and cardinals at this council knew history and Catholic dogma, consequently about one-fourth of them dissented; they knew it was an imposition, and that it contained the germ of death to the papacy.

Realizing its danger, all Catholics try to restrict the application and scope of the decree of Infallibility; that it is recognized as applying strictly to things spiritual.

The mission of Christ upon the earth was to perfect the plan of redemption, destroy the works of satan, and teach man the way home; although He was to return to His Father, He promised not to leave His people alone, but would send the Comforter, who would “teach you all things, and bring to your remembrance whatsoever I have said unto you,” John 14:26. The pope says he is holding the place of God on earth, and that through him God makes known His will—which is visualizing the manifestation of God in spiritual things; this demands a like means of teaching or reminding, equivalent to the work of the Spirit, therefore the pope uses the pen and issues Encyclical Letters, Bulls, Decrees, Allocutions, Constitutions, etc., visualized means of bringing to the remembrance of Catholics whatsoever he as god commands. To deny this is a denial of papal infallibility: if God is infallible, then the pope, if he is holding the place of God, must be infallible; and if the Holy Spirit is infallible in His office, so likewise must the means used by the pope, as a substitute for the Holy Spirit, be infallible—i. e., his letters, bulls, decrees, etc., by which he “impresses” upon the hearts of his children his will.

God is Infallible, Immutable—so also the Holy Spirit, in all things; hence, if the pope does not possess these characteristics in all things, he is an imposter. *Farrell* acknowledged that the pope is *not* infallible in everything!

(4) I am willing for the average American citizen to consider the evidence herein, and I will be satisfied with the verdict!

Mr. *Farrell* has a penchant for declaring “correct rules,” and the effect of “circumstantial evidence;” he should also indicate on what point I violated said rules, or used circumstantial evidence not applicable; for instance, he should have challenged my criticism of his answer to Question 13, or 29; these are the “posts” he should have “hitched” to—but he wouldn’t, because he couldn’t; he did the best he could, though—let them severely alone!

Augusta, Ga., Oct. 10, 1917.

Dear Sir: Regarding the "Intention" of the Index:

Refer to Leo XIII, Encyclical of January 25, 1897, relating to prohibited books, in the opening sentence of which the aim sought is stated—"that the integrity of Christian faith and morals may suffer no diminution." This, of course, is a worthy purpose, only you suspect it is not Leo's real purpose. (1).

(2) But mark further on: "The early days of the church were witnesses of the zeal of St. Paul in this respect ('the converted heathens brought him their books to be *burned*,' Acts xix:19); and every subsequent age has witnessed the vigilance of the Fathers, the commands of bishops and the decrees of councils in this direction." So you must connect the "Intention" you impute to Leo with a like "Intention" in his predecessors and other bishops, going link by link, back to the Apostles.

(3) They all did the same thing. Ostensibly, they had the same purpose, a worthy purpose, to safeguard faith and morals. You say their "intention" was criminal, to keep their followers in ignorance, and you foolishly imagine they have succeeded for sixty generations with their followers in every walk of life and numbering hundreds of millions and scattered all over the world.

Do you really believe yours is the *only* REASONABLE hypothesis to be drawn from the circumstances?

If you don't, you are out of court. If you do, God help you, man.

Very truly,

JJF/MC

J. J. FARRELL, Mgr.
M. O. C.

COMMENT

(1) Change the word "Christian" to "Papal," and I will concede all the rest.

Leo XIII was pope twenty-five years; his predecessor, Pius IX, thirty-one; if any men ever knew the spirit and genius of popery, they were the men. Catholics must believe what they taught, and be obedient to their decrees; so we must look to the popes and councils for information as to what is the "intention" of papalism—not what some obscure, priest-directed laymen may say. It is from considering evidence from the highest source that we arrive at a conclusion—and *the popes furnish that evidence*.

(2) It required just fifteen hundred and one years for popery to discover the need of the Index (although Gregory the Great burnt the priceless library of the Caesars, mutilated statuary, drove out the mathematicians and scholars—which was the beginning, and cause, of the Dark Ages). Alexander VI, a man "so damnably vile" that his record could not be printed—the man who bought "Peter's Chair" with gold—established the Index. So abominable was this man, that six temporal rulers demanded his reform, or they would have him deposed; their messengers were insulted and driven from the papal court; in this case, necessity being the mother of invention, Alexander issued an edict for Ger-

many, "to restrain printers from reproducing writings directed against the Catholic faith or calculated to give scandal to Catholics" (Pastor's History of the Popes, vol. 6, pp. 154-5), which gave the world that fetter to progress, the Index.

Leo X had to contend with Martin Luther and the Reformation, so he enlarged upon the principles of the Index. In the fifteenth, sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the popes found it a very present help in their times of trouble, to keep the "faithful" from scanning their records, and to prevent others from learning what the popes did not want to be known.

The efficacy of the Index was recognized as the best means of "closing" the records of popes and priests, and to prevent *anyone* from investigating *any* question except under papal censorship and supervision; hence, we find Leo XIII saying—and here he is exercising his SUPREMACY—in Decree 48, on p. 421, of Encyclical Letters, January 25, 1897, setting out the Law of the Index:

"Those who, without the approbation of the ordinary (bishop?) print or cause to be printed, books of the Holy Scripture, or notes or commentaries on the same, incur *ipso facto* excommunication."

This is quite an expansion of the Index as at first instituted by Alexander!

According to the Canon Law of the papal church, it is no crime, in a legal sense, to kill one who has been excommunicated. The Rheinish Bible, published for the use of priests in 1815, duly censored according to the Rules of the Index, in notes on John x:1 and Heb. v:1, says: "All Protestant clergy are thieves, murderers and ministers of the devil." (So said the present pope in his address to his sacred college of cardinals, 1914.) On Rev. xi:6-20: "Christian people, *bishops especially*, should have great zeal against heretics, and hate them . . . after the manner of holy Elias that in zeal killed four hundred and fifty false prophets." (See if that is not in accord with the bishop's oath, *to-day!*) On Acts xix:19: "A Christian should deface and burn all heretical books." In England, in 1543, the papists secured an Act of Parliament which permitted "Noblemen or Gentlemen to have the Bible read to him in or about the house, but no Woman, Artificer, Apprentice, Journeyman, nor Servingman under the degree of Yeoman; nor any Husbandman or Laborer might read it." Burnett, History of Ref., p. 30.

With the above facts in mind, we are better prepared to consider Mr. Farrell's reference to the Index, and what Leo said Paul did in Acts xix:19: Paul was preaching among the Ephesians; under divine direction his ministry was attended with great results; many of the heathen believed his message of the Crucified Christ—here's the account: "19. Many of them also which used curious arts brought their books together, and burnt them

before all men." Carefully observe, that they "brought" their books—Paul did not have to threaten them with *excommunication* and *removal from earth by death*, to get them; but when the Christ was made known, they choose Him in the place of what they had, displaying the free moral agency requisite to please God, and the right to exercise private judgment. They witnessed no "vigilance" on the part of Paul in this respect; he issued no "decree" concerning the matter; so this breaks the link the papacy tried to forge between them and the Apostles fifteen centuries thereafter.

Now, as to the "books" the converts voluntarily gave up to the flames: There were no books in those days, as we understand the word. The Ephesians used "curious arts," that is, magic, arts, sorceries, incantations, etc., and their "books" were Ephesian characters, which appear to have been "amulets" inscribed with strange characters, that were carried on the body for the purpose of curing diseases, repelling evil spirits, and for preserving from evils of different kinds—*just as the negro wears his rabbit foot, and the Catholic his Scapular*—and those "books" merely taught the science, manner of formation, and use of those charms. So, we understand, they voluntarily "brought" and destroyed their "books" treating of "curious arts."

I will admit that the Index has been a success in preserving *papal* faith and morals, but it has not served the Kingdom of Christ among men, nor benefited the morality of nations submitting to it; for on page 383 of the prayer book censored by Cardinal Gibbons we are told that the *Scapular* or *Little Habit of the Blessed Virgin* (Mary) was, according to a "most authentic tradition," given by Virgin Mary herself, as a pledge of her love and patronage, to Simon Stock, General of the Carmelites, July 16, 1215. There are now several different kinds of scapulars which the "faithful" throughout the world wear, suspended under their clothing from a string tied around the neck, to prevent sickness, keep off evil spirits, etc., just as the Ephesians did! Not only does the Roman church make and sell scapulars for those purposes, but blesses and sells little charms—images, of "St." Anthony, who commanded a mule to bow down before him and worship the "Sacred Host" (pancake-god) which he held in his hands, and also preached Christ to the fishes of the sea; the magic of this charm is to aid the purchaser in locating lost articles; then they have the image of "St." Joseph—it assists the purchaser to get rich—then there is the "Sacred Heart of Jesus" (!) which helps in securing a wife or husband, as the case may be, for the purchaser; and then there are the purgatorial societies, in which you buy a policy as you would any other fire insurance, which may be valid for the use of your friends, relatives or yourself! (In Eng-

land the law against Superstition prevents bequests for this purpose.)

This touches upon only one of the interests of the church of Rome served and conserved by the Index: the papacy threatens to excommunicate any of the "faithful" who may read a book exposing these hypocritical, blasphemous things, or the SYSTEM which commands their use. There is not a person in the world who can defend this practice of the Roman institution, either in print or on the platform, before intelligent people, so the pope uses the Index to keep his subjects from reading about them, and forbids attending any meeting where they are discussed and exposed. Should a Catholic ask a priest concerning dogmas or decrees of the Italian church which does not square with reason and common sense, the priest will either reply that it does not become him to be asking such questions, or he will cry "Creeda!"—the church says so—and that settles it: it becomes forever a "closed" question to that soul.

(3) The origin of the Index has been explained; its "intention" then was to shield the papacy and its priests; it has been enlarged since its beginning in 1501 so that for about thirteen generations (instead of sixty) it has kept the Catholic mind buried and steeped in papal lore of the Middle Ages.

Idolatry caused the loss of the Ten Tribes of Israel; it will destroy a soul, or hundreds of million souls, scattered all over the world, through successive ages; if superstitious dread of purgatory and priestly powers can keep *one* soul from free inquiry and thus pervert it, the system with its "sufficient number of priests" can just as easily produce the same effect on hundreds of millions in all ages.

I do not believe I am "out of court" in this matter, and will not be, until the Roman church can defend wearing scapulars before an audience of intelligent people in debate, or prove the Bible untrue. To me, however, these matters are of no personal concern—and would not be considered were it not for the fact that the same power that *makes Catholics* and shapes their "faith and morals," also requires them to believe they have the right to make me and my fellow-countrymen buy scapulars and bury Reason under the papal Index—which can be done, if the public schools are turned over to the pope's "children" and they are placed in political positions where they can assist in the propaganda to "Make America Dominantly Catholic."

Augusta, Ga., Oct. 11, 1917.

Dear Sir: Touching the doctrine of Infallibility.

Your not knowing the teaching of the church in this matter has caused you to set up the shield of suspicion here, too, and you suspect the purpose of infallibility to be also the shackling of the mind.

Now you do not have to subscribe to the doctrine of infallibility in order to understand what it is and what is its purpose. So far as shackling the mind is concerned, its purpose is not to shackle, but to free, the mind. And that is its effect, too. Let us see, now.

The human mind is hampered, hindered, halted, held, chained, enslaved, and all that, by one thing, and only one, and that is Doubt. Say what you please, "The truth shall make you free." Certainty is the very essence of intellectual liberty; doubt the very bond of intellectual subjection. In every phase of mental activity, touching every subject that engages the human mind, where there is doubt there is no progress; where doubt is removed the mind goes forward to the end.

The doctrine of infallibility has for its single aim and purpose, the removal of doubt in respect to faith and morals; its purpose therefore, is to free the mind. It does actually remove doubt among Catholics; its effect therefore is to free the mind.

You say it doesn't do that. But for Catholics, my friend, it does; so there you are. They, at least, are free.

Very truly,

JJF/MC

J. J. FARRELL, Mgr.

COMMENT

I have gazed with wonder and admiration on the great Mogul engine; have never built one, nor been present as each piece of steel and iron and wood and copper was shaped and assembled; but in viewing it as a whole, while IGNORANT as to the relation one part sustained to the others, I had no DOUBT as to the interdependence of one part on the other, nor any DOUBT as to what was the "intention" for creating that ponderous piece of perfect-fitting machinery. If I had never seen or heard of a steam engine, in my IGNORANCE I may DOUBT what may be told me concerning it; but, after seeing it in operation, I am no longer IGNORANT of it, therefore have no DOUBT of its capacity and speed—hence, we see that it is IGNORANCE which causes DOUBT and unbelief, which can be dissipated only by a *personal, individual investigation of the subject*—and it is *ignorance*, not *doubt*, that chains the mind.

Thomas was IGNORANT of Christ and His teaching, therefore he was hampered with doubt; but when he saw Christ—investigated the nail-prints *himself*, ignorance was *displaced by knowledge*, and doubt vanished.

Mr. Farrell uses the word "doubt" as a noun: "a fluctuation of mind respecting truth or propriety, arising from DEFECT OF KNOWLEDGE OR EVIDENCE," and that the doctrine of infallibility destroys that condition of mind in matters of faith and morals; he thus shows that the Index and Infallibility are merely interdependent parts of the great papal political machine for world-government. The Index prohibits a personal investigation of a given subject, while the Catholic is required to accept what

the pope declares to be true: he does not examine the evidence personally and secure a *knowledge* of the question, as a necessary means of freeing the mind from the chains of ignorance and superstition—he pins his faith to the word of the pope!

Ignorance is a want, absence, or destitution of *knowledge*. An Indian would accept onion seed for gunpowder, and pay well for it; was his trouble "doubt" or "ignorance"? When some calamity besets a scapular-wearer, what excuse does the priest offer? The Indian, when his gun failed to fire, scalped *his* deceiver!

If we are content to be as dumb brutes, with bridles upon our intellectual faculties, and be driven in any direction that may please him who holds the lines, we may be "free"; but this cannot be granted as long as man is born with an individuality, a reasoning faculty and a capacity for acquiring *knowledge*; Mahomet may burn the Alexandrian library, Gregory that of the Caesars—but they could not thereby convince any one that they were the sole possessors of the truth.

The very existence of a controversy precludes establishing the truth without evidence to prove it: have Catholics a personal knowledge that the pope is infallible in anything? What line of investigation have they pursued to secure the *knowledge* which removes doubt? They say, "The church says so"; granted; but how many times did the *church* say, "I do not know"? And who is the "church"? The pope! To free the Catholic mind from *doubt*: "fluctuation of mind respecting truth," the *pope* makes a declaration, the church says "Creeda!" "Infallible!" the Index says, "Enough—search no further—it's a 'closed' question!" And it is—to *Catholics*—who are required to make it a closed question to all others.

The association seems to have confused "ignorance" with "doubt." Man was practically ignorant of God and His purposes: Christ came to manifest the will of the Father; there can be no doubt where one is ignorant of a fact; a doubt arises in the mind relative to any question of fact, and remains until it is removed by such evidence as conveys a *knowledge* of it.

Mr. Farrell says Infallibility removes doubt from the minds of Catholics and makes them free; in other words, they must believe what the pope teaches through his priests as if it were God speaking to them, as He did to Moses on the Mount—that this is a dangerous, undemocratic, progress-destroying doctrine will be amply demonstrated as we progress with these letters.

Augusta, Ga., Oct. 13, 1917.

Dear Sir: You may say that you do not object to the church having dogmas, but to her claim that they are defined by infallible authority, even when, it might be, the pope declaring them is a wicked man. (1)

Which would convince me, if your paper left any doubt about it, though it does not, that you do not understand the doctrine of Papal Infallibility. Again reminding you, in order to disarm your suspicion as far as possible, that you do not need to agree to this doctrine in order to understand it, I shall try to make it clear, citing the Catholic Encyclopedia, as general authority for what follows on this score.

(2) First, we must distinguish the Infallibility of the pope from his Supremacy. Your failure to do this has caused you to cite as infallible many utterances of Pope Leo XIII which, though authoritative, are not infallible. To tell you the plain truth, not one citation you make from him is of infallible, as distinguished from supreme, authority. It is doubtful if Leo XIII ever once called into exercise the infallible magisterium of his office; or if any other pope has done so since Pius IX defined the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception.

(3) As Supreme Head of the Church, the pope in all that pertains to the church has supreme authority, executive, legislative, judicial, as preacher, doctor, and pastor. As the Infallible Voice of the church he is limited strictly to the DEFINITION of DOGMAS on faith and morals.

Mark the emphasis thoroughly; and more on this Monday.

Very truly yours,

JJF/MOC

J. J. FARRELL, Mgr.
M. O. C.

COMMENT

I am not interested in the dogmas of the papal church *per se*, nor their origin; but the effect they have on those who enjoy the rights of citizenship; I am concerned with the demands made by the head of that system for Catholics to exert themselves to make the laws of the land conform to the laws of the Italian church.

When I am convinced that God uses the devil to preach redemption to a lost world, I will believe He uses wicked popes for the same purpose; Paul said to the Romans, "Know ye not, that to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are, whether of sin unto death or of obedience unto righteousness?" Rom. vi:16. Christ said, "No man can serve two masters." For a pope to be like Christ, he must be infallible in *all* things—to say he is in some, but not in others, makes him, it seems to me, the servant of two masters—riding horses going in opposite directions: what does the history of the popes teach us?

(2) As to the distinction between papal infallibility and supremacy, there may be an impressive difference to Catholics, but to me they are twin doctrines—a sort of double-barrel-gun affair—one shooting a little farther than the other. From the year 606 A. D. the world has been kept in a turmoil by efforts to establish and maintain papal *supremacy*. It makes no material difference to the world whether the pope speaks as the *infallible* or *supreme* head of the church: in either case he demands submis-

sion, or obedience; if this were not true, it would be foolish for a pope to issue bulls, encyclicals, etc., *which are based upon the dogmas and laws of the church*, the purpose of said laws being to enforce his infallibility in matters of faith. He who has the power to *define* a dogma must also be clothed with authority to issue a decree *requiring* its acceptance and observance on the part of all who have been *baptized*; and with the infallible end of the matter, that is for Catholics to worry over, but as to the latter, his supremacy, his presumed right to enforce his dogmas and decrees, all free men must be concerned. Infallibility gives the pope the right to define a matter for belief, supremacy gives him the power to enforce it, for he is, as stated by the association in paragraph 2, "supreme . . . executive, legislative, judicial." As the infallible Voice of the Church alone he would be perfectly harmless and unobjectionable; but as chief *legislator, judge and executive* he constitutes a menace to the human race.

Augusta, Ga., Oct. 12, 1917

Dear Sir: You know, we are taught truths of mathematics, and many other "dogmas" of science and of life, long before our minds can grasp the reason for them. (1)

(2) If this practice were displaced by scepticism, so that each succeeding generation, denouncing all faith, denying all truth and relying upon unaided reason alone, would demand "proof" and "understanding" before believing anything, the intellectual advancement of the race would not be possible.

(3) The heathens, in the absence of religious dogma, continued to sacrifice human beings to their gods long after attaining to a high order of civilization in other respects (*i. e.*, where they had dogma); each succeeding generation was born into the same intellectual bondage of ignorance and doubt that clouded the infancy of the one before.

(4) With a man here yesterday and gone to-morrow, his vision of life is cut off by the horizon of a day, which is too short a time for the most brilliant mind to solve the mysteries of existence, here and hereafter; and this is saying nothing of the minds of the multitude.

(5) To deny the value of dogma is to disown for one's self and to deny to posterity, the greatest heritage of the human mind.

Very truly yours,

JJF/MOC

J. J. FARRELL, Mgr.
M. O. C.

COMMENT

(1) The word "dogmas" means "to think"; as now used by the papal church it means: a settled opinion, principle, maxim or tenet, especially in matters of faith and morals; the pope alone can define a dogma, therefore he alone has the right "to think" and investigate for the rest of the world. While "we are taught truths of mathematics," etc., before we can grasp the reason for

them, yet as we develop physically and mentally, our minds expand and we acquire an understanding of the reasons for them; take mathematics: a child begins school practically ignorant of quantities, but as the apple is divided by the teacher into two equal parts, and four equal parts, the young mind begins to understand and to reason; as a necessity for the knowledge of mathematics is realized, it may be pursued through the higher branches; (2) as advancement is made in the science, a most important fact is discovered, namely, that every question can be answered to "a mathematical certainty"—the science offers *proof to the understanding*, demonstrates the truth of the matter proposed to the child for belief. A teacher may inform the pupil that "two plus two equals four" and command the child to profess to believe it, which it may do; but unless it is taught all the rules of the science by which it is enabled to "investigate" and "prove" what it is taught to *profess*, it does not *know* that two and two equals four—cannot *prove* it, therefore its progress in mathematics would be limited indeed. Apply this principle to "faith and morals" and we have the Dark Ages.

It was a "dogma" among physicians many years ago to deprive the patient of as much blood as possible—destroy the life-sustaining element—as a means of "curing" disease. This criminal practice was abandoned as ignorance gave way to knowledge, which resulted from *investigations* pursued independently by different men; the "dogmas" of the pope cannot undergo this process. If the pope declares there is a purgatory, the Catholic will say so, too; the pope does the *thinking* for the Catholic, and forbids him to question his declaration or to make an independent investigation of the subject. This applies to every question arising under faith and morals—the pope declares that "two and two equals four," which prevents free inquiry and intellectual advancement; it is well that the pope forbids investigation of his *dogmas*, for if one does, he will become lost in the maze of ancient paganism: holy water, purgatory, vestal virgins, image worship, blessed candles, scapulars, beads, popes, sacred relics, mother of god, etc.; the Index is the instrument used by the papal institution to prevent investigation of any of these things.

Mr. Farrell is wrong regarding the *heathens*; it was a "dogma" among the Brahmins, *taught by priests*, that when a woman lost her husband she must be burnt alive on the corpse in order to please their gods; heathens were taught to believe that the birth of a female child signified that their god was displeased, and the only way to placate him was to consign the child to the waters to be devoured by alligators. He is correct, though, concerning the perpetuation of these heathen customs and "dogmas"—"each succeeding generation was born" under a system of ready-made

faith; and what he says in regard to them, I say respecting papalism; the principle of the Index in the hands of the Roman priesthood chains the intellect so that people otherwise intelligent bow down to a piece of pancake, worship it as God, then eat it, *professing* to believe they are actually eating Jesus Christ, and millions of human beings have been sacrificed on the altars of the papal god because they said the priests of Rome could not *prove* the truth of that dogma defined by the pope and proposed for their belief; and it is written in the fundamental law of the papal church that the pope has the right to murder dissenters, TO-DAY; the theology of the Roman church also teaches that "right"; so I ask Mr. Farrell to state what is the material difference between the dogma of the heathen requiring the wife to be burnt with the dead body of the husband, and the "right" of the Catholic church to burn man and intelligence on the funeral pyre kindled by papal dogma and superstition. Right here in Macon, Ga., in this, the twentieth century, papists endeavored to "close" the city hall against lecturers on these dogmas of the pope, who were to address non-Catholics!

(4) I admit the truth of this statement; and because it is true, I contend that every fact that has been proved by the best scholars throughout the ages should be accessible to *every* man *to-day*: the history of successes and failures should be an open book so that to-day and to-morrow man may profit by them; if they are "closed" by any creed or dogma, the result will be intellectual stagnation and retrogression.

(5) The effort to deny man the open Bible and free inquiry is an effort to subjugate the human mind to the "dogma"—"thought"—of one man; to forbid Reason the right to demand "proof" of the pope that he THINKS RIGHT, is to destroy the purpose of man's creation and make him unworthy of Redemption; it clamps the wheels of progress, and steeps people in ignorance that results in mental slavery and misery. Scan the pages of history of any country dominated by the pope since the year 606 for proof of the foregoing statements! The Great Jehovah has never tried to FORCE man against his WILL; He says "Try Me," "Prove Me," "Come, let us *reason together*." Christ said "Whosoever WILL"—the pope says "Everybody MUST," and that's why I oppose popery. The dogmas of the pope have not benefited the Latin races, they cannot benefit America!

The Good Book tells us how the devil attempted to overthrow God in His Celestial Abode; failing then, he now declares to all mankind that he "holds the place of God Almighty" on earth—and some people believe him, while others are too cowardly to deny it!

Augusta, Ga., Oct. 15, 1917.

Dear Sir: The pope is not infallible in every teaching he utters; not even in every one he utters concerning faith and morals. He is infallible only when defining dogmas of faith and morals.

And in defining a dogma of faith and morals his infallibility is limited strictly to the *definition* of the dogma; it does not extend to any amplification, exegesis, argument or commentary that may attend the definition. (1.) The church holds that in defining dogma of faith and morals, the pope cannot err. Here is the Vatican Council definition of Papal Infallibility:

"The Roman Pontiff, when he speaks *ex cathedra*—that is, when in the exercise of his office as pastor and teacher of all Christians he defines, by virtue of his supreme Apostolic authority, a doctrine of faith or morals to be held by the whole church—is, by reason of the Divine assistance promised to him in Blessed Peter, possessed of that infallibility with which the Divine Redeemer wished His church to be endowed in defining doctrines of faith and morals, and such definitions of the Roman Pontiff are irreformable of their own nature." (Sess. III, Cap. IV.)

"It is to be noted in the first place that what is claimed for the pope is infallibility merely, not impeccability or inspiration. In the next place the infallibility claimed for the pope is no more than that which the church as a whole possesses. In the third place, infallibility is not attributed to every doctrinal act of the pope. . . . He must teach in his public and official capacity as pastor and doctor of all Christians, not as theologian, preacher or allocutionist, nor as temporal prince, or as mere bishop of the See of Rome . . .

"It must be evident that he intends to determine some point of doctrine in an absolutely final and IRREVOCABLE way. . . . It must be clear that he intends to demand INTERNAL assent from all the faithful under pain of incurring spiritual shipwreck." (Catholic Encyclopedia, Vol. VII, p. 769.)

You can readily see, therefore, that the infallibility of the pope is much more narrowly restricted than you imply in your paper.

Very truly yours,

JJF/MOC

J. J. FARRELL, Mgr.

COMMENT

While the dogma of infallibility may be restricted to defining dogmas, *there is no limit to the co-equal power requiring unconditional submission and obedience to his temporal supremacy and authority*, which is the objectionable and dangerous feature of Roman Catholicism.

The Vatican Council that passed the above dogma of papal infallibility also decreed the supreme power and authority of the pope *in matters not pertaining to infallibility*, and it is as essential for a Catholic to believe in, and be submissive to, the pope's AUTHORITY as in his INFALLIBILITY. The decree itself forever settles that question. It seems strange that Mr. Farrell did

not quote it along with the *first* part. The claim set up by the pope that he has *supreme authority over all Christians* is the bone of contention. In the "Dogmatic Canons and Decrees," imprimatur of Cardinal Farley, New York, 1912, we read from that Vatican Decree:

"Hence we teach and declare that by the appointment of our Lord the Roman church possesses a superiority of ordinary power over all other churches, and that this power of jurisdiction of the Roman Pontiff, which is truly episcopal, is immediate; to which *all*, of whatever right and dignity, both pastors and faithful, both *individually and collectively*, are bound, by their duty of hierarchical subordination and true obedience, to submit, **NOT ONLY IN MATTERS WHICH PERTAIN TO FAITH AND MORALS**, but also **IN THOSE THAT APPERTAIN TO DISCIPLINE AND GOVERNMENT** of the church throughout the world. . . . This is the teaching of Catholic truth, from which *no one* can deviate without loss of faith and salvation.

"If, then, any shall say that the Roman Pontiff has the office merely of inspection or direction and not full and supreme power of jurisdiction over the *universal church*, **NOT ONLY IN THINGS WHICH BELONG TO FAITH AND MORALS**, but also in those which relate to the **DISCIPLINE and GOVERNMENT** of the church throughout the world; or assert that he possesses merely the principal part, and not all the **FULLNESS** of this **SUPREME POWER**, both over each and *all the churches*, and over each and all the pastors and the faithful—let him be anathema."

In the language of Mr. Gladstone, I say the "Third Chapter (of the Vatican Council) on Universal Obedience is a formidable rival to the Fourth Chapter on Infallibility. . . . The Third has an overawing splendor; the Fourth, an iron grip. . . . As he (the pope) **MUST** be obeyed in **ALL HIS JUDGMENTS**, though **NOT *ex cathedra***, it seems a pity he could not likewise give the comforting assurance that they are **ALL** certain to be *right*."

In the above letter Mr. Farrell substantiates the logic of Mr. Gladstone's remarks; he says "the pope is not infallible in every teaching he utters; not even in every one he utters concerning faith and morals." Notwithstanding this fact, that the pope is liable to err in his **JUDGMENTS**, the salvation of Catholics depends upon submission and obedience to him, right or wrong.

(1) At this point Mr. Farrell says "The church holds that in defining dogmas of faith and morals the pope cannot err," but he does not, neither can he, say that Catholics must not be obedient or that it is not commanded. While it may be impossible for the pope to err in defining matters of faith, yet *he can err as supreme judge, legislator and executive* for the whole world, still the Third Chapter binds every Catholic in conscience to obedience to him when he is exercising his fallible "judgment" in matters not per-

taining to faith and morals, under pain of eternal damnation; therefore, every utterance from Leo XIII cited in this book is valid, in force, and must be observed by Roman Catholics as "expediency" may render possible.

Augusta, Ga., Oct. 18, 1917.

Dear Sir: Now as to the infallible prerogative in case the pope should be a wicked man.

(1) Inasmuch as the pope is not clothed with infallibility for his own benefit, but for the benefit of the Christians of the world, in order that they might be free from doubt in regard to the truths essential to Christian salvation, infallibility would fail of its object if it were made dependent upon the character of the human agent through whom it is exercised. It would be an unbelievable hardship on Christian people if before they accepted a truth they were required to probe into the moral character of him who defined it.

(2) There is no more reason why a wicked pope should not be infallible than there is for a wicked man not to be inspired. Now Caiaphas the High Priest who condemned Christ was a wicked man, yet God bestowed the gift of prophecy upon him. (See John vi:49-52; xviii:14.) Truly, therefore, there can be no vital objection to the lesser gift of infallibility being likewise bestowed on unworthy agents. However, God has been good to His church in this respect, not trying the faith of Catholics too severely; for it so happens that no doctrine of the church has been defined by such popes as you have in mind.

(3) By way of illustration, I might suggest to you that the decision of a court has the same value, in law and in fact, whether the presiding judge be a wicked man or not.

Very truly,

JJF/MC

J. J. FARRELL, Mgr.

COMMENT

(1) If the pope is not clothed with infallibility as he sits in supreme judgment and exercises absolute jurisdiction in matters which are not of faith or morals, yet demands obedience and submission, it is very necessary that the personal character of the man be investigated and the world should know by what right he exercises his authority, from whom it is derived, and who are responsible in case he is guilty of malpractice in office; for it is evident if he is liable to err or to commit sin, he should receive that attention which is given to any other man in authority—or more.

The spiritual and physical laws run parallel: to illustrate the "freedom" enjoyed by those dependent upon papal infallibility, in matters of faith and morals, let us revert to the slavery of the South prior to the Civil War: negroes were either sold or born into slavery; the master did all the "thinking," provided food and clothing, and had medical attention rendered when sickness over-

took them; slaves had no rights under the law, therefore had no thought or concern except in the matter of obedience to the commands of the master, and, to the slave, what the master decreed was LAW, and he recognized no other. Under those conditions, the owner had the right to "legislate, judge and punish," while the slave could not question the character nor authority of his master, neither could he take issue with him relative to any command: these conditions prevailed until slavery was abolished: a Catholic cannot question the character of the pope nor his dogmas, while his decrees *must* be faithfully and implicitly obeyed, as superseding any other law. This supreme power of the pope, exacting obedience in all things as it does, has drenched the world in blood century after century, and will continue to do so as long as papalism exists in the world. If Catholics and the world are ever emancipated from papalism, the forces bringing it about will have to be extraneous—it cannot come from within that "church."

The presumptive right of the papacy to rule the world in all matters pertaining to life is based upon the blasphemous doctrine that the pope is Christ's Vice-Gerent—that is, God's "substitute" on earth—as Leo asserts, "We hold upon this earth the place of God Almighty." Now, if it be true that the pope holds the exalted position as God's superintendent of the world; if it be true that God has placed the management of this mundane sphere in the hands of an Italian in Italy, the world has the right to examine his credentials and expect this "superintendent" to be endowed, not only with infallibility as to faith and morals, but also the infallibility of God in his judgments, legislation and execution; to say the pope is without these attributes of God is to question, primarily, the pope's "credentials," as God could not place the world in the keeping of an "agent" without endowing him with all those attributes which He himself possessed—to contend that He did do so, places the Eternal Father in the impossible category of being Wise and Unwise, hence capable of being Good and Evil. The pope desires his credentials to be scrutinized—but they must be prepared by his agents and no questions are to be asked; if they are to be examined by the "faithful," only those documents are to be considered that the priesthood prepares per instructions from the pope.

That the pope exercises authority, no one denies—it is either of God or of the devil.

(2) The reference to Caiaphas proves nothing; the gift of prophecy was not restricted to the friends of God in every instance: we read of Balaam's ass making a statement, while the devils acknowledged the Christ; indeed, God makes the wrath of man to praise Him. The high priest was not the friend of God.

The Father has been good to His church and people: He gave His Infallible Son to die to redeem man, and is the Captain of man's salvation and the Head of His Church, gave His Word to indicate the way, and His Spirit to illumine the minds of men. Christ said "follow Me." Can the human heart and conscience become so depraved as to believe the Christ would strike a pleading, upturned face? Could it be possible for the Great I Am to "persecute" His creatures, or "wage war" with them, for refusing to follow Christ? If God did this, it would be using force, destroying the principle of free moral agency and the plan of redemption, and make salvation depend upon the will of God only, rendering the crucifixion of Christ a farcical, senseless murder.

What is the history of the popes and their church? If the pope is Christ veiled in the flesh, and the people are required to "follow" him (the pope) where and into what will he lead them? Compare the lives of the popes with the life of Christ and His Apostles: time was when the world *had* to "follow" the pope—and he lead it into hell's midnight!

As to any particular pope being in mind, that is not material; the decree of infallibility dissolved and eliminated individualities, creating the OFFICE of POPE, therefore it is not necessary to refer to any particular pope, or date of a decree or dogma: when we refer to the "pope" it is in the same sense as when we refer to God—one and the same, always; to deny this destroys the claim to infallibility and severs the papal institution from all kinship with God, while to admit it is to recognize that a "bad" pope "thought" good doctrine for the "faithful," which would be contrary to the teaching of the Bible, which says that good and evil cannot come from the same source.

(8) I admit that the judge on the bench may be, and many have been, a wicked man; but there is no similarity between a judge on the bench and the pope: the judge does not claim infallibility, the pope does; the judge does not MAKE the LAWS which he administers, the pope does; the tenure of office of the judge depends upon his correct interpretation of the laws which the *people* make, and they decide whether or not his judgments are in accord with *their* will, while Catholics must accept the *pope's* laws, his interpretations, and obey his commands relative thereto. The people make their own laws and select the judge; if either proves unsatisfactory, they change them; in case the judge errs in judgment—if it is not in conformity with the law—it is set aside upon review and the judge removed, if it appears that his error was intentional; but since the decree of infallibility the pope cannot be removed from office, neither can he be impeached, nor his laws or judgments questioned or set aside by Catholics.

Catholics are taught Infallibility applies to all the popes and

councils—from the first to the last; yet there have been disagreements in matters of faith from the first, and the “defining” powers were at variance at different times. Pope Sixtus V even revised the Bible and it was suppressed at a later period!

Augusta, Ga., Oct. 17, 1917.

Dear Sir: You not only in your paper fail to distinguish Papal Infallibility from Papal Supremacy, but you seem to confuse Infallibility, Inspiration and Revelation. These also are distinct.

(1) “Inspiration signifies a special positive Divine influence by reason of which the human agent is not merely preserved from liability to error, but is so guided that what he says or writes is truly the word of God, (so) that God Himself is the principal author of the inspired utterance; but infallibility merely implies exemption from liability to error.”

(2) “God is not the author of a merely infallible, as He is of an inspired, utterance; the former remains a merely human utterance. Revelation, on the other hand, means the making known by God, supernaturally, of some truth hitherto unknown; whereas infallibility is concerned with the interpretation and effective safeguarding of truths already revealed.”

(3) “It is well further to explain that infallibility . . . is independent of the fallible arguments upon which a definitive doctrine may be based, and of the possible unworthy human motives that may appear to have influenced the result. It is the definitive result itself, and it alone, that is infallible.” (Cath. Ency., Vol. VII, p. 790.)

(4) The infallible prerogative of the pope is not by any means the fetter on the minds or the tax on the credulity of Catholics that you have imagined, must now be clear to you.

Very truly,

JJF/MC

J. J. FARRELL, Mgt.

COMMENT

(1) Analyze this paragraph defining Inspiration and Infallibility, and we have the same answer for both. “Inspiration,” says the association, “preserves” the agent from error in speaking or writing, while Infallibility *exempts* from error, and instead of distinguishing Mr. Farrell has made the terms synonymous; in the first instance the pope is “preserved from liability to error,” in the next he is “exempt from liability to error”: in one case he is *preserved*, in the other, *exempt*. From this, then, it appears that the pope is both inspired and infallible!

(2) In the letter of October 15, the association quotes part of the Vatican Decree, in which it is declared that the pope has Divine assistance in defining doctrine, while the above letter declares, speaking of infallibility, that “it remains a merely human utterance . . . concerned with INTERPRETATION and EFFECTIVE SAFEGUARDING of truth ALREADY revealed,” which calls for the exercise of the pope’s legislative and executive prerogatives! In the Vatican Council held in 1870, Pius IX

defined the dogma of Infallibility, having "Divine assistance," but now Mr. Farrell cites the Encyclopedia to the effect that that "remains a merely human utterance"—or may be—yet no Catholic has the right to investigate whether or not it was the result of his human nature or the result of Divine assistance!

(3) How can "the definitive result itself" be infallible, if it be true that what the pope says "remains a merely human utterance"? If it be "a merely human utterance," its origin is neither inspired, revealed or infallible! In the Universal Christian church, the Bible is accepted as the Inspired, Revealed and Infallible Word of God, under the protection of the Holy Spirit; to impute these attributes to the pope of that Italian institution is to declare the office of the Holy Spirit vacant and His duties turned over to the pope, yet the best writers of the system seem unable to "distinguish papal infallibility from papal supremacy," as is evident from the above conflict between the Vatican Council and the Catholic Encyclopedia!

(4) No, it is not clear to me; a mind that concurs in the doctrines of a church depicted by these "clear" letters has reached that stage when nothing will be a tax on it.

Christ promised to send the Spirit into the world to comfort His people, whose office would be to bring to their remembrance all He had commanded: outside of the "proof" furnished by the popes there is no evidence to show that He has changed His mind and turned over to the pope the work of the Spirit; and, unless there has been such change of mind, the pope has no place in the Christian church, but heads a conspiracy against the human race, seeking to bury human intelligence under the decrees of that "church" which gave the world its intellectual bondage, slavery and midnight!

We cannot acknowledge as true the doctrine of papal infallibility without recognizing papal supremacy, thereby conceding the right of the pope to "think" for mankind in all matters that pertain to faith and morals without also conceding to the pope the right to legislate, and then inflict punishment for disobeying his decrees concerning things not pertaining to faith and morals; Mr. Farrell says, though, that this doctrine does not fetter, but frees, the mind! I admit it frees the mind of all personal responsibility, which is contrary to all Divine precepts, and antagonistic to democratic ideals.

Augusta, Ga., Oct. 22, 1917.

Dear Sir: You fall into the same error on No. 13 that was exposed under No. 5, so I refer you to my comment there. (1)

(2) You make another mistake in citing the Syllabus of Errors (which, by the way, you misquote) to show what the teaching of the church is. That document is a syllabus of the different propositions condemned as erroneous in the several Encyclicals

and Allocutions of Pius IX prior to 1864. In so far as it shows anything, therefore, it only shows what the teaching of the church is NOT. The truth cannot be derived from error. (*)

(3) Moreover the Syllabus of Errors cannot be intelligently read, much less cited as authority, without having the Encyclical or Allocution referred to in each of the Syllabi. It is little more than an Index; nothing more than a digest, such as lawyers use to find cases in point, but which they would be laughed at for taking into court as authority without the case cited at hand. It was compiled by some obscure cleric at Rome and without even the signature of Pius, though by his secretary, sent out to bishops merely for their convenience in referring to the original documents.

(4) Paragraph 24, which you (mis)quote, refers to an allocution treating of the rights of the church in connection with the States of the Church over which the pope has claimed temporal sovereignty since the eighth century, and it has no application to the church elsewhere.

Very truly,

JJF/MC

J. J. FARRELL, Mgr.

COMMENT

(1) The long letters Mr. Farrell (?) devotes to "Infallibility" and "Baptism" are very noticeable considering the fact that they are subjects which came up incidentally in my questions and criticisms, while he eases away from No. 13 like one who has suddenly come face to face with a bear while out fishing. Question 13 reads:

"Does the Roman Catholic church, impliedly or otherwise, teach (1) that the church has the right to employ force, (2) that non-Catholics ought to be harmed either in business or in person, (3) that the church has the right to remove heretics from the earth by death?"

Both in the press and through the mails the Catholic church in Georgia informed the people that if they desired to have a first-hand knowledge of what Catholics believe, their rights, faith and practices, etc., it could be secured from the Catholic Laymen's Association of Georgia, Mr. J. J. Farrell, Manager, Augusta, Ga.

To clause No. 1 of the question, "Does the Roman Catholic church, impliedly or otherwise, teach (1) that the church has the right to employ force"? Mr. Farrell answered "NO" in his original answer; in the present letter he attempts to divert attention from the question and center it upon another issue not germane to the fact sought to be proved.

That his answer to clause No. 1 is untrue is proved by the decree of the Council of Trent, Sess. vii, Can. 14, which reads:

"If any one says that the BAPTIZED are not to be *compelled* to a Christian life by any other penalty save that they be excluded from the participation of the Eucharist and of the other

sacraments until they repent, let him be anathema." (Let him be ACCURSED.)

Every Catholic in the world is bound in conscience to obey the decrees of this Council, and Farrell is now under the curse of his church, unless he answered with intent to deceive—which is permitted by said church!

The Constitution of Pope Pius VI, *Auctorem Fidei*, according to Taunton, "claims the *coercive power* of exterior judgment and of inflicting healthful penalties." He also incorporates in the Canon Law one of the propositions condemned as false by Pius IX, the authenticity of which Mr. Farrell denies; it reads:

"Syllabus n. 24. Pius IX, in the Encyclical *Quanta Cura*, 1864, condemned the doctrine that the church had no right to coerce with penalties the violation of her laws; and he also condemned the proposition that the church had no power of inflicting punishment nor any temporal power direct or indirect."

These citations are sufficient affirmations to all three questions embodied in No. 18, but I will cite authority to show the teaching of the church relative to each, *to expose the deceitfulness of those in authority when dealing with Protestants.*

"Does the Roman Catholic church, impliedly or otherwise, teach (2) that non-Catholics ought to be harmed either in business or in person?"

To this, Mr. Farrell also said "NO." From the *Corpus Juris*, the official code of papal laws, we read:

"If any one presumes to keep heretics in their house or lands, or to carry on business with them, he is to be excommunicated." *Decret. Greg. lib. V. Tit. VII. c-8.*

The Lateran Council legislated, under Pope Innocent III:

"Let secular rulers be warned, and if necessary compelled by ecclesiastical censures, to take a public oath to do all in their power to exterminate from their territory all manner of heretics."

In 1252 Pope Innocent IV issued a bull requiring Italy to incorporate in her Imperial laws the mandate to enforce all penalties against heretics; he also issued another in 1254, *Ad Extirpanda*, which was likewise endorsed and promulgated by many of his successors—Clement IV, Nicholas IV, Alexander IV—to exterminate heretics; in 1265 Pope Urban IV made it UNIVERSALLY unlawful for *any* civil authority to impede the work of the "holy" Inquisition against heretics under pain of excommunication, which is, *to-day*, incorporated in the fundamental law of the papal church.

We see what the law was, and how it was applied in the Dark and Middle Ages; now let us examine the utterances of a pope who died in OUR day—1903—and note if there has been any change in the law or spirit of popery since then. Turning to the

Encyclical of Leo XIII, *Libertas Proestantissimum*, June 20, 1888, we hear him declaring that "to allow people to go unharmed who violate or destroy it"—that is, truth as taught by popery—"would be most *impious*, most *foolish*, and most *inhuman*." All Protestants, Masons and other secret order men come under this condemnation, and it would be an act of piety on the part of the "faithful" to extirpate them; in doing so they would display great wisdom, and be very humane! Farrell answered "NO" to this question—Leo, for Farrell's church, replied "YES."

"Does the Roman Catholic church, impliedly or otherwise, teach (3) that the church has the right to remove heretics from the earth by death?"

"NO" was Farrell's answer to this question, so we will have to investigate the subject. Taunton's Canon Law says: "A society which is perfect must possess coercive power for attaining the end for which the society itself exists," which is a "necessary corollary of the public power of lawgiving, judging and of executing the penalties decreed upon *transgressors*." (All Protestants are "transgressors.") This law is based upon many decrees of the church, all of which are epitomized by St. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa*, 2a, 2dae, qst. XI, art. 3, 4, in which he teaches that the church has the right to remove heretics from the earth by death.

Mark you! Mr. Farrell is here answering officially for the Catholic church in Georgia; he replies "NO" to the three questions under No. 13. His blatant denials indicate official Catholicism's regard for truth when dealing with heretics, and show that *he knows* the papal church is a dangerous, murderous society that is waiting, panther-like, for the time when it may spring upon its prey, who may have been lulled to sleep by the Siren voice of papists and pro-papists or secret Romanists in Protestant pulpits, some of whom are "D. D.'s." That this official association has an ulterior motive in rendering these untruthful answers, denying the dogmas of baptism and intention, is apparent, and stamps that institution as being wholly unworthy of the confidence and "trust" of mankind, especially in America; this question, No. 13, and several others that will develop, should be carried to the Congress of these United States, and the papal church be made to show cause why it should not be "proscribed" by freemen to safeguard the peace and safety of the nation.

Farrell says I "fall into the same error on No. 13 that was exposed under No. 5," and refers me to his comment there. Turn to his letter of November 2, 1917: there he denies that Catholics are taught to obey the voice of the pope as being the voice of God, which has no connection at all with Question 13, except inferentially: that "Where 'NO' answers a question, it answers true, unless squarely the opposite, in *exact terms* of the question, can

be shown. This rule of right reason can in no case be ignored without a sacrifice of truth."

That "NO" *does not* answer No. 18 true, but that "squarely the opposite, in *exact terms* of the question," is the truth, has been shown. His interpretation of the "rules of right reason" and his opinion of what is "truth" may coincide with the training received in parochial schools, but from the American viewpoint he has answered with "a sacrifice of truth" and an intent to deceive; his answer comports well with the teaching that one must believe white to be black, if a superior so defines it, and accords with that "right reason" which requires a denial of physical evidences and the natural senses even when confronted by demonstrable facts. To those so trained, Farrell's "NO" is the truth, and closes the proposition, it is no longer a subject for investigation!

It has been demonstrated above that papalism is a menace to society, which seeks to destroy Truth from the face of the earth. Where truth dies, faith among men becomes extinct, and barbarism follows; therefore any agency in the world that in any manner destroys truth is a menace to the race. "Keep no faith with heretics" decreed the Council of Constance. The system that inculcates this principle among its adherents toward outsiders will find the "faithful" applying it among themselves, which will reach as far as the system extends among men—and it spreads best where opposition has been destroyed: and opposition has been destroyed wherever *any* American citizen betrays his country and civilization by remaining silent or indifferent to the question.

Is it possible for the Church of Christ to inculcate or practice deceit? Could a merely benevolent society teach deceit, treachery, and evince a desire to use "force," do "harm" or "murder" those who will not subscribe to its "dogmas"? No; a thousand times no! The Italian institution not only teaches that it is benevolent, but the "only" true Christian church, and uses these means to "convert" the world!

The devil, "the father of lies," put murder in the heart of Cain; he instills murder and deceit in the hearts of all over whom he rules, whether man or a system.

The citations from Leo XIII under this question were promulgated in the exercise of his prerogative as Supreme Judge, Legislator and Executive, so recognized by Farrell in citing the Vatican Decree of Infallibility; therefore the association could not discuss the question, so tried to smother it under a maze of irrelevant verbiage. Leo reigned twenty-five years; from a thorough knowledge of the papacy, he was conversant with all rights of the pope thereto appertaining, and knew what its laws gave him a right to exact from the "faithful." He also had at his command the great Vatican Archives from which he could secure information

concerning the "rights" of the church with which he may not have been familiar. Every utterance of this pope, therefore, was based upon his conception of his duty to his church, in the "effective safeguarding of truths *already* revealed" by his predecessors, among which was the Bull *Unam Sanctam* by the infamous pope, Boniface VIII—the fellow who frightened poor old Celestine V into resigning. Boniface caused a rupture with many of the sovereigns of Europe soon after he became pope, issuing orders and conveying threats to them. Philip the Handsome, King of France, resented the efforts of Boniface to intimidate him through the papal legate, so he dismissed the pope's representative from his court; this so enraged him that he issued the famous Bull, *Unam Sanctam*, declaring himself to be absolute sovereign of the kingdom of France with the power of dispensing secular as well as ecclesiastical benefices. In this Bull the pope sets out fully the prerogatives of the papacy accruing under the Decree of Papal Supremacy, which had been enjoyed from the seventh to the thirteenth century—which supremacy, by the way, was secured by what the Jesuit fathers now acknowledge to have been forgeries, known as the "Isidorian False Decretals"; in this decree, Boniface said:

"Outside of her (the Catholic church) there is no salvation nor remission of sins. . . . That in her and within her power are two swords, namely, the spiritual and the temporal sword. . . . Both are in the power of the church, namely, the spiritual sword and the temporal sword; the latter to be used for the church, the former by the hand of the priest, the latter by the hand of the princes and kings* (the government), but at the nod and sufferance of the priest. The one sword must of necessity be subject to the other, and the temporal authority to the spiritual. . . . For truth being the witness, the spiritual power has the functions of establishing the temporal power and sitting in judgment upon it . . . *but if the supreme power deviate, it can be judged by on man.* . . .

"Furthermore, that every human creature is subject to the Roman Pontiff." Schaff, *Hist. of the Christian Church*, Vol. V, Part II, p. 25.

This is a doctrine that seeks to change our Constitution, yet I have not learned of any Catholics resisting it, as Farrell said they would do! (See his answer to Question 9.)

In 1864 Pope Pius IX issued his "Syllabus of Errors," the twenty-third proposition of which teaches that it is an error to say that "The Roman Pontiffs and Ecumenical Councils have

* This doctrine is now taught in papal parochial schools: in the *thirty-second* edition of the "Manual of Christian Doctrine," the volume in hand being that of 1919, the question is asked: "120. Has the church the right and duty to proscribe schism or heresy?" and the answer is: "Yes, it has both the right and the duty to do so."

exceeded the limits of their power, have usurped the rights of princes, and have ever committed errors in defining matters of faith and morals."

(2) Language is employed by honest-minded people as a means of transmitting thought; but it appears Jesuitism has reduced the science to the art of ambiguity—concealing and confusing instead of revealing: this is very marked in the Syllabus of Errors; for example, an honest person, in declaring a fact, would say, "The female is the mother of its species," while the pope would teach, under a general caption of "Popular Errors": "The male is the mother of its species"; of course, in order to understand what he presumes to teach, it is necessary to know something about the subject, and reverse the statement, and thus "(mis)quote" him, by saying he teaches that it is error to say, "The male is the mother of its species," or (mis)quote (?) him by saying he teaches that it is error to say, "The female is the mother of its species." This in answer to Farrell's charge that I misquoted the Syllabus of Errors. In this connection, it would be just as logical for Farrell to say Aquinas did not say the papal church ought to MURDER heretics; of course not: he merely said they should be "removed" from the earth by "death"!

(3) In the Great Encyclical Letters of Leo XIII, he says: "To wish the church to be subject to the civil power in the exercise of her duty is a great folly and a sheer injustice. . . . Pope Pius branded publicly many false opinions which were gaining ground, and afterwards *ordered them to be condensed in summary form* in order that in this sea of error Catholics might have a light which they might safely follow. It will suffice to indicate a few of them: Prop. xxxix. The State, as the origin and source of all rights enjoys a right that is unlimited. Prop. lv. The Church must be separated from the State and the State from the Church," pp. 124-6. He cites only four of the eighty Propositions by Pius—which is also the doctrine now being taught Catholics from the "Manual of Christian Doctrine." Leo not only approves of this doctrine to be true Catholicism, but he runs Farrell into a "corner," by asserting that Pius IX "ORDERED" them condensed in summary form for CATHOLICS, not "bishops"; Farrell said that they were compiled by some "obscure cleric . . . and sent out to bishops" to be used by them as an index to the original documents! ("Keep no faith with heretics" is a wonderful help in times of papal stress!) In this matter, it is evident that Pope Leo XIII deliberately uttered a falsehood, or that Farrell, representing the Catholic church in Georgia, positively prevaricated in an effort to save the truth from being known, and to conceal what the Italian church teaches its "children" is their duty to the pope, camouflaged under "faith and morals"! Of the two—Leo

and Farrell—which one is more likely to be the prevaricator, he who taught the “faithful,” or the man who attempts to teach a “heretic”? I leave the answer to the reader!

(4) The Bull, *Unam Sanctam*, is the foundation of Proposition 24 of the Syllabus of Errors; of course, Pius may have delivered an Allocution or written an Encyclical on the subject, but by *decree* Boniface established the *principle*, making it LAW. The Propositions cannot be restricted in their application to the few Italian States over which the pope ruled as king and god—States that were won in wars, by forgeries, or presented to the papacy against the will and consent of the people therein—they refer to the State, the Civil Government, as a world-wide proposition; for it is evident that, if the pope “holds upon this earth the place of God Almighty,” the scope, force and power of his decrees and teaching extend as far among mankind as the will of God—and I do not believe even Farrell would say God is cognizant of, or restricted by, “state” lines as Supreme Ruler of the Universe.

Although Taunton’s Canon Law is the condensed teaching from several hundred volumes by former canonists treating of every phase of Canon Law, embodying Proposition 24 as a general, universal principle, Farrell says it applies only to the several States of Italy!

(*) Here, Farrell says “The truth cannot be derived from error.” I ask, in all candor, CAN TRUTH BE FOUNDED UPON ERROR? The False Decretals, establishing Papal Supremacy, made their appearance in the eighth century; upon this *falsehood* the great superstructure of Papal Supremacy and Infallibility were established. Truth cannot be derived from error, neither can it be founded upon error—and if error be removed from the foundation of the papal church, it would crumble and fade away! The following demonstrates upon what great ERROR the papal church is founded, cited from the Law of the Church by Taunton, S. J., London, 1906, pp. 340-1:

“1. The false decretails are a spurious collection of decretails attributed to the popes and councils of the first three centuries . . . Date (of appearance) from 845-853. . . .

“4. The object of the collection seems to be to protect the episcopate from the tyranny of the metropolitans. . . .

“6. The collection was universally received; and it was not until the *fifteenth century* that doubts began to be cast upon the authenticity . . . the Ballerini brothers have established their non-authenticity.

“7. One point is abundantly clear: the collection was not originated by the popes, but by a Gallican cleric. . . . If the popes made use of the collection they did so for two reasons:

“(1) The collection was generally received, and no hint was made that it was not what it claimed to be,

"(2) It simply asserted what for centuries had been the acknowledged right and constant practice of the Holy See.

"It is no argument against the truth of rights to allow that origins for these rights were . . . assigned, by an unknown writer, carelessly or uncritically to sources which more perfect knowledge shows to be false."

This is pure Jesuit casuistry, from which arises the charge against the order and the church it serves that "the end justifies the means."

From this we discover the popes claiming and enjoying the fruits of ERROR and FALSEHOOD from the third to twentieth centuries—fruits accruing from forged documents which gave them the supremacy "*Who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God or that is worshiped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God . . . whose coming is after the working of satan with all power and signs and lying wonders, and all deceivableness of unrighteousness.*" 2 Thes. c. 2.

Will God use deceit and falsehood to establish or promote His Truth? Yes, provided it is true that the pope is holding the place of God Almighty on earth; otherwise, no. If God hates a lie and liars, surely, He would not permit His substitute on earth to *live and practice a lie* in His behalf SEVENTEEN HUNDRED YEARS! It is sublimely ridiculous and absurd to say God makes the pope "infallible" when he is defining some dogma for the "faithful" but participates in and sanctions the fraudulent presumption of the pope in his enjoyment of a supremacy established on a LIE, which calls for two pertinent observations: first, this would be "class" legislation in that one rule of conduct in all things would be made for the "faithful" and another for the "head" of the church; second, creates the impossible, by implying pure water flows from an impure source.

To say the Christian religion was even remotely benefited by a principle of the devil—deceitfulness—puts either God or the pope in an unenviable predicament before INTELLIGENCE.

The title of pope, or Universal Bishop, was conferred on Boniface III by murderer Phocas; the pope's absolute dictatorship in and over the whole church—which includes all Protestant sects—was secured by forgery; his supremacy in temporal affairs of the governments of the earth was proclaimed in the Bull *Unam Sanctam*, all forever sealed as "truth" to the church by the Vatican Decree of Supremacy and Infallibility in 1870, obedience to which Catholics are bound hard and fast, and will so remain as long as they are members of the pope's church.

Solomon said that there were seven things God hates, which are an abomination unto Him: 1, a proud look; 2, lying tongue; 3, hands that shed innocent blood; 4, a heart that devises wicked

imaginations; 5, feet swift in running to mischief; 6, a false witness that speaketh lies; 7, he that soweth discord. Prov. vi:16-19.

I defy anyone called Catholic to say these seven "things" do not apply to the dogmas and decrees of the pope's church—and they would make good texts for some so-called Protestant ministers to prach from!

The Syllabus of Errors will receive further consideration as we go along.

I believe I have established the fact that Mr. Farrell has made false answers to Question 13, which, being from an association officially answering for the Catholic church, indicates to what extent we may "trust" Catholicism!

Augusta, Ga., Oct. 23, 1917.

Dear Sir: Regarding the "Intention" of infallibility.

You have no doubt concluded before now that if there were any such intention as you imagine hidden in the doctrine of infallibility, to limit its exercise so narrowly is rather a contrary way of carrying out its object.

You may say it makes no difference whether the pope teaches by virtue of his supreme authority, since Catholics submit to the pope whether infallible or not. But it makes a great difference, just as great as the rational meaning in the terms, intellectual liberty, freedom of the soul, and such like.

(1) If Catholics do not fully and unreservedly give, not only external obedience, but internal assent, to doctrines defined by virtue of the pope's infallible prerogative, they cease to be Catholics *ipso facto*, instantan. They are not required on the other hand to give internal assent but only external respect to teachings not so defined, and these latter constitute the great bulk of Catholic theology, philosophy, history, tradition, law and practices.

To illustrate: A Catholic need not agree that the Syllabus of Errors, the Rules of the Index, the strictures drawn by Leo XIII against Freemasonry and similar matters are unerringly correct. The church does not propose these things to the belief of her children as absolutely final, conclusive and irrevocable forever.

(2) Whatever prohibition or commandment is contained in these and like pronouncements of the popes or of the Sacred Congregation are to be respected and observed even though we do not give internal assent to them, so long as they are in force, unless, of course, conscience forbids.

For above all things Catholics know that a right ordered conscience is King of the Soul, and between these two, no man, in whatsoever matter, were he ten times supreme, can set a voice of authority.

Very truly,

JJF/MC

J. J. FARRELL, Mgt.

COMMENT

There are but two opposing forces in the world: call them Good and Evil, Light and Darkness, or Christ and the Devil, if you

will, and they are making war upon each other with the "intention" of subduing the world in the name of their respective Principals, therefore every act and wish of each is exerted to obtain that goal. Christ seeks to win the world by Love and Truth; the devil, by hate and lies. Before it was paganized in 606, the Roman church was doing the will of God, but after the pope was elevated to the throne and God deposed, I cannot believe Christ has any connection with the pope or his system. The Roman church has employed every means that the human intelligence and the devil could devise to bring the world to its knees before an Italian man-god. It matters not how erroneous I may consider the Catholic religion from a theological standpoint, I would not deprive Catholics of the right to its enjoyment, if it affords them any satisfaction; but by its very nature the system requires its devotees to exert themselves with the end in view of ultimately forcing all "baptized" persons under papal domination, providing for the employment of fire and sword in the process if it be necessary, and every Catholic must endeavor to inject the virus of Romanism into all the veins of the State—politics and education; and from the consideration of the conditions of nations which have had this "sap" of Catholicism in their veins, being interested in the welfare of my country, I most emphatically protest against any such procedure. There is no middle-ground with popery: you must be either Catholic or heathen; this is proved by the history of the church, which shows that it has always tried to exterminate the Christians, but does not make war on the heathen; consider the fearful oath of the Catholic Bishop—it is directed against Christians only. In this we see the scheme followed by the devil: he directs his attacks against the Christians; those on the outside give him no uneasiness, hence are not the object of his hatred.

In the above letter, the association again discusses the "infallibility" of the pope, instead of the laws of the church which give that institution the right to apply force, harm, and kill those who reject papal blasphemy. He admits (par. 1) that to be a "good" Catholic they must mentally assent to doctrines, but in other matters they **MUST** give "external respect to the teachings" *not defined as infallible* or proposed to belief, and that whatever prohibition or command is contained in this (theology, philosophy, history, traditions, laws, decrees, practices) "*are to be respected and obeyed, so long as they are in force.*" This is the only material admission he has made as a "witness on the stand"; I have been seeking to get him to state what *effect* the **DIRECTIVE PREROGATIVE** of the pope has on Catholics, as this is the power he possesses that pertains to matters not of faith and morals, but which vitally concern all non-Catholics; it is this

“external” or physical aspect of popery that constitutes the menace to all countries not Catholic; we care not a straw for their “internal” attitude toward papal “dogmas”—they may believe all that the popes have ever proposed as a matter for belief—but if their “external respect” to the decrees of the pope makes them strive to interfere with the rights of other citizens: makes them go to the polls as Catholics instead of American citizens, makes them labor to destroy the Constitution so that the laws of an Italian monarch, claiming to be God’s substitute upon the earth, can be put in force, the church of Rome stands branded as a menace to a free people, biding the time when it can force all the baptized to give “EXTERNAL RESPECT,” if not “internal assent,” to papal decrees!

Regarding the reference to conscience: I fail to see where conscience can find a lodgment in the papal mind, after reading the above letter. Conscience may be defined as that principle within us by which we distinguish between right and wrong: the only time I discover where a Catholic can display conscience is in his decision to adhere to the papal religion without giving any thought what it may require of him; being born into the system, his conscience was pre-determined; in after years, he confirms this accident of birth. To illustrate the principle: A person born in Germany of German parents, is by that very fact a subject of the Kaiser; when he becomes of mature age, and elects to remain in Germany, he thus confirms his citizenship; if a person leaves the land of his nativity and goes to Germany, assuming an oath of allegiance to the Kaiser, he is also a German citizen. We are all more or less familiar with the terrible deeds committed by German soldiers during the Great War: the German by birth or selection may not have given “internal assent” to the fiendishness that the Kaiser and Prussian Militarism demanded of him, but as long as he was bound by his allegiance to give “external respect” to any prohibition or command of the Kaiser, he was German, and while the horrible crimes he and his fellow soldiers committed—killing defenseless women and children and non-combatants—may have been repugnant to his mind, yet *conscience* played no part in the premises; his superiors had determined what he must do, *now he must obey*; the question of *conscience* was settled when he decided to remain a citizen of the German Empire: so, when he thrust his bayonet through the wasted body of a little French maid, the emaciated mother, or palsied grandfather, the effect upon the victim was the same—it mattered not in that case whether he gave “internal assent” to the deed or acted out of “external respect” to (German) “philosophy, history, tradition, law and practices.”

History’s pages are stained with the records of the many mil-

lions of non-Catholics slain by the Catholic church—and it makes no difference whether those murders were committed with an “internal assent” of the mind, or out of “external respect” to the will of the pope!

When *conscience* becomes seared as with a hot iron, no beast of the field can be more ferocious.

Farrell acknowledged that Catholics are bound to give “external respect” and obedience to papal regulatory decrees, which is the doctrine of the Vatican Council demanding Obedience—and I consider it quite an achievement in securing it from—a Jesuit?

Bishops are creatures of the pope, priests hold under bishops, while the laity are under them all. When a bishop is “consecrated,” he swears to “be faithful and obedient to . . . the Holy Roman Church, and to our Lord the Pope. . . . I will help them to defend and keep the Roman Papacy . . . against *all men*. . . .” (This makes no provision for restricting papalism to the Italian States, as Farrell contended in one instance!) “The rights, honors, privileges and authority of the Roman church, of our Lord the pope, I will endeavor to preserve, defend, increase and advance. . . . The rules of the Holy Fathers, the Apostolic decrees, provisions and mandates, I will observe with all my might and cause them to be observed by others. Heretics, schismatics, and rebels to our said Lord or his aforesaid successors I will *to my utmost power* persecute and wage war with.”

We turn now to the oath required of those who join the papal church, as contained in Gibbon’s Manual of Prayers:

“I, ———, . . . believe the holy, Catholic, Apostolic, Roman to be the only and true church established on earth by Jesus Christ, to which I submit myself with my whole heart. I believe ALL the articles she proposes to my belief, and I reject and condemn all that she rejects and condemns, and I am READY TO OBSERVE ALL THAT SHE COMMANDS ME. And especially I profess to believe: . . .

“The primacy, not only of honor, but also of jurisdiction, of the Roman Pontiff, successor of St. Peter, Prince of the Apostles, Vicar of Jesus Christ;

“Veneration of the saints and their images” (The Catholic bible being mutilated by the popes, Catholics do not know this is forbidden; that they violate God’s commandment every time they bow down before an image, or a priest).

“The authority of the Apostolic and Ecclesiastical Traditions, and of the Holy Scriptures which we must interpret and understand only in the sense which our holy mother the Catholic church has held and does hold”: (Fettering intellect and free inquiry; “two and two equals four”—we do not know how, but it’s so—the teacher said so!)

“And everything else that has been defined and declared by the Sacred Canons and by the General Councils, and particularly by

the Holy Council of Trent, and delivered, defined and declared by the General Council of the Vatican, especially concerning the Primacy of the Roman Pontiff, and his infallible teaching authority.

"With a sincere heart, therefore, and with unfeigned faith, I detest and abjure every error, heresy and SECT opposed to the said Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Roman church. So help me God, and these Holy Gospels, which I touch with my hands."

Analyze that oath, Americans! It is in perfect accord with the oath of the bishop, and all are in harmony with the "intention" of the church of Rome "to govern the minds of men."

On page 458 of the Encyclical Letters, Leo XIII says, "We hold the place of Him who came to save that which was lost." Again he says, on page 330, "We hold upon this earth the place of God Almighty," and on 183, he defined the relation each one sustains to the papacy: "But the man who has embraced the Catholic faith, as in duty bound, is by that very fact a *subject of the church* as one of the children born of her . . . which it is the special charge of the Roman Pontiff to *rule* with SUPREME POWER."

What chance is there in the above doctrine for the exercise of conscience? Leo says, and he is confirmed by the layman's oath, that "What we are obliged to do" or must not do, is laid down by the Roman Pontiff, and in swearing to uphold the Vatican and Council of Trent Decrees, papal subjects agree to give "external respect" to *all* the pope commands, which completely eliminates *conscience* from the individual.

The "intention" of popery is shown in what it has determined to accomplish; Leo says the church is to "control the minds of men . . . a task she is wholly bent upon accomplishing." (The Index is therefore indispensable.) The intelligence of the human race to be subjugated to an Italian foreigner—and all subjects of that system are a party to this "intention": "Him to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are."

As long as a man elects to fight under the German flag or follow it, he is the enemy of every man enlisted under opposing banners, likewise when a Catholic layman swears to "detest . . . every sect" opposing popery, he need not affirm or deny his belief; because serving under the papal standard fixes his position among free peoples, and it is sufficient to know what his church teaches. Papal law being in conflict with the rights of the people of this country, those who are subject thereto being aliens, *should be denied the rights of citizenship*. No adherent of or believer in the laws of the Italian church should be permitted to have the training of our youth in their hands—they should have no place in connection with the public school system, neither are such qualified to take part in politics or serve on juries: politics being

the science of government, Catholics must "play the game" in favor of the papal government, which is destructive of democracy, therefore they should receive only the rights accorded subjects of any other foreign ruler, because as citizens, it is their duty to carry out the will of their pope, to put his laws in operation in this land, which renders them a discordant factor in the body-politic seeking the destruction of the priceless heritages of freemen, namely, civil liberty, free speech, free press, and liberty of conscience.

Augusta, Ga., Oct. 25, 1917.

Dear Sir: Your Question 3 is next in order; but it occurs to me that since you say my answer to 22 is cause for "impeachment," I ought to set you right on that at once and not stand on the other. It may help us along generally.

(2) You take it altogether too seriously that you got different answers from different persons to different questions put, wasn't that what you wished to get? In court, when it is sought to impeach one witness by another, exactly the same question must be propounded to all. Instead of my being impeached then by the different answers you got, if we were in court, you would be stultified by the different questions you put. Ask any lawyer.

(3) When a certain lawyer, long ago, with the intention of confounding Him, stood up in the crowd and asked Jesus Christ what he must do to be saved, he was told to love the Lord God with all his heart and his neighbor as himself. When Nicodemus went to Jesus in the night, seeking the words of eternal life, he was told that unless he was born again, of water and of the Spirit, he could not enter Heaven.

(4) Your question to me smacked of the intention of the lawyer; the one you sent to Cardinal Gibbons, Bishop Keiley and *Sunday Visitor* seemed to ask light for a troubled soul, as did Nicodemus. I gave you the answer that Christ gave the lawyer; the others gave you the information you appeared to seek, the same that Christ gave to Nicodemus.

(5) Your question to me was not about salvation; you were not concerned about that. Your intention was to show that Catholic teaching in regard to Baptism is unreasonable, hard and narrow. Sensing your purpose, I answered in a way that would open a little, for a sincere mind, the flood-gates of that inimitable love for souls that the Church of the Savior of mankind must have in order to be His Bride.

We shall see next if I answered true.

Very truly,

JJF/MC

J. J. FARRELL, Mgr.

COMMENT

(1) Any person intelligent enough to read Question 22 will recognize that it was one seeking information as to the doctrine of "Intention" that was decreed by the Council of Trent, while the Catholic association replies with a dissertation on baptism!

(2) Speaking in his official capacity for the Catholic church, Mr. Farrell denied the dogma of baptism as well as that of "Intention," in his original answer. Upon discovering his superiors had reversed his answer relative to baptism, he makes an effort to confuse the subjects of intention and baptism, no doubt hoping to escape the main question by injecting other issues, although the wording of No. 22 is an admission, on my part, that I understood the subject of baptism, which precluded legitimate discussion of any other issue except secondarily.

Mr. Farrell says that, in court, to impeach one witness by another, exactly the same question must be put to all. Not necessarily, especially where a witness seems to parry. If, for any reason, a witness will not answer a direct question as to fact, it is legitimate to present hypothetical questions, and the answer to the one would establish the truth of the other. He charges that I put different questions to different parties, consequently got different answers. I asked HIM about INTENTION: to deny that dogma, he had to deny the correlated dogma of baptism; so, to show his unreliability as a witness on the stand, in the matter of baptism, I wrote letters to his superiors—the highest authority in the church of Rome in America, as follows:

Macon, Ga., March 25, 1917.

Rev. J. Cardinal Gibbons,
Baltimore, Md.

Dear Cardinal: I am desirous of obtaining the following information, and address you as being the highest authority to whom I could refer, as follows:

Is Baptism essential to salvation and membership in the Catholic church?

Thanking you for your attention,

Very truly,

C. A. YARBROUGH.

Cardinal's Residence,
408 N. Charles St.
Baltimore.

May 28, 1917.

Dear Doctor: His Eminence, Cardinal Gibbons, instructs me to say that Baptism is essential to salvation, according to the teaching of our Savior, hence it is necessary for membership in the Catholic church.

He refers you to his book, "The Faith of Our Fathers," which has an article of some length on the subject.

Faithfully yours,

E. J. CONNELLY,
Asst. Chancellor.

C. A. Yarbrough, D. D. S.,
Macon, Ga.

Macon, Ga., March 25, 1917.

Editor Our Sunday Visitor,
Huntington, Indiana.

Dear Sir: Will you kindly state whether or not Baptism is essential to salvation and membership in the Catholic church?

Thanking you for your attention,

Very truly,

C. A. YARBROUGH.

(NOTE.—A self-addressed envelope, stamped, was enclosed in these letters. The answer to the above came back in the envelope furnished, written on the bottom of the letter sent the Editor):

"Yes. We hold that Heaven is a supernatural reward; that, therefore, the soul must be elevated to a supernatural degree, and that Baptism effects this. John iii:5 is our authority. Baptism is called a re-birth, *viz.*, to the supernatural life, and the word translated here, 'a man,' is *DIS* in Greek, which means *anyone*."

Macon, Ga., March 25, 1917.

Rt. Rev. Benj. J. Keiley,
Savannah, Ga.

Dear Bishop Keiley: I would thank you to give me the following information:

Is Baptism essential to salvation and membership in the Catholic church?

Thanking you for your attention and for the information,

Very truly,

C. A. YARBROUGH.

Bishop's House,
222 E. Harris St.
Savannah, Ga., June 11, 1917.

Dr. C. A. Yarbrough, D. D. S.,

Dear Sir: On my return after an absence of ten days, I found your letter of May 25th.

You ask me: Is Baptism necessary to salvation and membership in the Catholic church?

The Form of Baptism, that is to say, by immersion or pouring, as practiced in different religious bodies, is not essential; but the reception of the Sacrament of Baptism is necessary for salvation. Obviously the second question is answered in the reply to the first.

Most sincerely,

† BENJ. J. KEILEY,
Bishop of Savannah.

Mr. Farrell says I would be "stultified by the different questions" I put; but, did I put different questions? I asked *him* for information concerning "Intention," which doctrine he denied; having at the same time denied the doctrine of baptism in connection, I laid this question before his superiors, to show by tangible evidence that he was *not* truthful as a witness, and this fact their answers established.

(3) Without going into the animus of the questions asked by the lawyer and Nicodemus, suffice it to say they both, in effect, asked the same question, and the sense of the answer to each was the same: love of God and man is equivalent to re-birth. And He did not even intimate that He had an "army" sworn to "persecute" them if they refused to accept His teaching!

(4) Mr. Farrell had nothing to do with the "smack" of a question; his association was formed to give information concerning the faith and practices of Catholics, and all answers should have been confined to that purpose. Perhaps the association intended to answer such questions only as "smacked" of a desire to become a papist? He did not give me the answer, however, that Christ gave the lawyer: the lawyer received the plain truth—did I get that from Farrell? But what has all this to do with the doctrine of "Intention" about which I was asking him?

(5) Oh, certainly not; having formed an association, with permission of the bishop, to teach "heretics" what Catholics believe, the faith and practices of their church, surely he did not expect me to apply for information concerning salvation? Suppose one *should* desire such information, and ask the identical question, would Farrell's answer above "open a little, for a sincere mind, the flood-gates of that inimitable love for souls that the church of the Savior of mankind must have to be His Bride," or would the doctrine of Intention in connection with Farrell's answer cause the interested soul to fear that that dogma of the pope is a Jesuitical trick the teaching church hopes to "put over" on the Judgment Day when lost souls cry to God for vengeance, saying that it was the fault of the priest or penitent who did not have the right *intention*, and not the fault of those who possessed an infallible power to define what was necessary for salvation? Mysteries of Babylon!

Augusta, Ga., Oct. 27, 1917.

Dear Sir: You were asking about Baptism, actual Baptism.

Your idea of Catholic teaching was, that membership in the church is essential to salvation, that baptism is essential to membership in the church, that the validity of baptism depends on the "intention" of the priest; thus, the priest holds the soul in the hollow of his heart (hand?).

Your mistake was in thinking that actual baptism is essential to salvation. It is not. Desire for the grace of baptism is sufficient for salvation. Any Catholic half way instructed could have told you that. You will find it stated in Deharbe's Catechism, if you will take another look.

There is no Catechism of Christian Doctrine published by Catholic authority in which it is not stated that there are three kinds of baptism—of water, of blood and of desire. "It is the teaching of the Catholic church that when the baptism of water

is a physical or MORAL impossibility, eternal life may be obtained by the baptism of desire." (Cath. Ency. II, p. 266.)

"Howe, only the first is a real sacrament. The latter two are denominated baptism only analogically, inasmuch as they supply the principal effect of baptism, namely, the grace which remits sins." (Ibid.) "Baptism of desire (*baptismus flaminis*) is a perfect contrition of heart, and every act of perfect charity or pure love of God which contains, at least implicitly, a desire (*votum*) of baptism."

This doctrine is declared by the Council of Trent, Sess. VI, cap. iv, where in speaking of the necessity of baptism, it declares man cannot obtain original justice "except by the laver of regeneration or its desire (*voto*)." The same doctrine is taught by Pope Innocent III (*De Baptismus*, cap. IV).

The contrary is condemned by Pius V and Gregory XII, in proscribing the 31st and 33rd propositions of Baius (author of the system known as Baiasism).

Truly, therefore, baptism is not essential to salvation; that is, actual baptism, which is what you were asking me about.

Yours truly,

JJF/MC

J. J. FARRELL, Mgt.
Per R. M. C.

COMMENT

Instead of answering the simple question regarding "intention," Mr. Farrell comes forward with another long letter and presents other matters not at all pertinent to the question. To get the original question again before us, I reproduce it:

"22. If baptism is essential to salvation and membership in your church, and if its validity depends upon whether or not the officiating priest had the right 'intention' at the time of baptizing a subject of the church, how can any one know he is a member of your church—from the pope on down; do you require a certificate from the priest wherein he declares he had the right 'intention' at the time of performing the ceremony?"

This question is somewhat in the form of a syllogism: salvation, membership, and intention were admitted, while the *conclusion* was to be established by Farrell's answer, but he failed.

Is there any suggestion in the question calling for the above letter? Does it even remotely touch upon the question? He continues to treat the subject of baptism, a question I did not raise; having a copy of Deharbe's Catechism, I am familiar with the subject to which he devotes so much space; its questions and answers are ample, and often amplified by foot-notes—all *except the doctrine of intention*: this it touched upon very lightly and dropped, just as Farrell did; here is Deharbe:

Question "16. What intention must he have who baptizes?"

Answer: "He must have the intention to baptize *indeed*—that is, to do what the church does, or what Christ has ordained."

In his letter Mr. Farrell is soliloquizing upon what he thinks I ought to have thought, which caused him to wander away from the point and delve into baptism of "desire" and of "blood"! After all that, he does not attempt to explain how one may know, according to the teaching and law of his church, that he is in reality a member thereof. He says my mistake was in thinking that actual baptism was essential to salvation—even had I made this mistake, the letters from Cardinal Gibbons, *The Sunday Visitor*, and Bishop Keiley show me to be in "distinguished" company in this respect.

The association seems to be laboring under the impression that I should have been inquiring concerning salvation rather than as to what Catholics are taught by their church, as per invitation.

Any school boy should know that no law is enacted except there is a possibility and probability of those things being done which it would prevent; if there were no thieves in the world, we would not have a law against stealing; so, if the Council of Trent enacted a decree requiring the priest to have the right "intention" when he officiates in the church, it is self-evident that the church recognized the possibility of a priest not having the right intention, which would cause shipwreck to the penitent, while that doctrine places a soul's eternal destiny in the hands of the priest; therefore, no Catholic, be he pope or layman, knows he is a member of the papal church. *This* is the post Farrell should have hitched to when he "drove up," but he wouldn't. Why?

The Redeemer said that the way of salvation was so plain that a wayfaring man, though a fool, need not err therein: the pope says the institution he "thinks" for is the only true church established by Christ, yet neither he nor any of his priests can explain the way; the lawyer discovered it, so did Nicodemus, and the Eunuch—even the thief on the cross was not at a loss in the matter. Amusing? No, tragic! robbing the Master of the fruits of His suffering and death, placing salvation in the hands of men who are often viler wretches than any penitent who kneels before them seeking "absolution."

The doctrine of "Intention" of the papal church reminds me of the effort satan made to get Christ to fall down and worship him: *promising all things, but unable to make delivery!* The pope says to all mankind: "Join my church, obey my decrees, let me think for you, and while I may have to let you spend a term in purgatory, you will be saved at last—*providing, however, my priest had the right INTENTION when he baptized you: without that, your 'internal assent' to all my dogmas, and your 'external respect' for all my decrees will avail you nothing—you have not been baptized!*"

Deharbe declares that "Intention" is required on the part of

the priest, that's all; no foot-note—like Farrell, he let it alone!

That is not the only "dogma" of the only true church which the pope and his priests will not discuss: Taunton, in the Canon Law, under the caption of "Preaching," referring to the Decree of the Council of Trent, Sess. XXV, says: "The Council of Trent warns preachers not to enter into curious and subtle points in their sermons on Purgatory." So purgatory is a "closed" question—let it alone! Does the *way* seem clear under the pope?

On this subject the Manual of Christian Doctrine teaches:

"31. What is requisite that the lawful minister of a sacrament confer it validly?

"It is necessary and it is sufficient that, *while administering the sacrament*, he have the intention of doing what the church does.

"32. Why is it necessary that the minister have the intention of doing what the church does?

"Because *without* this the *action* would be profane and *not* sacred; for the minister would act in his own name and not as a minister of God."

That "church" makes those statements to the "faithful"—and they dare not question, and the priest dare not attempt to answer—and all are afraid to take it up with the pope, because he would be in the same plight before Reason!

If one approaches the nest of a partridge, we are told, the old bird will leave it, making considerable noise—fluttering around, creating the impression that it is crippled and easily captured, but it keeps withdrawing from the nest, keeping just ahead and out of reach of its enemy, until it is assured attention has been diverted from the nest, then—away it flies! Mr. Farrell (?) can "flutter away" all he wants to: he may go as far as he will into the baptism of water, "desire" or "blood," but MY intention is not to let him get away from the "Intention" of this sacred papal dogma as taught by his church! The Roman church teaches that it is necessary for me and my fellow-countrymen to submit to the *authority* of the pope to be saved, and if not submissive, it has the right to employ force, even to the extent of resorting to capital punishment; to make it "expedient" for her to enjoy these "rights" her subjects must exert themselves to bring about conditions favorable thereto, but even after she should get you, she has nothing tangible to offer: cannot prove to a reasonable certainty that there is a *real* member of that institution in the world, notwithstanding which, she would commit murder as a means of making "converts" to the only "true" faith!

"Truly, therefore," says Farrell, "baptism is not essential to salvation; that is, actual baptism, which is what you were asking about." He omits from this sentence the words "and membership in your church," which were incorporated in the original question. This omission is very important, as it would put a

different meaning on the question, making his answer correct; but I will not grant the omission. I was asking about "actual" (water) baptism in connection with the question of "Intention," both of which he denied, declaring that "any person, Catholic, non-Catholic, Protestant, Jew or Infidel could administer valid vaptism," which leaves no doubt about his having understood the question thoroughly in the first instance. He became very badly tangled in his own barrage: Baptism of "desire" or of "blood" being mere substitutes for "water" baptism—to be accepted where the baptism of water is not possible—strengthens the fact of the necessity for baptism. That "water" baptism is requisite is proved when he said that ANY ONE could administer it—that the church provides for emergency cases when the duly appointed minister is not available accentuates the necessity of baptism—yet Farrell denies it! These substitutes for actual baptism, where the intention is accepted for the deed, become "actual baptism" to all intents and purposes—they constitute "valid baptism," and to successfully sustain his answer as to "water" baptism would be absolutely voiding BAPTISM, so when Mr. Farrell admits and explains how a Catholic, non-Catholic, Protestant, Jew or Infidel can administer valid baptism of *desire or blood* I will admit his answers are true, also that he knew what I was thinking about.

When a political institution attempts to masquerade as Christian, taking for its rule and guide the "Traditions of Men" instead of the Bible, being absolutely under the government of an "infallible man" instead of an "Infallible God," it certainly needs an Index to prevent its adherents from investigating such "holy" dogmas as "Intention," "Infallibility," etc., and subject them to an inhuman oath when proposing the like for belief.

Augusta, Ga., Oct. 29, 1917.

Dear Sir: Of course, the answers you received to the question you submitted to Cardinal Gibbons, Bishop Keiley and the *Sunday Visitor* were also correct.

You asked them a different question. You seemed to be concerned about salvation in that question. They, no doubt, took you in good faith, thinking that you wished information for your spiritual comfort, believing that you were in doubt on the important question of your eternal salvation; therefore, they answered you just as our Lord answered Nicodemus. Do you object that they treated your question as though asked sincerely?

You know, of course, that the Catholic church places more emphasis upon the value of baptism and its necessity where physically and morally possible, than any other denomination, accounting the baptism of infants even as necessary, even more necessary than for adults, since except by a miracle of grace they can not have the desire or make that pure act of love which is a substitute for baptism; therefore, the church loses no opportunity to teach to all who are in good faith the ineffable graces

bestowed in this sacrament. And it is because her clergy have no time for indiscriminate controversy that they answer such questions as you propounded without any qualification.

They know that if you accepted their answer, as they took your question, in good faith, you will be benefited by it and if you have merely laid a trap to "ensnare" them, like the Pharisees who "watched" the Master and tried by "subtlety" to inveigle Him, you are only bringing confusion upon yourself in the end.

Be fair; all big men are fair. What, weren't you fair to me? Oh, yes, you were fair to me. Well, weren't you fair to Cardinal Gibbons and the others? Yes, you were fair to them. Then, what do you mean, "be fair"? You were not fair to yourself. You did not give your *mind a chance*; that is what I mean. There is something in every man and there is something in you that is bigger, more worthy, more noble than the petty predisposition to play smart at the expense of right and truth.

Very truly,

JJF/MC

J. J. FARRELL, Mgr.

Comment on this long letter, wherein Mr. Farrell is continuing to "flutter away" from the doctrine of "Intention" on the broken pinions of "baptism," is barely necessary, as it shows perhaps better than anything I may say how he attempts to becloud the question; but as he continues to press a subject NOT raised by me, but admitted in original question, a few observations will be in order. I *do* know the value the Roman church attaches to baptism—it being the first sacrament upon the validity of which *all the other six depends*, which so deeply impressed me with his flat denial. The Bible declares that whosoever believeth and is baptized shall be saved—baptism being an outward symbol of the inward cleansing which comes with the re-birth, while the pope teaches that "in baptism . . . original sin, and all the sins committed before baptism, are forgiven" while those committed afterward is forgiven by the priest, who may require the penitent to do penance, which may consist in paying a sum to the "church" or perform some act of torture to mind or body. Those of a studious, theological turn of mind can ponder over this dogma of that church which imputes to the symbol the power and work of the Holy Spirit and makes the soul depend upon the priest instead of the Father for forgiveness of sin after baptism. Yes, I understand the emphasis Roman Catholicism places upon baptism—an emphasis that found expression in the Jesuit priests going into heathen lands, as stated before, becoming members of heathen priesthoods in order to "baptize" the people, without their knowledge or consent, making a specialty of baptizing children. In the "Short History of Religion" contained in Deharbe's Catechism, the information is conveyed in the statement that Francis Xavier "himself declares in one of his letters that in one month he administered Holy Baptism to ten thousand heathen."

Xavier was a Jesuit "missionary," Deharbe was a Jesuit—and it seems from his letters that the man who writes as "J. J. Farrell" is a Jesuit; they are especially trained in the art of evasion. Centuries ago they were denying their Christ as a means of winning converts to His banner: to-day Farrell is denying the necessity of that dogma; so essential did these Jesuit fathers of Farrell's church deem baptism that they practiced deceit to administer it—their "intention" was, "The Greater Glory of God"—the "end justifying the means," all of which is now denied by him, the official exponent of Catholicism in Georgia!

Some people wonder how the papal church has survived the Dark Ages; the solution to the problem is simple: just make it a capital crime to exercise the powers of the mind, interpret Holy Scripture, or read any book on faith or morals not issued according to the Rules of the Papal Index—make it a crime to hold an opinion contrary to the "thought" of an Italian foreigner clothed with power of enforcing his "thought," and you have a streak of darkness that will reach through Time and Eternity.

Had the question of "intention" been presented by a Catholic—which would be impossible—the church would have disposed of it by stating that the pope had so declared, and that to question would be unbecoming the "faithful," while for a heretic to ask such questions, though ostensibly invited, is "butting in," or is questioning their religion, which Mr. A. J. Long said Catholics resent. He could show *resentment*—but could not answer questions!

The Catholic Laymen's Association of Georgia was asked to explain the dogma of "Intention." The doctrine was denied, which made it necessary to deny also the dogma of baptism to sustain said denial of the main question. To demonstrate that his testimony was not according to established fact, baptism was referred to other witnesses, who promptly confounded his testimony, after which he writes long epistles discussing *baptism*, explains what he thinks the other witnesses thought I wished to know, seems hurt that I was not seeking information relative to salvation (after admitting the association was not formed for evangelical purposes), but never answered the direct question, how any one may know he is a "sure-enough" member of the pope's church, although the Bible commands the followers of Christ to be always ready to "give a reason for the faith that is within you."

Mr. Farrell said I tried to "play smart at the expense of right and truth," but he does not "put his finger on the spot": does the papal church deem it an attempt to "play smart" for Reason to ask for an explanation of a doctrine which it proposes for belief, and claims it has the right to enforce belief, yet is unable to explain? The Christ invited questions—and did not "upbraid" His questioners!

Augusta, Ga., Oct. 30, 1917.

Dear Sir: You say you "are NOT satisfied" with my answer to Number 3. Evidently, however, you are convinced it is true, as you did not ask Cardinal Gibbons, Bishop Keiley or the *Sunday Visitor* about it, although you had it before you when you wrote them.

Of course, you are not "satisfied" because my answer dissolves into nothingness a link in the chain of your imagined conspiracy that you had so painfully wrought. Your Question 3 was based on the assumption that the seal of confession binds to secrecy the penitent as well as the priest.

"If it does," you thrust, "how could you know that priests do not ask immoral questions of your women?" Now that was not half bad, had your assumed premise been sound. To cling to a point after it is blunted, however, shows bad judgment.

When you were informed that the seal of confession does not bind the penitent, that every penitent is free to disclose matters of confession, that Catholics frequently talk among themselves about them; your premise broke down flat.

You, then, can imagine NOTHING to keep us from knowing that immoral questions are not put to our women in confession. That is, unless you will accuse our women of concealing what nothing but their own complicity could compel them to conceal. You will not accuse them, so that ends the chapter, leaving absolutely nothing.

The second quotation you impute to Liguori, I abjure. The first and last are not to the point; you can see that. Your charge that Catholic men are "recreant to womanhood," I pass over; let our women make that.

JJF/MC

Very truly,

J. J. FARRELL, Mgr.

COMMENT

If Tabby was caught eating biddies to-day, we know he will do so again to-morrow, if occasion permits: Mr. Farrell had occasion, and he "abjured" baptism! It isn't necessary to engage a busy person with more than one question to show an intelligent jury what weight is to be given to the testimony of a witness who has testified contrary to the established facts in a case—therefore he has been impeached by his superiors in the faith.

Perhaps I did not refer this question to the gentlemen named, knowing they "have no time for indiscriminate controversy." Cardinal Gibbons, Bishop Keiley and the Editor were asked a direct question; they had no knowledge of its import; it may be interesting to know, in this connection, that when some of them have "time for indiscriminate controversy," they may consider TRUTH more elastic than it really is; for instance, in his attempt to sustain the papal contention that Mary had no other children than Jesus, Cardinal Gibbons says, in his book, "Faith of Our Fathers," as to "first-born" not necessarily meaning there were other children: "We find this epithet applied to Machir, for in-

stance, who was the only son of Manasseh," while in Joshua vi:17 the fact is mentioned that "the daughters of Manasseh" had an inheritance "AMONG HIS SONS."

When is a "point blunted"? A *point* can not be *blunted* unless it is driven against some *resisting* substance: certainly Mr. Farrell will not say *he* has offered any resistance in his arguments to *blunt* any "point" of my questions—by evasion he always *kept away from the point*. It must be blunted, though, because he said so! But it appears to me as long as a point meets with no resistance, penetrating without being forced, it is not blunted.

Mr. Farrell (?) says he adjures the citation from Liguori—the *papal church gives him that right!*—he was very verbose in letters explaining what he knew I was familiar with, so why is he so sparing in regard to the teaching of Liguori? Why did he not cite from him? If he was not trying to conceal this doctrine—the doctrine that the papal church tried to put Mr. Watson in the penitentiary for exposing—it would have been the simple, honest, straightforward, convincing thing for him to have had this theology translated by a non-Catholic Latin scholar in Augusta and submitted it (Catholics can send it through the mails, but heretics like Tom Watson can not do so); this would have been conclusive.

As this subject will be discussed at length in connection with another topic, I will leave the reader to muse over Mr. Farrell's expressive brevity in handling Liguori's (moral) Theology!

Mr. Farrell is sure I am evidently convinced his answer is true, as I did not refer it to Cardinal Gibbons: in referring to "truth" and the cardinal in the same breath, reminds me! I believe I can prove to the satisfaction of Mr. Farrell even that his cardinal is not altogether above practicing deceit in matters affecting his church, but is in fact deceptive.

In the "Manual of Prayers, for the Use of the Laity," a notation on a fly-leaf reads, "having been diligently compiled and examined, it is hereby approved" by James Cardinal Gibbons, bearing the imprimatur of Augustinus, Archiep. This imprimatur is an indication that the book was censored and printed in accord with the Rules of the Index, stamping it as true Catholic doctrine which laymen may read. Page 413 of this volume contains the "Profession of Faith" or layman's oath, wherein the promise is made to observe *all* that the church commands, to believe *everything* defined and declared by the sacred canons, especially *all* the decrees of the *Council of Trent and the Vatican Council*, all of which are in the Canon Law of the Roman church to which I often refer. This Manual of Prayers, remember, is authoritative, being issued for the use of *Catholic laymen*; now, I pick up another book; it is written by James Cardinal Gibbons—written for *Protestant* readers and has no "imprimatur." It is a grand

ex parte presentation of the Roman Catholic religion, and, like Mr. Farrell's answers to my questions, very plausible and satisfying to those who know nothing of the subjects or who are uncritical; in his book the cardinal reveals one face (the religious) to a groping non-Catholic public, while he keeps the other face (the canon law and decrees) out of sight!

In this book written for non-Catholic consumption the cardinal says, on page 220, "that the Catholic church has always been the zealous promoter of religious and civil liberty" and that "her doctrine is, that as man, by his own *free will*, fell from grace, so of his own *free will* must he return to grace. Conversion and coercion are two terms that can never be reconciled." We now turn to Canon 14 of the Seventh Session of the Council of Trent, which converts to Roman Catholicism swear to obey and believe, and we read: "If any one says that the baptized are not to be *compelled* to a Christian life by any other penalty save that they be excluded from the participation of the Eucharist and of the other sacraments until they repent, let him be anathema" (let him be damned). Unless Mr. Farrell can reconcile that doctrine with the statements above cited from Gibbon's "Faith of Our Fathers," the cardinal will stand convicted of deceit—can this reconciliation be perfected? I think not! *Gibbons was writing for Protestants*—the Council of Trent was *legislating for the faithful* of the pope; these two citations show the two faces of the papal church; one for the heretic, the other for the faithful, and reveal a deceitfulness not inculcated by Christ.

The copy in hand mentioned above is the seventy-seventh edition, one million copies; perhaps it has had its weight in the "conversion" of those 500,000 adults Mr. Farrell boasts of; certainly, if a person reads that book, *and nothing else* along that line—having no knowledge of the laws and decrees he *swears* to uphold and defend in becoming a member of that institution—he may embrace the papal faith, even though it may also be true that every argument presented by the cardinal would fade away as mist before the sun if both sides were diligently studied. No doubt this fact accounts for the law of that church which prohibits debating with *heretics*.

Musing over Farrell's allusion to the cardinal, in the matter of establishing truth by his testimony, reminded me of other things in "The Faith of Our Fathers," especially where the cardinal refers to liberty and coercion, etc., so I wrote him the following letter, to see if a certain book supported the cardinal's statements:

Rev. J. Cardinal Gibbons,
Baltimore, Md.

Macon, Ga., July 7, 1919.

Dear Cardinal: I have recently finished reading your book, "The Faith of Our Fathers," which was very interesting.

I was very much impressed with the statement, among other things, made in the "Introductory," p. xiv, that:

"There is no Freemasonry in the Catholic church; she has no secrets to keep back. She has not one set of doctrines for the Bishops and Priests, and another for the laity. She has not one creed for the initiated and another for outsiders. Everything in the Catholic church is open and above board. She has the same doctrines for all—the pope and the peasant."

I would thank you to send me a copy of the Roman Ritual: "Pontificale Romanum" (for which will remit), or advise where I may secure a copy of it.

Thanking you for your attention,

Very truly,

C. A. YARBROUGH.

I secured the book; I will let the reader judge whether or not it proves the cardinal a (——) or supports his "Faith of Our Fathers" in the matters of civil and religious liberty and *free will*, which will be cited in pages to follow. In view of the cardinal's assertion that the papal church "has not one creed for the initiated and another for outsiders" makes Mr. McCreary's tactics appear very strange, indeed!

Augusta, Ga., Oct. 31, 1917.

Dear Sir: You have had a trick turned on you (or have you?), where you quote from a "priest's hand book" questions that you say priests MUST ask of penitents.

(1) First, there is no such book. Second, the questions you quote are from a layman's prayer book. They are questions the penitent asks himself in his secret examination of conscience, which he makes in preparation for confession. There is a list of such questions under each commandment, all framed in a way calculated to help the penitent to recall sins committed.

(2) The object of these questions is exactly the contrary of what you say. They are provided so that the priest need NOT ask such questions of the penitent. So your indignant protest about the tearing off the garment of modesty, etc., is all lost. If a woman penitent has not sinned against purity she has nothing to say and the priest must *not* ask touching the subject. If she has been guilty, of course, she must confess; but who rends the garment of modesty in that case?

(3) You object that confession is "unnatural." Well, it is no more unnatural for a woman than for a man, for a layman than for a priest; and you know doubtless that even the pope must make his confession the same way as any poor sinner. Unnatural? Well, it rubs nature rather hard sometime; but so did the sufferings of the Master; should we expect Him to do all the hard things, and leave us "primrose paths of dalliance"?

(4) You attribute our submission to early training; but how do you account for the submission of thousands of adult converts (over 500,000 in this country alone last year)? You do not fail to ring in the Index (My! how things must haunt you!), but what

could there be for the Index to conceal that people who use the confessional do not know?

(5) In conclusion now; if we are satisfied with it, ought you not to be satisfied without it? Very truly,

J. J. FARRELL.

COMMENT

Yes, I have a copy of the book referred to.

(1) Mr. Farrell says there is no such book—that the quotations are from a "Layman's Prayer Book"—all right, so far; but let us analyze the proposition: For Farrell to be correct in fact, and for a book to be a "layman's" in the true sense of the word, it *must be one prepared and issued by laymen for the use of laymen*—at least laymen must have a voice in determining its contents; if not, but is prepared and issued solely by Roman priests in accord with Rules of the papal Index FOR the use of laymen, then it's a "Priest's Hand Book" or "Priest's Prayer Book" for laymen. Mr. Farrell knows that no layman in the world can have a voice in such matters; he also knows that what laymen are to believe and what they are to do and what they are to avoid doing are all laid down, as Leo says, by the pope, assisted by the holy fathers (the forces that made the Dark Ages) who attend to all such things for laymen *before they are born subject to them*.

A thorough investigation of this subject reveals the following: Only a nominal percentage of the Roman Catholics of the world can read; now, as the papal church claims to be the same, always, everywhere, the suggested questions cited from the "prayer" book *form an outline which must be followed*—the information the priest *must* obtain in the confessional from men, women and children, and where people can not read, as is the rule where the papal church has control of education, *then the priest must probe the most secret chambers of the heart* as a doctor probes for an imbedded bullet, *orally* indicating the *nature* of the sins to be confessed, and draw them out with questions to the point. No sane person will attempt to deny this conclusion. Of course, it may be true, that in communities where an appreciable number of Catholics can read, the PRIEST puts the book of prepared questions into their hands and gives them to understand that they must study them and make answer; in either case the result and effect are the same. There can be no moral difference between asking direct questions of a woman and placing a list of questions in her hands and demand that she take them up in sequence and answer "guilty" or "not guilty" to every count in the Decalog, specifying all circumstances surrounding each sin.

A Georgia publicist was harassed five years in the courts for citing some of the questions prepared by Liguori, Dens, and others, that priests are required to ask women in the confessional,

although said citations were printed in Latin, therefore, as I do not wish to "tangle" with Uncle Sam, who is becoming quick to obey the Roman church, I will not quote any of the raw language of these papal theological "saints," but will go just far enough to show what they are and what they do for a nation.

(2) Two of the leading theologians of the papal church are Alphonsus Liguori and Peter Dens; the theology of one or the other, if not both, is taught in every Catholic seminary in the world where priests are being trained, and they declare, as to the confessional, that priests must have the following versicle in readiness:

"Who, Which, Where, With Whom, Why, How, When."—Dens, Vol. VI, p. 125; Liguori, Vol. II, p. 464.

(I most respectfully ask Mr. Farrell what becomes of the "garment of modesty" of those who voluntarily go through this or do so at the command of the priest?)

In "The Mirror of the Clergy," p. 357, priests are instructed:

"It is necessary for the confessor (priest) to know everything on which he is to exercise his judgment. Let him, then, with *wisdom and subtlety, interrogate sinners on the sins which they may ignore, or conceal through same.*"

Shame for their sin caused Adam and Eve to make garments of fig leaves, indicating there was some sense of righteousness left in them; shame for sin except to the utterly depraved is concealed from the vulgar gaze of man by the "garment of modesty," and the less sinful, the tighter this garment is entwined. Where a bachelor priest finds this garment tightly drawn, he must *be wise and subtle* in his questions and tear it asunder! Mr. Farrell says, in par. 2, that "the object of these questions (in the hand book) is exactly the contrary of what you say"; is his statement supported by his saintly theologians, above cited? If not, who are more liable to be the deceiver, he teaching a heretic, or they teaching the pope's priests?

Through the theologians the papal church puts this question to priests after they have heard the confessions of daughters, wives, mothers and sweethearts:

"While hearing confession, have I not asked questions on sins against the Sixth (Seventh in Protestant Bible) Commandment, with the intention of satisfying my evil passions?"—Mirror of Clergy, p. 582.

According to this doctrine of the papal church, the priest is first required to swim through a filthy sewer and after getting out is thrown in again to see if he enjoyed it!

The very popular book by Debreyne instructs young priests in the "art" of questioning penitents, in a "Treatise on All the Sins

Against the Sixth Commandment," as well as questions on married life.

Dens, Liguori, Debreyne, Bailey, and other Roman Catholic "holy" theologians warn priests against the determination of girls and married women refusing to confess sins against this commandment. These hell-hounds knew it would require the *wisdom and subtlety* of the devil to tear from woman the garment of modesty of the soul and conscience that God provided as a protection against the wiles of satan!

In Apostolic days many of the people of the early church decided to have all things in common; there was nothing compulsory about it. Ananias and his wife Sapphira deposited a part of their goods in the common fund and withheld a part. They tried to fool the people with their false piety, but God revealed their sin to Peter, who reminded them that they were not required to do as the others, that their lying deceit had been made known, so they paid the penalty—God punished them, not Peter: when the Jesuitical deceitfulness of the devil was manifested in the Garden of Eden, telling Adam and Eve that if they ate of the forbidden fruit "ye shall not *surely* die," they ate, contrary to the command of God, whereupon they discovered their nakedness and prepared a covering of fig leaves. Man lost Paradise through the wisdom and subtlety of the devil and was separated from God. To perfect a reconciliation, Christ gave His life to atone for that sin, so that all who call upon God for pardon in His name receive it. The papal church says this is not so; that God gave the pope's priests the right and power to forgive sin and inflict expiatory punishment by doing penance: if this be true, it shows that God is a "respector of persons"—yet Peter said He was not—in that He did not give the *Roman priests* the same aid of the Holy Spirit in detecting sin as He did to Peter in the Ananias case, so that they could read or discern the hidden secrets of the hearts and minds of men and women; so, by implication, the pope says that, to overcome this grave oversight on God's part relative to papal priests in the confessional, it is necessary to put penitents through the grilling process of Liguori's Versicle, with *wisdom and cunning!*

In the matter of the confessional, it appears to me that God ought at least to vouchsafe to the priest that "Divine assistance" of infallibility in carrying out the dogmas of the pope that the pope says he has in defining them to make sure that the dogma of the pope is infallible and that it would be without sinful consequences in its operation with the priest and penitent in the confessional. This is so logical, even a Hottentot would agree with it if he was permitted to exercise his own judgment in the premises!

The instant a woman confesses her sin to a man, that instant she doubtless becomes an instrument in his downfall; no person can act as the sewer through which must flow all the filth of human depravity without becoming defiled. The confessional destroys the Lord's Prayer, wherein is the petition, "*Lead us not into temptation.*" If the pope has given the priest the power to call Jesus Christ from Heaven, cause Him to enter a piece of pancake and be devoured of men, surely the priest should be clothed with power to get His aid in the matter of locating sin in the confessional—be his X-Ray—as a means of keeping his servant the priest out if unnecessary temptation in making subtle searches for the hidden sins of women and girls!

From these facts, it seems to me that the Italian church seeks, through the confessional, to pollute the human race at its very source, even as the devil did in the beginning by ensnaring woman; this conclusion is based on a consideration of what is required in the confessional, and the admission of papal evidence, as follows:

Cardinal de Boland wrote a book for the exclusive use of priests; as Archbishop of Lyons, he was one of the pope's princes, and evidently knew what he was talking about when he said that priests are in "continual temptation" in the confessional with female penitents, and that "the soul is gradually enfeebled in such a way that the virtue of chastity is forever lost." Who rends the "garment of modesty" of priest and penitent, Farrell, women, or the damnable dogmas of an Italian imposter posing as GOD? If the confessional destroys the chastity of priests, what does it do for women? If it destroys the chastity of *one* soul, yet is ordained of God, then the prayer to Him, "*Lead us not into temptation,*" is of no avail—in fact, is a travesty on human intelligence!

Because of the large number of complaints lodged against the priests, Pope Pius IV issued a Bull requiring *all girls and married women* who had been seduced by their holy fathers in the confessional to denounce them to the "Holy" Inquisition. But before attempting its general enforcement throughout Europe, he made an experiment in Seville, Spain. Thirty Inquisitors were appointed to question the women, being provided with thirty notaries to record the answers. The women came; the Inquisitors found the task greater than could be attended to in the prescribed time, so thirty days more was granted, but because of the long stream of ladies the call was made for thirty additional days, which was also granted. The expectations of the pope were so far exceeded that the investigation was suspended, the ladies released from further testifying and the priests—left *in statu quo!*

It is a true saying, that "You can not prevent a bird from

flying over your head, but can keep it from making a nest in your hair." The bird flies on, and is forgotten; but if a fitting evil thought crosses the mind it *must be caged in memory's chambers and held there until convenient to release it in the confessional*—the passing bird must be given a nest for a day or a year; if not, then a grave, mortal sin is committed in going to communion without having first turned the "bird" over to the priest, notwithstanding the Bible declares that a man must *examine himself* to see if he partake of the communion worthily or unworthily.

Let us come a little nearer home. In 1901 President McKinley, by Joint Resolution of Congress, appointed a Commission to investigate the lands held by papal priests in the Philippine Islands. In the name of the United States Government this Commission conducted a regular court of inquiry, submitting its findings to the Fifty-sixth Congress, second session, which report is known as Senate Document No. 190. The entire information along certain lines may be condensed in the statement that a Roman priest was lord of all he surveyed; when he officiated at a marriage, the "first night" was his if he was so inclined; if he fancied any woman he could deport the father, husband, brother or sweetheart if an objection was raised, as he had the power to banish. Ex-President William Howard Taft was Chairman of this Commission, and the document presented to the Senate was sworn testimony. Because Uncle Sam has so many of the pope's faithful in high places, that document soon went out of print, *and President McKinley was soon "removed from the earth by death."*

We will look a little closer around us for further evidence; State's evidence. Jeremiah J. Crowley was a Roman priest twenty-one years—from 1886 to 1907. In his remarkable book, "Romanism, a Menace to the Nation," he prints the names of a number of priests who co-operated with him in efforts to purify the Roman church from the inside in Chicago, Ill., lodging more than one hundred documents with the pope of Rome and his representative in Washington, D. C., containing charges against the hierarchy, which received the same treatment as the report from Seville, Spain—nothing was done, except to promote some of the worst priests to better fields, according to Crowley. On pages 62-3 he prints a letter which he says was signed by 1,500 Catholic women of Chicago and sent to Archbishop Quigley demanding that he protect them from drunken, lecherous priests, the last paragraph reading: "We humbly and respectfully look to you for protection and redress."

Mr. Crowley states that "Priestly celibacy and auricular confession have been, and are now, prolific sources of crime and licentiousness (p. 71). This doctrine actually increases crime (p. 73). It was established as a portion of the system before the thirteenth

century—history attests that it originated in the licentiousness of the Roman clergy in the ninth, tenth and eleventh centuries, and made a law of the church at the Fourth Council Lateran in 1215, was confirmed by the Council of Trent, Sess. XIV (p. 74). *This wholesale demoralization was one of the principal motives for instituting celibacy and auricular confession.* The result accomplished was just what the Vatican machine wanted. This demoralization compelled wicked priests, prelates and other members of the hierarchy of both sexes to stand by each other for the Vatican System—stand by Authority, right or wrong," (p. 77). No papist would meet him in debate, but a so-called "fanatic" ruined his mind, it is said, by breaking a water-pitcher on his head at one of his lectures!

P. A. Seguin tells the same story (and his testimony was answered by a broken jaw-bone and a fractured arm); the priests and historians with manhood enough to say anything at all in each country and century prove its demoralizing effect.

The pope teaches, and Catholics believe, that the Italian is the only "true" church established by Jesus Christ: now, if the papal church is Christian, that is, follower of Christ, it must give unquestionable evidence that it tracks Christ in all things; so, let us make only one test and see if papalism is following Him: When the Samaritan woman met Jesus at the well, did He ask her, "Who, Which, Where, With Whom, How, When," according to the papal versicle, or did He simply inform her what *she* knew was true? Did He quizz the woman taken in sin and brought before Him at the temple—was she "grilled" by any process similar to that invented by Liguori? NO! Are the popes Christlike in the confessional? If the Christ did not probe—which would have been the use of force, destroying free moral agency—what right has a bachelor priest to probe the hearts of females?

The devil, with a plausible, Jesuitical lie, got Eve into his power, and it required a God to die to undo the mischief. From that day to this, satan has never relaxed his efforts to strike at God through His creatures for casting him out of Heaven; by dominating the woman, satan knows he can land mankind in hell if there is any chance of doing so at all—so observe how he uses women: Mohammedanism centers around the harem; Mormonism, polygamy; Romanism, the confessional!

Mr. Farrell (?) says, "If she has been guilty, of course she must confess." But, who is it that *says she must*—God? NO; the *Italian pope* says so!

Here is a maiden, sweet as the perfumes of many flowers, pure as a lily, artless as a dove: in his going to and fro seeking whom he may devour, the devil causes an evil thought, like the bird, to flash across the mind's vision; she goes to her "father-confessor"

who by wisdom and cunning makes her refresh her memory, the repetition accentuates the thought—the bird has been caged by the assistance of a papal priest—and the clutches of satan may never be broken!

Charles Chiniquy was a member of the papal church fifty years, twenty-five as a priest; he turned State's evidence: he said that he attended one dying priest in Canada who confessed he had heard about 1,500 confessions of married women and girls, and that he had destroyed or scandalized at least 1,000 of them with depraved questions, while the purity of 95 was destroyed by him through actual sin. (That priest grasped the meaning or suggestion of the "fathers": couldn't marry one but went wrong with almost one hundred.)

Chiniquy said a banker would not let a priest go into his vault, handle his gold, pry into his private business affairs, but will let that same priest search out the hidden rooms of his wife's heart! He was priest long enough to know what he was talking about.

(8) It is said that the papal church once debated whether or not a woman had a soul; anyway, the early fathers of that church abhorred her as a thing unclean, yet some of them always "used" her, even when she belonged to another man. With these facts in mind, it is not hard to understand how Farrell (?) can say it is no more unnatural for a timid, shrinking girl or wife to unrobe, as it were, in the presence of a wine-fed bachelor agent of popery than for a man. Shame on anything that calls itself a man who says that! I have suspected before now that "Farrell" was not doing this writing for the Catholic Laymen's Association; my suspicions are now confirmed. I do not believe a Catholic *layman* could make that assertion—it "smacks" too much of the priest!

"Unnatural," adds this priest or cleric, "well, it rubs nature rather hard sometime; but so did the sufferings of the Master." What blasphemy! Christ's sufferings did not rub nature at all; to break the chains, pay the debt and set the captive free from sin was the task for a God, and when it was "finished" on the cross, all Nature shook in acclaim for the Majesty of its God. The price was paid—the chasm between Man and his God bridged, the throne of grace once more accessible; notwithstanding this, and also that the confessional is liable to destroy the priest and penitent, Farrell says it is no more unnatural for a woman than a man. Papal theologians acknowledge that the confessional is a constant danger to priests, which is equivalent to saying that in trying to follow Christ *there is grave danger of losing your soul*. "It rubs nature rather hard," I will admit, for a soul to be Christ-like where it must go through the *Italian* confessional in life, and *pagan* purgatory after death—and never know even that it was really after all a member of the Italian institution!

The "holy" fathers realized that the confessional would "rub nature rather hard sometime"; for it is only *after* a priest takes the vow of celibacy that he is initiated into the mysteries of the confessional through the study of Rome's *Moral Theology*—studies which no man can pursue without degradation to mind and body—studies which act upon the natural organs and cause pollution, yet young priests are brazenly told that "There is no sin for you in these pollutions."—Dens, Vol. I, p. 315. (If the studies themselves have this effect, what will result from their use in the confessional on priest and penitent?) The popes have certainly made it possible for Roman priests to travel "primrose paths of dalliance" in the confessional, yet Christ said, "Take My yoke upon you, for the yoke is easy and the burden is light." The gulf between the Gospel of Christ and the dogma of the pope is as deep and wide as that between Heaven and Hell.

(4) I account for it on several grounds. Some one has said you could sell moonshine—not the kind revenue officers hunt—if it could be bottled and adequately advertised: with the newspapers filling their columns every time the pope or one of his principal agents sneezes or has himself interviewed, or a notice is printed of some papal clan holding a meeting, monopolizing the picture screen to advertise priests, nuns, shrines, crucifixes, relics, and so on, preventing all discussions of papalism in the press, applying the principles of the boycott in attempts to prevent Protestant preachers from making a comparison of papalism with Protestantism, closing public halls against this information being disseminated, making it a crime to sell papers on the streets that criticize the decrees and dogmas of the pope, attempts to put men in the penitentiary for citing in Latin from papal theologians, intimidating men in all stations of political, business and private life, censoring the school books of the nation, I doubt if there were as many as one hundred among that whole number who knew or know any more about papalism than I did a few years ago—that the very oath they swore when they joined makes them enemies of the very Government that harbors and gives them the protection of its laws!

"You do not fail to ring in the Index," said Farrell. "But what could there be for the Index to conceal . . .?" For one thing, it conceals the fact that the confessional is an invention of the Dark Ages, and that it has no warrant for existence in the Gospels of Christianity, and that the "history" of the thing, written by Catholics who endeavored to live Christ-like, condemns it as being destructive, rather than an aid to salvation.

(5) Priests of Rome know that nearly all women look upon the confessional as did those of Chicago; that they shrink from it naturally as being something unclean, and that "it rubs nature

rather hard sometime" for them to enter it, so I am not satisfied with it, even if Catholics are; I am no more satisfied with it than I would be content to know that a desolating disease was prevalent in some other part of the country, but headed my way (and if the laws of the pope are not "headed" my way, they are headed toward no one!) I look upon Roman Catholics under papalism just as the United States looked upon the poor Cubans under Spanish and papal misrule: brow-beaten, mentally downtrodden, spiritual skeletons who fear to *ask* but must accept with a smile whatsoever is given them! At times, when I consider what Italian popery has done for the peoples of the world, and what would be the fate of Catholics themselves right here in Georgia were it not for the presence of Protestantism which TIES HER BLOODY HANDS, and then realize how hard Catholic laymen are struggling to advance that system, I feel toward them a little of the resentment I have for the system. For them to bury their heads in the sand (in the Index) and yell "LIAR" when facts are presented does not hide the facts any more than the ostrich is hidden from the hunter because he has stuck his head in the sand!

Farrell says, "If we are satisfied with it, ought not you to be satisfied without it?" The pipe-smoking opium fiend and the drunkard ask the same question, and my reply is the same to Farrell as to them.

To return to the Cubans: They would still be plodding in a lifeless, degraded, servile, starving, emaciated state, had they not been liberated by America; in this condition they may have gone on until they became extinct without knowing they were more than a species of bipedal animals but for their enforced emancipation: for the only freedom the Roman church inculcates is, freedom from having to think in matters of faith and morals. Catholics may be "satisfied with it" (the confessional)—they may remain as the Cubans were; I do not hope to influence them, because they fear the pope, who has decreed excommunication against those who read such as this for the purpose of honestly weighing the matter; but if my efforts will keep one soul from being ensnared in the toils of the fowler, I will consider my work not in vain as a freeman discharging his duty as he comprehends it; and if Roman Catholic women in America are NOT crucified in the confessional, as demanded by their pope, they owe a debt of gratitude to Protestantism which only eternity can reveal.

To those who can read, the questions in the hand-book must be read and answers rendered to the priest; Farrell says they are provided "so that the priest need NOT ask such questions of the penitent." In this matter, the priest is like a highway robber who meets his victim at some secluded spot—it makes no difference whether the highwayman "covers" him with a gun and makes him

"hand over" his valuables, or probes his pockets himself; it makes no difference to the penitent man or woman whether the priest draws the pope's dogma on them and forces a "voluntary" confession, or whether he employs "wisdom" and "subtlety" in probing the heart—the result in each case is the same.

When a pope issues a Bull or Decree known as "*Motu Proprio*," he is "using the fullness of his powers"; and what he commands in such Bull is valid, "even when it would be contrary to laws," or when "contrary to his own decrees."—Taunton's Canon Law, p. 446.

The real meaning of such a decree is, "Above the Law."

On October 9, 1911, "Pius PP. X" issued a *Motu Proprio* decree to protect the Roman Catholic hierarchy, both men and women, against scandal, and show contempt for civil law, excommunicating any person who presumes to summon a Roman Catholic ecclesiastic before a lay tribunal, either for a civil or criminal offense, as follows:

"In these evil days, when ecclesiastical immunities receive no consideration, and not only priests and clerics, but even bishops and cardinals of the Holy Roman church, are cited before lay tribunals, this condition of things absolutely demands of Us to restrain by severe penalty those who can not be otherwise deterred from the commission of so heinous a crime against the religious character. Therefore, by this *Motu Proprio* We determine and ordain that whatever private person, lay or cleric, man or woman, shall, without having obtained permission of ecclesiastical authorities, cite to a lay tribunal and compel to appear there publicly any ecclesiastical person, either in a criminal or civil case, will incur excommunication '*latae sententiae*' specially reserved to the Roman Pontiff. This by these Letters is decided, and We wish it to stand ratified, everything to the contrary notwithstanding."

Pius X was voicing the Encyclical of Leo XIII, who said that "no private person may arrogate to himself the office of judge which Christ our Lord has bestowed on that ONE ALONE (the pope) whom He placed in charge of His Lambs and His Sheep. . . . Subjects should be admonished not to rashly judge their prelates even if they chance to see them acting in a blameworthy manner. They are to be warned against the danger of . . . opposition to the superiors whose shortcomings they may notice. Should, therefore, the superiors have committed grievous sins their inferiors ought not to refuse them respectful submission . . . even when they are rightly judged to have deserved censure," p. 203, subject, "Chief Duties of Christians (Catholics) as Citizens."

Pius X was Leo's successor; these two men lived and died in our day; and it seems that as the Roman Italian church advances in years it digs deeper and wider the chasm to engulf the human

race; here we see how the pope first forces his subjects into the confessional, then threatens with excommunication those who may see fit to *protest* against what may take place there with the bachelor priest. Remember, Americans! Not only does this Law of an Italian monarch trample the laws of the land under his unhallowed feet, but there are millions of women who are driven into the confessional by the pope's laws in America, and there are about 65,000 women in America locked up in papal prisons called convents, where the LAW of the land is forbidden to enter, because such places have become the territory of the pope—but the priests have keys to said asylums; the relic of ancient paganism revived by the pope when papal mental darkness covered the known world. Remember, also, that hundreds of thousands of Americans, in their ignorance of Romanism, are annually becoming tangled in the meshes of that foreign institution each year—how do you know that your daughter or sister will escape being caught in it, when you are forcing it across their paths by sending them to Catholic schools and permitting Roman Catholic teachers in the public school?

The laws of the pope are a blot upon civilization as to the confessional, which has been abolished in some Roman Catholic States, and such laws are a challenge thrown in the face of every free man in America, and membership in that institution should, *ipso facto*, disfranchise any one from exercising the rights of citizenship—being alien in spirit and intention, they should be made such in fact as a means of preserving our civilization and our free institutions.

One Romanist on a jury would no doubt cause the miscarriage of justice if papalism was involved, regardless of the crime: further, the Roman church boasts of seventeen or eighteen million members in America, and the Catholic man who bows to the *Motu Proprio* decree of Pius X has not at heart that welfare of women and mankind in general as fits him to assist in making and administering the laws of a free people; where is the actual difference between this law of an infallible pope and the "rights" the priesthood claimed in the Philippines? The laws of the pope afford 20,000 bachelors the Time, the Place, the Opportunity, and Immunity—and those priests are obliged either to be saints or devils. In this connection I fully concur in what ex-Priest Charles Chiniquy said: "I do not say that all priests and female penitents fall . . . thanks be to God . . . but these are exceptions. . . . The confessional is like the spider's web. How many unsuspecting flies find death when seeking rest on the beautiful frame-work of their deceitful enemy! How few escape! And this only after a most desperate struggle. See how the perfidious spider looks harmless in his retired dark corner . . . how patiently he waits

for his opportunity! But look how quickly he surrounds his victim with his silky, delicate and imperceptible links; how mercifully he sucks its blood and destroys its life!" Priests in the confessional are as worms gnawing on the tap-root of the fairest, most fragrant and healing flower that grows in God's garden on earth—woman.

Americans! no use to waste energy on the average Catholic man! He must believe a thing is not so, even if he is sober and sees it with his own eyes, if the priest says it is not so; here is the law by which he is governed: Says "Saint" Liguori, "That we may in ALL things attain the truth that we err not in anything, we ought ever to hold, *as a fixed principle*, that what I see WHITE to be BLACK if the superior authority of the church define it to be so," which doctrine was confirmed by Pope Gregory XVI in an Encyclical, August 15, 1832, saying, "If the church so requires, let us sacrifice our own opinions, our KNOWLEDGE, our INTELLIGENCE and the MOST SUBLIME ATTAINMENTS of the human UNDERSTANDING." And now who is it that says this? The CHURCH; who is the church? The POPE! And who are the "superiors"? Any one who is NOT a LAYMAN! The average Catholic is so steeped in this papal doctrine that he is more ready to kill one who makes these facts known or discusses them than he is to seek the truth, or try to change them—he is as a corpse in the hands of the priests. Take A. J. Long, of this city, for example; he says "a Catholic's religion is so much a part of him that he naturally takes exception to those who question his belief or practices as such." Let me explain right here why "a Catholic takes exception" to criticism of his religion or his pope; in the Catechism by Deharbe the question is asked, "34. In how many ways may we become accessory to another person's sin, and be answerable for it?" Of the nine ways, we quote two of them: "3. By consent." "6. By silence." Now we have it! If a newspaper discusses the faith and practices of Catholics, or a preacher does so, or a lecturer does it, or any individual in any manner, if Catholics do not "take exception" they become accessories to the "crime" and "thus are as guilty before God as if we had committed it ourselves; or, it may be, even more so." (Ans. to qu. No. 35.) This accounts for the activity of Catholics in Congress, in city councils, and as private citizens, to suppress with the boycott or other strenuous methods any criticism of popery, for, to remain silent, is to make them as guilty as he who committed the deed! Weigh that proposition well, Americans! Does it tend to establish democracy and uphold the principles of freedom of our land, or destruction? So, I repeat: there is no use bothering with Catholics; but there is some hope of awakening sleepy-eyed Americans to the presence of this foreign, obnox-

ious, poisonous weed that will choke the life out of *our* LIBERTIES unless we take up Rome's challenge, and in the name of Freedom and in behalf of helpless victims on our shores, pass such laws as will abolish the confessional, the convent, and put all children of school-age in the Free Public Schools, the great Melting Pot, and make Americans of them instead of subjects of a foreigner whose laws are destructive of every principle which has made this a great nation; make it a felony with an adequate penalty to teach any theory of government that conflicts with the Constitution of the United States.

It is alleged by some students that there are twenty-five million Jesuits in the world—secret and otherwise; this order controls the Roman Italian institution; here are a few of the principles of Jesuitism, according to a French Roman Catholic historian, de Cormenin, Vol. II, p. 313:

"It is not a great sin for young girls to abandon themselves to love before marriage, nor for women to receive the embraces of other men, and be unfaithful to their husbands, under certain circumstances. . . . Young women without experience think that to be chaste they must call for aid and resist their seducers with all their strength; it is not so. They are equally pure if they are quiet and do not resist. We sin but by consent and co-operation."

It is no exaggeration to say that Jesuit casuistry destroys every command of the Decalog.

Augusta, Ga., Nov. 1, 1917.

Dear Sir: Your objection to my answer to Question 4 shows a lack of discrimination. (1)

(2) There is one Law for Catholics in regard to Masonry, one *order*, one *command*, and only one; which is, not to join the order or in any way encourage or assist it as such. Now, unless Masons insist that we agree to join the order or assist the order as such, they can live in peace with us. We are not asking them to agree to join the church or assist the church as such before offering to live at peace with them; do they demand the converse of us? We do not believe it.

(3) You say, "If the various Grand Masters . . . were to issue letters . . . the Catholic church (in this country) long ago would have been stripped of her faith and practice in action." Strange, now, isn't it? The Grand Masters are not infallible; and I presume they have not got an Index; but they have only "to issue letters" and, despite the guarantees of a free people, the thing, you say, is done. Though they have less than 2,000,000 subjects (you force the term), they could outlaw nearly 20,000,000 free citizens! And you talk of liberty.

(4) Some Catholics have an idea that this is just what was done in France, Portugal, perhaps Mexico and elsewhere. And, now, you say in reference to this country—"Masonry has taken very little notice of the pope and his children, *BUT some day*"—

If you speak by the "card" here, can you wonder if we sometimes think that after all the pope may not be so far wrong?

(5) Do you speak by the card, my friend?

Very truly,

JJF/MC

J. J. FARRELL, Mgt.

COMMENT

(1) If the Catholic Laymen's Association can convince one rational being that the pope expects Catholics to "extirpate the foul plague" of Masonry merely by refusing to become members or assist it in any manner, then I will admit a "lack of discrimination." But let us look into this. The *esprit de corps* of Catholics to a large extent is to be found in the Catechism; it teaches that there are "Six sins against the Holy Ghost," the third being, "Resisting the known Christian truth"; among the nine ways one may become accessory to another person's sin is, "9. By defense of the ill done." Now, Freemasonry and all orders as well as Protasantism, and those who belong to no lodge or church, are guilty of sin against the Holy Ghost, according to popery, which is logically then an "ill" being done; and he who sees a wrong being done and is "silent" and does not exert himself to *prevent* it, becomes guilty himself of the "ill done."

(2) In my limited investigation of Romanism, I find that in days gone by, the Roman church burnt Masons at the stake *as such, for being such*—that it was death to be a Mason; does Leo's strictures and accusations show the church has the same spirit to-day as when she put those men to death, or do they show that in this instance the church has changed? If she has NOT changed, then she only bides her time—"expediency." The last sentence of this paragraph is true; of the 2,000,000 more or less in America, not a single man has ever been solicited to join; freely ye come, freely ye go.

(3) Sure! "The Grand Masters are not infallible," neither are the members of the order; in fact, they often show signs of being real human—so near human, that they are liable to resent the effort of the pope to "extirpate" them in America. ("Extirpate"; uproot entirely; destroy wholly.) The nagging of the order by priests in their papers, the attempt to bar them from army cantonments while Rome was admitted *as such*—such as this may arouse the sleeping lion, and the real contest between the PRINCIPLES of POPERY and what Masonry stands for would be fully presented to the American people for an everlasting decision, which would no doubt result in stripping the pope's church of her faith and practices, at least to the extent of making it a felony to use auricular confession, and throw open the convent doors, as has been done in some Roman Catholic sections.

(4) This idea is from the pope and his he-virgins, who do not believe it; they use *Masonry* as a scape-goat for the activities of

Roman Catholics who desire to be progressive—who desire freedom, and the pope along with his priest-agents strive to keep from other Catholics the fact that some are throwing off the galling yoke of popery and grafting superstitions and rites that originated in the Dark Ages; for if they believed Masonry to be powerful enough in Catholic countries, where they are few in number, to overthrow popery, they know that here in this land they could give the pope many sleepless months, and would not be proading the order to activity as such; in this the church is presuming upon its usually peaceable spirit.

(5) As a member of the Baptist church and Knights of Pythias, and not having a lunacy commission to sit in judgment on my sanity, I believe I understand human nature sufficiently to know that when a set of people are called upon to "extirpate" another, there will be friction.

Augusta, Ga., Nov. 2, 1917.

Dear Sir: Regarding No. 5.

You ought to know that a categorical proposition can not be established by implication, inference, analogy or any other form of indirection.

Where "No" answers a question, it answers true, unless squarely the opposite, *in exact terms* of the question, can be shown. This rule of right reason can in no case be ignored without a sacrifice of truth.

Your mistake was in not framing your question in the precise language of Pope Leo; but, of course, he or any other pope never anywhere taught that Catholics must "obey the voice of the pope as BEING THE VOICE OF GOD ALMIGHTY." And I knew it. You tried to hit too hard.

Apropos the detached quotations you make, they are all perfectly sound in the context, like the Scripture—"And thou shalt be to him instead of God"—which God Himself spoke. (Ex. iv:19.)

Very truly,

JJF/MC

J. J. FARRELL, Mgr.

COMMENT

Question 5 reads: "Are Roman Catholics taught to obey the voice of the pope as being the voice of God Almighty?" Mr. Farrell answers "No." We haven't an altogether "categorical proposition" before us; but if "No" answered true, and the opposite could not be established, then there would be no question to be determined. The word "voice" in a Scriptural sense means a command, or precept, or person; in John x:4 we read, "The sheep follow Him; for they know His voice." What is the "inference," "analogy," or "implication" here? That Christ is the shepherd, and the sheep knowing His voice, are lead by Him; at His command they go or come; their movements are absolutely governed by His VOICE.

In Deharbe's Catechism we find the following question and

answer: "What, then, must the Catholic Christian in general believe? He must believe all that God has revealed and the Catholic church proposes to his belief, whether it be contained in the Holy Scripture or not." According to this "precept," a Catholic must believe what the church proposes, whether it is from the Bible or not; and who is "the Catholic church" in this connection? The pope. By whose commands are they governed in all things that pertain to faith and morals? The pope's. To whom do they submit themselves for guidance and direction? The pope. Are they ever permitted to read God's Word and interpret it? No. Even priests swear at ordination to interpret it only as "the church" construes it, therefore they hear no "voice" except the pope's; hence, they are taught to obey the voice of the pope as being the voice of God Almighty; the premise can not be refuted, therefore the logical conclusion to the question should be Yes. It will be observed that I did not ask if they "must," but if they are "taught" to obey, etc. Also, I do not find the sentence as quoted in "Ex. iv:19."

The church of Rome teaches that the pope is the Vice-Gerent of Christ; that the pope holds the place of Him who came to save that which was lost; that he holds upon this earth the place of God Almighty: "vice-gerent" means one who has been given the power to act in the place of another—that after God got the world in good running order, He made the pope of Rome His Superintendent. As everyone knows, a superintendent is vested with all the rights and privileges of the owner in all matters affecting the policy, polity and general management of the concern; and that such superintendent is answerable to no one except his principal, and every one employed in the establishment, or those having dealings with the concern, must treat with the superintendent as if he were proprietor; being supreme in command, he has the right to employ and discharge; increase or decrease the output and the quality of the materials entering into the line of goods produced; and those under him, in the course of time, completely lose sight of the owner—would not know him if he was passed on the street—which irrefutably establishes the fact that the employees are taught to obey the voice of the superintendent as being the voice of the owner. This analogy establishes the truth of the question at issue; Leo says that Catholics must be submissive and obedient to the will of the pope "as to God Himself." If we scan a few of the "dogmas" of the popes and compare them with the Word of God, we will see at once that such dogmas are in conflict with, or are not taught in, the Bible; yet Catholics practice and are obedient to them—they are obeying a "voice"—is it God's? No! Then it's the pope's, which they are taught to believe is the voice of God. Here are a few of the "dogmas" of the

church that Catholics **MUST** believe, which are unscriptural, yet they are following a "voice":

1, Peter was pope twenty-five years and was in Rome; 2, Holy water; 3, Virgins consecrated to use of the church; 4, Marriage not legal without benediction of priest; 5, Use of candles; 6, Observance of Saints' days; 7, Mass; 8, Pope as universal bishop; 9, Image worship or adoration; 10, Priestly celibacy; 11, Praying with beads; 12, Real presence of Christ in the bread and wine; 13, Penance; 14, Auricular confession; 15, Adoration or Host (pancake); 16, Right of pope to depose rulers; 17, Indulgences; 18, Immaculate conception; 19, Purgatory; 20, Absolution; 21, Papal infallibility. These are only a few of the innovations established by the "superintendent," but they must be observed, for Catholics hear no other voice in regard to them than the pope's, and if they dissent, they will be "fired"—excommunicated.

Now, does any one think I "tried to hit too hard" and missed? Mr. Farrell endeavors to escape the only conclusion by raising technical questions as to the language used, instead of explaining HOW "No" can be a true answer. He also says this letter answers No. 13! (See letter of October 22.)

Augusta, Ga., Nov. 8, 1917.

Dear Sir: You have asked that Nos. 6, 7, 8 and 9 be debated. so in the hope that you can arrange for that, I pass them. You are silent on No. 10; but, in objection to No. 11 say: "Your answer is not in harmony with your popes."

(1) Without discussing whether it is or not, I will say it doesn't need to be on this question. As the great Irish Catholic and Patriot, O'Connell, once said in Parliament: "We take our religion from Rome, but not our politics."

(2) As to our denying the pope the right to teach what you cite, he may teach what seems to him good (you wouldn't deny him that, would you?); but I deny, if you wish it straight, and the Catholic people of America as a body would deny, were there any occasion, that the pope has any right to interfere with the running of our Government according to the Constitution as it stands.

(3) You say, "If he blunders in matters as important as this," he is like any other man. Who says otherwise? He is not divine, not inspired, not without sin; but he is a great and good man, nevertheless; may God keep him.

(4) And when he points the way of eternal life for the Christians of the world, like his glorious predecessor, St. Peter, to whom the keys of the Kingdom were given, he cannot err.

Very truly,

J. J. FARRELL, Mgr.

COMMENT

We look upon a blackberry bush, and know that according to the laws of nature it will bear blackberries at the proper time; see that grape vine—nothing on it but leaves; look again, laden

with grapes. We look for fruit from the vines according to the laws of nature governing. So, likewise, we must know the law by which Catholics are made and governed to know what sort of fruit to expect; primarily, the pope considers all members as "children," and they look upon the pope as their "holy" father; and as children under that system, they are entirely dependent upon the pope for spiritual food and raiment; they are his especial charge, to be directed and governed in all things which affect them and himself—and he never loses sight of himself. It is the nature of a child to ask ten thousand questions, some of which startle philosophers; it is the natural duty of a parent not only to direct, control, and govern the child, but also *answer its questions* as far as he is capable, if he expects the child to develop and assume its place according to the natural order of things. In the home, the father inculcates the spirit of love and service one toward the other—that we term "religion"; he requires each one to strive to keep the house, yards, etc., cleared of all trash, and the premises kept free of all that would impair the health of the family in general—that we term "politics." For a child to say it is willing to abide by the "Religion" of the home, but will not be governed in the "Politics" of the institution places it in the category of an alien enemy.

Par. (1) According to the above reasoning, the "great Irish Catholic and Patriot O'Connell," was a rebel against his "holy father," or resorted to "mental reservation." Try this assertion by the law which makes and governs Catholics: "We take our religion from Rome," said O'Connell; this is based upon the decree of the Vatican Council that established Papal Infallibility, the Fourth Chapter, wherein by its own terms the pope is limited to defining dogmas in *ex cathedra* utterances; O'Connell continues: "But not our politics" (from Rome). In the Third Chapter, Vatican Council, decreed by the same pope and council as the Fourth Chapter, there is no limitation placed upon the pope's authority, requiring unconditional submission to papal discipline and absolute obedience to authority; it says: "If, then, any shall say that the Roman Pontiff has the office merely of inspection or direction, and not full and supreme power of jurisdiction . . . not only in things which pertain to *faith and morals*, but also in those things which relate to the discipline and government of the church spread throughout the world; or assert that he possesses merely the principal part, and not all the fullness of this supreme power; or that this power which he enjoys is not ordinary and immediate, both over each and all the churches, **AND OVER EACH AND ALL THE PASTORS AND THE FAITHFUL**—let him be anathema." As the physical man needs food and raiment, so the spiritual man: the Fourth Chapter supplies

"spiritual" food—dogmas—for the Catholic, while the Third Chapter provides his "clothing." The one is as essential as the other; you can not accept the one and reject the other.

Let us see if this is not substantiated by physical facts of recent history: in Ireland there are Catholic and Protestant Irish; as other subjects of Great Britain, the Protestant Irish freely responded to the call to arms, while the Catholic Irish refused to do so, the hierarchy administering a pledge to about 90 per cent of the "faithful" to resist the English Government in prosecution of the war, while in the Dominion of Canada the French Catholics were obstructionists, and Catholics in Australia maintained the same spirit and attitude. This was a political question; the very life of the nation was at stake; where did the Irish, French-Canadian and Australian Romanists get *their political* attitude?

I will admit, and hope it is true, that in a conflict many Catholics would be true to the Constitution and principles of this Government; but we are not discussing individuals, but a system; and as long as one adheres to a system, the presumption is he will support and contend for its principles, which presumption remains until he demonstrates the contrary to be true, by a test or withdrawal from it.

It is the wish of the pope to make all peoples Catholic; to this end, he has authority over and can command obedience from "ALL THE PASTORS AND THE FAITHFUL" in things which relate to "DISCIPLINE and GOVERNMENT" of the church, and as "POLITICS," or the science of government, is the main obstacle in the way of papalizing the world, it behooves papists to enter politics in the effort to make conditions favorable to the will of their "holy father"; they must strive to remove those things which impair the health of papalism in the body politic, by "infusing" Romanism into all the veins of the State.

It may not be out of place to explain what is meant by "mental reservation" in reference to Catholicism: "St." Liguori, Thomas Tamburini, Suarez, Basenbaum, Bellarmine, Emanuel Sa, Sanchez, and many other Jesuit Fathers teach, "To swear with equivocation . . . is not an evil; because there is a just cause for concealing the truth," and "a just cause" is said to be "any honest end in order to preserve good things for the spirit or useful things for the body."

"If the conscience recoiled before a false oath, one might murder the words of the formula in pronouncing them, so as to be beyond all suspicion of sin; for example, instead of '*juro*,' which signifies *I swear*, he may pronounce '*uro*,' which signifies *I burn*."

Coming from the fountain sources of popery, what is the spirit of popery, if not deceitfulness? Can a government carry out the will of God actuated by that spirit? Is it possible to know one is telling the truth, governed by such doctrine?

The power and rights of the pope as decreed above give him the power to declare what a person must believe, as also the power to enforce acceptance of the belief, which is exemplified by the Bull *Unam Sanctam*, previously set out, that the pope through his priests wields the spiritual sword, and at his command the secular sword must be drawn and used in behalf of the spiritual power—which is equivalent to saying that the pope actually rules the “spiritual world,” and has direction of the political world. Farrell holds up O’Connell as an example of Catholic political independence; first, let me ask, was this secured by Catholics, or was it directly due to the influence of “Freemasonry” and “Protestantism”? Second, if not, then the Catholics are as cakes “unturned”—half baked—a mixture of two systems—a cross between Romanism and Protestantism, in which case O’Connell and others like him are as guilty in the eyes of the church as Luther, Huss, Wycliffe, Calvin, and others who demanded *spiritual independence*—that is, freedom of conscience, as O’Connell demanded *political* freedom. But let us hear an eminent authority: Cardinal Newman, speaking in the name of the pope, said, “I acknowledge no civil power; I am the subject of no prince; and I claim more than this. I claim to be the supreme judge of the consciences of men. Of the peasants that till the fields, and of the prince that sits upon the throne; of the household that lives in the shade of privacy, and the legislator that makes laws. I am sole, last, superior judge of what is right and wrong. Moreover, we declare, affirm, define and pronounce it to be necessary to salvation to every creature to be subject to the Roman Pontiff.”

What an Irish Catholic may say in the English Parliament is one thing—what they do in *practice* when tested is different. Let us now look at the “Irish” Catholics in action in America: in the Tablet, R. C., of Brooklyn, N. Y., Jan. 23, 1915, we read: “One of Brooklyn’s Congressmen, Hon. John J. Fitzgerald, spurred to action by the repeated demands of the members of the Brooklyn diocesan branch of the American Federation of Catholic Societies, has introduced in the House of Representatives a bill to amend the Postal Laws, H. R. 20644. If this bill is reported favorably and passes both Houses . . . publications attacking the church . . . will be denied the privilege” (of the U. S. mails). In both the Sixty-third and Sixty-fourth Congresses five different bills were presented by Romanists to destroy the most fundamental guarantee of the Constitution: freedom of the press—a principle as vital to the life our Republic and the perpetuation of the Constitution itself as air is to the human system. The Gallivan and Fitzgerald bills show political Rome in action; “*the Catholic people of America as a*

body" were demanding this "right to interfere with the running of our Government according to the Constitution as it stands."

(2) Oh, no! I would not deny the pope the right to "teach what seems to him good," provided he does not attempt to prevent me from combating with free inquiry and the press "what seems to me bad." The City Council of Detroit, Mich., passed an ordinance on June 19, 1918, at the instigation of Roman priests and Knights of Columbus (representing the Federated Catholic people of America *as a body*), prohibiting the sale of periodicals on the streets that reflected on any one's religion; this was an act under the science of government—politics; where did they get their inspiration—from Rome, or "the Constitution as it stands"? From ROME, of course! And where did Rome get it? From the pope. Where did he get that principle? From the Index, established in the pitch blackness of Rome's noonday, when she was in control of the governments of the world. Incidents of a similar nature have occurred all over the country during the past few years, which does not dove-tail with what Farrell says the Catholic people of America would do. "By their fruits ye shall know them."

Mr. Farrell said "the Catholic people would deny—." In the "Manual of Christian Doctrine," issued according to the RULES of the Index, we find the following question and answer: "16. Ought a government to take part in public worship?" Answer: "Yes . . ." p. 239. Let him who can reconcile Farrell and this school book used by Catholics "as a body"!

(3) If Catholics believe the pope is no better than any other man, then it seems to me it is a case of "the blind leading the blind," which is contrary to human wisdom derived from experience, reason by which we are to be governed, and the laws of God, which declare, "I am the Way."

(4) A shepherd does not "POINT," but LEADS in the "WAY"; the pope "pointed" the way from the sixth to fifteenth century—and the world went through a period of Egyptian-like darkness that has never vanished; the pope points the way in many countries to-day; Poland, where Jews are suffering as much at the hands of Romanists as the Armenians under the Turks; in Cuba, in Spain, in Mexico, in Portugal, in the Philippines, in Ireland, and elsewhere.

Augusta, Ga., Nov. 5, 1917.

Dear Sir: Regarding answer to No. 12.

You say your comments on Answer 11 apply to this with equal force, so my criticism nullifying your comments apply here with equal truth.

(1) You say as answering for the Catholics of Georgia, you question the truth of my answer. Who is representing the

Catholics of Georgia, you or I? Had you conferred with one, just one Catholic in Georgia who told you my answer was contrary to his views? If so, name him. If not, your stricture is purely gratuitous.

(2) One is reminded of the Village Schoolmaster, "who was so skilled, that e'en though beaten, he could argue still." You get an answer that is not open to honest objection; but you WON'T be satisfied, so you chase out imaginary "Concordat" or some indefinable "Intention" or that ubiquitous, wet-blanket affair you have made of the "Index," and move them about like pawns, just as if you hadn't been checkmated.

(3) My dear man, won't you ever put down that shield of suspicion, and give your *mind* a chance?

Very truly,

J. J. FARRELL.

COMMENT

(1) I endeavored to get the views of TWO rather prominent Georgia Catholics—the Hon. Gus Daly and Mr. A. J. Long; they had no permit from their bishop, therefore could not answer any one of the questions, nor would they violate the rules of the Index or its "Intention" by attempting to answer; however, I put one question to three of his *superiors*—and one is a "Georgia" Catholic—on baptism, which caused the Association to cover many pages of paper in efforts to remove the kinks, without success.

To tell the truth, I do not know who is representing the Catholics of Georgia, under the *nom de plume* of "J. J. Farrell." If Farrell could point to "JUST ONE" instance in all the long history of Romanism where the church has *taught* and *decreed* according to his answer, then it would be true; but he can't do it.

The great World War was instigated by the Pope of Rome and Crown Prince Ferdinand of Austria signing a Concordat, which covered civilization with a *blanket wet in human blood*.

The basic principle of Romanism is, that no private persons can read or interpret Holy Scripture or religious questions; that the subjects of the church must obediently submit, not only in matters which pertain to faith and morals, but are bound "both individually and collectively" in those that pertain to discipline and government; this is the law; did Farrell answer by referring to the law, or from his imagination? He can not "laugh this case out of court."

Claiming to possess all truth, and as truth is intolerant of error, intolerance is the chief cornerstone of the papacy; the Catechism prevents one from maintaining "silence" in the face of heresy else he becomes guilty himself; the law forbids him to become heretical—the inevitable result is, he must strive to destroy error or he is guilty of error; to say the Roman church is not intolerant is to admit an ignorance so dense it can be cut

with a dull knife! And if a Catholic is "tolerant," he is marching under the wrong banner.

(8) In his letter of October 28, 1917, Mr. Farrell admits that all decrees of the church are binding upon Catholics *until they are repealed*—that is, "as long as they are in force," and a law is in force until the creating power revokes it; therefore, if I am holding up a "shield of suspicion," how can I afford to drop it until the pope revokes those Catholic-guiding decrees of intolerance, and the murderous doctrines of the "holy" fathers? Can a man drop a bullet-proof shield as long as he is "covered" by a gun—what chance has the mind to be free of suspicion when papalism holds before the mind's eye Inquisitions and Massacres and laws which sanction these things?

Next to the pope and his general councils in making authoritative, binding declarations, is the Apostolic Delegate of the pope. In a letter to Thomas Carey, of Palestine, Texas, June 10, 1912, Archbishop Bonzano, the papal delegate to Washington, D. C., answered the following question: "Must I as a Catholic surrender my political freedom to the church? . . . By this I mean the right to vote for the Democrat, Socialist, or Republican party when and where I please?" The delegate replied: "You should submit to the decisions of the church, even at the cost of sacrificing political principles."

Here is what Catholics are taught in their schools:

Qu. "34. How should citizens exercise their political rights?"

Ans. ". . . they should, in their choice of candidates . . . be governed only by the best interests of country and religion. To . . . vote . . . for those who are friendly to religion, or at least not hostile to it." p. 274, "Manual of Christian Doctrine." ("Religion" here means Roman Catholicism.)

In *The Catholic Educator*, published in 1902 by John G. Shea, LL. D., New York, and endorsed as true papalism by Augustine, Bishop of New York, is found a defense of the law of Romanism establishing and operating the Inquisition. It says:

"In no age of Christianity has the church had any doubt that in her hands, and only in hers, was the deposit of the true faith and religion placed by Jesus Christ, and that, as it is her duty to teach all nations, so she is bound by all practicable and lawful means to restrain the malice of those who would corrupt the message or resist the TEACHER (POPE). . . . The power of the church, according to Fleury, is 'purely spiritual.' . . . The overwhelming majority of the canonists take the opposite view—namely, that the church can and ought to visit with fitting punishment the heretic and the revolter; and since the publication of the numerous encyclical letters and allocutions of the late pope treating of the relation between Church and State, and the inherent rights of the former, the view of Fleury can no

longer be held by any Catholic." (This also corroborates my position as shown under Question 13, that the papal Italian institution is a standing menace to any government not Catholic.)

A person can not remain a member of an institution holding fundamentally, as an "inherent right," such doctrine in this twentieth century and be entitled to the protection of the laws for such institution, or worthy to be "trusted" with the rights of American citizenship.

(I am sure "The Village Schoolmaster" was not a *Romanist* arguing with a *priest*!)

Augusta, Ga., Nov. 6, 1917.

Dear Sir: (1) Your objections under No. 14 remind me of the advice of Samuel Johnson, when he said, "Endeavor to clear your mind of cant," and, you know, "cant," according to Carlyle, is "a double distilled lie; the second power of a lie."

(2) This in reference to your statement that "Ferrer was shot a few years ago for advocating free progressive school system for Spain." Because Francisco Ferrer, professional agitator, atheist, anarchist, was shot for inciting riot, in Barcelona in the latter days of August, 1910. His character, principles and aim may be judged by the following excerpts from his writings.

(3) First, from his book entitled "Patriotism y Colonezacion," where he says, "Don't get excited about the flag, it is only three yards of cotton stuck on the end of a pole" (p. 15). And again, "Property has been established by spoliation, cunning, trickery, rapidity and deception, under the name of commerce and industry" (p. 240). And again, "The words country, flag, family arouse in me no more than hypothetical echoes of wind and sound" (p. 180).

Second, from his book, "Historia de Espana," where he says "Government, usurpation, tyranny—a question of words; not only all government, more or less legitimate, but all power is tyranny" (p. 121). Finally, in his "Compendio de Historia Universal," where he speaks derisively of Jesus Christ as one "devoid of filial sentiment, and let's pass no opportunity to insult his mother" (p. 43).

(4) A man with such principles, inspired by such a sentiment as these words from his own pen show, is a criminal at heart, and having incited a mob to riot, being tried and condemned in manner and form prescribed by law, is a criminal in fact, and it is pure cant, cant raised to the 'nth power, to play him up as a martyr of progressive thought.

Very truly yours,

JJF/MC

J. J. FARRELL, Mgr.

COMMENT

(1) I agree with Carlyle and Mr. Farrell: because my objection to his Answer 14 is based upon statements of two recent popes. It is characteristic of Roman priests or near-priests to hide behind their petticoats and yell "Liar! Liar!" whenever they are confronted with derogatory facts pertaining to their religion

which they "can't" answer in the presence of an intelligent audience.

The reference to Ferrer is purely incidental; however, will not "pass" Farrell on that; but before taking it up for consideration will present additional "cant" here as Question 14 is in regard to education.

I have charged elsewhere that one means of destroying the principles of this free Republic, Rome was concentrating upon getting control of education—either destroy public schools or convert them into parochial schools by filling them with Catholic teachers.

From *Harper's Weekly*, New York, November 11, 1871, we can see how Rome began long ago her war on the free public schools, which I will supplement with statistical facts; said *Harper's*: "Emigrants to our own country will find renewed the struggle which has ended so prosperously in Europe. Baffled in Italy, the papal faction is still powerful in America. It rules New York. . . . Its agents are active in every election; it aims its chief blows against popular education . . . it is still in doubt whether that wide system of instruction which has flourished so signally from ocean to ocean may not sink amidst the strife of factions, or live wounded and decaying. . . . The ruin of the common school system has become the secret or open aim of every adherent of popery."

From statistics prepared in 1915—forty-five years after that statement—we find the papal power increased in politics to this extent: In thirty-one States, the Democratic Central Committees are Catholic; Republicans twenty-three; President and Secretary of National Democratic Committee, Catholic; President Wilson's Campaign Manager, Catholic; his private Secretary, Catholic; 70 per cent. of his appointments Catholic; ten States under Catholic administration; in 20,000 public schools, one-half of the teachers are Catholics; over 100,000 public schools have a large per cent. of Catholic teachers; 600 public schools use Catholic readers (school books) and teach the Catechism; New York, Chicago, Baltimore, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Buffalo, Cleveland, Toledo and St. Louis employ 75 per cent. Catholic teachers in public schools, while Detroit has 65 per cent.—yet those cities do not have over 20 to 35 per cent. Catholic population. In all the cities and towns of over 10,000 inhabitants, Roman Catholics form 80 per cent. of the police and fire departments, and are in the majority in 15,000 councils of towns and cities of this country.

In a little book entitled, "The Catholic Church and Modern Christianity," Rev. B. J. Otten, Jesuit, Professor of Philosophy in the St. Louis University, lays down a clear rule by which every

school teacher is guided. On page 180 he says, "They teach and must teach such branches as history, literature, and the natural sciences, and in these THE RELIGIOUS BIAS of the teacher will manifest itself in spite of his best intention. . . The teacher who takes his or her profession seriously can NEVER be content with the mechanical teaching of the 'three R's,' but will SOMEHOW blend them with the fourth, 'Religion,' and while no text-book of dogma are in his or her hands, will so teach . . ." (He clearly substantiates my charge as to why Rome permits her grown-up "children" to teach in those schools that she terms "godless" and "sinks of pollution," which Catholic children can not attend except for such reasons as may satisfy the bishop, who will give permission to attend.)

(2) To advocate Liberalism (or progressive schools) in Spain, as Ferrer did, means certain death, on some sort of pretext. If the papal church will teach the following doctrine in Catholic schools IN AMERICA TO-DAY, against the laws of the land and in the very face of overwhelming Protestant sentiment, we can imagine the fate of one who opposes such teaching in an ALL-CATHOLIC country; here's what the pope is teaching in our country:

Qu. "122. May the State separate itself from the Church?"

Ans. "No, because it may not withdraw from the supreme rule of Christ.

"123. What name is given to the doctrine that the State has neither the right nor the duty to be united to the church . . . ?

"It is called *Liberalism*. It is founded principally on the fact that modern society rests on *Liberty of Conscience and of Worship, on Liberty of Speech and of the Press*.

"124. Why is *Liberalism* to be condemned?"

"1. Because it denies all subordination of the State to the Church; 2. Because it confounds liberty with right . . ." p. 123 "Manual of Christian Doctrine," a book *American* "village" schoolmasters never use, but essential to the life of *papa's* schoolmaster priests!

As you read the following also from the pen of Jesuit Otten (pp. 183-4) keep in mind the number of Catholic teachers in public schools: "Wherever our pupils, whether from parochial schools, or academies or colleges, have had an opportunity to compete with those of corresponding institutions of the State, they have INVARIABLY shown to advantage. Listen, . . . do these parochial schools turn out better educated children than those from the public schools? Last summer, while 75 per cent. of the graduates of the parochial schools who presented themselves for examination for entrance into the normal college were admitted (and many with honors), ONLY 25 PER CENT. OF THE GRADUATES OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS WERE SUCCESSFUL. This summer the Catholic percentage was higher. Similar re-

ports come from Chicago, Pittsburgh, and other cities, where the matter has been publicly investigated.

Here we have the unvarnished fact from the pen of a Catholic University professor, that where there are 75 per cent. Roman Catholic teachers in the public schools, *AND ON THE EXAMINING BOARDS*, the pupils are just **SEVENTY-FIVE PER CENT. DEFICIENT**, as compared with pupils educated by the same kind of *teachers*, but *IN their* schools—the rival of the public schools.

American Citizens! Must you, like the little dog, have your brains knocked out before you can get your eyes open? Can't you see that Rome is getting her teachers in the public schools for one purpose—to destroy its efficiency while teaching, imperceptibly, the fourth "R"—that they are put there by the commander of the papal army?

No one should be permitted to teach or be a member of the public school board except those who receive their training in the public school, and possess a certificate to that effect. It is said that a president of the Chicago public school board was a Romanist, who sent his children to the papal school.

The hatred of the Roman Catholic church is voiced by the hierarchy—hear them "praise" the public school system, that has made America the greatest nation in the world:

"Let the public school system go to where it came from—the devil."—*Freeman's (Cath.) Journal*, Nov. 20, 1869.

Cardinal Gibbons is impressed thus with the public school system: "An imperfect and vicious system of education which undermines the religion of youth."

"The common schools of this country are sinks of moral pollution and nurseries of hell."—*The Chicago (Cath.) Tablet*.

"Education outside the Catholic church is a damnable heresy."—Pope Pius IX, Syllabus of Errors, Props. 45, 46, 47, 48.

"It will be a glorious day in this country when, under the laws, the school system will be shivered to pieces."—*Catholic Telegraph*. (How can it be shivered to pieces by law unless we put Catholics where they can make or administer the law?)

"We must take part in the elections, move in solid mass in every State against the (political) party pledged to sustain the integrity of the public schools."—Card. McClosky.

"The day is not far distant when Catholics, at the order of the pope, will refuse to pay the school tax and will send bullets into the hearts of the officers who attempt to collect them."—Mgr. Cappell.

"Education must be controlled by Catholic authorities . . . even to war and bloodshed."—Priest Hecker in *Catholic World*, 1870.

"The children of public schools turn out to be horse thieves, scholastic counterfeiters and well versed in schemes of devilry."
—Priest Phelan, St. Louis, 1873.

"The American Federation of Catholic Societies has been organized to bring the powerful influence of the entire Catholic church in America against the injustice of the public school system."—Bishop McPhaul in an address before the society in Milwaukee. (Mr. Farrell admits that the Catholics of Georgia are affiliated with that society—but a little thing as that should not stand in the way of us having *peace!*)

Many pages could be filled with documentary evidence showing that the pope is a deadly enemy of popular education and the free school system—a system that was provided for by many States as soon as they became States, by setting aside large tracts of land for the erection or maintenance of public schools as the only means of perpetuating government *by the people*—there were but few Catholics in America at that time; and those knew what they ran away from in Europe, and acted very much like free people; they didn't have a sufficient number of people and priests then to oppose the principles of the early pioneers, as they are doing now.

With the above information before us, we can better understand the Ferrer case, with but one other reference by which to judge the real truth of a proposition when presented by a Roman Catholic:

In an address before the Society for the Preservation of the Faith, in Rome, Italy, November, 1915, the present pope, Benedict XV, paid his respects to the Protestant ministers from America, saying:

"What is it that these emissaries of satan do who, in the midst of the Holy City, raise temples within which the true worship is denied to God, who establish pestilential chairs for the spread of error in the midst of the people, and who, with free hands, scatter broadcast lies and calumnies against the Catholic religion and its ministers? These diabolical arts are so many assaults against the children of Rome. . . . The conspiracy of these thieves should be destroyed." (In Protestant communities, priests refer to us as "separated" brothers; in papal communities, "Emissaries of satan.")

Now for the Ferrer case (Par. 2): Ferrer was a native Spaniard. When about 20 years old, he took part in a revolutionary movement led by General Villacampa; fled to Paris, where he made a living teaching Spanish. He gave much time to reading and study along progressive lines, by which his social and political views were materially changed; realizing that a sound educational system on non-Catholic lines, as in America, held the hope of the future, and loving his country, he desired to see her liberated from the long night of priestly domination under which she

had slept for centuries; he wanted her to keep step with advancing civilization—which could be possible only through the light of liberal education.

He returned to Barcelona, near the place of his birth, and established the Modern School. Any one can imagine the frocity of papal priests, who dread nothing so much as liberating human reason through freedom of thought, conscience, inquiry, speech, press and assembly. Consider Benedict's screed against the Protestant preachers now in Rome, nearly fifty years after the Italian Government drove the pope out of civil affairs and permitted other churches to exist in Rome—now think of Ferrer in a community where the pope is supreme, establishing a free school!

The world at large believes he was shot on trumped up charges, and executed October 18, 1909. (It will be recalled that in 1914 the Christian Endeavor Society held a meeting in Spain; the Government had much difficulty in preventing Catholics from massacring them.)

(3) As to his books, they may have been written before he reached a broader view—in young manhood; not having these books, I do not know; but I can imagine that the Spanish flag, hanging figuratively as it does under the papal flag, does not mean much to one who knows history, as he evidently did—signifying a combined tyranny, the like of which may the world soon banish. A flag of a nation means nothing, except the principles over which it floats to protect; the Stars and Stripes—what was it more than “three yards of cotton stuck on the end of a pole” to those Knights of Columbus who mobbed Otis Spurgeon in California, or that mob of ten thousand Romanists who assaulted the city hall of Haverhill, Mass., wounding many citizens, destroying property—exciting a riot to prevent free speech wherein a man was going to make public protest against appropriating public funds to sectarian schools—insults to the Flag and attacks upon the Constitution over which it floats—and these facts were not even put on the wires! And what can any flag mean to those subject to the bishop's oath?

As to his derision of Jesus Christ: Christ said, “Let your light so shine, that others seeing your *good* works, may be constrained to glorify your Heavenly Father”—what did the history of all Europe and of his own country under the papal yoke tell him of Jesus Christ—what did he see in the “light” of papalism? Nothing but tyranny, bloodshed, murder, ignorance and superstition. Some of the blackest of all the black pages of history had the name of his country on them—written there in crimson letters of blood drawn from human veins to satiate him who said he was “Christ veiled in the flesh!” the diabolical instruments of torture

invented by the so-called followers of Christ, the pope's priests, to break human bones, to dissever the body, limb by limb, to pluck out eyes, the very reading of which makes the blood course faster and the fists to double hard as lightwood knots while the brain almost reels with fury—all these crimes by devils in robes as "rays of light" to draw men unto God through Christ; priests before whom the people must bow or have their quivering hearts torn out, bone after bone broken until the victim died from sheer exhaustion; or placed in a dungeon, isolated from mankind and cut off from God's sunshine if they refused to pray to "Mary, the Mother of God."

I will say right here that God's command is, "Thou shalt have no other gods before Me—*thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them,*" and every time a soul supplicates any person outside of the Trinity, it is committing spiritual adultery, or fornication, which is an abomination to the Lord.

(4) Where a man has a religion which permits him to use mental reservation or evasion of mind, when he speaks, swears or writes, what he says must not be taken too seriously; no doubt Benedict XV, if he had the power, would take pleasure in having those Baptist, Methodist and other Protestant preachers in Rome shot, as "St." Thomas Aquinas teaches, because they are counterfeiters of the true faith, and as he, Benedict, says, "These thieves should be destroyed."

If Ferrer was a "criminal at heart" and deserved to be shot because he was not in love with the flag and what it protected, what is to be said of the Irish Catholics who riot against the Flag of England, one or more of these Irish "martyrs" having been canonized—that is, made "Saints" by the popes? Practically all said against Francisco Ferrer by Farrell applies with equal weight against the papists of the world, and does not help his case at all.

Augusta, Ga., Nov. 7, 1917.

Dear Sir: (1) Referring again to your objection under Number 14, and still having Dr. Johnson and Carlyle in mind.

(2) You say, "A Concordat MUST provide for church control of education." To persuade you to the contrary, I cite the following Concordats which make no mention of education: That with Prussia concluded in 1821; that of the Upper Rhine Provinces concluded the same year; that with Belgium concluded in 1827; the Concordat of Hanover between Pius VII and George IV of England concluded in 1824; the Concordat of Oldenburg concluded in 1830; the concordat with Austria concerning Bosnia-Herzegovania concluded in 1881; that with Russia concluded in 1847; that with Switzerland concluded in 1828; that with Switzerland concluded in 1845; that with the Two Sicilies in 1834. I think probably there are others equally silent as to education, but this ought to be enough.

(8) Am afraid you do not know very much about these things,
my friend.

Very truly,

JJF/MC

J. J. FARRELL, Mgr.

COMMENT

Par. (1): I am perfectly willing, and invite, Americans to keep Johnson, Carlyle, Farrell, the pope, and Jesus Christ in mind as they read Farrell's letters and my comments, and draw their own conclusions, as to what is, and who indulges in, cant, lies, or truth.

(2) Two facts are proved here: first, that the pope has executed many concordats—Farrell omits the one which was at the bottom of the great war; second, verifying the claim of the popes that they are *civil or temporal sovereigns*—Romanists in America attempt to deny.

Temporal rulers enter into treaties; this is an attribute of temporal sovereignty. A treaty is an agreement reached by the commissions from two or more governments, which must be ratified by the sovereign power of the government, if such power is not delegated to the commissioners.

A concordat is also an agreement. Taunton's Canon Law defines concordat: "1. A concordat is an agreement which the pope makes with some supreme civil power. By it the church delegates and communicates some of her powers to the State in return for an *acknowledgment and the free exercise of duties and rights inherent in HER Constitution.*"

In the concordat between Ferdinand and the pope, *education* was one of the many *specified* articles of the agreement; but this need not be specified by name, as the right to control all education is claimed by the church of Rome as one of "*the duties and rights inherent in her Constitution.*" Hence, it is clear, if a civil power makes a treaty with the pope, *unless the agreement specifically stipulates otherwise*, but agrees to give the pope's church "*the free exercise of duties and rights inherent in her Constitution,*" the first "*inherent right*" is to "*teach,*" as the church proclaims all education outside of it is a damnable heresy. In his letter on Human Liberty, Pope Leo leaves no doubt as to what are among the rights of the Roman church. He says: "She is therefore the greatest and most reliable teacher of mankind, and in her dwells an *inviolable right* to teach them," p. 154 Gt. Lets.

The Jesuit Professor of Philosophy in the Catholic University of St. Louis, Rev. B. J. Otten, says: "To understand properly the attitude of the Catholic church. . . . *She never* loses sight of the fact that education is in a certain sense but a continuation of the creative act of God, and as God created human beings, not merely for the enjoyment of this world, but for the endless joys of eter-

nity, so also must education be directed to the attainment of that same end." And what is her record?

That Rome claims the sole *right* to educate where she has an agreement, is proved by her attitude in America to-day; she can not get "the favor of the civil law" to do this, so she sets up her own parochial schools, in which she teaches this doctrine.

When there is a union between a man and woman by marriage, it is mutually understood without mention that one of the natural rights is to propagate the race; and where there is a concordat between the State and the pope, it is understood that one of the rights accruing to him is, *to have control of education. To deny this, is to belie the existence of the pope's parochial schools in America; to deny this "right" of that institution calling itself the only true church which arrogates to itself the rights of a "perfect society" destroys its claim as such.*

(3) I will admit that I do not know much about these things—but I am striving to learn. One thing is certain, however: in denying the doctrine of baptism until in a subsequent letter the Catholic Laymen's Association learned that their "superiors" had been questioned and answered differently; and in denying the authenticity and import of the Syllabus of Errors of Pius IX, Mr. Farrell (?) does not seem to be so sure that he knows any more than THE LAW allows about "these things"—*or, that the law forbids him to tell what he knows!*

Augusta, Ga., Nov. 8, 1917.

Dear Sir: (1) You say Mr. Taft reported over 1,000 priests in the Philippines and not over 6,000 "educated" people. Inasmuch as there are some 6,000 islands in the Philippines, with about 7,000,000 souls inhabiting them, it strikes me as rather remarkable that there were 6,000 "educated" people.

(2) For "educated" people are not so plentiful under the most favorable conditions, as you no doubt, being one of them, ought to be aware. As to "educating" a dog, cat, flea, etc., you are welcome to all the comfort that thought or that practice brings to you.

(3) Regarding the illiteracy of Spain, the official educational report of 1908, "La Estandística Escolar de España," gives the percentage as 28 instead of 65, which you name. By the school census of 1903 there were in Spain 31,838 schools with a total of pupils between the ages of 5 and 15 years, of 4,896,927; which in a population of 18,618,086 is not a bad showing.

Compare it to our 19,000,000 school children in a population of over 102,000,000 and there seems to be no less educational activity in Spain than among ourselves. Of course, if you go back far enough you can find when we had 65 per cent. illiterate.

You will note that I cite you nothing but official documents and I hope you will appreciate the fact.

Very truly,

JJF/MC

J. J. FARRELL, Mgr.

COMMENT

(1) Having denied almost every other fact, though demonstrable, I am a little surprised that he did not deny the subject-matter and findings of the Taft Commission as being "cant" as per Johnson and Carlyle.

As the Roman church declares she alone has the right to teach—that is, educate—"draw out," "develop" the God-given powers of the mind, it certainly is "rather remarkable that there were 6,000 educated people" on those islands containing 7,000,000 souls, with 1,000 priests: 6,000 among 7,000,000 is less than ONE to the THOUSAND inhabitants! *This is pure, unadulterated Romanism in action where it is not surrounded by Protestantism.* In Protestant countries, Rome must show some marks of trying to keep step with progress—to see what a beast really is when not under restraint, observe it in its *native* surroundings; to learn how popery discharges its obligations in the matter of education, note results in her native element, that is, where there is no opposition! The priest ruled in all matters in the islands; one witness said the people were practically all "fanatical Catholics"—1,000 priests could make them fanatically Catholic, but nothing else. (Have *those ignorant people* a "*Layman's Hand-Book*," to keep the priest from having to ask them questions?)

God created the human body and gave it a mind. It is the duty of parents to take such precautionary measures as will assure the child given into their keeping a healthy body and a strong mind. To follow any course which would dwarf the body or impair the mind would be a crime against the child and its Creator and condemn the parents as brutes unfit to rear children—this natural law applies to Rome in regard to education. She says God committed the welfare of the human race into her hands—intellect and all; we see how she discharged the self-imposed obligation in those islands, where she was without opposition since the fifteenth century! Less than one to the thousand—and many of those went elsewhere for their education—though she has an "inviolable" right to teach!

(2) The fact that dogs, cats, etc., can be "educated" affords certain comfort, proving that all of God's creatures can be developed to a high state of perfection in accordance with their natures and the purposes of their creation, and it proves that any *nation* existing under the bondage of ignorance and superstition is a victim of circumstances at times rather than a mental defect as a people.

(3) I am glad to note the percentage has been reduced in recent years; however, Rome can not claim the credit. For centuries Spain has been a decadent nation, but of recent years the "Liberals" have increased, who desire to pull her out of the rut; and

like one who realizes that if he does not make some effort at self-preservation under certain circumstances, he is doomed, it seems that education is being recognized as necessary if Spain hopes to keep in speaking distance with the other nations of the earth. But think! For a thousand years education in Spain has been dominated continuously by Rome, yet her last and best showing in this glorious age is twenty-eight out of every hundred can not read or write.

Verily, a tree is known by its fruit.

It is indeed refreshing to note that Mr. Farrell here quotes figures, and *one time* cites official authority to substantiate an *incidental* proposition; I asked him to do this in answering *all* of the thirty-two questions—but he wouldn't—because he couldn't!

The Bureau of the Census, 1910, shows Spain to be 58.7 per cent. illiterate, America 7.7!

Augusta, Ga., Nov. 9, 1917.

Dear Sir: (1) Your objections under No. 15 appear to be due to a confusion in the mind of the real claim of the pope to temporal sovereignty over the papal States and the alleged claim wrongfully attributed to him to universal temporal sovereignty.

(2) You know the grandfather of Charlemagne ceded to the pope certain territory in what is now Italy and some time later the papacy purchased from the Countess of Tuscany a certain additional territory and these two became what is known as the Papal States over which the pope until toward the close of the last century was considered by the whole world to be rightfully the temporal sovereign.

(3) The Papal States comprised about 18,000 square miles which included the City of Rome. The present Italian Government took this from the pope by force and the pope still claims that he is rightfully the temporal ruler over this territory. The present Italian Government recognized this claim to the extent of voting the pope an annuity of 15,000,000 lire as indemnity for having deprived him of his patrimony. This sum has been set apart every year since 1870, but the pope has consistently refused it, claiming his temporal sovereignty instead.

(4) Now this question as to whether the pope is entitled to sovereignty over the Papal States has no practical interest for Catholics outside of Italy; and, in deed, the Catholics of Italy seem very little concerned about it. And if you will separate this claim of the pope, which he really does make, from the claim that he does not make, but is attributed to him, of wishing to be universal temporal ruler, you will avoid many pitfalls in your investigation of the political bearing of different papal utterances.

Very truly yours,

J. J. FARRELL, Mgr.

JJF/MC

COMMENT

That the pope claims universal temporal sovereignty can be established, I believe, from carefully considering the question on the following bases:

- a. Was the pope ever a temporal sovereign in fact?
- b. Did a pope at any time crown a temporal ruler?
- c. Did any pope at any time ever declare a temporal ruler had forfeited his crown?
- d. Has any pope ever dethroned a ruler and given the crown to another?
- e. Did any pope ever receive his crown from a temporal ruler?
- f. Does the pope claim to be God's instrument, substitute, superintendent, or vice-gerent upon earth?
- g. Does the pope consider members of his church as "subjects"?
- h. Are such subjects restricted to any particular state, territory, country, or continent?
- i. Does the pope expect his subjects, in any land, to aid him in establishing his "religion" to the exclusion of others?
- j. Has a pope ever asserted the claim to universal temporal supremacy?

All these questions may be reduced to two propositions:

I. Has any pope ever exercised temporal sovereignty over any people? And

II. Does the pope exercise a spiritual sovereignty over any one person?

The answers to these propositions determine the issue under discussion. Let us see, now:

(a) The Supreme Court of the United States, in 1908, said: "At one time the United States maintained diplomatic relations with the Papal States, which continued up to the time of the loss of the temporal power of the papacy" (in 1870), 210 U. S. loc cit. 318, 28 Sup. Ct. 737; Farrell also admits the pope was temporal sovereign over certain States. Now, if it was in the general scheme of Redemption that the pope should be sovereign over ONE State, presumably for the good of that State or for the interest of the church, then no restriction can be placed upon the extent of his principality, as he must, as God's substitute, sustain *the same relation to all men on earth as he maintains to any ONE or any section.*

Competent authorities on International Law establish the fact: Says one, "As head of the Catholic church, the pope exercised powers and possessed attributes absolutely unprecedented. His authority transcended the material boundaries of the States and extended throughout the entire world, in the East as well as in the West, in Asia, in Africa, as well as in Europe and in America,

everywhere that there was a Catholic community." *Droit International Public*, Paris, 1914.

"Innocent III freely exercised the privilege of creating as well as deposing kings."—*Hosack on Law of Nations*.

(b) King Henry of Germany surrendered his crown to Pope Gregory VII with all humility and degradation; Pepin, Emperor of France, was crowned by the pope, Celestine III.

(c) Instances too numerous to mention throughout the ages.

(d) Yes.

(e) Yes, from about the sixth to eighth century.

(f) This is the foundation of the pope's church; Leo XIII said, "We hold upon this earth the place of God Almighty."

(g) Yes; Leo refers to Catholics as "subjects" of the church.

(h) All Catholics are bound to the pope through the decree of Infallibility and that of Universal Obedience, hence they are subjects in whatsoever he commands, in all lands.

(i) Declaring he has been intrusted with the custody of all truth, and truth being intolerant of error, it is the duty of papal subjects *throughout the world* to strive to render papalism supreme.

(j) To Philip King of France, Pope Innocent III wrote: "To princes power is given on earth . . . but Peter, as in the plentitude, so in the extent of his power, is pre-eminent over all, since he is vicar of Him whose is the earth and the fullness thereof, *the whole wide world, and all that dwell therein*," while the Bull *Unam Sanctam* of Boniface VIII declares that "every human creature is subject to the Roman Pontiff."

I. From the time of Pepin in the eighth century to 1870, the popes were *civil sovereigns over certain Papal States*. On this nucleus the church hoped to build a world-wide temporal sovereignty; from Emperor Phocas Pope Boniface III received the title of Universal Bishop, or "Pope," which was cemented by the use of false decretals establishing permanently the supremacy of the pope in the church; so, in like manner, the grant of what is known as the Papal States was to be the base of universal temporal supremacy.

II. Every cardinal, legate, archbishop, bishop, priest and layman of the Catholic church take some sort of oath of subjection to the pope, who directs what they shall or shall not believe, and what they must do or refrain from doing, to gain his "spiritual" blessing in life, death and eternity.

Remember that the pope is the church; now listen to Leo XIII: "Both the will of God and the common weal of society imperatively require that the civil power should be in accord with the ecclesiastical in its rule and administration . . . it is necessary that each should be united in the bonds of accord. . . . Let us

ONE and ALL, then, for the sake of the common welfare, labor with equal assiduity *to restore the ancient concord.*" Gt. Lets. pp. 313-14-18.

Would any one contend that Leo was speaking for and in relation to the several small papal "states"? If so, Leo himself disabuses the opinion; says he: "The mission of Christ is to save that which had perished; that is to say, not *SOME nations or peoples, BUT THE WHOLE HUMAN RACE.* . . . Wherefore . . . it is necessary that this church should be one in all lands and at all times. . . . That the one church should embrace *all men everywhere and at all times,*" p. 356 *Ibid.*

Thus, in writing to Catholics around the whole world, Leo makes it plain that the pope is supreme sovereign over every foot of earth inhabited by man—extending as far in fact as God's rights among men, which doctrine is taught in papal schools.

Wherever the church of Rome is established in any land its "rights" are demanded as soon as there are enough subjects to make the demand. The first thing the church begins to do, is, to define her position; to remove doubt, Leo cites the Syllabus of Errors of Pius IX, who branded "publicly many *false opinions*" which were gaining ground; one of which reads: "Prop. xix. The Church is not a true, perfect, and wholly independent society, possessing its own unchanging rights conferred upon it by its Divine Founder; but it is for the civil power to determine what are the rights of the church, and the limits within which it may use them," p. 125.

Another opinion that was branded as false: "Prop. iv. The Church must be separated from the State, and the State from the Church."

The "ancient concord" desired by Leo renders temporal rulers mere puppets of the pope, to be enthroned or dethroned at his pleasure; that "accord" which enabled popes to order temporal rulers to extirpate all heretics in their realms; that "accord" which would allow a bishop to enter the kingdom and butcher those whose conscience repudiated popery with its idols, relics, bleached bones, saints, etc. To those millions who weltered in their own blood rather than surrender free conscience, it made no difference whether they were murdered according to the papal rights set out in the *Third* or *Fourth* Chapter of the Vatican Decrees!

By what test are the subjects of the church proven? Leo XIII says: "Obedience to the Roman Pontiff is the proof of the true faith," 380.

I do not believe there is any "confusion" in the mind of the reader as to the "real claim of the pope to temporal power."

(2) It was the decision of a pope that made Pepin Emperor

of France; he engaged in wars with the Lombards. About the year 754 Pepin was importuned by the pope to war on Astolphus, King of the Lombards; this king, desiring to secure peace at any price, among other concessions, agreed to recognize the sovereignty of the Franks, pay them tribute, and ceded to Pepin the towns and lands belonging to the jurisdiction of the Roman Empire, which were then occupied by the Lombards, which took in Ravenna, Pimini, Pesaro or the Romagna, the Duchy of Urbino, and a part of the marches of Ancona. These being subjugated by the sword, Pepin deeded them to the pope—which was the beginning of the temporal sovereignty of the pope over them, known in history as the "Papal States."

(3) Those who believe in Democracy, and the Bible, recognize that all just powers of the government are derived from the "consent of the governed." Having been favored by the pope, Pepin believed that "one good turn deserved another," so he presented the pope with the fruits of his conquest—and it took those people just one thousand years to realize they were being governed without their consent; and when they did, they cast off what Leo terms the "sweet yoke" of the papacy.

As to other territory gained by purchase or grant—every school boy is supposed to know that the people have the right, under the law of Eminent Domain, to terminate or abrogate the rights of an individual or combination of individuals when that course is deemed to be for the best interests of the *community*, just compensation being tendered; the darkest spot throughout all the Dark Ages was these same Papal States when the pope was King.

By the sword were the original Papal States won—by the sword were they liberated.

(4) This is a very blatant assertion, and it would pass muster were it not known that the popes demand and strive for the restoration of the temporal sovereignty, as Leo says, "by the very nature of Our office and Our sacred promise *confirmed on oath*," p. 15. Here is the pope, God's Superintendent (!) upon earth, swearing before his "sacred" congregation of cardinals to strive to get back his temporal power (although Christ said, "May kingdom is not of this world"), while Farrell says that question "has no practical interest for Catholics outside of Italy!" The pope says it is necessary for him to have it, and this question contains the germ of a world-disaster; like Samson, when he realized his day was done, he may try to wreck the world, and not even Romanists know what infernal trickery the pope under the direction of Jesuitism may stage, by an infallible decree calling upon the "faithful" of the world to rise up in his behalf and attempt to restore his "princedom": the pope sent Pepin a message, which he said had been delivered to him by St. Peter from heaven,

directing him to make war on the Lombards—thus the origin of temporal sovereignty; can the Catholic Laymen's Association of Georgia give valid bond that the pope will not get in touch with Peter and again attempt to hoax the world?

The people of Italy are very much concerned with this matter. So much so, that the pope has less real influence in Rome than he has in New York, Chicago, or other large American centers—because the people of Italy KNOW HIM AND HIS WORKS; his priests are forbidden, by Catholic-made law, to officiate at marriages unless they have first been performed by the civil authority, while in some of the States of Italy it is against the law to sell such books as Liguori's "Moral" (?) Theology.

Cardinal Manning evidently spoke by the "cards"—he predicted this question would bring on a world war.

Augusta, Ga., Nov. 9, 1917.

Dear Sir: You quote the Syllabus of Errors again under 15 (rather you misquote it).

(1) I failed to mention that you misquoted it, also, under 14; in fact, you invariably misquote it, as you yourself will see if you only take the trouble to read the Syllabus first-hand. And you might know by inference if you only reflect that the Syllabus of Errors is a collection of negations from which it is clearly bad logic to conclude the opposite affirmative as necessarily true and worse argument to quote that opposite in language that does not appear in the document you purpose to quote from.

Moreover, paragraph 27, which you misquote, has no reference to the universal church but only to the Papal States, as you would know, if you had by you the allocution which this particular paragraph refers to. (2) As to the statement of Leo XIII where he says "if the laws of the State are manifestly at variance with divine law . . . to resist becomes a positive duty; to obey a crime," I endorse that. All Catholics endorse it. All men ought to endorse it.

If that be treason—make the most of it.

Very truly,

JJF/MC

J. J. FARRELL, Mgr.

COMMENT

Mr. Farrell here again charges me with misquoting the Syllabus of Errors and also denies their relevance to countries outside the Papal States. Claiming he holds the place of God on earth, the pope's jurisdiction, necessarily in all things, extends as far as that of his principal—God. It is needless to say more as to that proposition. Any intelligent person knows that if I had misquoted the Syllabus of Errors, Farrell would have set me right, **BY QUOTING THEM.** If a lawyer at the bar objects to the citation of his opponent, or denies the sense in which the law cited is used in the instant case, it is his duty not only to object, but he must sustain his objection by himself reading the citations

objected to for the benefit of the court and jury: a simple denial does not help his case—especially when he is supposed to have the volumes at hand. Apply this rule to Farrell's charge.

Farrell says "the Syllabus of Errors is a collection of negations from which it is clearly bad logic to conclude the opposite affirmative as necessarily true." "Negation: Denial"—"a collection of denials," then, if you prefer; what do they *deny*? Leo says, certain "false opinions that were gaining ground." If the premise is true that Pius IX branded as false certain opinions, then the only logical conclusion is, the opposite affirmative IS TRUE. Again I will cite one of the propositions as quoted by Leo XIII: "To like effect . . . did Pius IX brand publicly many false opinions . . . it will suffice to indicate a few of them: Prop. lv. The Church must be separated from the State and the State from the Church!" Farrell says it is "bad logic" for me to say that Pius taught "it is error to say the Church must be separated from the State and the State from the Church!" and that in doing so, I am misquoting! To say that it is error to hold that "The male is the mother of its species," and then also say it is "bad logic" to conclude the opposite affirmative is necessarily true by declaring "The female is the mother of its species," may be good logic to those accustomed to accept the dictum of a priest, but is senseless, childish twaddle to minds free from the Papal Index. I am surprised to learn that Leo fell into the same error as myself; the pope should get Mr. Farrell, of the Catholic Laymen's Association of Georgia, to straighten out the contents of the Vatican archives. (I will have occasion later to refer to this Syllabus of Errors—and will show that one of its propositions is now written in the canon law of Farrell's church!)

A Catholic acts according to papal law—it's his *conscience*. So, before discussing Farrell's deleted quotation from Leo, we will first consider "conscience" and what it signifies to the mind of a Romanist; we have previously treated of the law.

The untutored savage would not kill more game than he could dispose of properly—his "conscience" forbade it; primitive instinct was his monitor. "Conscience" is that element of the human mind and heart by which man distinguishes good from evil, if it has not been "seared as with a hot iron" by some subtle process; it is subject to a refined state of development, or debasement. Under the Christian dispensation, God gave man His Word the Bible as a guide for his conscience: "The entrance of Thy Word giveth light" and is a guide to all truth; we can not have a conscience void of offense to God and man unless it is developed under the influence of the Bible, as summed up in the Ten Commandments; based upon any other theory, is paganism.

In placing himself between the Creature and its God, the pope

diverts the human conscience from the Bible to himself and human "Traditions," placing the writings of man (St. Thomas Aquinas) on an equal footing with the Bible; hence, the Catholic conscience must be developed universally in accord with the will of a man—the pope; and if it is exercised at all, it must be in harmony, not with the Word of God, but with the word of the pope.

Under stated conditions, a Catholic will disobey the laws of the land; his *conscience* prompts it. Let us consider a few manifestations of Catholic conscience; it may throw some light on their attitude to our law, whether or not it is a safe monitor in a democracy:

Following the promptings of *his* conscience, John Wycliffe translated the Holy Scriptures in the common tongue, for which he was harassed by popery; thirty years after his death, his remains were exhumed, by a decree issued by the Council of Constance, and burnt; that's Catholic conscience.

John Huss embraced the teaching of Wycliffe by the promptings of *his* conscience; he was summoned to appear before this same Council of Constance; he appeared, having a safe pass-port from the Catholic king going and coming—he *trusted* them. This council found him guilty of heresy, and the Catholic conscience and plighted word burnt him at the stake.

In obedience to *his* conscience, the monk, Savonarola, denounced the wickedness and corruption of his fellow-priests; the Catholic conscience burnt him.

Bruno discovered it was death to know more than the conscience of the pope allowed.

The earlier Christians, known as Albigenses, Waldenses, and Lollards, were put to death by wholesale because their conscience would not permit them to subscribe to popery.

A writer has said: "Among the hereditary or transmissible qualities in animals and in man, the most stubbornly persistent is an instinctive tendency to respond to environment."

The real characteristics of a man, or nation, will not only be developed, but revealed by environment, and the inner conscience—or what the nation is at heart—will be manifested in actions, words, deeds, literature and *law*.

A cannibal inherits his taste for human flesh; his environment fosters and develops it; this characteristic finds expression when opportunity brings a victim within reach. To overcome this barbarism, there must be enlightenment: "The entrance of Thy Word giveth light"; when the cannibal learns the true relation of man to man and his God, this practice that was once a joyous feast becomes abhorrent—but make it impossible to change environment by keeping intellect in the dark—as by an "Index"—

and each succeeding generation would be man-eaters to the end of time.

To appreciate the conscience of a Catholic, it is necessary to understand somewhat of the environment into which he is born and raised—the nature he inherits: viewed from a religious standpoint, Romanism dethrones God and substitutes the pope; destroys the Gospel and relies upon Tradition; fetters reason with the iron grip of authority, *making it criminal to reason, but virtue to murder*; all this produces a heart, mind and “conscience” that will hear no voice but the pope’s, and hence, like clay in the potter’s hands, can be moulded into any phantastic shape the enemy of man desires; if the pope declares the blackness of hell to be the light of heaven, the environment of the Catholic has been such as to force him to assent to the pope’s definition.

Now let us consider Leo’s statement, and set it out in full, as it was intended to be construed by Catholics:

“If the laws of the State are at variance with divine law; or,
“If the laws of the State contain enactments hurtful to the church; or,

“If the laws of the State convey injunctions adverse to the duties imposed by religion; or,

“If the laws of the State violate the authority of Christ vested in the pope of Rome, Catholics must not only resist such, but to obey these laws of the State would be a crime.”

Now, as between the State and the pope, who is to determine when the laws of the State violate the pope’s laws? The pope. Who is to resist these laws of the State when the pope declares they violate his laws? The Roman Catholic:

Deharbe’s Catechism teaching “On Faith” says:

“1. What is Faith as proposed by a Catholic Christian?

“Faith is a virtue infused by God into our souls, by which we believe, without doubting, all those things which God has revealed, and proposes by His church to our belief.

“7 How did Divine Revelation come down to us?

“Divine Revelation came down to us partly by *writing*—that is, by the Holy Scripture or the Bible; partly by *word of mouth*—that is, by Tradition.

“14. Is it enough to believe only those doctrines which are contained in the Holy Scripture?

“No; we must also believe *Tradition*.

“17. How has Tradition been handed down to us?

“. . . by the rites of the church . . . *in the decrees and definitions of the church, and in the writings of the Holy Fathers*.

“20. What, then, must the Catholic Christian in general believe?

“He must believe all that God has revealed and the Catholic

church (that is, THE POPE) proposes to his belief, whether it be contained in the Holy Scripture or not."

Observe, that in the earliest training, the Catholic is taught to believe in God only as He is revealed by the pope, to believe in Tradition, the *Decrees* and Definitions of the popes, and the *writings* of the "holy" fathers of the church; all subsequent education is but to strengthen belief in papalism along these lines: therefore, when the pope through his priests says any law is in conflict with the laws of God, a Catholic has no alternative but to believe it, and act accordingly; being the *only* person in the world who has the right to teach what is "Divine Law," naturally the pope is the sole judge whether or not the laws of the land conflict with "divine" law; now—

The Constitution of the United States, and the laws of the several States of the Union, separate the State from the church; this is "manifestly at variance with divine law," and for a Catholic to assent to it is, *to commit a crime* against his church.

Every law of every State in the Union which provides for and maintains the free public school in which citizens are to be trained to perpetuate the State is an enactment "hurtful to the church" of Rome, and it is the positive duty of Catholics to resist this law—"to obey, a crime." One manifestation of "resisting" this law is concretely shown by *the competitive parochial school* being formed where there are enough Romanists to make it pay.

The laws of the land give every man the right to civil and religious liberty—a "Free Conscience," which "convey injunctions adverse to the duties imposed by religion"—laws which prevent the pope's subjects from killing their fellow-citizens because they will not subscribe to Traditions and writings of the papal fathers, pray to Mary, worship the pancake god and eat him at the command of the priest—"to obey" these laws is "a crime."

The laws of the land provide penalties against liars, thieves, adulterers, murderers, etc., all of which "violate in the person of the pope the authority of Jesus Christ," which Catholics are taught to resist as a duty, and a crime to obey, such being an invasion of priestly precincts!

If Romanists were numerous enough in America to put into effect the pope's interpretation of "divine" law, every right guaranteed by the Constitution along with the free public school would be blotted out and the polluting doctrines of the "Holy Fathers"—Aquinas, Dens, Liguori, *et al.*, would do for America what they have done for the Latin nations of the earth—the destruction of morality, justice, and truth, while rivers of blood would flow to satiate an insatiable monster.

Mr. Farrel, speaking with authority for the Catholics of Georgia—and a unit of the Federated Society of Catholics—says: "If that be treason—make the most of it." Digitized by Google

Farrell and all Catholics receive their inspiration and direction from Rome—from the “Traditions” of the “holy” fathers—the product and cause of the Dark Ages—people among us, but not of us, who live under oath to wreck American civilization the instant the pope thinks it can be done with safety to himself, with a wrecking-crew of 20,000 priests and Jesuits to direct his “faithful,” who boast of their position: “If that be treason—make the most of it.” The American people will dispose of that issue—they have never yet failed to handle a matter when it was up for action—and if that attitude of Catholics be treason, the people will make the most of it.

The fundamental law of the land grants freedom of conscience and enforces religious toleration; but it does not give any one the right to use that very law as a basis upon which to stand and destroy or undermine such fundamental law, so that the reverse can be instituted.

To the Romanists of America, the pope says, “Whosoever is separated from the (Roman) church is united to an adulteress”: this is a picture of our beloved land as impressed on the “conscience” of a Catholic, who is in duty bound to aid him in establishing the opposite, by uniting State and Church under popery; like the German Kaiser, the Romanists want “Peace”—but it must come only after the opponents of the pope are under the sod, or are resistless under the spiked heel of that institution, reason secure under the pope’s Authority, with virtue and honesty committed to his agents the priests!

What does “the” church teach which must be held as of equal authority as the Gospels? Here are a few articles of “faith” which will indicate what may be expected from a Catholic “conscience”:

“Saint” Liguori: “When a crime is well concealed, the witness, and even the criminal, may and even must swear that the crime has not been committed.”

“The guilty party may yet do likewise, when a half proof can not be brought against him.”

Can a woman who has committed adultery deny it under oath? Liguori answers: “Yes; provided she has been to confess, and received the absolution; for then the sin has been pardoned, *and has really ceased to exist.*” (1)

Liguori (L. 2): “Though lying is forbidden, we may be allowed to conceal the truth, or to disguise it under ambiguous or equivocal words or signs for a just cause. . . . If, for example, you are among heretical people, you can do more good by concealing your faith.” (To what extent were the Jesuit “missionaries” governed by this “principle” among the heathen of India, China, Japan? To what extent does Farrell’s letters show *he* was governed by it

in this the twentieth century? Verily, the Roman church NEVER CHANGES.)

Qu. "22. Are we sometimes allowed to use mental reservation in a loose sense or determinable equivocation?"

Ans.: "Yes; when there is a grave reason for doing so. Such a manner of speaking" merely permits the hearer "to deceive himself concerning matters which he has no right to know," p. 306, "Manual of Christian Doctrine." (This is the predicate of Liguori's theology.)

The pope can release from any oath.—St. Thomas, Ques. 89, Art. 9, Vol. IV.

Heretics must be killed.—St. Thomas, Vol. IV, p. 91.

Pope can release subjects from oath of allegiance to civil ruler.—St. Thomas, Vol. IV, p. 91.

All the foregoing goes to shape the Catholic "conscience." And here's more; from the decree of the church adopted at the Lateran Council, which is not dead—but sleeping—awaiting "expediency":

"We excommunicate and anathematize every heresy . . . by whatever name they may be known. . . . Secular powers . . . are . . . compelled . . . to swear that they will exert themselves to the utmost in the defense of the faith, and extirpate all heretics.

"If any temporal lord . . . neglect to clear his territory of heretical depravity . . . the fact shall be signified to the Supreme Pontiff, who will declare his vassals (subjects) released from their allegiance from that time, and will bestow the territory on Catholics, to be occupied by them, on the condition of exterminating the heretics.

"Catholics who shall assume the cross for the *extermination* of heretics shall enjoy the indulgencies as are granted those who go to the help of the Holy Land" (i. e., same as those who fight against the Turks!)

"We decree further, that all who may have dealings with heretics, and especially such as receive, defend, or encourage them, shall be excommunicated."

THE LAWS OF THE STATES OF THE UNION FORBID ALL THESE LAWS AND DECREES OF THE ITALIAN CHURCH—Farrell says if it be treason to oppose the laws of the land in favor of the laws of his church, make the most of it.

When a man studies for the Roman priesthood, he spends about six years with the "classics"—ancient paganism, and the same amount of time with the "traditions" and "decrees and definitions" and "writings of the holy fathers"; now give him a "subject" with a "conscience" brought up under the Index, one not allowed to question, and you can the more readily understand from Farrell's letters what chance a papal subject has of learn-

ing the difference between God's law and the pope's will—the utter impossibility of appreciating the liberties of a free people, and to ever be content to live in a land where the accursed doctrines of popery are not the laws of the land.

The Congress of the United States should appoint a joint commission and make a thorough investigation of the pope's *religion*; and if it be found conflicting with the fundamental laws of the land, or tends to debase the morals of the people, or subverts the principles of democracy, **ABOLISH IT**. Make it a penitentiary offense to teach or practice Rome's polluting Theology, just as Mormon Polygamy was abolished. It can be done—it must be done. What say you, Americans?

To Roman Catholics, I say: "If this be 'religious' intolerance—make the most of it."

That foreign, Italian institution that has slipped into America under the veneer of Christianity to tear down what our forefathers erected at the cost of blood, teaches that in countries not Catholic, in order that the demoralizing, blighting curse of popery may have freedom to operate its laws and practice its political schemes for a world-empire under the livery of heaven, "it is lawful to seek for such change of government as will bring about due liberty of action." Leo XIII, Enc. Lets., p. 16.

This is inciting to treason and rebellion—awaiting opportunity or "expediency," for execution, as in Ireland.

Augusta, Ga., Nov. 10, 1917.

Dear Sir: In answer to your Question 17, I stated: "The Catholic church does not recognize any other church as having been founded by Jesus Christ. Christ established but one church. Our church teaches, and we Catholics believe, that the Catholic church is that church."

(1) Your objections under this head are not pertinent. Indeed, since we do not demand that you believe that the Catholic church was founded by Christ, and since you have nothing to do with our believing it, it seems rather bordering on the impertinent; but it is a small matter.

(2) Only, you ought to be satisfied NOT to believe what you don't believe. If you are not, how can it satisfy you better to have us also dissatisfied?

Very truly,

J. J. FARRELL, Mgr.

JJF/MC

COMMENT

(1) Christ said: "Beware of false prophets, who come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves.

"Ye shall know them by their fruits. Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles?

"A good tree can not bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit." Matt. vii:15-18.

Farrell says "since we do not demand—" Who are "we"?—Catholic laymen? Since when has the pope delegated to *them* the right to speak authoritatively for him on *this* subject? What Catholic laymen say and what the LAW of the POPE DEMANDS are different matters, and until Farrell can show credentials authorizing what "we" demand as being LAW, his remarks must remain as those of an individual, and not an answer to what the church teaches. I have tried all the way along to get him to distinguish between what *individuals wished* and what *his church taught* "we" must do. When an unfettered mind can be convinced that Christ has any connection with an Institution with the record of the popes behind it, with bloody record behind it, with the murderous laws now supporting it, with the anti-social doctrines it teaches, then I will be willing to admit such to be Christian; however, I am not so much interested in whether the Roman church be pagan or Christian in religion, as I am in what it teaches in regard to those who refuse to acknowledge the authority of the pope; and the Italian church has ever considered it "impertinent" to question what the pope teaches through his church the priests, especially when the fruits of the system are involved.

(2) The ten lost tribes of Israel were at one time among God's chosen people: the Roman church was Christian, until it fell into the pit the devil dug for Christ: "And the devil taketh Him into an exceeding high mountain, and showeth Him all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them. And saith unto him, All these things will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me." Matt. iv:8-9.

As an American, I am satisfied to let Romanists enjoy their religion in all its phases, even if such be abhorrent to me, until said religion intrenches upon the rights of non-Catholics; then, I am for abolishing by law every phase of that religion which seeks to interfere, or would if in the ascendancy interfere, with the laws of the land and the guarantees of liberty of the Constitution.

It is impossible for me to make "Catholics" dissatisfied; there is no chance in the world for this book to "get by" the Index—that's what it is for: a few priests may read it—and admit its truth; but these letters from the association have been a revelation to me; I see deeper into the system now than could have been possible from any course of reading, and if I can show my fellow-countrymen the social and political menace of the papal institution, I will consider my work not in vain. I am convinced Romanism is a political institution with a world-wide ambition, masquerading under the thin veil of Christianity, and if not held in subjection to the laws of the land will make America what she has made Spain—for the forces which made this country did not make Spain and Italy—Italy up to 1870. The issue is purely

political, and if "religion" enters into it at all, it is merely used as a cloak.

I ask the reader to carefully consider the laws and decrees of the Roman church, and ask himself the question honestly: Can they bless a free people? Are the laws of the pope the will of Christ? If not, then, they must be suppressed.

Augusta, Ga., Nov. 10, 1917.

Dear Sir: You asked me in 16 if I thought there is any persecution of Catholics in this country.

Now, you say, "the object of this question was to ascertain if you really believe . . . that Catholics and non-Catholics are of the same flesh, with the same feelings, the same nature," and so on.

I hope you will pardon me, but I am at an utter loss to fathom your meaning. Since you have been good enough to disclose the hidden motive of your question, you will doubtless be willing to unveil the hidden meaning of your objection.

(1) I shall await your helpful and enlightening assistance on this score.

Very truly yours,

JJF/MC

J. J. FARRELL, Mgt.

COMMENT

(1) Mr. Farrell wants enlightenment—very well: Human nature has been the same since the day Adam and Eve walked out of the Garden of Eden: the laws and decrees of the pope have been the same through all the centuries where papal subjects were in the majority in every country, and the result has been the same in those countries. Where popery has been in power, a country's law-makers must make it a penal crime—punish with death or debasement—not to belong to the papal church, the essence of the papal laws and decrees.

Now, Romanists can not point to a single country in the world where the church was in "accord" with the State without admitting the above charge, and that this "accord" blighted that nation; now, then, if Catholics believe all men are essentially alike—that we are all of the same flesh and blood, they know that that which will make one bleed, will also make another bleed; that which will make one smile, will have the same effect upon another; that which will stir and kindle the wrath of one will have like effect upon another; AND, if it has ever been true, or would be true again, under Romanism, to be a Protestant was your death warrant, certainly Rome can not fill a non-Catholic country, as this, with her priest-agents to direct the laymen toward control of politics, secure 80 per cent. of all prominent national appointments, secure and hold valuable untaxed property in the name of the pope, monopolize the picture shows to advertise priests, nuns, and other papal propaganda while holding up all non-Catholic affairs and institutions to ridicule in the most subtle manner,

ensor and curb the free press, intimidate Protestant ministers and non-Catholic speakers by boycott or murder and mob violence, attempt to close all public halls against those who desire to speak on popery, combine into one society all the Catholics in the country and become the balance of power politically, work for the destruction of the free public school system in favor of the papal parochial school, introduce bills in Congress, State Legislatures and City Councils to suppress free speech and the free press, and use its membership to try to block every civil moral reform of the country—I repeat, if Catholics believe we are of the same flesh, such activities as above enumerated in an overwhelmingly non-Catholic country, they know will arouse bitter opposition—not as exemplified by papists: of death, exile, and confiscation of property, but they know it means absolute disfranchisement of every subject of the pope in America. If it goes further than the battle of ballots, it will be because the pope believes his 350,000 Knights of Columbus and 300,000 Hibernians can turn the trick with the bayonet.

Romanists think they have “put one over” Americans in capturing the “movies” and muzzling the press—but every Romish suggestion thrown on the screen but augments the antagonism, and intensifies the study of the question, while the antics of a muzzled press are viewed with contempt.

I trust this will elucidate my meaning to Mr. Farrell’s satisfaction.

Augusta, Ga., Nov. 12, 1917.

Dear Sir: You have reserved No. 19 for discussion to be held at the meeting which I hope you are making some success in arranging for. So I shall take up 20.

You ask why not eliminate certain words from my answer. Why, man, it would be meaningless then. I said, and repeat: “There is no question of any sort open to investigation, that we are not as free to investigate as any other person.”

(1) You say eliminate “open to investigation.” But there are some questions that are not open to investigation; can’t you recognize this to be true? We need not investigate an error where we know the truth, that necessarily excludes the error. Catholics know Christ is God, for example; if they don’t, they are not Catholics; since they do, it is perfectly idle for them to “investigate” the theories of Renen and his various copyists and imitators. The divinity of Christ is a closed question for Catholics.

Knowledge of the truth closes any question. As to the lives of the popes, of course they are open to investigation like any other fact, and open to Catholics no less than others, as is any other passing fact.

(2) You ask the name of “JUST ONE” Catholic layman who possesses an uncensored history of the lives of the popes. I gladly give you one, sir; it is

Yours truly,

JJF/MC

J. J. FARRELL, Mgr.

COMMENT

(1) To say *any* question is not open to investigation is to deny both the existence of Reason and its Source; to admit Reason but prevent its exercise, is equivalent to fitting the eagle with wings, but not allow it to soar beyond the confines of a cage: the eagle can fly, oh, yes—*around in his cage*; a Catholic can investigate any question—oh, yes, *within the confines of the cage of papal censorship*; here are the BARS to the mental cage made by the pope: Holy Scripture, Sacred Theology, Ecclesiastical History, Canon Law, Natural Theology, Ethics, Religious or Moral Questions; any question arising under these subjects ARE NOT open to independent investigation, although they cover every phase of man's existence as the canopy of heaven covers the earth; therefore, there is no question open to investigation by Catholic laymen.

(2) Mr. Farrell says: "*We* need not investigate an error where *we* know the truth . . . Catholics know Christ is God." Here again Mr. Farrell uses the personal pronoun "*we*": who are "*we*"? Does he mean the Catholic *laymen*, or the *pope*? If he has laymen in mind, is he *sure* they know "Christ is God?" Did they learn this by a personal, independent investigation of the subject, or did they learn it from the pope? If from the pope, *then they do not know it as a fact of their own knowledge, but only as hearsay*, evidence that is not admissible even in a court of justice among men. A knowledge of God is had primarily from His Word, which commands, "Study to show yourselves workmen that needeth not to be ashamed," which enables one to "give a reason for the hope" within, and it is those who "search the Scriptures" who are competent to testify of Him. The Catholic, being restricted, having to get his knowledge from the priest and not allowed to question, DOES NOT know Christ is God—he only knows the priest says the pope says He is; the priest also tells the Catholic that the little pancake is Christ the God, which he must worship, then eat; does he *know* this pancake is Christ the God from a personal, independent investigation of the subject? No; he says he knows it is, because the priest said the pope said it is. The tragedy of the ages! The divinity of the pancake "is a closed question for Catholics."

In a nutshell Pope Gregory encloses the Catholic mind; said he: "If the Holy Church (i. e., the pope) so requires, let us sacrifice our own opinions, our knowledge, our intelligence, and the most sublime attainments of the human understanding." When a Romish priest takes a little pancake and says, "*Hoc est enim corpus meum*" over it, to believe it then has become the living Christ the God to be eaten certainly requires absolute obedience

to Gregory! which is paraphrased by Loyola, who teaches "What I see White is Black, if the superior authority defines it so."

But I do not object to one believing this if his conscience has been so developed as to admit of it; but I do object to Catholics being in politics and in public schools as teachers when I know the same forces that shaped their conscience in this particular also makes it a matter of religious conscience to so shape conditions as will bring me and mine to the point when we must consider that a question "not open to investigation" and suffer the penalties prescribed in the LAWS of the ROMAN CHURCH for *refusing to eat what the pope says is my God*. My object in enlarging upon this "religious" part of the discussion is to show that if one can be thus directed by the will of another, I do not believe such to be safe custodians of democracy and human liberty.

(8) Mr. Farrell says he has an uncensored history of the lives of the popes; if he has, his bishop had to issue a permit for him to retain it, just as the Laymen's Association could not be formed without a permit; even if he has, HE IS NO LONGER A LAYMAN in the true sense of the word—he has become what may be called a "cleric"—he is a "teacher," and to be a teacher and a layman in the Catholic church, in his capacity, is impossible, according to canon law.

Augusta, Ga., Nov. 12, 1917.

Dear Sir: You seem to be badly tangled in your objections to No. 18.

You say in your first paragraph, "your answer is neither democratic nor Catholic," and "if followed to its logical conclusion in practice would be the reign of anarchy." In the second paragraph you say, "your theory . . . is the bedrock of Protestantism."

Now if my answer is the bedrock of Protestantism and yet, if put in practice, would mean the reign of anarchy, as you conclude, you must think very poorly of Protestantism. As to whether it "destroys Catholicism," we can let that pass; you certainly should not demur on that account.

But before going further into the matter, I wish to know if you stand on the proposition that the bedrock of Protestantism if put in practice would mean the reign of anarchy.

Then I shall tell you how Catholics are taught to obey Conscience in spite of everything in the world.

Very truly,

JJF/MC

J. J. FARRELL, Mgr.

COMMENT

Let us see, now, if I am badly tangled, or if Mr. Farrell is trying to hide the fact that the spirit of Romanism is such as to pit every Catholic against the laws of the State.

Referring back to his original answer, he says that in the event there is a conflict between the laws of the State and Roman

church, one or the other would be exceeding its authority, in which case one must determine *for himself* which one is right. This would be anarchy—not democracy; democracy, that is, where the people in a free country determine what should be, then legislate to that end; his answer above referred to is not Catholic, for in Catholic countries, where autocracy obtains, laws are made at the behest of the king and sanctioned by the Catholic hierarchy without reference to the wishes of the people. According to Farrell, each individual is to determine for himself, *after* a law has been passed, whether or not it suits his particular conscience; how long would a democratic form of government endure—would it not certainly end in anarchy?

Formerly I said “your theory . . . is the bedrock of Protestantism.” What was Farrell’s “theory”? It was, the matter of each individual *choosing for himself*; but such choice on the part of Protestants or supporters of democracy to advocate or oppose legislation is exercised BEFORE, and NOT AFTER, it has become LAW.

A Catholic layman can not “choose” in politics or religion; the word “heretic” means to “choose.” All Protestants are “heretics” because they “choose” instead of having some one else indicate or direct what they must do; and if the majority of “heretics” choose a certain proposition and make it law, the minority must abide by it.

The exercise of individual conscience to determine whether or not a question or proposed law is right, “is the bedrock of Protestantism”—*by which democratic laws are made*, and the same exercise of *individual* conscience prompts obedience.

Romanists must be governed by what the pope defines as law; call it “conscience” if you will; they are governed by his AUTHORITY, not “conscience,” as I understand the word; if there is a conflict between the laws of the State and church of Rome, a Catholic can not choose between them as a matter of conscience, for the very simple reason he had no voice in making the law of the church—his conscience nor choice had nothing to do with its creation, neither can he question as to its being right or wrong, hence his attitude in such case is pre-determined by the same authority which makes him a Catholic.

Mr. Farrell says he will tell how “Catholics are taught to obey Conscience in spite of everything in the world,” so I will take up the matter in part right now, in connection with the instant subject of choosing between the laws of the State and of the church.

“Prudence,” says St. Thomas Aquinas, “proceeds from reason, and to reason it specifically pertains to guide and govern. . . . But it is evident that the SUBJECT . . . and the SERVANT . . . ought neither to control nor govern, but rather be CON-

TROLLED and GOVERNED. . . . Whence it manifestly results that prudence exists in the RULER, as it exists in the architect with regard to the building he has to construct, . . . and that it exists in the SUBJECT, as it exists in the workman employed in the construction." St. Th., 2a 2ae, Q. ii, 2, 4, 7, art. 12. This is the highest authority in the Roman church; he plainly shows that the pope in all things is the "architect" while laymen are but as "workmen," whose only expression must be obedience in carrying out the designs of the "ruler."

Now, let us see what this "ruler" tells Catholics what constitutes law: "Human law is law only by virtue of its accordance with right reason; and thus it is manifest that it flows from the eternal law. And in so far as it deviates from right reason it is called an unjust law; in such case it is no law at all, but rather a species of violence."—St. Thomas Sum. Theol., 1a 2ae, Q. xciii, art. 3. There you are! There's where Farrell gets his answer; to a Catholic where there is a conflict between laws, to his "conscience" the laws of the State are but "a species of violence." To the intelligent, I say, memorize these quotations—they are the life principles of the papal system.

In a great church council the writings of St. Thomas were placed on the altar with the Bible, as being equally worthy of emulation, and Popes Pius IX and Leo XIII ordered his doctrine taught in every Catholic seminary in the world; Lee ordered all writers to be guided by him; surely, Farrell will not contend that "St. Thomas" leaves any room for an exercise of an individual conscience; an individual conscience carries with it the right of private judgment which calls for individual reasoning to pursue the investigation—principles which CAN NOT exist in the pope's church.

Compare the laws of the United States Constitution and the laws of the papal church; observe how they conflict at every point; then remember what those laws are in the mind of a Catholic; they are as fire and water—both can NOT exist at the same time in the same place—ONE must go; WHICH SHALL IT BE?

Augusta, Ga., Nov. 13, 1917

Dear Sir: (1) Under 27, what have your first four citations to do with the subject?

(2) You say they "reveal the attitude of the church toward the priesthood." You are wrong; they show her regard for the sanctity of marriage, which a priest, since he cannot either lawfully or validly contract, can scarce do worse than pretend he has contracted.

Your fifth citation seems pertinent at first blush; but read the question and answer again:—"Does the church teach that members must not *accuse* priests or bishops *known* to have committed *grave* sins?" "No." And now, read what Leo says: "No private

person may arrogate to himself the office of *judge*" (not accuser); next he warns us "not rashly to judge," not to set ourselves "in audacious opposition," not to refuse "respectful submission" to superiors. Where is there anything here forbidding Catholics to accuse a priest *known* to have committed *grave* sin?

If you wish instances where Catholics have accused some priest of a grave sin, ask some ex-priest whose undoing came through his own parishioners who knew it was their duty to accuse him and have him judged by his superiors, as was done.

(4) You are aware, of course, that Catholics are human; but you do not at times seem conscious that the church also is aware of this fact.

Very truly,

JJF/GT

J. J. FARRELL, Mgt.

COMMENT

(1) These citations answer for themselves.

(2) Mr. Farrell (?) says those citations show the regard the Roman church has "for the sanctity of marriage"! To me it shows the utter depravity of a society which has accepted ancient paganism for Christianity, and a pope instead of God, the result of following the Traditions of men instead of the Word of God.

Refer to those citations under Question 27: now remember that marriage is a union of a man and woman according to the will and command of God which renders it holy in His sight; it is the means of populating the earth in obedience to His command; it is also a type—of Christ and His Church, by which souls are born unto God, and it is *so* sacred that popery has elevated it to "sacrament," while the "writings of the holy fathers" say that it is better for a priest of the pope to go wrong with a hundred different women than to marry one; it is better for them to use and abuse every RIGHT of marriage than to violate its *sanctity* by assuming the RITE!

Farrell's answer can be impressed on the mind in no better way than by illustrating it with the act of a Roman Catholic priest in New York about six years ago, Hans Schmidt, who married his housekeeper, and because he "loved her so," killed her, and after cutting the body into small pieces, threw it with the unborn child into the river; he loved her so well as to destroy her and his own unborn child: to preserve the "sanctity" of marriage Rome would rather her priests become as stray tom cats in human society than have them "desecrate" its "sanctity" by obeying the law of God and His Natural Laws!

Let us see what "Saint" Liguori has to say along this line: if a priest should, from human frailty "fall, say, once a month, it should not be held against him if repentant!" Hans Schmidt was repentant; to hide from the world the result of the logical teaching of the "holy fathers," all he had to do was, *commit double murder*, "confess" to his father confessor, get "absolution" and—hunt another victim.

Paul refers to this "dogma" of refusing to marry, also of keeping holy days, abstaining from eating meats, etc., as being "the doctrines of devils."

(8) The language of Leo here is too clear for its meaning to be perverted even by Jesuitical skill: "No private person may arrogate to himself the *office* of judge which Christ our Lord has bestowed on that one *alone* whom He has placed in charge of His sheep." As the context shows, this word "Judge," as here used is an intransitive verb, indicating a person in an office or holding the position of Judge; in this sentence, Leo gives the whole world to understand that the Roman priesthood, because of ITS "sanctity," is above the laws of every country, and that *no one* can sit in judgment on a priest, because Christ has committed to him, the pope, the sole right to be the judge in such cases; the next sentence deals and refers specifically to those who are "subjects" of the pope under the priest and bishop, and warns: "Subjects should be admonished not rashly to judge their prelates even if they chance to see them acting in a blameworthy manner. . . . Should . . . the superiors really have committed grave sins, their inferiors . . . ought not to refuse them respectful submission." Only a rudimentary knowledge of grammar is sufficient to recognize that as used here the word "judge" is a transitive verb, passing over *from* the *person*, considering his *act*.

Leo does not use the word *accuse*; but his language when analyzed proves even stronger than my question: before you can *accuse*, it is necessary first to "judge" (v. t.) by what you know or have seen that your grounds upon which the *accusation* rests are tenable; so we see at a glance that, as Roman Catholic laymen can *not* "judge," they are naturally estopped or barred from *accusing* a priest.

To paraphrase Leo, the teaching here is: although a priest may have committed a grave sin, laymen would be rash to notice it, because in so doing, they are "judging" the *acts* of their superiors and thus not only refusing them respectful submission, but are acting in disregard of REASON, as the pope only has the right to REASON for them.

I do not think there is any doubt left as to the meaning of what Leo teaches—and what seemed "pertinent at first blush" has been strengthened by the second.

I pause here to call attention to the papal characteristic shown in Farrell's effort to twist and pervert the use of words in the effort to conceal what he did not want to reveal.

If any doubt of Leo's teaching above remains, the *Motu Proprio* Decree of Pope Pius X, October 9, 1911, would clear it away. Said he: "We determine and ordain that whatever private person, lay or cleric, man or woman, shall, without obtaining per-

mission of ecclesiastical authorities, cite to lay tribunal and compel to appear there publicly any ecclesiastical person, either in a criminal or civil case, will incur excommunication." (A decree *Motu Proprio* is the most forceful document a pope can issue.)

Where the Roman church bows in submission to civil law in English-speaking countries, it is from expediency; no where in the Canon Law of the church is the *right* as such recognized for a layman to hale a priest before the courts, as Pius X shows; therefore, while the church destroys both the laws of God and man to protect the "sanctity" of the marriage CEREMONY, the layman can not under the laws of that Italian institution protect the SANCTITY OF HIS HOME against the pope's priests!

(4) Oh, yes; knowing that "the church" is the pope, and having the history of the popes, I know they were *very* human—in fact, more human than divine; so also are all the laws which they made. The priest who really desires to live according to the Word of God knows that the devils in hell could not invent a more cruel torture or promulgate a more dangerous doctrine than to say a priest shall not marry, then place him daily in the confessional with the Moral (?) Theology of Dens and Liguori, to discuss matters which even in his preparatory studies Dens admits will cause "pollutions"! Paul says that "evil communications corrupt good manners." The Master taught His followers to pray, "Lead us *not* into temptation." The "writings of the holy fathers" admit that the confessional *leads into* temptation: IS THE ROMAN CHURCH DIVINE OR HUMAN? If a doctor's prescription kills instead of healing, it is the wrong prescription; if the pope's church leads into temptation instead of from sin, it is not Christ's church; and if not Christian, it must be pagan, and no pagan should be a citizen of this Republic.

If the pope uses every known remedy to prevent his subjects from knowing both good and evil, why does he not apply a certain, positive remedy to his priests *and make it physically impossible for them to "go wrong"?*

Augusta, Ga., Nov. 14, 1917.

Dear Sir: Your Question 24 assumed that Catholics are forbidden "to discuss or study, independently of priest-censorship, any subject relating to religion, morality, etc."

(1) I answered that we are not so forbidden, and you are "amazed," you say, because Leo XIII forbids Catholics to read books defending heresy or schism or attacking the foundations of religion.

It is your idea, then, that the only way to study religion, morality, etc., is to read books attacking the foundations of religion or defending heresy or schism? If you profess a religion (I can not judge from your paper), do you deem it necessary to deny or doubt it in order to dwell on its mysteries and its truths?

If you profess a religion, you must either believe it or doubt it, and if you doubt it you can not profess it very sincerely. But if you believe it without a doubt, you are in the same attitude as Catholics, who can not be benefited through the doubts of others.

(2) My answer to 24, therefore, is not inconsistent with the rules of the Index which you cite and it fully answers your question.

JJF/MC

Very truly,

J. J. FARRELL, Mgr.

COMMENT

The object of Question 24 was to learn on what basis Catholics hoped to establish peace with non-Catholics, when the church of Rome forbids its members to discuss or study, INDEPENDENTLY of PRIEST-CENSORSHIP, any subject relating to religion, morality, ecclesiastical history, etc., as these subjects embrace all that is worth while among people, for it is obvious that if they as laymen are barred from exercising THEIR OWN REASON AND MIND in these things, there would be no ground upon which LAYMEN could meet non-Catholics; Farrell flatly entered a denial, saying (1): "I answered that we are not so forbidden," then rambles along, grumbling about what he perhaps thinks I ought to have said and what he thinks was my "idea."

I was "amazed" at Farrell's answer—not Leo—where he denied a FIXED LAW OF HIS CHURCH—denied the faith again. He repeats, in this letter: that Catholics are not forbidden to pursue an independent study of the subjects enumerated; I remain amazed with his answer, coming as it does from one who claims to be governed by the tenets of the only church established by Christ—and if I understand anything at all about the Christian religion it prohibits deceitfulness. The rules of the Index have been in force many centuries, and instead of a bald denial, Farrell should have cited an authority for his answer destroying Leo's Decree and the Canon Law which forbid Catholics to read or even have in their possession any UNCENSORED book that treats of "Holy Scripture, Sacred Theology, Ecclesiastical History, Canon Law, Natural Theology, Ethics, all writings treating of religious or moral subjects." This is a question of law and fact, and is established as clear as the noonday's sun, yet Farrell disputes it.

(2) Is my question fully answered? If Jesuitical evasion is an answer, yes.

Augusta, Ga., Nov. 14, 1917.

Dear Sir: What you say of the Jesuits under 22 is subject to the same comment made under 21.

Really, there is no longer much excuse for well-informed persons to take seriously those writers of fiction who exploited "diabolical Jesuitry" a few decades back. The verdict of enlightened scholarship, since the opening of the Vatican archives to the public by Leo XIII, has everywhere discountenanced them. His-

tory is now seen clearly to condemn them. Judicial decisions have been pronounced against them, among which one of the most notable is the case of *Vaughn vs. "The Rock,"* in which the defendant newspaper was convicted in libel for publishing some of those old fictions that you have been taking for true.

I refer you to the record of that case tried in a Protestant country before a court where Judge, Jury and Counsel were all Protestant. You will find some first hand information there that will surprise you.

Very truly,

JJF/MC

J. J. FARRELL, Mgr.

COMMENT

When it comes to trying a case in our courts involving a priest of Rome, it seems to be a joke. In such cases, so great is the political and intimidating power of Rome in America, although so few in comparative numbers, that to convict, guilt must be established to a mathematical certainty and beyond a shadow of a doubt, and even then the thousand-and-one technical loop-holes must also be closed—therefore the citations do not interest me; especially when I know that a priest in Massachusetts only about four years ago kidnaped a girl from the altar-rail of his own church, and ruined her; he escaped the just penalty for his crime against God and virtue through a technicality, when he should have been hanged; also the Knights of Columbus who murdered William Black in Marshall, Texas, who saved their necks by papal influence; also the priest who got on a drunken spree and stabbed an old man to death at the railroad station in Chicago—a Mr. Patterson—the priest was turned loose on the plea of "temporary insanity"; also the case in Minnesota where one of Rome's holy fathers took advantage of a defenseless woman who had shortly before undergone an operation and raped her: she appealed to the courts for justice—after about three trials, she took justice in her own hands in the shape of a Colt's—and sent him along to his popes; special cases tried here in America, I repeat, do not interest me; but the historical, world-wide case tried in a CATHOLIC country by a CATHOLIC PARLIAMENT, the findings of which were sustained by a CATHOLIC KING, does interest me; I refer to the famous "Father Lavalette" case of France, wherein he tried to "do" a certain banking house out of several million francs, pleading certain "technicalities" created in his behalf by the "Constitution" of his order. To sustain his point, the constitution of the Jesuits was submitted to Parliament—a blunder on their part—I will let the Catholic historian, de Cormenin, present the gist of it. On page 393, "History of the Popes," he says:

"The Parliament again took hold of the proceeding, and after some months of inquiries and pleadings, made decrees, which pronounced the doctrines and practices of the Jesuits 'as perverse, destructive of every principle of religion, and even of probity; as

injurious to Christian morality, pernicious to civil society, seditious, dangerous to the rights of the nation, the nature of the royal power, and the safety of the persons of sovereigns; as fit to excite the greatest troubles in States, to form and maintain the most profound corruption in the hearts of men'; it accordingly ordered that the institution of the Jesuits should forever cease to exist throughout the whole extent of the kingdom." Farrell can call his "fiction" if he will; those who "exploited diabolical Jesuitry" had only to "exploit" the findings of a Catholic Parliament. (And even to-day, although France has set up a republic, she forbids Jesuits to enter the country—which means, of course, that the French are not "informed persons," and won't accept "the verdict of enlightened scholarship.") What is true of France is also a fact now, to-day, in Catholic Spain; and what those countries did, one of the rather recent popes did in Rome—ran them out.

The writer of the "Farrell" letters seems to be well-versed in many of the "principles and tenets" of the Jesuit order!

Augusta, Ga., Nov. 21, 1917.

Dear Sir: Regarding No. 21.

(1) You ask me if various things you say in reference to the Jesuits are not true. In the main, no. You hit the truth sometimes, of course, but not enough to give the impression that you have any first-hand knowledge of the matter.

(2) Pope Clement's Brief in particular, *Dominus ad Redemptor*, suppressing the Jesuits, is misquoted, mutilated, perverted past all recognition. (3) The reference to Russia, also, is tortuous, without any mention of the Protestant Catherine's position in the matter, which falsifies the expression attributed to Alexander. (4) And the way you substitute "popular disfavor" for what all first-rate scholars know as courtly intrigue, is—well, noticeable, to say the least.

(5) But in the notion that the Jesuit General is above the pope and the real head of the Catholic church, imagination runs riot, suggesting the idea of some novelist striving for the sensational and indifferent to probabilities even though, of course, it lacks originality.

In fact, your entire treatment of 21 seems little more than a rehash from Eugene Sue's melodramatic diatribes featuring Rodine in his "Wandering Jew."

(6) Did you not know that is classed as fiction?

Very truly yours,

JJF/MC

J. J. FARRELL, Mgr.

COMMENT

(1) I plead guilty of not having "first-hand" knowledge of Jesuitism—as yet I have not attained unto that exalted (?) mental and physical state of a CORPSE, which is the first qualification for becoming a Jesuit and securing knowledge "first-

hand." It will be remarked that Mr. Farrell (?) says I "hit the truth sometimes" as to the Jesuits; *how does he know*—is he a Jesuit? If so, what sort of conspiracy against the people is the "Laymen's" association trying to palm off, by having a Jesuit at its editorial end INSTEAD of a LAYMAN? If he is NOT a Jesuit, then he has no "first-hand" knowledge of the subject, and can not say anything I have said concerning the order is not true.

(2) Mr. Farrel seeks to mitigate the fact that the order was suppressed, by raising an issue as to the language alleged to have been used in the Brief. To sustain his charge, HE SHOULD HAVE QUOTED the Brief himself; not doing so, his veracity is pitted against standard, accredited historians—and we have seen what regard he has shown for truth, rules of logic, and definition of words: so, the presumption remains in favor of the witnesses I have introduced; any one at all familiar with the spirit of popery knows that when a pope legislates against a person or proposition, he always uses the strongest language in his vocabulary; and surely if an institution was bad enough to be killed, we may look for the strongest language from the pope in the sentence.

(3) Catherine's position in the matter has no bearing on the fact at issue; Emperor Alexander and his decree are what we are discussing, which expelled the Jesuits in 1820, disobedience to which meant decapitation. Here also the presumption is in favor of the use of caustic language. However, the tenor of the language employed, whether mild or severe, does not alter the fact which it establishes—the expulsion—the main point I am presenting.

(4) "Popular disfavor" follows "courtly intrigue" as certainly as decay follows death. "Courtly intrigue" is more damnable to the rights of a free people than an invading army with banners thrown to the winds. "Courtly intrigue" is the polished name for political chicanery; and what is "courtly intrigue"? Let the Historian Nicolini of Rome, Italy, answer: "The Jesuits, by their very calling, by the very essence of their institution, are bound to seek, by every means, right or wrong, the destruction of Protestantism. This is the condition of their existence, the duty they must fulfill, or cease to be Jesuits." Now to "destroy Protestantism" is equivalent to the destruction of all human liberty—as expressed in the Constitution of the United States—and subject the world to popery with its Dark Ages.

Pope Pius IX did not expel the Jesuits from Rome because of their "courtly intrigue." Hear Hon. R. W. Thompson, ex-Secretary of the United States Navy: "Their Society," Jesuits, "was regarded as a cankerous sore eating at the heart of society. They had been driven from every city in the provinces, and were fol-

lowed by a degree of POPULAR ODIUM, which would have dispirited any other body of men. . . . Having found shelter in Rome, they crowded around the pope. . . . At last the measure of popular odium which rested against them became so great that Pius IX was awakened to a consciousness of their dangerous presence, and HE DROVE THEM OUT OF ITALY." This pope reigned from 1846 to 1878. At this period, the temporal principality of the pope was getting very shaky, and the "popular odium" or "popular disfavor" of the Jesuits must have been *very* great among those Italian CATHOLICS for God's substitute on earth to drive from his side a society whose very existence is, to crush popular government by "courtly intrigue."

(5) "Imagination runs riot" and keeps running that way when the tenets and practices of the order are considered; fact is, when one becomes subject to it, so riotous does his imagination become that ever afterward he imagines himself to be a corpse. But to believe the Jesuit General is above the pope does not require a great stretch of the imagination: Leo XIII said that "the weaker power yields to the one which is stronger in human resources," and Farrell knows that the Jesuit order is the strongest factor in the Catholic church; that it is the most powerful in all resources: it is the brains of the church; to it principally has been committed the duty of educating and capturing all means of education throughout the world and to bring the nations to the feet of the pope by their peculiar doctrines, a few of which have been noted elsewhere in these pages.

(6) Truth is, at times, stranger than fiction; for instance, Jules Verne's "Twenty Thousand Leagues Under the Sea" may be classed as fiction, but it presented a very tangible theory which gave birth to the submarine; Sue's "Wandering Jew" may also be classed as fiction—but with history for a background, it seems to point unerringly to a "submarine" influence more destructive of free Ships of State than German submarines to ships of commerce.

By the way; "Farrell" seems to be quite familiar with Sue's works to be a "*layman*"—Sue's works are prohibited by the rules of the Index, and anathema is pronounced against laymen who have or read them!

Augusta, Ga., Nov. 15, 1917.

Dear Sir: (1) Your discussion under 29 might be taken seriously if you had the advantage of knowing anything about the subject, but never having yourself been obedient to the church, you must see that you ought to take the word of her children regarding the obedience she requires of them.

(2) Her obedient children, I mean, not the disobedient. We who try to observe her rules know best whether they are like iron law of the trenches or the gentle sway of the home; and that hun-

dreds of millions yield her faithful, true loyalty, notwithstanding she has no army or navy or peace officers or prisons, would seem sufficient evidence to most men that we love her guide and rule.

(3) That one in a thousand or so deserts her is proof for all that don't, and though it is evident he did not love her, his conduct beforehand is proof as to why. You "defy" me to name an ex-priest or ex-nun she has not branded as wicked. I shall do that when you name one she did not expel because they were wicked. This is the rule. I shall gladly admit any exceptions shown.

(4) Your last paragraph under 29 does not do you justice, for you know Catholics are not given a Catechism and told not to read any other books, but on the contrary are told not to read certain books and are permitted to read anything else, which is precisely the rule of a "well regulated family."

Your best self will not thank your other self for this transparent effort.

Very truly,

JJF/GT

J. J. FARRELL.

COMMENT

(1) It is evidently bad logic to say one must pick up a deadly "live wire" before having the "advantage" of knowing anything about the subject of electricity; for, like Romanism, if you are put within its grip when you can not help yourself, take hold accidentally, or pick it up intentionally, you will know nothing of earthly interest very soon! And I do not have to take the word of her "children," because the greatest of these are the Jesuits, and we know they have become as dead men, all of whom are in its grip; I go to the "power house" and study the nature of that which holds them hard an fast, and its effect upon the children—and among other things I find that in serious matters affecting the faith, practices and claims of the church, the tongues of the "children" seem to be electrocuted—I have reference to these letters from the layman's association as illustrative of the point; I go to the source of power—the laws of the church; all knowledge that the "children" of the church may acquire is available, and more.

(2) In our day, Romanism indeed has "no army or navy," the popes of bygone days controlled and commandeered these; this is proven by the bloody trail of Rome which festoons the pathway of man from the sixth century up to and including the Great War; the "courtly intrigue" of Romanism goes on perennially to that end; and if the "children" are obedient to "papa" they are also striving to the same end. The pope does not maintain an army or navy, but he is rapidly putting his subjects in control of ours of the United States, to be used for him when expedient! As to the "hundreds of millions" who are faithful to the pope, that does not prove anything in favor of the system; for if numbers are to be considered, China, with her four hundred million

Ancestor-worshippers would have the first seat; and no doubt every German subject, especially *officers*, would say that the people love the Kaiser's guide and rule. As to prisons—I will pass without comment the convents and monasteries all over the world, where the civil law is barred—that are closed against inspection; and as Mr. Farrell is a layman, he does not have access thereto, hence can not say whether *they* are prisons or not.

(3) This conclusion will not hold; there was very little difference between the rule of Romanism over its subjects and the Russian Czar over the Russians; the heads of the two systems merely refusing to recognize each other; and the few Russians who "deserted" that country was not "proof for all" who didn't! The Orthodox Catholic Church of Russia did for the people just what the Roman Catholic church has done for the nations that follow popery—kingcraft coupled with priestcraft can result in one condition only. The whole world knows something of "Darkest Russia," from tales told by "that one in a thousand or so" who deserted *her*; and that was not "proof for all" that did not, for few could—Russia had her secret spies and emissaries scattered throughout civilization to deal with a "protesting" deserter—so has the papacy. Some one has likened the priesthood of Rome to a dagger whose points pierce the heart of every country, with the hilt in Rome.

Farrell says when I name an ex-priest whom the church did not expel because he was "wicked," he will then name one that the church does not call wicked. It is a little difficult for a Roman Catholic and a Protestant to agree on what is meant by "wicked." Take Savonarola: he held to all the tenets of popery so far as dogmas were concerned; being one who tried to obey the injunction of Holy Writ to "cry aloud and spare not," raised his mighty voice against what he considered wickedness of the pope and the priesthood of his day; Rome burnt him alive. I begin at the top, and scan the lives of the popes of Rome, and I find that Cardinal Gibbons along with Farrell admits there were a number of "wicked" popes according to the real meaning of the word as it is used in a Biblical sense, and over a hundred of those fellows should have been branded as "wicked" by the church and turned out; but instead the church canonized or made "saints" of some of them; history, written by Catholics, especially in the ages when Rome had no apparent valid reason to believe Protestantism would ever be powerful enough to use it against her, shows that Rome was indulgent to priests and nuns who were "wicked" even as she was to the popes; therefore the fact is disclosed that the Roman church does not consider them "wicked" according to Farrell as long as they remain SUBJECT TO THE SYSTEM and the pope—they become "wicked" only in leaving Romanism; I

will modify that statement somewhat, by saying that also when one becomes so audacious as to learn more than a pope, and lets the pope know it, he is "wicked"—Galileo, for instance. It is true, many of the popes were put out of "Peter's chair" because of their deviltry, but "the church" never "branded" them as being "wicked" and expelled them.

State's evidence is acceptable in all cases; the Roman Catholic murderers who blew up the *Los Angeles Times* some years ago, killing twenty-one people, were convicted on State's evidence. Therefore, I will put up three witnesses who have turned State's evidence—let them speak FOR ALL THE PRIESTS WHO DON'T "desert": they have been "children" obedient to the church, and will testify to what "she requires of them."

Charles Chiniquy was born in the faith, spent fifty years in the church, twenty-five as a priest. Hear him speaking from a "first-hand" knowledge:

"Theology is the study of the knowledge of the laws of God. . . . How solemn were my thoughts and elevated my aspirations when . . . I commenced my theological course of study . . . !

"I supposed that my books of theology were to bring me nearer to my God . . . in their study. . . .

"The principal theologians which we had in our hands were 'Les Conférences d'Anger,' Bailey, Dens, St. Thomas (Aquinas), but above all, Liguori, who has since been canonized (made a "saint"). Never did I open one without offering a fervent prayer to God and to the Virgin Mary for the light and grace of which I would be in need for myself and for the people whose pastor I was to become.

"But how shall I relate my surprise when I discovered, that, in order to accept the principles of the theologians which my church gave me for GUIDES, I had to PUT AWAY all principles of TRUTH, of JUSTICE, of HONOR and of HOLINESS! What long and painful efforts it cost me to extinguish, one by one, the lights of truth and of reason kindled by the hand of my merciful God in my intelligence! For to study theology in the church of Rome signifies to learn to SPEAK falsely, to DECEIVE, to COMMIT ROBBERY, to PERJURE one's self! It means how to commit sin without shame, it means to plunge the soul into every kind of iniquity and turpitude without remorse! . . . The truth may be denied by many, but my witnesses are even infallible. They are none other than Roman Catholic Theologians themselves, approved by infallible popes! These very men who corrupted my heart, perverted my intelligence, and poisoned my soul, AS THEY HAVE DONE WITH EACH AND EVERY PRIEST OF THEIR CHURCH, will be my witnesses. . . .

"And let it be remembered that all those abominations have to

be studied, learned by heart and thoroughly understood by men who have to make a vow never to marry! For it is not till AFTER his vow of celibacy that the student in theology is initiated into those mysteries of iniquity." According to the inference of Farrell, Chiniquy was "branded as wicked" and expelled; if Farrell is a layman, how does he know this witness has not told the truth?

("St." Thomas Aquinas, according to the Roman Breviary, required angelic aid and intervention in this matter of celibacy. While in prayer before a cross he was seized with sleep and "underwent a miraculous operation by angels." (?) It is history that instead of using the natural means provided by God for His praise in letting women sing, in the Catholic church choir the Canon Law requires the use of boys "ACCORDING TO THE ANCIENT CUSTOM OF THE CHURCH," that is, it is alleged, mutilate them by a surgical operation, so they can reach the high tones in church songs, "to the greater glory of God"! But we do not know of the church adopting the suggestion toward her priests said to have been delivered by angels, relative to St. Thomas, although he is now the principal doctor of the whole church; an angel delivered the scapular-charm to drive away evil spirits, and the church adopted and kept it up—because it pays—"there's millions in it"; but the "church" did not take kindly to the angelic suggestion as to priests!)

Now I will put a living witness on the stand for the State, Dr. Joseph Slattery, an Irish ex-priest, who is now a member in good standing of the medical profession of Baltimore, Md. Hear him:

"The treatise of . . . Pithou was sanctioned by Gregory XIII, and its teachings are embodied in the Canon Law of the church of Rome to-day. Concubinage is preferred to matrimony."

The theology of Romanism "is the vilest literature that can be published, and that must not only be studied, but read and talked about in the class. It is impossible for anyone to go through a course of it without being corrupted by it.

"One result of this study was the filling of the mind with the most appalling pictures of iniquity, and then you were told to pray TO MARY to remove these infernal imaginations. (*Here, Farrell, is where "imagination runs riot!"*)

"There are good men and bad men in the Roman Catholic priesthood; BUT IF THEY ARE GOOD, they need not thank the Roman church for it."

The late P. A. Seguin's testimony; he was a priest for long years, "deserted" and turned State's evidence: "Catholics say I was put out of the church because I was a bad man. I was born and raised a Catholic; I studied Rome's theology and became a priest! if I was a bad man, I WAS THE LEGITIMATE PROD-

UCT OF THE SYSTEM. The world thought me a good priest until I left the church, then Rome says I am a bad man." (He mentioned *one* priest in Canada who personally accepted and applied the "angelic" suggestion as a means of keeping his vow!)

After many centuries of tyrannical misrule, the Russian people destroyed Russian autocracy—from the wreck, liberty will eventually arise as the bird from its own ashes; after hundreds of years the Latin races are beginning to throw off the "sweet" yoke of papalism, while at the same time the papal cohorts are striving with might and main to keep a foot-hold in Europe, *and concentrating all forces to establish a strangle-hold upon America.*

One of these days the American people are going to make Rome take her Dogmas, Laws and Moral Theology—Dens, Aquinas, Liguori, and the "fathers" along with the Roman Rituals, to the floor of the United States Congress for inspection!

(4) Of course, anyone understands that my language here was figurative—but true in a sense; I know they can read Grier's Almanac, the local paper—if it does not discuss "religion" or allude to the pope in an unpleasant way, etc.; the Catechism is supposed to teach a Catholic all he is to know about religion that the pope wants him to know; beyond this a Romanist can not budge an inch, without the consent of the Roman censor. Anyway, if the principle and fact were restricted to and among Catholics as "a well-regulated family" (by the way; what does a bachelor priest know about a "well-regulated family"? According to logic *a la* Farrell (?) not having a family, his knowledge is not "first-hand" and should be discredited—yet Romanists are willing for priests to state the rule for them to go by). I say, if this censorship was kept among themselves, I would not object to it so strenuously; but after Rome properly "regulates" her "children," she lays it on *their* "conscience" and makes them feel in duty bound to try to regulate others as to what they shall read or hear—even resorting to mobocracy and murder to prevent the pope and his priests from being criticized in print or speech. I say Rome lays the principle on the Catholic conscience: this doctrine is taught in Deharbe's Full Catechism of the Catholic Religion—that one can be guilty of the sins of another, by SILENCE; so, if any one, any where violates the rules of the INDEX to the knowledge of a Catholic, his church teaches that to remain SILENT renders him as guilty as if he had committed the offense against the pope himself. And I lay the principle of that teaching as well as papal moral theology on the heart and conscience of every loyal American citizen.

Any man who follows that Catechism's teaching and would try to prevent a discussion of popery, and does not force the church to let him read Dens, Liguori and the Liturgies, is unfit for

American citizenship—he should be reduced to the status of any other alien. Also any so-called Protestant preacher who can be tolerant of such principles to the extent of letting his people remain in ignorance of them so they will place papal subjects in civil positions, should himself be unfrocked; while any editor of a paper who knows the political aspirations of popery and does not combat it as he would an alien armed invasion, is unworthy to mould public opinion.

In my criticism of Mr. Farrell's answer to question No. 29, it will be seen that my objection to his answer was based on the citation from the bishop's oath, the Canon Law, and the Theology of Aquinas. In the above letter, he is endeavoring to combat my *conclusions*, but does not even mention their *premise*, which was the issue claiming his attention.

He resented the ironical touch in the last paragraph under 29—why did he not discuss the fifth paragraph? He is very verbose in treating points of faith, and such matters that are within themselves secondary and harmless; but when he is asked to explain the laws which teach that papists have the right and that it is their duty to kill non-Catholics, he remains as silent as the grave—absolutely ignores it. As a witness on the stand, he is fluent enough on irrelevant questions; but when direct questions are put, as in No. 13, and presented in criticism under No. 29, he seems only able to mutter "No" before lock-jaw sets in and seals his lips till such pertinent, german facts have been passed!

I most earnestly ask that the criticism under No. 29 be referred to; read it, then read letter above, November 15, 1917—it will be impressive and instructive to note how he treats a question that involves persecuting non-Catholics and taking human life—murder of fellow-mortals, because they refuse to join an institution—the Italian "church"—that can not prove by any rule of evidence that even the pope is a real member of it!

Mr. Farrell does not fail to "call me" if I make an error in a date, or seem to make a technical error in minor matters, but he refuses to perform the self-imposed duty of answering questions pertaining to Catholic faith and practice that involve the lives of others.

Augusta, Ga., Nov. 15, 1917.

Dear Sir: You say my answer to 28 "Is open to several peculiar constructions," and I am willing to agree.

Most anything is susceptible to "peculiar" construction, and the more constructions there are the more *peculiar* some are likely to be.

My answer to 28 is only open to one sensible construction, however, for it is plain on its face;—If necessary to secure redress for a wrong he had done a member, we would prosecute a priest by appealing to the laws of the land.

(1) The word "necessary" seems to frighten you into seeing things. Well, would you prosecute a priest by appealing to the law if that were *not* necessary to secure redress for a wrong he had done you?

(2) Ever hear of that counsel of the Scriptures—"go not to law with thy brother"?

Very truly yours,

JJF/MC

J. J. FARRELL, Mgr.

COMMENT

(1) We meet with the same difficulty here as with the word "wicked"; the answer to the question is to be determined by what may constitute "redress." In my opinion, an adequate redress may require a term on the chain-gang, imprisonment, or a seat in the electric chair; while some may consider the crime amply "redressed" by removing the priest to another parish, secluding him for a season in a monastery (when public scandal attaches to the case), or shifting him to a new field, or to some other country.

Yes, the word "necessary" frightens me into "seeing things" when I view it in the light of Leo's Encyclical, and the *Motu Proprio* Decree of Pius X, of recent date! When a so-called "religion" can not square with Holy Writ, Reason, Common Sense and Human Experience, it must necessarily protect those who propagate it rather than those upon whom it is propagated!

(2) Yes; but nothing there against going to law with "CHILD-LESS FATHERS."

Augusta, Ga., Nov. 16, 1917.

Dear Sir: Numbers 30 and 31 pertain to the same matter and in a general discussion as distinguished from question and answer, should be combined.

(1) Inasmuch as you have devoted so much space to comment on these you must deem them of first importance and it occurs to me they should be given place among those matters to be debated in that meeting at Macon. Unless you object, therefore, we will reserve them for that occasion.

(2) It is only fair to you, however, to say now, that I shall challenge the sense in which you cite Liguori, question your Bauney authority, deny both the teaching and the practice you impute to the Jesuits and demand your reasons and your proofs for the existence of secret Jesuits or Jesuits in disguise.

(3) I shall also oppose your statistics as incorrect, show your comparisons to be illogical and your conclusion unfounded, abjuring as contrary to the truth, the doctrine, the practice, the intention and the fruits you impute to the Catholic church and her people, here and abroad, in politics and war, touching liberty, prosperity and education.

And I trust you will advise me if you have the least objection to including these in the Macon discussion, for if you have, only

say so, as I do not wish anything to interfere with that meeting.

Very truly,

JJF/GT

J. J. FARRELL, Mgr.

COMMENT

(1) Numbers 30 and 31 are important only in so far as they throw light in a general way upon the whole question of papalism. Mr. Farrell disposes of them in a very unique way—consigning them to the “debate,” of which, more anon.

(2) As Ligouri can not be discussed at length in print or in public, but must be confined to the *confessional*, Mr. Farrell would find it rather difficult to sustain his challenge—so we will let that matter stand as it is. He also says he will “deny both the teaching and the practice” I impute to the Jesuits; he speaks as one who has “first-hand” knowledge of Jesuitism, yet he is writing as “Manager” of a LAYMEN’S association—and a “layman” can not know any more about the Jesuits than any one else can learn, and as to his challenge on this score, he can not make good; whether or not the person *writing* as “J. J. Farrell” is a secret or disguised Jesuit priest, *he* would not debate.

As to Bauney: that is merely a paraphrase of the Canon Law, which says: “The Holy Office also declared that it is not lawful for Catholics to be present at the sermons, baptisms, and marriages of heretics and schismatics; *but if they go for some lawful reason*, without any communion *in sacris*, and if such a going is not held to be professing a false religion, it is *in se* an indifferent act.” The law also “forbids Catholics to go to the temples of heretics *for the purpose of assisting at their worship or of hearing their sermons.*” This law is the essence of the Bauney citation.

Mr. Farrell would demand my reasons and proof as to the existence of secret Jesuits. Man alive! The order was given a new lease on life after it had been consigned to the boneyard, because its very nature, as shown by historians, forces it to make unending warfare against Protestantism, popular government, free speech, press, school and conscience. And who ever heard of a “war” where spies and alien enemies did not peregrinate and become as chameleons? The founder of it was a played-out Spanish soldier, and it is but natural that its principles should follow the line uppermost in his mind, incorporating the actuating principles of army usage and custom as to discipline, etc.; hence we find, according to Nicolini, that the Jesuit Constitution, Part VI, chap. I, sec. 1, says: “As for holy obedience, this virtue must be perfect in every point—in execution, in will, in intellect—doing what is enjoined with all celerity, spiritual joy, and perseverance; persuading ourselves that *everything* is *just*; suppressing every repugnant thought and judgment of one’s own, in A CERTAIN OBEDIENCE; . . . and let every one persuade himself that he who

lives under obedience should be **MOVED AND DIRECTED . . .** by his superiors, **JUST AS IF HE WERE A CORPSE, which allows itself to be moved and led in any direction.**" Farrell would demand my *reason*—I offer the above.

Now for proof: Troy fell because of the trick of the Trojan horse. Romanism and especially the Jesuit order would die with dry rot if it did not make war upon everything Protestantism stands for; so we know that if a Catholic can be put in a certain advantageous position "under cover," "all things are just"—"the end sanctifies the means," and judged by all rules of warfare, Rome can be expected to "play the game" this way as well as any other, especially when she has cohorts trained for "courtly intrigue." who are as dead men in the hands of the superior to be placed where he wills, as a soldier under arms. This is circumstantial and documentary evidence, which a layman can not disprove, as he can not know; but here is documentary evidence direct to the point, according to Greisinger, pp. 670-674; France, Austria and Bavaria were all Roman Catholic countries; though forbidden the realm, the Jesuits slipped back under the alias of "*Peres de la Foi*" or "Fathers of the True Faith," while they re-entered Austria and Bavaria under the name of "Redemptorists."

In the war the pope waged against Queen Elizabeth of England to destroy her, by assassination, according to Hume's History of England, two Jesuits—Campion and Parson—were sent from Rome to direct those conspirators already on the ground. They pretended to be Protestants; when Parson reached Dover he wore the uniform of an English officer, and made arrangements for the passage of Campion, whom he represented as being also a fellow-officer.

According to Daurignae, Vol. I, the Jesuits joined the Chinese in worshipping Confucius; in India they assumed the role of Hindu priests.

Proof of this kind could be multiplied, but the above is sufficient.

When pinned down to the doctrine that says no one can be saved who are not members of the Roman church, priests say this does not mean what it says, but that if any one is saved who has not become a member of the pope's church and submitted to his authority, such are Catholic whether they know it or not; and if Rome contends for *that* principle, does it not open the way for me in like manner to conclude that any one—editor, preacher, school teacher, lawmaker or private citizen—who aids or abets or fails to oppose Romanism, is a Catholic in disguise—a secret Jesuit, if you please? This conclusion is so palpably clear, I do not believe any Catholic would question it, as this is their course of reasoning.

But let us hit the nail on the head as to secret Jesuits: "St."

Liguori teaches: "It is often more to the glory of God and the good of our neighbors to CONCEAL our religious faith, as when we are living among heretics, we can more easily do them good in that way; or if by declaring our religion, we cause some disturbance or deaths, or even the wrath of the tyrant."—Liguori Theol., b. 2, chap. 3, p. 6.

(3) Mr. Farrell here proposes a job for his champion in the "debate." I will say here, I impute no fruits to the Catholic people—they are helpless pawns in the game; all my imputations are against the pope and his dogmas, as impressed by the bishop's oath.

The Catholic people are the result of a cause—their general attitude toward all civic reform is based upon the spirit of popery, which is, don't clean up and drain the miasmatic swamp, because it breeds mosquitoes and spreads disease which keeps the doctors and druggists and undertakers busy; Rome does not permit her "children" to take part in general national, state or city moral house-cleaning—because that invades the sacred precincts of the priests; why destroy a vice, if it makes one have to keep in touch with his father confessor? (Elsewhere I have referred to the "children" of the church and the liquor traffic—a damnable business that Cardinal Gibbons has exerted himself to perpetuate; here are more statistics and facts for Farrell to wrestle with in this connection. In the *American Issue*, August 17, 1918, Hon. James A. Collins, Judge of Marion County, Indiana, Criminal Court, who is recognized in Indiana as an authority in the study of criminology, stated in an interview printed in the *Indianapolis News*, as follows: "Intoxicating liquors are responsible for the downfall of 90 per cent. of all men who go behind the walls of penal institutions. The greatest blessing that has ever come to this commonwealth was the enactment of the prohibition law.")

What is true as to Indiana is true of all the States.

The National Enquirer (Prohibition), July 11, 1918, as well as the secular press, carried in part the pastoral letter of Archbishop S. M. Messmer, Milwaukee, Wis., forbidding his priests to assist in prohibition work, on the plea that it is the work of sectarians against the Catholic church: "I hereby positively forbid all pastors of parishes in this archdiocese from allowing any prohibition speeches to be given on any premises, be it for church, the school or a hall." Messmer is in strict accord with Gibbons and the spirit of papalism. Gibbons is the leading prelate of the Roman church in America; if Catholics were in the majority in this country, his authority over them would cause the destruction of every prohibition law on the statute books—therefore, I repeat that the Roman church is opposed to progress, is a bar to Christianity, morality and soberness, and a bane to the general welfare of human society.

The test of the pudding is the eating thereof; a tree is known by its fruit, and the result of an institution's influence upon its own members is conclusive: Romanism seeks to destroy all other churches and secret societies—that necessarily implies she has something better to offer; let us see the criminal record in States where Rome has an average of only 25 per cent. of the population. According to statistics for 1912-1913, there were 28,541 convicts in Arizona, California, Connecticut, New Hampshire, New York and Rhode Island; of this number, 17,007 were Roman Catholics, while 11,534 were from the 75 per cent. non-Catholic population. Unless the SYSTEM is inherently and essentially bad, a crime-breeder, what's the answer to this? And this thing called popery says it alone has the right to the education of our youth! that all education outside of the Catholic church is damnable heresy! this thing says it has the right to use force to enforce its decrees! this thing has concentrated all its voters into one society and using that as a club with which to brain politicians unless they give the "children" of that institution approximately 80 per cent of all appointments—from judges on the bench on down to policemen and firemen, yet rolls its eyes heavenward and with folded hands declares it is not in politics!

The Canon Law of the Roman church declares the pope to be a temporal prince: every Catholic is his subject—and we are letting the subjects of a foreign power get into every strategic position in our nation, whose chief aim is, to inject the virus of papalism into every vein of the State and destroy the government that protects them from the curse and fruits of their own religion! You preachers, editors—Americans, are you secret Jesuits, in league against LIBERTY? If Rome could she would cut the throat of every Protestant preacher in this land, burn at the stake every member of the Masonic fraternity, put the priest at the helm of State and wreck our civilization on the shoals of Romanism. Under the camouflage of Christianity, Rome seeks the destruction of this free Republic as she has wrecked others in the past—and unless the common people meet her at the ballot box and legislative halls, she will succeed. But to return to statistics:

The United States Statistical Abstract, a Government document of 1908, on crime in wet and dry territories, shows one murder in dry to three in wet cities; one arrest for drunk and disorder in dry to three in wet cities; one murder to every 14,518 people in wet cities and one to 44,020 in dry; one arrest to every 92 people in wet cities and one to every 299 in dry; but being taught to hold black to be white and white to be black if the superior authority so declares, priests can say these facts and figures are all lies, and the "children" will believe they are till the crack of doom.

As to priestly denials—Peter began the practice of denying the Christ—the popes took up where he left off and kept it up ever since; even Farrell denied the First Sacrament of his church—Baptism!

Augusta, Ga., Nov. 17, 1917.

Dear Sir: (1) You should not object that the church "is governed largely by expediency in the matter of enforcing her laws"; it was written by St. Paul that "all things are right, but not all things are expedient."

(2) When you say "laws relative to faith," however, you should know that laws relate to conduct, not to faith. Truths relate to faith, and in her teaching of truths to be held *de fide*, the church is always and everywhere the same. Here the church is seen in her divine character, indefectible, incorruptible, infallible, as her divine Founder, Jesus Christ, wished her to be.

(3) In her laws and disciplinary regulations, and in the conduct and practices of her children, we see an organization which, though great and wonderful, full of wisdom and sanctity and love, is human in its workings, and because she is human in these respects and must work through human agents, to attract to a better life human souls, she is, as far as she may be, like St. Paul, who was "all things to all men."

(4) These words of the Apostle show one note of the church, her Humanity; his words, "if an angel come down from heaven were to *teach* a doctrine contrary to what I teach, let him be anathema"—these show the other note of the church, her Divinity. Jesus Christ is a divine Person, with two natures, human and divine, which were essential to His mission in the world. His church must be a divine institution, and also, have two natures, in order to carry on the mission which He began.

(5) What you criticize, therefore, as reprehensible, namely, the church's regard for expediency in the enforcement of her laws, is really one of the distinctive merits which in common with the Apostles she shares.

Yours truly,

J. J. FARRELL, Mgt.

COMMENT

(1) From further consideration of the matter, it seems the church is governed *absolutely* by expediency instead of "largely." The difference between the expediency of Paul and that of the Roman church is as great as the difference between light and darkness—and the "letter" of the law is liable to kill. Where Paul was governed by expediency, it was for the benefit of his weaker brother, as in the matter of eating meats that were offered to idols; it was lawful or "right" for him to eat it; but if in doing so he should become a stumbling block to some one else, then to him it was not "expedient" or "profitable"; the Roman Catholic church reverses the sense in which Paul used the term, but in this that institution is true to its principle in magnifying the "letter" of the law while destroying its "spirit"—which is not according

to the true precepts of the Gospels. As a follower of Christ, all things were right for Paul that were right for Christ or that did not conflict with His laws and precepts and where the exercise of such right did not hurt his brother or cause him to offend; Rome considers "*all things are right*," or, "the end sanctifies the means," provided it does not hurt the church, with outsiders.

Mr. Farrell's argument shows how papalism perverts even the Holy Scriptures, and why she keeps subjects of the church from reading or placing a private interpretation on them, but must accept their meaning as interpreted by the "holy" popes.

An individual Christian, like Paul, may be governed at times by expediency in his personal activities, which is concomitant with a free conscience and display of individual, independent reason, as for instance, a Protestant preacher may deem he has the right to go into a Catholic bar-room and preach Christ or exhort—but he would not perhaps deem it expedient, in which case, as in that of Paul, expediency determines an individual act which in itself could NOT affect the LAW under which he was serving, but becomes a matter calling for personal judgment as to what is best under certain circumstances. Nowhere in the Bible is there the least intimation that any tenet of the Christian religion is contingent upon expediency; for if it was, that very fact would reverse the whole order of things, and in its final analysis render Christ subject to the will of the devil; light would be dispelled by darkness, and truth be overcome by error.

Paul knew it was "right" for him to eat meat, if he wanted it; but his weak brother, shortly removed from paganism, did not believe it should be done—so Paul did not consider it "expedient" to eat; we see Paul again—he is now standing upon the stairway of a castle with an angry mob surrounding him (typical of some of the mobs of Romanists in America); now the principles, the Law and the Gospels and tenets of Christianity were to be decided by him—his very life as well as all he represented was in the balance; did Paul then resort to the "expediency" enjoined by the great Catholic Doctor, Liguori, and "conceal" his faith among "heretics"? No! Like a true soldier of the cross he "gave a reason for the hope" that was within him, and presented one of the greatest examples of Truth's victory over Error the world has ever witnessed.

(2) Truths as revealed by God's Word relate to faith in His Son; but we are discussing popery now, and I mean just what I say. "Faith," declares the Word, "comes by hearing," while the so-called faith in the Roman church comes from *pope-made* law and decrees, where the "children" get it as they do citizenship when born; hence, being born in the "faith" of Romanism, and with all laws being framed to keep them in, it is not erroneous to say that laws relate to faith in that system.

Farrell says that in "her teaching of truths to be held *de fide*," that is, as a matter of faith, "the church is always and everywhere the same." If popery could substantiate this claim, there would at least be a shadow of truth to the claim of being Christian; but let us see if the pope's sifter will hold water:

If Romanism is the true church of Christ and has the right to exclude every other religion from the world, then its unity must extend to *all places and all ages of its existence*. Those things which were essential at one time, must be so at all times. Does Rome present a history of unbroken unity in matters *de fide*? If not, then, "smash!" goes her claim.

The Greek church is a "split" from the Roman; the doctrine of Purgatory has never been known in it, was very little heard of in the papal until the twelfth century, but was made a matter of faith, *de fide*, in 1458—so for fourteen hundred years under the popes the Catholic church had no Purgatory; but in the midst of the Dark Ages the pope made this dogma an essential of salvation to Catholics. IS "she everywhere and always the same?"

In the fifth century after Christ, the doctrine of Transubstantiation (turning pancake into God) began to be discussed. In the ninth century, such eminent Catholic scholars as Bertram, Scotus and the Archbishop of Metz were against *reviving* the discussion. In the time of Eutyches (A. D. 50) transubstantiation was *rank heresy* in the Roman church, while about the middle of the eleventh century Berengarius was condemned as a heretic for *approving* it! In this matter of faith, a man would be burned by the church for heresy for believing in transubstantiation, while his grandson a few years later would be burned as a heretic for NOT believing in the dogma! IS she always the same, everywhere, in matters of faith?

For almost two thousand years no anathema was hurled against the intellect that did not believe in the Immaculate Conception—to-day the pope will "cuss you out" of the church as a heretic if you refuse to believe it! Where's her boasted "unity" in matters of faith?

A variation in essential doctrine will destroy unity: the Council of Sirmium, under Pope Liberius, adopted the Arian creed of "half communion"—people eating the bread, priests drinking the wine—which was later abandoned and declared heretical, but finally adopted as now used. Where is unity, and the presumptive *infallibility* of popery in defining matters *de fide*?

"The church is always and everywhere the same," says Farrell. History records how papal armies moving on papal money, under papal officers, ravaged papal countries, butchering the "children" of the church; especial attention is called to Pope Julius II, at the dawn of the sixteenth century, leading in person his soldiers

against his "children." In front of Ravenna a French cardinal was fighting in the front ranks, while another cardinal was as furiously assailing him from the ranks led by the pope. A combination of spiritual and carnal things, which destroys the boast of Christian unity.

Unity which must be maintained by force may be unity—but not *Christian* unity. Bellarmine, in Book 3, chap. 22, on the Laity, declares "as the church has ecclesiastical and secular princes, who are her two arms; and therefore when her right hand is unable to *convert a heretic* with the sword of the spirit, she invokes the aid of her left hand, and *coerces heretics* with the material sword," proving the efficacy of this means by saying "for the Donatists, Manicheans, and Albigenses were routed *and annihilated* by arms." (The pope secured "unity" of faith here, in obedience to the "letter" of Christ's "must," by destroying those who did not accept his *de fide* definitions!) If Rome *ever* used force to maintain unity, it is not Christian unity, and Farrell's boast dies; not only is history replete with evidence of such efforts to maintain unity, but the principle is in the fundamental law of the pope's institution, to be applied the day it becomes *expedient*. Is that Christian unity?

From the pope on down the line including the newest "convert" to the "true" faith, a binding oath must be sworn! "The unity whose bond is in official *oaths* is not the unity of Christ."

Paul was willing to "become all things to all men," like his Master; he taught that his body was the temple for the indwelling of the Holy Spirit which would prevent him from becoming anything incompatible with the One who commissioned him to teach; while he, in ignorant zeal, persecuted the Christians even unto death, after his conversion he would not again commit murder or be a party to it, to "attract to a better life human souls," as Italian popery teaches; he would not, in order to win some, deny his Christ, as Farrell denied Baptism, and as the Catholic priests did in India and other pagan lands. Paul "became all things that he may win some"; that is, as a member of the Jewish Sanhedrim, being learned in the law, he could become as Jew to the Jews and preach Christ to "win some"; as a free-born Roman citizen, he could stand before Agrippa the King of the Romans and become as a Roman speaking to Romans, to "win some" to Christ. He never sneaked in among any people under disguise and become as their pagan priests in an effort to make them Christians without their knowledge or consent by baptizing them secretly, as did papal priests!

I will admit that the Roman church, having a human head, is absolutely "human in its workings," but its record of fifteen centuries of turmoil and bloodshed, being "human in these respects

and must work through human agents" will not "attract souls to a better life."

I do not think Paul would become an advocate of the liquor traffic, as Cardinal Gibbons—the business that is the parent of the brothel, gambling den and dance-hall, misery, degradation, ignorance, crime and vice, that he may "attract some to a better life." Paul would not set up the confessional "to win some" and destroy many! An agent of the devil will sponsor these things that he may "attract some" dollars to the coffers of popery by direct gifts from such institutions of crime, and the rich harvest in the way of taxes reaped from "absolutions" and other papal graft levied on the people for their sins; the more sins committed, the more business for the "human agents" of the pope!

The devil could quote Scripture even to Christ—but He would not let him INTERPRET it for Him!

(4) The Roman church, in its faith and practice, reminds one of the story, "Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde," in its faith and practice; Christianity as the Rock of Ages—changeless.

While Christ took up His abode among men, His human nature was manifested only by His expressions of joy and sorrow, hunger, thirst, weariness, etc.; He never partook of the Original Sin of Adam's race—He did not have to repent; He came to pay man's debt for sin—to redeem HUMAN nature, and had He been possessed of that human nature Farrell seems to imply, HE COULD NOT HAVE PAID MAN'S DEBT, and set the captives free.

(5) Paul never resorted to expediency in enforcing the laws of Christianity as laid down in the Bible, neither in regard to the work itself, or his relation thereto; he would not deny his faith, as the papists do, not even to escape persecutions and stripes and dungeons; his mission was to preach Christ and Him Crucified, leaving the results to God; had the human nature of Christ asserted itself when before Pilate, there would have been a different story to tell—by papal *expediency* He could have escaped Golgotha.

Christ was hungry—his human nature called for bread; the devil suggested that He turn stones into bread and eat: He had the power, the craving, but His divine nature refused to heed even a suggestion coming from the devil; again, the devil tried to resort to expediency to gain submission, suggesting that if the Master would cast himself as a human being from the highest pinnacle of the temple, the angels would preserve him from hurt, which would be a great *miracle* in the eyes of the world—and submission to satan; the proposition may have appealed to the purely human nature of The Man, but not the spiritual. What a contrast here of the Christ and the Roman church with her lying wonders and miracles!

Farrell says that "the church's regard for expediency in the enforcement of her laws is really one of the distinctive merits which in common with the Apostles she shares."

Christianity is governed by PRINCIPLE.

Romanism is governed by EXPEDIENCY.

Christianity is anchored forever to the Rock of Ages.

Romanism drifts with every variable wind of papal dogma!

Christianity says, "Render unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's, and unto God the things which are His."

Romanism says, "Render unto the pope the things which are of the world, and he will take care of the things which belong to God."

Augusta, Ga., Nov. 17, 1917.

Dear Sir: Your notion of the *Ne Temere* Decree is laughable. Whatever made you imagine it is retroactive in effect?

By the way, have you read this decree? Of course you have not, or you would not have perpetrated that "retroactive" bull. Only, one would think that before venturing to construe a writing or to fathom its intention, or to analyze its bearings on "social, civic, commercial and political life," or to draw parallels from internal disturbances of foreign countries to illustrate its workings, one would at least read the thing.

One ought to do this as a matter of caution if not of conscience, for it is a decided advantage to know what one is talking about before one talks too much. For example, had you read the *Ne Temere* Decree, these words would have arrested your attention—"Decretum quibus sponsalium et matrimonii disciplina in posterum regetur"—Decree by which the discipline of engagements and marriage is to be regulated in the future.

This is the official text with the authorized English rendering. I imagine you are just game enough to join in the laughter.

Very truly,

J. J. FARRELL, Mgr.

COMMENT

Mr. Farrell says my notion of the *Ne Temere* decree is laughable; well, let him laugh, for he has had very little to appeal to his risibles, so far! But let us see.

The original law as to marriage as adopted by the Council of Trent (a council called to try to "reform" the papal church at the time of The Reformation), Sess. xxiv, cap. i, reads: "Those who attempt to contract matrimony otherwise than with the presence of the parish priest . . . and before two or three witnesses, the Holy Synod makes them altogether incapable of contracting, and declares such contracts null and void."

The Decree *Ne Temere* is a document which in a general way enforces the above LAW, which had not been put in operation in all the American States until it was published in 1908, and was in effect retroactive in that it *presumed to abolish marriage as*

provided by the civil law of the land, and was retroactive in effect right here in Macon, Ga., where a Catholic man on his death-bed required his wife to submit to re-marriage after living together under civil marriage fifteen years; retroaction is a practice not unknown to popery: Hildebrand's decree, demanding priestly celibacy, applied to the men who were later to become priests, while those who were married had to forsake wife and children; the pope had the remains of John Wycliffe dug up, brought before a solemn council and formally tried and convicted of heresy, and had his bones consigned to the flames—some retroaction which "is laughable."

In declaring he is God's vice-gerent, the pope claims jurisdiction over all men, especially all *baptized* persons of any and all denominations called "heretical," and that he has the right to use force to secure their submission to his decrees; and while the *Ne Temere* decree of Pius X may in itself be an order respecting marriage in the future, *said decree does not nullify the Canon Law* as in part above set out; it is merely an order requiring the observance, in part, of the original law; and when I refer to the *Ne Temere* decree I have in mind more especially the Tridentine Law.

The marriage law of the Roman church is retroactive in effect in all things that it touches. In a famous legal case in Georgia, the late Hon. Judge Emory Speer disqualified as presiding judge, because Roman Catholicism was at the bottom of the case, and he had a Roman Catholic wife—its effect was retroactive.

It is retroactive in effect in that when a non-Catholic marries a Catholic, an agreement has to be signed pledging not to interfere with the free exercise of faith of the Catholic, pledging that all children from the union shall be brought up in the Catholic school and religion; this is retroaction personified in that it swears away from the child that which God decreed thousands of years before it was born—a personality, and the right to a free mind and conscience.

This decree is retroactive in effect, in that if any one should presume to marry without the presence of the parish priest, such would only be legalized concubinage, while the fruits of such union would, according to the law of the church, be bastards, which would leave the children of parents married before its promulgation in a very unhappy plight in the eyes of those coming afterward!

It is retroactive in effect, in that all those who are related to a Catholic feel in duty bound to maintain "peace" in the family, not only permit such Catholic relative to enjoy the "faith," but must assist in all things as far as possible to propagate it, or surrender their principles by not resisting popery in general, which tends to

destroy liberty and progress, and the fundamental principles of the American Government.

If anyone now feels inclined to laugh, I am just game enough to join in. Did Mr. Farrell know what *he* was "talking about" when he denied Baptism? And has he, in any one of his letters, shown any desire to assist one to know what they *ask about*?

Augusta, Ga., Nov. 19, 1917.

Dear Sir: You say that a leaflet I sent you quotes Cardinal Antonello, Prefect of Rome, in reference to the *Ne Temere* decree. (1)

(2) You did not know, of course, that Cardinal Antonello (or Antonelli), Prefect of Rome, died almost a century before the *Ne Temere*, in 1811, while the last cardinal of that name died in 1876. The leaflet quotes Antonelli in reference only to civil duties, and the *Ne Temere* reference is wholly apart from that subject, is in separate quotation marks and on the opposite side of the page.

(3) Your quotations from Leo XIII in this connection are beside the question. He did not issue the *Ne Temere*. Cite Pius X or Benedict XV and you can get somewhere. For the *Ne Temere*, you should remember, is not a dogma but a discipline, which does not involve the infallible *magisterium*; therefore, it dates from the date it is given and is only as broad as it says.

(4) But it says, in the words and figures which follow, that "Non-Catholics, whether baptized or unbaptized, who contract among themselves are nowhere bound to observe the Catholic form of betrothal or marriage." *A catholici sive baptizati sive non baptizati, si inter se contrahunt, nullibi ligantur ad catholicam sponsalium vel matrimonii formam servandam.*)

(5) If this decree is not satisfactory to a non-Catholic, then, it must be because he wishes Catholics bound to observe a form of marriage to suit him; what do you say?

Very truly,

J. J. FARRELL, Mgt.

COMMENT

(1) As will be observed, there is a cut-off rule closing the discussion of Question 32 at that point; what follows, are notations as a sort of appendix. It will also be noticed that where I refer to Cardinal Antonello, I do not mention the *Ne Temere* decree at all.

(2) As every paragraph on the leaflet in question is in "separate quotation marks," and at the bottom of each side is printed "over," and as the name of the cardinal is appended at the foot of one side, this seems then on its face to be an effort to mislead. However, the name is immaterial; the statement as to marriage which it contains is placed against the statement of Leo XIII, as to marriage—the slip, a nondescript, unsigned statement, against a pope!

(3) My reference to what Leo said deals with the *original* Canon Law of the church on marriage. No reference in this note is made to the *Ne Temere* decree, which subject came to an end with the rule under 32. And those notes speak for themselves; the *Ne Temere* may be a disciplinary measure or order as to marriage, but it is based upon the dogmatic decree of the Council of Trent, on which Leo based his position in his Encyclical cited—which can not be changed.

Mr. Farrell says: "Cite Pius X or Benedict XV and you can get somewhere. For the *Ne Temere*, you should remember, is not a dogma but a discipline." (A discipline relating to a dogma.) Marriage having been made a sacrament in the papal church, is a dogma, and Romanists are taught that it must be contracted according to the law of that church to be "lawful"; and a disciplinary measure, like the *Ne Temere*, is only to indicate to what extent, at different times and places, the LAW itself is to be observed; therefore, I can get beyond "somewhere" by citing THE LAW instead of any decree by Pius X or Benedict XV, unless they should issue a "*Motu Proprio*" decree ANNULING the original LAW, which has not been done up to this time. Citing from that *original* Canon Law, the following makes the subject clear; says Taunton:

"(2) Marriage, according to Canon Law, can exist in three states:

"(1) Natural marriage, which is formed between persons UNBAPTIZED and bound by no civil laws.

"(2) Civil marriage, which exists between persons UNBAPTIZED but living under civil laws.

"(3) Ecclesiastical marriage, which is between BAPTIZED PERSONS" (all non-Catholic Christians are "*Baptized Persons*") "or between persons one of whom at least is baptized. This marriage is defined: 'A sacrament between baptized persons by which a man and woman, capable by natural and ecclesiastical law, are, with mutual consent, bound by a single and indissoluble matrimonial contract.' By the institution and will of Christ *the contract and the sacrament are inseparable*. Hence, what is **WRONGLY CALLED CIVIL MARRIAGE**—that is, a marriage which is contracted in defiance of the law of the church" (as among Protestants) "*which profanes the nuptials consecrated by Christ, LEGALIZED CONCUBINAGE, and attempts to destroy the sacramental nature of the contract*—IS ALTOGETHER UNLAWFUL, as being against the very essence of matrimony among BAPTIZED PERSONS. This does not mean that the State, as at present constituted" (that is, while separated from the papal church) "can not lawfully make such civil laws as are necessary to secure those civil effects of the matrimonial contract which

now are beneath its laws. *But it can not LAWFULLY make any statutes which destroy the nature of the sacramental contract or impede the JURISDICTION OF THE CHURCH in sacred matters,*" p. 422. This is but a paraphrase of the law on marriage adopted by the Council of Trent, which declares that marriage contracted otherwise than in the presence of a papal priest is null and void.

The canon law on any subject is superior to a decree issued relative to its enforcement. For instance, the canon law declares the pope is *Bishop of all baptized persons*, and that he has the right to use coercive measures to secure submission to his jurisdiction; whether or not he may deem it expedient to issue a decree relating to this right as *Bishop of all Protestants*, does not affect THE LAW—it is unchangeable; likewise, in regard to marriage, being bishop of all the baptized, they are all subject to his law concerning matrimony; and if he does not exact such observance by "ALL the baptized" it is merely because "the State, as at present constituted," is a barrier, which has the effect only of preventing the papal church from enforcing all her rights, which rights the pope merely holds in abeyance or suspends until the reverse can be instituted.

In stigmatizing marriage under civil law as "LEGALIZED CONCUBINAGE," indicates that Leo XIII understood the fundamental law of his institution relative to any subject, upon which everything contained in his Encyclical Letters were based.

The following is quoted from the "Manual of Christian Doctrine," pages 494, 498:

Qu. "34. What right does the civil power possess in regard to marriage?"

"It has *no right* except over the civil effects of marriage; that is, it has NO CONTROL except over the SETTLEMENT of the PROPERTY of both parties, the succession of the children, and other like effects that pertain to its authority. BUT IT HAS NO RIGHT EITHER TO DECLARE VALID A MARRIAGE THAT IS NULL IN THE EYES OF THE CHURCH, or to pronounce null a marriage that is really valid."

Qu. "46. When did the new Marriage Legislation according to the decree of the Congregation of the Council go into effect?" (*The Ne Temere Decree.*)

Ans. "It went into effect Easter Sunday, 1908.

"50. What, then, do *the faithful* need to know about *present* marriage legislation?"

Ans. "1. NO marriage is VALID unless it is performed by a priest duly authorized, and before at least two witnesses; 2. A marriage performed between two Catholics, or between a Catholic and a baptized non-Catholic, by a civil magistrate, alderman, notary public, or Protestant minister, IS HENCEFORTH NULL AND VOID; 3. No marriage is *licit* or *legal* unless performed by

the pastor of the bride or a priest designated by him or the bishop of the diocese."

The Canon Law of the church and this papal school book teach that *no* marriage is lawful or valid unless it is contracted before a papal priest. Protestant marriages are considered only as "a custom" allowed by civil law, or "legalized concubinage," which means that the laws of the land are not recognized by papists, who are taught to look upon non-Catholics as practicing "legalized concubinage"!

Being an institution actuated entirely by "expediency," the pope can issue a decree to *fit any* circumstances over which he has lost control, as a means of eventually *regaining* his "rights." If I, being a *baptized person*, and baptism *per se* makes the pope *my* bishop, then *any* law to which a Romanist submits is equally binding upon me, the only difference being this: the Romanist acknowledges such jurisdiction, while I repudiate it; the law of the papal church says that the State "LEGALIZES CONCUBINAGE" which "IS ALTOGETHER UNLAWFUL," in not forcing me to go before a papal priest to be married.

If the pope issues a decree saying that such-and-such law is to apply ONLY to ROMANISTS in certain sections of the world, that decree proves TWO POINTS: First, in obeying such, a Romanist *acknowledges* the legislative and directive power of the pope over his mind and conscience; and second, that the pope can just as easily, when it may seem expedient, withdraw the regulatory DECREE and enforce the ORIGINAL LAW, and, with the threat of excommunication, force all his subjects *throughout the world* to take steps to put it in force, just as the Catholic priests and bishops in Ireland pledged the "faithful" of that land to resist England in the Great War, *such resistance to take any form necessary to render the attitude of the Catholic church's political activities and plans in Ireland effective*. Therefore, we are to judge the Roman church by what its laws give it the right to do, and not by any decree modifying their observance for the time being; so, also, this rule applies to a member of that church: *he is to be judged by what his church-law requires of him* when "expedient" and not by what he is or says he is while awaiting directions from his pope. Being made by law, he is governed by law; this is plain, logical, and conclusive, and nothing a priest or bishop or cardinal may say can alter a law of the church; in Protestant lands, they may say they acknowledge Protestant marriage as "legal"—never that it is "lawful"—but what they say and what the law of the church says must be in harmony, to be true. This principle applies to EVERY law of the Roman church; and as the pope can dispense with the observance of *any* law for what he

may consider a "just cause" for the present, so he can also enforce *any* law when in his judgment it can be done.

No doubt this is why Priest Phelan declared that the Roman Catholic church would give no bond for its "good behaviour." And why John Wesley said no Catholic should be given the rights of citizenship in any country not Catholic.

(4) This paragraph shows the sifting sands upon which the Roman church stands, and destroys its boasted "unity." Marriage, being made a sacrament in that institution, is something essential to salvation; and by implication, in letting the Catholics of the United States go on centuries without requiring them to go to the priest, says that in Spain Christ demands one thing as necessary to eternal life, but in America another. It may be laughable to recall that when the pope ordered the *Ne Temere* to be enforced in this country, he sent the same order to Germany; that Government gave him about forty-eight hours to withdraw it—and he withdrew! One man-god backing another man-god off the board! The law as to marriage was applied in some cities, in some states. The decree of the Council of Trent has been in force in some American centers long before Pius X or Benedict XV were born; in New Orleans, San Francisco, part of Utah, Santa Fe, Vincennes, St. Louis, St. Genevieve, St. Ferdinand, St. Charles and other cities.

This authority of the pope to issue a decree putting in force, little by little, laws that were adopted back there in the Middle Ages is a menace to any country not Catholic, and a curse to countries Catholic.

By a decree, a pope can upset the whole scheme of Catholic existence, as there is nothing fixed that he can not change, if expedient.

(5) What do I say? This: if a pope after hundreds of years can put into effect and force a law that was made in the ages of the world's darkness under popery, he may as expediency dictates attempt to enforce some of the other laws *and devastate this fair land with human blood*—therefore, Congress should pass an Act making it treason or a felony, punishable as such, *for anyone to practice a law in America, or propagate it on any subject, if it is not in accord with the Constitution of the United States.* If Congress will *not* act, then it is up to the several Legislatures; if they will not act, *then the question is up to the people at the ballot box* to keep Romanism out of touch with politics and law-making and administering laws and educational institutions of the country. For according to Canon Law, the pope is a temporal prince, hence his followers are subjects of a foreigner—and we are granting them what we refuse any other sovereign or king on earth: the right to dual-citizenship and allegiance.

Augusta, Ga., Nov. 19, 1917.

Dear Sir: You say "Hildebrand, in the fourteenth century, passed a decree that forced priests and bishops to put away their wives and children—although he kept his concubines."

(1) But Hildebrand lived in the eleventh century, not the fourteenth, and conciliar decrees of celibacy had been passed many centuries before that, beginning with the Council of Elvira, in 295, followed by Ancry (314), Rome (386), Orleans (438), Tours (567), Trullo (692), and others, long before Hildebrand's time. You ought to get at least the main facts right.

(2) "—although he kept his concubines." I am sure one ought to excuse even a gratuitous libel like this, if one knows how, but when a great historical character is conspicuous for a splendid virtue, the wilfulness that imputes to him a contrary vice seems excusable gross, and one must leave the author of that invention to his own defense.

(3) Some care should be exercised even when attacking popes, if not for the sake of truth, then, lest malice betray ignorance.

Very truly,

J. J. FARRELL, Mgr.

COMMENT

(1) A clerical or typographical error in copying or printing is seldom a grave matter; Gregory VII, or "Hildebrand," was pope from 1073 to 1085. The fact that many efforts were made at different periods covering hundreds and hundreds of years to keep priests from marrying tends only to accentuate the purely human origin of the law which finally culminated in being written in the Canon Law at the Council of Trent. Priest and people must believe in this law as a matter of faith—and there was no unity in the church as regards the question of priestly celibacy for many hundreds of years; it required a decree of Infallibility for the pope to quell the voice of dissenters among the "faithful"—even then hundreds of the "fathers" at the Vatican Council in 1870 withdrew rather than be a party to such legislation, which gave the pope *the iron grip of authority*. And I believe I have *the main facts right*.

(Referring to errors: did Mr. Farrell really mean to say "excuseable gross"?)

(2) Eminent historians are responsible for the history of the popes; their word to me is at least as good as Farrell's! But history is not given the whole burden of proof; I will turn to the Canon Law of the church, and see if it does not seem to lay some foundation for the "presumed" facts of history.

According to the law, a "cleric" is one "removed from secular cares and business, and especially devoted to divine worship or service . . . the lower order of the clergy."

By common law of the church clerics are forbidden:

"(1) To cohabit with persons of the opposite sex, except SO

FAR AS THE LAW OR LEGITIMATE *CUSTOM* ALLOWS."

A cleric is exempted "from all power and jurisdiction of secular courts," except in English-speaking countries (because such have no agreement, yet, with the pope to the contrary).

It's a well established maxim that "The servant is not greater than his lord," and if the *law-giver* issues this license to *clerics* where either law or custom allows, and if his power and influence is such as to *establish* law or custom, would it be illogical to say that the *servant* shall enjoy what his *lord* denies himself?

A system that, when necessary, requires one to believe black is white, or white black, at the will of his superior authority is the answer to this paragraph.

(3) Farrell will admit that the Theology of the Roman Catholic church either makes a priest a saint or devil—popes were priests first, with a full knowledge of *theology*; and Hildebrand is said by historians to have been one of the most famous or infamous of the bad popes. The French Catholic historian, Louis de Cormenin, gives him considerable attention, citing other historians as his authority. Why does Farrell show white-heat here at the recital of *Gregory's* history? Cardinal Gibbons, as well as the Catholic Encyclopedia cited by Farrell, says there were *several* bad popes—"wicked" popes—and as all popes form one unbroken, successive chain from the Apostles, supposed to have been chosen by the Almighty as His substitutes on earth, we look on the word pope as being the head of the Catholic church—his name or the age in which he served not being considered, and what one did a thousand years ago or what one does to-day is the "pope"—the OFFICE. The Vatican Decree of Infallibility, it is contended, merely announced a fact to the world that existed from the beginning of the church, *i. e.*, that all popes and councils were infallible—that necessarily eliminates the INDIVIDUAL, and creates an OFFICE as continuous as that of the Christ, which has the effect in fact as if the pope of to-day had served in that capacity two thousand years—anything short of that conclusion, to ascribe to each separate pope a personal, individual existence as having lived at any specified time, would wreck and break down once for all the papal successorship of the Apostles, and destroy the claim of infallibility. I think an intelligent Romanist will agree to this. Now to the point: to admit that the HEAD of the institution, at any time, was BAD, proves either that Christianity *per se* is bad, or that papalism is not Christianity. (The Christ said, "Call no man father"; is Rome obedient to this in letter or spirit?)

Catholic historians admit and charge that many popes were bad—can bitter and sweet water flow from the same fount? Can a tree bring forth good and evil fruit? If a pope is bad, is he not

the fruit from the tree? And if they were bad, how could they lead others to a "better life"?

Isn't it a peculiar fact, that many Catholic men will take the name of God in vain hundreds of times a day, yet to speak lightly of a bad pope in their presence is equal to flaunting a red garment in the face of a male member of the bovine tribe?

Augusta, Ga., Nov. 20, 1917.

Dear Sir: You say the law of God must be in "FULL" force at all times, in ALL places, under all circumstances."

(1) Agreed. But your "divisional difference" will not hold—that before Christ the "LETTER of the law was sufficient." Abraham did not comply with the LETTER when he was sojourning with his wife abroad, nor Jacob when he secured his father's blessing, nor Moses when he slew the Egyptian, yet were all these good men and blessed.

(2) On the other hand, Moses, though following the letter, did not obey the spirit in striking water from the rock, and for that he was denied the promised land; and the ancient writings are full of instances where one in expressive parlance tried to "put one over" on God, but failed to "get by" with it in the end. It was true then as now, "The Spirit quickeneth."

(3) Nor is it correct to say, as an irreformable and universal principle, that, since Christ, "both the letter and the spirit, at all times, in all places and under all circumstances, must be obeyed," for the two not infrequently stand in contradiction when it is impossible to observe both. "Thou shalt not kill" is just now rather a dead letter for the embattled hosts of the world.

(4) You know, Christ said the Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath. It is very much the same with other institutions, only one must know what one is about before one starts to plucking things by the roadside.

Very truly,

J. J. FARRELL, Mgr.

COMMENT

(1) My "divisional difference" will hold; Farrell is just a *little* confused in his theology. Abraham or Abram (to be correct) lived in the Patriarchial period, when each man was the high-priest of his own household; Jacob and Moses also lived in this period: Abraham was living 900 years *before* God gave man the LAW; when Moses slew the Egyptian, he was living in the pre-law period, hence *neither one of them* could violate the "LETTER" of the law, *for they did not have it!*

(2) Here, now, we have Moses *under the law*; and here again Farrell runs amuck with his theology. Moses was not obedient to the letter or spirit of the law. God said to Moses, "Speak ye unto the rock before their eyes; and it shall give forth its water," but "Moses lifted up his hand and with his rod he *smote* the rock twice." In *striking* the rock, he was taking upon himself the power which God was to display before the people, by causing the

rock to obey Him through His *servant*. Neither was this command a Law, but the directing Hand of God preserving His people on their journey, which ended with the transaction. He was told to "speak" to the rock, and in no wise was he obedient to the letter or spirit of the command in striking it; otherwise he would not have suffered for disobedience, the consequences of which were more serious than killing the Egyptian, without the law. (It would be well for Romanists to consider this incident; Christ said that if He were lifted up, He would draw all men unto Him—His commission was, Go preach the gospel—"speak" to the rock; the efforts of Romanism to force people into what she terms His kingdom at the point of the sword or with fire-brands, using every imaginable instrument of torture that expediency may permit, is "striking" the rock—presuming to assume the divine office of the Holy Spirit, whose work it is to take the gospel message from the servants and plant it as living water in the hearts of men. Christ's "must" is to be left to the individual conscience—no pope is given the right to use the sword to drive one into Christ's kingdom!)

(3) The letter and spirit of "Thou shalt not kill" are not only *just now* a dead letter in the scheme of Italian popery, but has been a rather distinguishing characteristic of it almost since the sixth century. Many of the great wars since the dawn of Christianity, including the present great war, can be traced directly or indirectly to popery or the *principles* which papalism stands for; and just what will be the fate of soldiers who kill and are killed in battle to protect their own homeland, flesh and blood from the invader, can be only a matter of conjecture; the same principle applies in civil society when a jury finds one guilty and exacts the death penalty: is the sheriff or the jury murderers—have they violated the spirit or letter of the Law? All human society is supposed to be patterned after that law and order which obtains in the Great Beyond—God cast the devil and many angels out of His realm for disturbing its peace: in like manner, a free people enact certain laws defining where the rights of one end and those of another begin, and he who oversteps such defined rights must suffer for it; Rome teaches this as a "perfect society"; so as to nations in war the same principle, I believe, obtains; anyway, God is a God of Mercy as well as of Justice—and He loves mercy, and one thing is certain, regardless of the final fate of soldiers, the "divine right" theory that *brings on wars will make popes and kaisers form the very mudsills of hell.*

In the Great World War, the world has the evidence that the pope and kaisers worked together—the sword of the kaisers being used to extend the "spiritual" (?) domination of popery, while the pope's secret spies no doubt assisted the kaiser that he may set up a commercial world-supremacy under the pope.

It is thought that the concordat signed by Crown Prince Ferdinand of Austria and the pope to ram Romanism down the throats of the Serbian people, which was the beginning of the Great War, will prove the death-warrant to papalism.

As the world settles down after the great battle to count its dead; as the crippled go hobbling by; as the widows' tears flow, and fatherless children cry from want and grow up bereft of that love, care and protection which was theirs by natural right; as the chair by the fireside remains vacant while millions of mother-hearts bleed and break listening for the foot-falls that will never be heard; as little sisters, brothers and sweethearts weep and sigh for absent ones; as the whole world looks upon the bodies upon the battlefields;—I repeat, after the last great battle and all the world settles down to a sober mood, every one of God's creatures who have suffered from this Great War, along with the blood from many battlefields, will stand as one mighty monument with one voice crying to Almighty God to blast popery and "divine right" puppets from the face of the earth! The sight of every Romish pagan temple of idol worshipers will but kindle afresh the wrath of an outraged world! Every priest and other garbed agent of popery as they move about as dark spectres, on the streets, on the movie screens, but reminders of the world's arch enemy! And every "Angelus" that rides the sound waves of God's ethereal blue as but the death-knell to peace, righteousness, and human happiness!

(4) So! Farrell admits his theory as to the Sabbath—that is, the interpretation required by his church, is applicable to "other institutions"—and so I understand! We go to Spain—after the priest has edified his parishioners in the confessional and a sermonette on Mary, along with creating and eating his God, then he can go and engineer a bull fight for the entertainment of the "faithful" on the Sabbath if he so desires; *or anything else.*

This admission also calls to mind the Canon Law above cited as to clerics cohabiting if "law or CUSTOM" allows.

One does not have to study very tediously to learn that CUSTOM MAKES LAW with the ROMAN ITALIAN church. This explains why nothing but a chaingang sentence could make the pope's subjects in Macon obey the prohibition or Sabbath closing laws of the State—the custom where they came from, or the religion they adhere to, commands their attendance at mass at day-break perhaps, after which the rest of the day can be devoted to money-making or anything else. (Just note how many papists keep their business going every Sunday in your own city!)

If many people in a community keep concubines instead of wives, it becomes a CUSTOM, hence equal to being the law, as in Mexico!

And this is the institution that stigmatizes our public schools as "godless" and strives to get our children under its "moral" theology!

And, strange to say, there are many so-called Protestants helping it along!

Augusta, Ga., Nov. 20, 1917.

Dear Sir: (1) Here are the "Divisional Differences" between the time before Christ and since: The spirit of the Old Law was Justice. The spirit of the New is Love. "Without charity I am nothing," says the Apostle.

(2) Speaking of the Catholic church, Draper, the Protestant historian, said: "From her central seat in Rome, her vision goes out to the world, her heart takes in the world, and in all the world there is not a man too obscure, too lowly or too desolate for her protecting care."

(3) Can you visualize that picture, taking in the long, long vista, with its many lights and shadows, reaching back through nineteen hundred years?—See the millions who have worshiped at the shrines in this perspective, and the millions yet unborn who shall come to worship there?—Hear them all, except the wicked, never cease to bless the hour they first learned to call her Mother in their prayers?

(4) And, then, talk about the cruelty of the Catholic church to her children? Man, you do not know her as a friend knows, but as an enemy imagines her to be.

Yours truly,

J. J. FARRELL, Mgr.

COMMENT

(1) It will be noted that I have seldom, if ever, raised a strictly theological question as such; where referred to, it has been in connection with certain principles and laws of this Government which it requires Catholics directly or indirectly to oppose. So, when Mr. Farrell brings forward matters that have no direct bearing on the thirty-two questions (for the Jesuitical purpose of leading me away from the direct issues, that he would not discuss—which is clear all through his letters, and is the Jesuit principle), I will be pardoned for discussing "religion," I am sure.

The actuating principle of Christ's teaching is Love. "Without love, I am nothing." In 1 Cor. chapter 13, Paul defines love. So imbued was he with that Christian requisite that he said if the eating of meats offered to idols caused his brother to offend, he would eat no meat. As a Christian (Christ-follower) he could not afford to do anything as an individual or as a teacher that would cause the less learned or one weak in the faith to stumble, therefore he was careful not to do what was really harmless in his desire to win men to the Christ-standard: we turn now to the oath Roman Catholic bishops swear when they are "consecrated" (to

the service of the pope), and we hear him say, "I will, to my utmost power, *persecute and wage war* with" all who refuse to submit to papal *authority*. (Note: In the Canon Law Taunton says the pope permits bishops in England to omit that part of the oath "Persequar"—*perhaps* he does; but the copy of the "Pontificale Romanum" I have bears date "MDCCCXCV": 1895, and if it is not effective in England, why should it be effective in America? in Spain? or anywhere in the world? And right here I will say in the language of Mr. A. J. Long: "If the bishop's oath does not apply to me as a heretic, it does not apply to any one." (Mr. Long did not offer to take me through his priests' library.) If it applies to any one in the world, it applies to me—for you know "God (1) is no respecter of persons!" As we know, every member of the Catholic church in the various dioceses are under the direction and supervision of the pope through his bishops, who constitute in part the "power" the bishop swears to use when and where expedient to persecute and war on heretics: do we find any resemblance in this damnable law to the teaching of the Christ or any of His Apostles? NO! Contrast Paul's refusal to eat meats, in his desire to keep from the very appearance of evil, so that he could win souls to Christ, with the pope's command for his "faithful" to PERSECUTE and MAKE WAR on those whom Christ died to win, and the monstrosity of the ultra-paganism of the papal thing calling itself THE Christian church will be impressive! Nowhere in the Gospels do we find Christ authorizing His followers to persecute those who would not follow Him! his "faithful" to PERSECUTE and MAKE WAR on those whom

(Protestant England forced the pope to have that oath modified; that's one reason why his subjects in America are trying to foment war between that country and America: keep your weather eye on the "Irish question.")

(2) Draper is correct—regarding those who SUBMIT: Mr. Wm. E. Gladstone was one of the greatest statesmen England ever produced—he wrote: "No more cunning plot was ever devised against the intelligence, the freedom, the happiness and virtue of mankind, than Romanism," while Lord Acton, a Catholic English Peer, wrote: "Pope Gregory XII decided it was no murder to kill excommunicated persons. This rule was incorporated in the Canon Law. . . . Far from being a dead letter, it obtained a new application in the days of the Inquisition; and one of the later popes has declared that the murder of a Protestant is so good a deed that it atones, and more than atones, for the murder of a Catholic." He also said that this rule "appears in every reprint of the *Corpus Juris*" (Code of Laws).—*London Times*, July 20, 1872. (Acton was a Catholic—not a *papist*.)

(3) Yes, I have contemplated all this as far as the finite mind can, "with its many lights and shadows, reaching back through nineteen hundred years." Scientists tell us if a cannon should be fired in a desert where nothing existed to hear or reproduce the sound, *there would be no sound*: there are some nine or ten hundred million Confucianists, Buddhists, Hindoos, etc., who have worshiped at "shrines" to be followed by hundreds of millions more to come who will do likewise—because they have not heard the "report"! If they will not hear, like the Catholic who will not listen, I would not, if I could, be a party to FORCING Christ upon them: "And I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto Me," said the Master; by right living and preaching the Word He is to be lifted up before mankind; it is presumptuous for man to venture beyond that deadline, as it would be invading the sacred precincts of the Holy Spirit whose office it is to woo the heart to accept the message of Glad Tidings—the message of God's LOVE, and if He will not FORCE a soul to accept His mercies, no messenger of Christ will attempt to "round up" a human soul at the point of the sword or with fire-brands to make the sinsick soul "Look and Live," yet this is the irreformable principle of the Roman Catholic church, written in its "sacred" Canons! To this I voice opposition. From a religious standpoint, when I have performed my duty as best I can in holding Him up, my responsibility ceases; certainly God would not have me employ "FORCE" or "PERSECUTE" any one of the hundreds of millions who are bowing at the "shrines" of Mary, Joseph, Confucius, Mahomet; God will take care of them in His own way—if COERCION is used, it must be by Him through His Divine Providence.

(4) Wrong, here! I do not "talk about the cruelty of the Catholic church to her *children*." The bishop's oath is not directed against "her *children*," but those who refuse to become such! And this is the point—the only point. Under the Edict of Nantes, Catholics and Protestants were living together in peace; for the sake of argument, I will say that Roman Catholicism was Christianity, Protestantism heathenism. That edict was revoked: the "heathen" knelt as it were, defenseless, with upturned faces to "Christ" *to be struck in the face with mailed fists*; half a million men, women and children were made to "vanish from the face of the earth" at the hands of the "faithful" children of the papal church—yet Paul would eat no meats offered to idols!

As a dental surgeon I have had many people under the influence of anaesthetics; while in that condition I could have taken out their very hearts instead of an aching tooth, so far as they were concerned—they did not know, and were incapable of offering resistance. While under its influence, many went "wool-gathering"; being for the time mentally deranged their visions were distorted,

which caused them to imagine all sorts of impossibilities: when papalism gets the human intellect fully under its baneful influence, it becomes filled with a superstitious terrorism of purgatory and papal "anathema" in which condition the "faithful" are powerless and must accept any dogma proposed for belief and agree to obey *any command* the pope issues; under that influence their *conscience* prompts them to MURDER "enemies" of the "holy" mother church rather than display the Christ-precept to "LOVE" your enemies and pray for those who spitefully use you! IS the Italian church Christian? If so, in what is it shown?

If all Roman Catholics were to migrate to some far-away country where there were no people but Catholics, and would not admit a messenger of the Protestant faith into their realms, I would then be indifferent to the bloody laws on her books; but they are not all in a far country; there are about seventeen millions of them right here in America—one out of every six in this land—and the laws of the pope decree what they must believe; the laws of the pope say what they must do—when expedient; so, when a Roman Catholic says he will not be obedient to what the pope commands, I determine the truth of his statement by first ascertaining what the pope can command him to do, then learn his present attitude toward the system: as long as one remains within a certain circle, or society, or "church," he is subject to the rules thereof. Not to be obedient to the commands of the pope is to be a heretic—and membership in the Catholic church is *prima facie* evidence that one is no heretic!

Augusta, Ga., Nov. 21, 1917.

Dear Sir: When can one be said to be "outside of the church" and therefore in the way of perdition? (1)

(2) In any authorized Catechism you will find substantially these questions and answers: What is the Catholic church? All the faithful under one head. Who is the Head of the church? Jesus Christ, our Lord.

The catechism teaches also, that the Catholic church is made up of the Church Triumphant or the saints in heaven, the Church Suffering or the souls in Purgatory, and the Church Militant or the Faithful on earth.

Finally we are taught that the Catholic church is the Mystical Body of Christ, of which every human being from Adam to the end of time, who lives a conscientious life and dies in the peace of the soul, is a true member, in Christ made one with the saints.

(3) You see, therefore, that the Catholic church has a visible and invisible membership and it is humanly impossible to know when the dispositions of a man's heart make him a member of the invisible fold.

Very truly,

J. J. FARRELL, Mgr.

COMMENT

(1) I turn to the Catechism by Deharbe, sanctioned by two cardinals as being true doctrine and authoritative. The answer to Question 64 reads: "Every one is obliged, under pain of eternal damnation, to become a member of the Catholic church, to believe her doctrine, to use her means of grace, and to submit to her authority." This language is clear, concise and conclusive.

"Every one is obliged under pain of eternal damnation:

"To become a member"—no provision or room here for an "invisible fold";

"To believe her doctrine"—which is impossible where it has never been heard—as faith cometh by hearing;

"To use her means of grace"—many of which were comparatively recently adopted;

"To submit to her authority"—according to the Vatican Decree.

This is what the "children" study—this is what they are taught—this is what they believe. It destroys much in this letter under consideration; certainly no one up to the time of Christ was "subject to *her* authority."

(2) Mr. Farrell for some reason best known to himself, I suppose, indicates what the Catechism teaches, but does not quote it—is he ashamed or dubious of quoting an "authorized" catechism?

Here is Deharbe: (Qu. 6) "What, then, is the Church even at the present time?" Ans.: "The Church is the same congregation of all the faithful, who, being baptized, profess the same doctrine, partake of the same Sacraments, and are governed by their lawful pastors under one **VISIBLE HEAD, the POPE.**" Of course, to a Romanist, "Jesus Christ, our Lord" and "One visible Head, the Pope," may mean the same thing; but Farrell should state the facts as they are in print, not as he thinks they ought to be in Protestant lands.

On page 18 of the Catechism I find another question of interest: Question "36. Have not the Protestant sects also received their doctrine from Christ Himself, and preserved it uncorrupted?" Answer: "No."

One of the most vital questions to non-Catholics is asked and answered by the Catechism, page 226: Question "29. Which are the Six Sins against the Holy Ghost?" Answer: "1. Presumption of God's mercy; 2. Despair; 3. **RESISTING THE KNOWN CHRISTIAN TRUTH**; 4. Envy at another's spiritual good; 5. Obstinacy in sin; and, 6. Final impenitence."

Now, the Bible distinctly declares that there is an "unpardonable" sin, and that it can never be forgiven—if sin is not pardoned, the sinner will be eternally damned; and we have just read the papal interpretation of what constitutes the unpardonable

sin: *all who oppose popery with pertinacity of will and intellect are heretics*, "3. RESISTING THE KNOWN CHRISTIAN TRUTH." This doctrine puts all non-Catholics out of the pale of God's mercy, hence enemies of God who should be removed from earth by death, according to the Italian religion.

(8) If the doctrine of the papal church was what Farrell here intimates, then in the name of Reason I ask, *why the numberless massacres and murders of those who refused to submit to "her authority"?* They resisted the known Christian truth proclaimed by the pope and—were removed by death, according to the present laws of that church!

I know that the papal church claims everything, from Adam to the toot of Gabriel's horn—in earth, heaven and hell, destroys the Judgment Seat of Christ by vesting the pardoning power in priests of Rome, seating the pope on the Throne of Grace: but it has been quite a task to get Farrell to admit all this in so many words.

"It is humanly impossible to know when the dispositions of a man's heart make him a member of the invisible fold," says the association; if what it says is Catholic doctrine, then the Catholic bookseller who sold me a recent issue of the Canon Law should be prosecuted for selling a book that, according to Farrell, is NOT the law of the church! But the Roman church does not hold or teach what Farrell tells me; like Saul of Tarsus, the laws and decrees of that institution fairly breathe out threatenings against all other baptized people!

Augusta, Ga., Nov. 21, 1917.

Dear Sir: So you think that Catholics are taught from tender childhood that Protestants and all others but themselves are on the way to perdition.

You could not be more grievously mistaken. The charity of the Catholic church is boundless. It extends to all mankind, living and dead. Of no one who ever lived are we permitted to say "He is damned." Judas Iscariot is the only one of the human race whom this broad mantle of charity does not cover. The Scriptures say he is lost.

(1) But does not the church teach the formula, "Outside of the Catholic church there is no salvation," or, as Deharbe puts it, "Everyone is obliged to become a member of the Catholic church under pain of damnation"? Yes, but you should know what is meant by the "Catholic church," and when one is "outside," or not a "member" of, the Catholic church, for here is the nub of the whole matter.

You may see no difficulty in this, but if there were none, it would not be a sin against charity for us to say of this one or that one who died "outside of the Catholic church," that, like Judas, he is lost.

Very truly,

J. J. FARRELL, Mgr.

COMMENT

Having put Mr. Farrell's former letter against his Catechism—which, to my mind, eliminated what he said—I shall try to pass this one briefly, reserving its nullification for another page in connection with what he has a pope say. As to Judas, or who are saved or lost, we are permitted to be as broad or as narrow as the Bible warrants: it says those who believe on Christ shall be saved, those who do not shall be lost.

(1) I know what Mr. Farrell is striving to put in understandable English; what he means to say is, being paraphrased: "Any person, anywhere, at any time, who lives a life acceptable to God, whether pagan, heathen, or heretic, is a member of the 'invisible' department of the Catholic church." Granted, as gospel truth—that is, such an one is a member of the "catholic" or "universal" church of Christ, but in no sense a member of the "Roman" Catholic church. That this is true is proved by the Catechism, which ends the question on that subject by saying, in order to be saved, one must not only BE A MEMBER, but shall ALSO "*submit to her authority.*" Give him all eternity without interruption and still Ferrall would not be able to reconcile this letter, to a "heretic," with the Catechism prepared by the pope for the "faithful."

As an evidence of the disagreement between Farrell's letters and the Catechism, it is necessary only to remember the many centuries that the Italian church employed *every means of torture* to FORCE people to "SUBMIT TO HER AUTHORITY." JUST READ THE CANON LAW, TO-DAY!

Augusta, Ga., Nov. 22, 1917.

Dear Sir: (1) You doubt that a Catholic bishop knows his religion; would you be better satisfied with the teaching of an archbishop or a cardinal?

In 1874, the first Archbishop of America, John Carroll, in answer to a Dr. Wharton, ex-priest who had charged that Catholics are taught that none who are not in communion with them can be saved, which is probably the beginning of that error in this country, wrote the following:

"*Members of the Catholic church are all those who with a sincere heart seek the true religion in unfeigned disposition to embrace the true wherever they find it. The distinction between being a member of the church and in the communion of the church is no modern distinction but the doctrine taught by ancient as well as later divines.*

"What is said," says the Cardinal Bellarmine, 'of one being saved out of the church must be understood of those who belong not to it in body or soul.' It has always been uniformly affirmed by our divines that baptism, actual baptism, is essential to initiate one into communion of the church; but the doctrine is no less uniform, and the Council of Trent expressly declares (Sess. 6,

chap. 4) that salvation may be obtained without actual baptism.

"Thus, then, it is clear that we not only may but are obliged to believe that out of our communion (visible) salvation may be obtained."

Very truly,

J. J. FARRELL, Mgr.

COMMENT

(1) When a priest of Rome attends a papal synod or is ordained he swears that he will "never interpret the Holy Scriptures except according to the 'unanimous' consent of the holy fathers." There are several hundred volumes written by the "holy fathers" at different ages and in various countries, which would require ten or twelve years for a student to learn upon which texts they were "unanimous" and, as illustrated by Farrell's letters in matters pertaining to questions of law and dogma, the student would find very few texts or articles of faith on which the "holy fathers" were unanimous; he would find instead of Christian unity that popes were "damning all" that was done by others, some abrogating all decrees of another, some councils hurling anathema against the pope, popes disagreeing with councils; he would find theologians disputing about this or that dogma, and some "holy fathers" holding with "St." Thomas Aquinas, Bellarmine, and Liguori, that heretics should be killed like wild beasts, while a few teach a sense of toleration—like Fleury, for instance; he would find that one of the holy fathers, a pope, deemed it a sin to be looked upon as the supreme head to lord it over that church: like Mr. Farrell's letters and the Catholic Catechism and Canon Law, there is disagreement without end—consequently few priests ever read the holy fathers sufficiently to know much about what texts of Scripture they really agree on—if any—all this by way of preliminary to my answer *No* to paragraph (1). What a bishop, archbishop, cardinal, priest or layman may say must accord with the LAW AND DECREES of the popes and the past record of the papal church in regard to how they were interpreted and administered, to be the truth in the case!

Deharbe's Catechism, along with the Canon Law and history, settles this question; it is authenticated by *two* cardinals, and was issued according to the "rules" of the Index for the faithful. Leo XIII accentuates and confirms its doctrine as to church membership, saying, "Whosoever is separated from the church is united to an adulteress." *To be a member of that church, or "united" to it, according to the Catechism, requires submission to the authority of the pope*; it seems to wreck the testimony of Carroll and Bellarmine. Christ said, "He that gathereth not with Me scattereth abroad," and "He who is not for Me is against Me"; He was speaking to LIVE people, THEN AND NOW, who should hear Him or His servants anywhere, any time, so the question to

be determined is, Who are working with, or against, Him? In a major sense the answer to this question solves the matter of who are lost or saved—visibly. Is Romanism or Protestantism for or against Him? I will be satisfied with no answer unless based upon the Word. If reason can be convinced that Christ commands His followers to kill those who refuse to “gather” with Him, then Romanism can establish the claim of being Christian; if it can not be done, then the opposite is logically true. Christ taught, among other things, that the tares and wheat should grow together to be separated on the Judgment Day by the Supreme Judge of the Universe, who alone would be competent to decide which may be wheat or chaff, sheep or goats: *the pope would pull up now and consign to the flames what he terms tares—“heretics.”*

I care nothing about the theological hair-splitting of Farrell and his theologians on the question of who may or may not be a member of the visible or invisible church, or whether one can or can not be saved by “actual” baptism, baptism of desire or of blood; if one does not hear Christ, he can not experience either, in which case that question is to be settled by the Great Judge; I am concerned, though, with the teaching of the church, claiming to have the right to remove from the earth by death *those who will not submit to the authority of the pope.*

Augusta, Ga., Nov. 22, 1917.

Dear Sir: Some days since, a printed folder, entitled, “BATTLE AGAINST FREEMASONRY,” etc., came to me in the third class mail, and from the contents I judge that it must have come from you.

As no authorship is assigned to the paper, however, I am writing to ask if you are circulating this folder, and if you are, and the matter is not private, in whose interest you are acting? You will, of course, see the propriety of these questions from one receiving the folder mentioned, and this information will be very much appreciated.

Should you say that you are acting in the interest of the public, would you in that case state whether your object is to stir up the Masons of Georgia an “sic ‘em on” Catholics with a view of “stripping the Catholic church of her faith and practices,” as you say the Grand Masters can do if they will only “issue letters” to that effect, or whether it is to warn the Masons that the Catholics now number almost one in one hundred of the population of Georgia and are rapidly growing, on account of the great ignorance of the people of Georgia, therefore, they, the Masons, must wake up.

In short, assuming that you cannot wish to see ill-will cultivated among citizens for the mere sport of the thing, I am anxious to learn, since you say the Masons in Georgia are so numerous, and, through their Grand Masters, so powerful, if you aim to make their power absolute, so that none can live in Georgia in peace, except the Masons so will.

I await your answer to these questions with interest and expectation, hoping that you will not withhold same through a fear that you surrender anything by being candid and free.

Very truly,

J. J. FARRELL, Mgr.

COMMENT

The folder referred to contained Question No. 4, the association's answer, and my criticism, etc., which was placed in the hands of a number of prominent Georgia Masons; Mr. Farrell does not "call" me on its contents, but desires to know what's the idea.

Incidentally, I may say I was not entirely instrumental in its publication and distribution, yet willing to accept all responsibility therefor, if that is material.

In a periodical called the "Mission Movement in America," published in 1909 by the Roman Catholic University of America at Washington, D. C., the heart of the nation, this statement was made:

"Our purpose is, to make America dominantly Catholic."

In an address before a large audience of Catholics in a convention, Bishop McPhaul said:

"The American Federation of Catholic Societies has been organized to bring the powerful influence of the ENTIRE Catholic church in America against the injustice of the public school system."

(The *injustice* he spoke of was in the matter of levying taxes on Catholics with all others to maintain the free public school system, which Farrell said they *willingly* supported. They "willingly" support free public schools in America just as a man "willingly" supports his wife—where the law makes him provide *alimony*. Catholics contend it is an injustice to tax them for support of public schools, as they pay to maintain their parochial schools; that instead of their paying the State taxes, the State should put papal teachers and schools on its pay-roll. To attempt to operate along this line would mean placing education in the hands of each separate sect, leaving the non-church man to look out for his class, which would mean that education was everybody's business, hence nobody's—and the pope would rejoice for at the last it would wind up by making America what illiteracy has made of Spain, or the Philippines.)

In a speech delivered in Chicago May 4, 1903, as quoted in the *Chicago Tribune*, May 5, 1903, the late Archbishop Quigley, of the diocese of Chicago, said:

"In fifty years Chicago will be exclusively Catholic. The same may be said of Greater New York, and the chain of big cities stretching across the continent to San Francisco. . . . Nothing can stand against the church. I'd like to see the politician who

would try to rule against the church in Chicago. His reign would be short indeed."

McPhaul and Quigley stated the true program of the Catholic church in America—which would indeed "Make America Dominantly Catholic" were it rendered as prepared; and to carry out even in part the program requires the militant, active support of not only the one-in-six Catholic population of the country as a whole, but also the "almost one-in-one-hundred of Georgia," who are required to do what they can, to muzzle the free press especially, so that the above program can not be commented on adversely in any manner; to silence the press is the first number on the program; the next is, cow editors so they will always say something "nice" about papalism, or say nothing at all, and seal their columns against the discussion of any phase of the papal program; I recite one instance by way of illustration: A mob of Catholics, ten thousand strong, assaulted people in Haverhill, Mass., made an attack on the city hall and tried to secure the speaker, wrecked other property, maimed people, hung and burnt free speech in effigy, but not a word about it gets in the columns of the press outside the immediate community, although it was an attack on the Constitutional rights of the people, and was a matter of national interest and concern—as important and serious as the landing of hostile troops on our shores to pull down the flag which is entitled to honor and reverence only as long as the principles safeguarded by it are preserved, yet the press kept silent, but space can always be found to print the views of such papists as Gibbons against American laws and progress, and all other things papal, right in the heart of non-Catholic centers, where there are "almost one in one hundred" only who are interested in papal lore!

Another number on the program is, the attack on the free public school system—a dead press and wrecked free school system is equivalent to "Making America Dominantly Catholic" and prevents anyone from ruling against the Catholic church.

The papal program was prepared with painstaking care, and being rendered effectively in part. Long ago, we learn of papal priests in India—it required considerable effort for them to conceal from the people that they were really what they were—foreigners: to-day, in America, they are having the same difficulty: to prevent the people from knowing that they are really what they are, foreigners to everything American, they have assumed the camouflage of "Laymen's Association" under which disguise they hope to ply their nefarious trade of papalizing this country, by slipping up on the blind side of Protestantism. In all this grand papal program, however, no provision seems to have been made to dispose of, or take into account, the spirit of free, Ameri-

can manhood. Cripple or destroy our leaders, kill every natural agency through which a free people expect to defend and maintain their freedom, if they will; that only means the beginning of the fight, when every individual will constitute himself his own captain in the fray and direct his "fire" in the ranks when and where he chooses.

Freemasonry, as far as I have observed, squares with human reason and the Word; being "square" it can not be driven into a round hole, therefore must be "extirpated." Masons generally do not know the "intention" of papalism regarding the order, and this is also true relative to Protestantism (the papal cohorts have admirably concealed from the people that the papal church is foreign in every sense—in fact, comparatively few Protestants even know the difference between Romanist and Protestant), because if Masons or Protestants were to discuss these things in the press, the paper would be boycotted, and the proprietor usually goes the way of least resistance; as a rule Americans do not know that the Italian church demands *submission or annihilation*.

Just in proportion as the influence of the Roman church interferes, or attempts to interfere, with the constitutional rights and liberties of American citizens, to that extent will they accept the challenge to defend such rights, and do their duty. Americans never act in matters of importance for the "sport of the thing" nor do they ever attempt to "sic 'em on," but rather make it their business to defend their rights, and will "lead" against the subjects of any foreigner who attempt to destroy their birthright.

Though "almost one in one hundred in Georgia," the head of that institution defied the laws of the State, and its incubus, the parochial schools, does not tend to make citizens who would condemn Bishop Keiley for his attempt to render papal law superior to the laws of the State.

Standing before the world as a "perfect society," with its head in the Vatican, the Roman Catholic church segregates its votaries from the rest of mankind and then demands that the reins of government be placed in *their* hands: the present great war has presented much that is illuminating, which will be taken care of, after it is over! The American people never fail to do their duty—if they are made to see it!

Few people would consider a man sane had he made the assertion several years ago that Rome was strong enough, politically, in America to exert an influence sufficient to bar Masons and Protestants from cantonments where they were overwhelmingly in the majority; that this was accomplished, while Catholicism was recognized and given the right-of-way, yet having only one-in-six of the total population, and through Jesuitical manipulation the eighty-three in one hundred were virtually forced to con-

tribute millions of dollars to the support of Italian popery in its proselyting among soldier-boys has knocked a few scales from the eyes of Masons and Protestants—and they will not grow back!

To establish Democracy in Europe, America is paying the price; to maintain a free, popular government at home, Americans are willing to meet Autocracy anywhere, any time: they will give the "divine right" rulers and advocates the choice of weapons yet come out of the conflict winners!

All of which by way of reply to the above letter.

Augusta, Ga., Nov. 23, 1917.

Dear Sir: Your statement in the folder mentioned in my letter of yesterday, assuming until advised to the contrary that the folder is yours, to the effect that you think of putting our correspondence from the beginning into pamphlet form, attracted me.

This would be quite an undertaking, in a way, involving no little expense, which, if the matter is fairly edited and generally distributed, ought to be borne by both of us, in proportion of course, to the matter each of us put in and the pamphlets each received.

I offer, therefore, if the arrangement and proper redaction of the matter can be agreed on, and a suitable foreword be inserted, with standard references to be made where necessary, that we get out this pamphlet in conjunction, having it include all or so much of our exchanges as either of us wishes to appear and by that I mean all of my letters that either of us wishes to include and *vice versa* as to yours, each bearing the expense of his own matter or in that proportion, each taking half the number of pamphlets agreed on.

In this way the public would get a document edited in a perfectly fair way and presented without that friction that appears to exist when two sides are presented independently, and without that bias that must accompany the presentation of both sides through the partial medium of one.

You might select your own printer to do the work, I would not care about that. My sole object is to have the matter properly presented to the public, so that hurried people will not jump at rash conclusions and reflecting people will not need wait for another side to draw conclusions.

I hope you will accept this offer.

Very truly,

J. J. FARRELL, Mgr.

COMMENT

In answering this letter, I practically agreed to the suggestion; at a later date, however, thinking we may arrange a debate, I wrote Mr. Farrell to the effect that I thought it would be more interesting to have the arguments stenographically reported and printed in lieu of our correspondence. As will be shown by the letters forming part of the Appendix, the "debate" could not be

arranged—why? I believe the letters will answer that question—and along with other letters there from Mr. McCreary, in conjunction with all that have been used herein from Mr. Farrell on other subjects will make clear my reason for not entertaining any proposition from him in regard to joint-publication.

In the above letter Mr. Farrell speaks of “proper redaction” and “standard references”; in the light of his other letters, and those on the subject of debate, will any one say I am uncharitable in asserting that his offer to make “proper redaction” was simply Jesuitism in action attempting to dispose of publication altogether by following the same tactics in this as in the matter of the debate? He wants to insert “standard references”—it will be recalled that all the way through I requested that he prove his answers in each instance by citing what he terms “standard references,” which he persistently and consistently ignored, while those he has used in letters answering my criticisms were incompetent to establish the truth, not being from the highest authority of his church, *i. e.*, from popes and councils: “In the place where the tree falleth, there shall it be,” THEREFORE, WHAT HAS BEEN WRITTEN, IS WRITTEN!

Augusta, Ga., Nov. 23, 1917.

Dear Sir: You might take the position that the teaching of a pope as to whether Protestants can be saved, will alone convince you, so I shall capture that position by immediate assault. (1)

(2) Pius IX in his Encyclical Letter of August 10, 1863, wrote: “Those who live in invincible ignorance (a technical phrase meaning, as Bishop Carroll says, ‘a disposition to embrace the truth whenever they find it’) as regards our holy religion, and who, diligently observing the natural law and its precepts, which are engraved by God on the hearts of all, are prepared to obey God and lead an upright life, are unable by the operation of divine light and grace, to obtain eternal life.”

(3) Is there any further retreat, any other position, you can fall back on? You may say there seems to be some conflict here; but there is none. There seems to be some conflict in Nature when the gentle warmth of spring causes the little buds to open and the bosom of the earth to swell, except the surface of her frozen lakes and rivers and the tops of high snow-capped hills, which, instead of swelling, shrink before the warmth and disappear. But this only shows Nature’s art in adapting herself to *all* life, as without this wise exception the waters of the earth would freeze solid and never thaw.

(4) The church of God, like Nature, is ordained to life. Nothing that works unto this end can be hindered by her law; rather, whatsoever does, is the workings of her law.

Very truly,

J. J. FARRELL, Mgt.

COMMENT

(1) It is not necessary to give this subject much attention. The people of this country are not very deeply concerned with Roman Catholic theology. By way of answer, I may say that Roman Catholicism teaches that some may be saved without having received "actual" baptism—and Protestants who are saved are about in the same proportion. If any one is saved, Romanism claims the credit, which fact is in conflict with the law of "Intention" adopted by the Council of Trent; but a little thing like that does not bother papalism. The Spirit giveth light to every soul; those who are saved are quickened by the Holy Spirit: that is His office, yesterday, to-day and to-morrow; papalism has no more to do with it than Confucius or Buddha.

(2) Several times I have been charged with misquoting. In this paragraph an effort is made by Farrell to quote Pope Pius IX; would it be presumptuous or charity to say he has misquoted? He said he was going to "capture that position by immediate assault," but it seems his powder was wet: did he mean to say "able" instead of "unable"?

If some may be saved under the Providence of God without having heard the Gospel, many more can be saved by hearing; but I am not discussing salvation with the Catholic Laymen's Association of Georgia; my efforts have been directed to ascertaining the moral and political effect Roman Catholicism exerts in America through its followers. To know what is its effect, it is necessary to know the *spirit* which actuates the institution, and that is to be found in the laws and dogmas of that church; afterward, observe Catholicism in action where there is or has been practically no opposition for actual demonstration of its spirit and effect on a country: Wendell Phillips said, "The answer to the Shaster is India; the answer to the Koran is Turkey; the answer to the Bible is the Christian civilization of Protestant Europe and America," and I say the answer to Catholicism is Mexico.

Listen to this Voice as it is wafted down the corridors of Time and catch a vision of the great heart breaking for love of mankind: "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, that killest the prophets that are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together even as a hen doth gather her brood under her wings, and ye would not," then from the endarkening shadows of Roman Catholicism hear the blood-curdling cry of the wolf, Pope Gregory IX, who said he was that "Voice": "It is not fitting that the Apostolic See should withhold its hand from bloodshed, lest it fail in its guardianship of the people of Israel."

What effect has Romanism on the world? What is its spirit? Hear Cardinal Manning, in the *Roman Catholic Tablet*, January 24, 1874, relative to re-establishing the temporal power of the

pope in Europe: "There is only one solution of the difficulty, a solution, I fear, impending; and that is, the terrible scourge of a continental war which will exceed the horrors of any of the wars of the First Empire. And it is my firm conviction that, in spite of all obstacles, the Vicar of Jesus Christ will be put again in his own rightful place, *but that day will not be until his adversaries have crushed each other with mutual destruction.*" There are those who have eyes to see, yet see not; because the papacy does not make a megaphone announcement of its program, some people will never connect it and Manning's prediction with the Great War!

From the Roman Catholic *Western Watchman*, September 3, 1914: "The late Cardinal Rampolla always said that a general European war would undoubtedly restore Rome to the pope. If *Italy* does not get into this war while it is on, she will have to get out of Rome when it is over." (Italy went in on the side of Protestant England, yet papal priests came near stampeding her army at a crucial moment!)

Mr. Gladstone warned the nations of the world against the smooth Jesuitical exterior of the papal system as being pregnant with dangers to civil order; said he: "I am confident that if a system so radically bad is to be made or kept innocuous, the first condition for obtaining such result is that its movements should be carefully watched, and, above all, that the basis upon which they work should be faithfully and unflinchingly exposed." The conduct of the papists of Ireland, Canada, and Australia, in opposing England in the Great War, would not have surprised Gladstone had he been alive: the so-called "Irish Question" is a papal proposition to be used as a base from which to bring on a greater war, among Protestant nations.

Mr. Gladstone is quoted as saying further: "There is a fatal purpose among the secret inspirers of Roman policy to pursue, by way of force, upon the arrival of any favorable opportunity, the favorite project of re-erecting the terrestrial throne of popedom, even if it can only be erected on the ashes of the city and amidst the withering bones of the people. . . . *I do not hesitate to say it is an incentive to general disturbance, a PREMIUM TO EUROPEAN WAR.*"—Rome and Reason, by Sidney Harris.

It is said that "man's extremity is God's opportunity," that is to say, when man has done all he can, then God comes to his aid, while the world's extremity is the pope's opportunity; when it is in the throes of a death-struggle, that's the pope's opportunity to tower above nations, raising his throne mountain high on human skulls.

Mr. Farrell quoted from one of the encyclicals of Pope Pius IX to prove that the papal church does not teach that Protestants

can not be saved. We turn to the CONSTITUTION of that same pope, *Apostolicae Sedis*, 1869, wherein he decreed excommunication against every heretic called by whatever name, which is incorporated in the Canon Law. Those densely ignorant of papalism may have a kindly feeling toward the system because its head said there was some chance under certain conditions for one to be saved without seemingly being a member of that church—while a close scrutiny of the language shows that to meet those conditions makes one a papist—but to the intelligent, the above law by that same head has excommunicated every heretic in the world—they have all been condemned; if they are not executed, they are merely living by grace of the pope, who has taught that it is no crime in a legal sense to kill one who has been excommunicated—therefore the seeming concession in the encyclical in favor of Protestants is completely destroyed.

“Is there any further retreat, any other position, you can fall back on?” asks Mr. Farrell; I have never *retreated*; but, again advance on him with his own DOCTRINE to show that the Catholic Laymen’s Association is utterly false in matters affecting Catholicism, which proves also that the papal church is the enemy of TRUTH and a menace to Christian civilization: I turn to the “Manual of Christian Doctrine,” a Catholic school text-book, and find it is in accord with Deharbe’s Catechism regarding who shall be saved. By way of parenthesis I may explain that all doctrine in the papal church is the predicate of dogmas or decrees, the import of which is explained by the following question and answer from that book:

“14. Do the laws of the church bind in conscience?

“Yes, even as the laws of God,” and that Catholics “owe to them not merely *external* obedience, but an obedience that is *internal*,” p. 235.

It will be remembered that, in a former letter, Mr. Farrell was saying something about what was meant by being a member of the Catholic church, while in the present letter he thinks he is citing competent authority to prove his position in referring to Pius IX, so I will offer the following from the “Manual of Christian Doctrine” to show that it is impossible for him as a Catholic to discuss or defend papalism and to further substantiate my charge that the decree of the Council of Constance, “Keep no faith with heretics,” and the teaching of the Italian church to conceal the faith when among heretics, and to speak with reservation, are all vital principles of that institution, TO-DAY:

Question “45. Which are the errors against revelation?”

Answer: “. . . 2. Protestantism and all the heresies which attack any one of the revealed truths.” (The pope commands belie

in purgatory, the fairy stories in Liguori's "Glories of Mary," scapular-wearing, and the like, to which Protestants object.)

"46. What is the *source* of these errors? (Emphasis mine, as usual.)

"It is the CRIMINAL revolt of reason against the divine teaching; a revolt which is the outcome of the *pretended* RIGHT of PRIVATE JUDGMENT," p. 6. (So, *Protestants* are criminals in the eyes of Romanists—which caused St. Thomas to say they should be removed from the earth by death—and Pius IX has excommunicated them, to be executed when "expedient.")

"14. *Why is it necessary to belong to the church to be saved?*

"*Because salvation outside the church is just as impossible as salvation without Christ.*

"Who do NOT belong to the church?

"Infidels, HERETICS" (Protestants), "schismatics, excommunicates, and apostates do not belong to the church.

"20. Who are heretics?

"Heretics are such as, although baptized, reject one or more articles of faith taught by the church, as Protestants.

"The Greeks and Russians are schismatics.

"Excommunicates . . . They who enter secret societies," pp. 117-8, "Manual of Christian Doctrine."

That language is clear and simple—made so to be easily grasped by papal youth, and writes FALSEHOOD across everything Farrell has said in all his letters on this subject.

The Canon Law teaches that the pope is bishop of all *baptized* persons, which doctrine is paraphrased in this Manual, as follows:

"24. Who are subject to ecclesiastical law?" (i. e., pope's law.)

"ALL THOSE PERSONS WHO HAVE BEEN BAPTIZED AND WHO HAVE THE USE OF REASON."

This takes in every Protestant minister and laymen in America, *if they have the use of reason*, and I hold it to be a fundamental truth that needs not to be argued, that any Protestant who does not *oppose* the Roman church in America as actively as the papists are propagating his tenets is in fact and in deed a member of the papal church, and subject to the pope in all things, and should be treated in the same manner as any other secret spy or enemy.

Paragraphs (3) and (4) were intended to lead me away from my objective—but they don't. I understand Jesuitical subtlety.

When His own people rejected Him, Christ turned to the Gentiles: the wild olive was grafted on the old stock; when papalism turned from Christianity, it was grafted on the old pagan stock, like Ephraim of old, "joined to his idols." With the tender sprigs of Christianity which existed from the days of the Apostles, that papalism could not destroy, Martin Luther replanted Christ's vineyard in the fertile soil of Protestantism to present a bleeding Savior to the world instead of the system which requires a bleeding world for the pope's footstool.

Augusta, Ga., Nov. 24, 1917.

Dear Sir: You will naturally ask, now: What, then, is the advantage in one being a Catholic, if one can be saved anyhow? (1)

(2) A very proper question, my friend; but not for me. Because if I can only persuade you to respect us in our faith, my work is done. It is not ours to make converts, as I stated at first; not ours to raise up doubts in minds at peace or to settle doubts already there. We stand ready to show that citizens of the Catholic faith ought not to be molested or maligned on account of their belief, and only ignorance of what they believe or a wilful purpose to deny them common justice in their own country, can excuse or explain the necessity of their doing this much.

(3) You know well enough, I do not doubt, that Catholics are the original advocates, and exponents, of religious liberty as embodied in our Constitution and laws, which mean, simply, if you are satisfied with your belief and we are satisfied with ours, there is no reason, justice or sense in our trying to stir up dissatisfaction even if we could, and, therefore, the spiritual advantages and consolations in one being a Catholic, from the very fact that this is not absolutely necessary to all without exception in order to be saved, are not proper to our discussion.

(4) Really, our exchanges ought to have been confined all along to such matters as are pertinent to the common life of citizens, and would have been, but for the plain intimation on your part that you intend to take advantage of any irrelevant matter you could twist to advantage in an *ex parte* presentation made to stir up dissension and ill will among citizens, and our whole purpose being to avoid that very thing. I have tried to show your error even in matters not pertinent, assuming that, though not a peace-loving man, you are a self-respecting one who will not knowingly practice deceit upon your fellow citizens.

(5) Through all, and above all, we are only trying that you may understand that Catholic people just like other people, more or less reasonable, more or less virtuous, more or less human, with few of them as good as they ought to be and few as bad as they could be and none as "black as they are painted."

Very truly,

J. J. FARRELL, Mgr.

COMMENT

(1) No, I will not; the thirty-two questions show what I "would naturally ask," while these letters "naturally" show how a Jesuit practices the doctrine of evasion and reservation; whether or not a Catholic will be saved is a matter for that person and God to settle, but what the Catholic is taught to do, as one claiming the rights of citizenship in this country is a matter to be settled by non-Catholics, NOW.

(2) Reiterating the invitation in the "Plea for Peace," Farrell says "we stand ready to show . . ." I sent him thirty-two questions and the only thing he has shown in his letters and answers has been somewhat in the nature of a marathon race to keep from

showing anything. He thinks Catholics are molested and maligned on account of their belief, or a wilful purpose to deny them justice: as long as the Catholic church has a dagger driven into the vitals of Protestantism she is happy in the possession of all her "rights," but the instant you grasp and hold the dagger-hand then Rome howls "persecution!" or that Catholics are "molested and maligned on account of their belief" or that "justice" is denied them and that such is born of ignorance. To change these conditions, papal priests formed the so-called "laymen's" association through which questions on papal faith, practices and tenets were invited. All these letters from Farrell show how cunningly the Roman church conceals its faith from those who ask information, and prove that the organization of that association was for a fraudulent purpose. That the people have been "ignorant" of papalism, I admit!

(3) If "Catholics" were the "original advocates and exponents of religious liberty as embodied in our constitution and laws," their efforts in Congress and in other directions to destroy that provision belies the statement; the school books and Canon Law also belie it; if Catholics ever appeared to stand for religious liberty, it was when there were not a sufficient number of priests to make the opposite effective. In the pioneer days there were few PAPISTS in America; if there were liberty-loving Catholics then, all honor to them; if there are any now, all glory to them: but what an individual Catholic is, when left to himself, and what they are under the direction of "a sufficient number of priests," who are foreign to everything American, is altogether a different question. Lord Baltimore had to be tolerant in order to get a charter for his colony. Compare the number of Catholics with Masons who signed the Declaration of Independence!

(4) This spokesman for Catholics in Georgia says that I "take advantage of irrelevant matter" and "twist it to advantage in an *ex parte* presentation" to stir up ill-will: the average reader, I presume, is as intelligent as Farrell, and will detect the "irrelevant" matter presented—and will also detect the fact that he fails to indicate what constitutes such in my papers! and no one but Farrell will see how I "twist it to advantage in an *ex parte* presentation" when he had my statements before him in which I endeavored to show wherein his answers were not satisfactory; and how can it be "*ex parte*" when he himself closed the correspondence, through which he was making rebuttal, or defense, or explanation—or whatever he is of a mind to term his letters?

A Roman Catholic is such, *only so long as he is obedient to the laws of the pope which create him*; the pope makes the laws that make a Catholic, and all through this discussion I have tried to get Farrell to confine himself to that law, requesting time and

time again that he base his answers on the *law* of the pope, but instead of doing so, he kept away from it entirely—not once did he cite law to substantiate any point he has attempted to make! If criticizing the laws, decrees and dogmas of the pope is “maligning” Catholics; if they can not or will not defend them before the bar of reason, justice and common sense; if they refuse to advance reasonable explanations of them, yet to demand this is “maligning” them, then I plead guilty to the charge—I leave the verdict with the jury: all American citizens.

“—though not a peace-loving man,” says Farrell, “you are a self-respecting one who will not knowingly practice deceit upon your fellow-citizens.” I sincerely wish I could return the compliment. If I have attempted to deceive anywhere in my letters, Mr. Farrell failed to indicate where it occurs; he has not proved me in error in any one material fact—he can’t! If to be a “peace-loving man” means that I must not question papalism and what it intends to do for me and my countrymen, I plead guilty to that charge also. I do not desire “peace at any price.” The trouble with Roman Catholics is, they say we must not only love them and their dog, but also every flea on the dog!

In the Canon Law of the church, issued in strict conformity with the Rules of the Index, under caption, “Pope,” pp. 491-2, sec. 4, we read:

“Canonists distinguish in the pope a three-fold power:

“(1) The power of the bishop of the *Catholic* church.

“(2) The power of the bishop of the *Roman* church.

“(3) The power of a TEMPORAL PRINCE.

“5. . . he has the power, as the supreme legislator, of *making laws and of enforcing their observance.*

“6. . . he can absolve from ANY sin, RELAX VOWS AND OATHS.

“7. . . as the supreme judge himself, *he can be judged by no man.*”

Leo XIII, a recent pope, said: “But the man who has embraced the Christian” (papal) “faith, as in duty bound, is by that very fact a subject of the church as one of the children born of her, and . . . which it is the special charge of the Roman Pontiff to rule with supreme power.” Encyclical, January 10, 1890. The Canon Law shows to what extent the pope is to RULE his SUBJECTS, AS A FOREIGN PRINCE, AS BISHOP OF THE UNIVERSAL CHURCH, AND OF THE ROMAN CHURCH—his rule is absolute, from Alpha to Omega, with papists, and when we have forced upon us the conviction that Romanists are obedient to the pope in the exercise of *all his powers*, in God’s name, should we not ask questions, and DEMAND answers from papal subjects in this country? Farrell says ignorance on the part of

non-Catholics is the reason why it is necessary for him "doing this much"—whatever that is; he apparently resents being called on to make answer at all—and when he does answer, does not tell the truth!

The following is cited from another eminent authority on Canon Law, Sebastin B. Smith:

"203. Has the church the power to inflict the penalty of death? Cardinal Tarquini answers thus: 1. Inferior ecclesiastics are forbidden, though only by ecclesiastical law, to exercise this power **DIRECTLY**. 2. It is **CERTAIN** that the pope and Ecumenical Councils have this power, at least mediately; that is, they can, if the necessity of the church demands, require a Catholic ruler to impose this penalty. That *they* can not **DIRECTLY** exercise this power can not be proved."

This explains in part the desire for union of Church and State.

What is the general relation of the pope to the whole world? In his "Law of Nations," a standard authority for over one hundred years on international law, Edmund De Vattel says:

"There is no middle course. Either each State must be master in its own territory on the subject of religion as on every other, or the system of Boniface VIII must be accepted and all Roman Catholic Christendom be looked upon as a **SINGLE STATE**, with the pope as supreme head, and kings as subordinate administrators of temporal affairs, each in his own province, much as the Sultans were formerly under the sovereignty of Caliphs."

Many volumes could be quoted and considered, but the foregoing is sufficient to prove:

I. Without regard to where he lives, or in what country, a Roman Catholic must recognize in the pope a **TEMPORAL RULER**;

II. The pope, being a temporal ruler, every Roman Catholic in the world, being subject to the pope, is *a subject of a foreign temporal power or kingdom*;

III. The pope alone has the power to make laws by which his subjects in all lands are to be governed;

IV. *He can absolve said subjects from any sin as well as release them from any oath of allegiance to any other power at his pleasure*;

V. Being himself supreme lawgiver and judge, no one in the world—individual, or nation—can sit in judgment upon him, question, or nullify his legislation, which Roman Catholic subjects must maintain and defend;

VI. As supreme legislator for a "perfect society" which is "not inferior to that of the State," *he has authority to use the State, called the secular arm of the church, to enforce his mandates, and it can not be proved that even his priests can not immediately inflict the death penalty*;

VII. Where the various States or foreign kingdoms have no concordat with the pope, he has the right to rule them, *through his subjects therein residing*;

VIII. As "bishop of the Catholic" or "Universal Church," he is not only the head of the Roman, but his jurisdiction extends over all churches or sects called Christian, collectively and individually—all *baptized* persons belong to his spiritual kingdom, hence subject to him and his laws as a TEMPORAL SOVEREIGN.

The Great Preceptor declared: "A house divided against itself can not stand." It will be seen from the above eight counts that no Roman Catholic can appreciate citizenship in any country not under concordat with the pope, yet in America they are holding a double citizenship—and the pope's kingdom is first with them, according to the Canon Law. Catholics say this is "maligning" them; if it is, it is merely holding before them and the world the laws of their pope. If they do not agree with and support them, they are traitors to him; if they are true to the pope, they are untrue to this country: "Ye can not serve two masters," also declared the Christ.

A consideration of the eighth count may throw light on Farrell's assertion that the papal church does not teach that Protestants can not be saved, and is the reason why, in non-Catholic communities Catholics are forced to try to keep other people from practicing what the pope's laws forbid—free speech, free press, etc.

Jesse James was "a law unto *himself*"; he trampled the laws of God and man under his feet; to offer resistance to him, his "laws," or the workings of his followers in their plundering raids—or the failure to assist if required—meant death according to his "decree": any person who assisted him, *either as a member of his band, or through fear or favor*, became himself an outlaw—an unworthy citizen—and the enemy of civilized society.

THE POPE OF ROME DECLARES HE IS A LAW UNTO HIMSELF.

If Roman Catholics know the laws of their church, they know said laws make them wilful enemies of a free, democratic country, and have no right to say one is a "bigot" for opposing them for political place, and their presence in public schools as teachers.

Mr. Farrell says I am not a "peace-loving man." If opposing the pretensions of a foreign power to set its laws in opposition to American law, I must plead guilty to the indictment; even so, I would go no further than prevent Roman Catholics from exercising the rights of citizenship, applying to them only the laws that obtain relative to any other subject of a foreign principedom—make them resident aliens; I would not advocate "removing them

from the earth by death," nor "persecute" them just because they refuse to quit the pope's church. I would not harm any subject of a foreign power—unless said subject evinced a desire to destroy the laws of the country which have made this a better place in which to live than those countries that his kind have made unfit to live in. Farrell no doubt would say he and his church are "peace-loving"—the laws and history of that institution show it is "*peace-loving*": it provides "peace" in the *tomb* for those who refuse to submit to papal *authority* through the "loving" embrace of the "Iron Maiden" and otherwise!

Let us see what Roman Catholicism means where the laws of the pope are recognized:

Dr. O. A. Bronson, a noted Roman Catholic authority, said: "Protestantism of every form has not and never can have any right where Catholicity is triumphant." (It makes Protestants "disappear from the face of the earth.")

M. Louis Venillot, a French Roman Catholic writer who stood high in Vatican circles, said: "Where there is a *Protestant* majority, we claim religious liberty, *because such is their principle*; but where *we* are in the majority, *we refuse it, because that is ours.*" (So commands papal law!)

A few citations from the *Corpus Juris*, the code of law of the papal church, will show where the above papal authorities get their inspiration:

"If any one presumes to keep heretics in his house or lands, or to carry on business with him, he is to be excommunicated," 11 c-8.

"The possessions of heretics to be confiscated . . . even though the heretics have Catholic children," c-10.

The papal church is a "peace-loving" institution! Here are a few citations from the decrees of its supreme legislator, as enforced by puppets ruling under him, establishing that fact (!):

Pedro of Aragon made it a positive law to burn heretics.

Frederic II made it a law in Lombardy that heretics should be burned, or should at least have their tongues torn out.

Burning was prescribed for heretics in France under direction of the papacy.

The Constitution of Pope Pius IX, *Apostolicas Sedis*, 1869, decreed "excommunication *latae sententiae*, especially reserved to the Roman Pontiff against all and every heretic called by whatever name; and also against their believers, RECEIVERS, favorers, and DEFENDERS."—Taunton's Canon Law. Leo XIII, the successor of Pius, taught that it would be *most impious* and *most inhuman* to let people go unharmed who violate what the popes decreed to be truth—and the above laws tell us what he considers "truth"!

Farrell closes this letter by saying there are few Catholics "as

bad as they could be and none as 'black as they are painted'." THE LAW OF THAT CHURCH DETERMINES THE 'COLOR' of a Catholic: if he is sailing under false colors by not being "AS BAD" as the LAW REQUIRES, he should be true to the promptings of his natural instinct and get from under their influence; if he remains in the system, that very fact is an acknowledgment made to the world that he is "READY TO OBEY WHATSOEVER" THE POPE "COMMANDS"—and the pope's laws show what he can and may *command*, when expedient! To remain in that system is to abet the laws, rules and regulations of the papacy, which absolutely disqualifies him for American citizenship.

Augusta, Ga., Nov. 26, 1917.

Dear Sir: In my letter of November 12, I promised to tell you how Catholics are taught to obey conscience in spite of everything in the world.

You may not have known that in 1874, on the occasion of the definition of papal infallibility, Sir Wm. Gladstone, in a pamphlet entitled "Vaticanism," made the charge which you now repeat about Catholics not being in conscience free. In an open letter to the Duke of Norfolk, written in answer to Mr. Gladstone, Cardinal Newman, speaking in particular of the "Authority of Conscience," said: "Conscience is not a judgment upon any speculative truth, nor abstract doctrine, but bears immediately on conduct, or something to be done or not done. 'Conscience,' says St. Thomas, 'is the practical judgment or dictate of reason, by which we judge what *hic et nunc* is to be done as being good, or to be avoided as evil.' Hence conscience can not come into direct collision with the church's or the pope's infallibility, which is engaged on general proposition and in the condemnation of particular and given errors.

"A collision is possible between conscience and the pope's authority ONLY, when the pope legislates or gives particular orders, and the like. But a pope is not infallible in his laws, nor in his commands, nor in his acts of state, nor in his administration, nor in his public policy.

"Since, then, infallibility alone could block the exercise of conscience, and the pope is not infallible in that subject matter in which conscience is of supreme authority, no deadlock can take place between the conscience and the pope."

Very truly,

J. J. FARRELL, Mgr.

COMMENT

Before entering upon a general discussion of the subject of "Conscience" again, I shall attend to the contention of Cardinal Newman. (No doubt Mr. Farrell thinks he has fooled me by citing what some cardinal or theologian said; they all have a right to say what they wish, I suppose; but they are not COMPETENT authority in defining what the *church* teaches concerning any sub-

ject: the pope alone is "competent" authority—why did he not cite from one of them? HE COULDN'T!) Newman said: "Conscience . . . bears immediately . . . on something to be done or not done," and that St. Thomas says it "is the practical judgment or dictate of REASON, by which we judge what . . . is to be done . . . or to avoid as evil." Both citations are correct, as far as they go; but the all-important question to be decided here is, *WHO is to exercise this conscience?* St. Thomas also teaches that "TO REASON it specially pertains to guide and govern . . . it is evident that the *subject* (of the church) so far as subject . . . OUGHT NEITHER TO CONTROL OR GOVERN, *but rather to be controlled and governed.*" Has any one ever heard of a *layman* of the Catholic church assisting in the control or government of that institution—ever exercised Reason in shaping its dogmas or laws? No. WHO, then, controls and governs? The pope; so, therefore, by "judgment or dictate of reason" we are to decide what is to be done or not to be done, but the *ruler* alone can exercise this *reason*, hence conscience, the predicate of reason, as it exists in the Catholic, can be only as that of the one who does the *reasoning*: the pope.

Newman says further that "no deadlock can take place between the conscience and the pope," and I most assuredly agree with him, for it stands to reason that if the pope alone has the right to exercise the reasoning power, and conscience being the result of reason, *there can be no deadlock between the one who reasons and the one who accepts such reasoning.* In other words, there can never be a "deadlock" between the caboose and the engine pulling it! As long as it is coupled to the engine, it will go in any general direction the engine goes: as long as the subject remains subject to papal reason that conscience goes where its "motive-power" directs. A Catholic may not appreciate this, but it is a logical conclusion that he can not refute.

Particular attention is directed to the fact that in no one of the citations pertaining to conscience does Farrell set up the claim that an INDIVIDUAL may exercise the right to REASON, which is necessary to the possession of conscience as an individual.

Mr. Farrell attempts to show that conscience has an elevated place in the papal system not substantiated by evidence; never does he cite an authority that unequivocally and unmistakably gives the *layman* the right to reason; he conceals that fact. And in this he portrays the DOUBLE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH OF ROME!

The word "conscience" is from the Latin *conscio*: *con* and *scio*: *to know*, therefore conscience is capable of great development, which is influenced or shaped according to the environment in which it "learns" or "knows," eventually assuming as a fixed

principle the predominating nature of the influence under which it is developed. So true is this, that a person can be persuaded to doubt his physical senses and say black is white if required by those who were in charge of the process of shaping the conscience, and such person would be *conscientious* according to his conscience, that is, he "knows" what he was taught, although another person may contend that white is white and black remains black, with an absolutely clear "conscience"—knowledge. After a fashion, both would be right; but, to discover the error, if error exists, it becomes necessary to exercise reason: make a personal investigation of the laws by which white and black are created, to have a "conscience" or "knowledge" of what is white or black. A parrot learns by rote what is repeated to it often enough, but a parrot does not *know*—it has no *conscience*—because it can not reason. "Conscience" that flows from the *reasoning* of another is like *music* that flows from a phonograph!

Where one is trained, beginning in early infancy, to believe that some other person alone has the right to direct and control its every thought and act; that even to desire a change from that condition is sinful, it will have a *conscience*—that is, it will *know* what is right or wrong or what it must do or avoid doing—only as it is taught by the preceptor, in which case there is no "self-knowledge, or judgment" as to what is right or wrong, and, without this "self-knowledge," as is evident, one does not *know*, there can not be a true "conscience," and if that person be taught to "harm" or *kill* those who disagree with that system of training, that "conscience" will accept that doctrine as readily as it will believe the priest makes Jesus Christ out of a piece of pancake which he must eat to be saved!

Concentrating every energy and straining every nerve the papal system strives to get control of the child in early infancy and puts it under the influence of teachers who will mold its conscience by papal laws and decrees so that all it ever *knows* will be papal, and all its judgments of right and wrong will accord with papal law. Under this system the child may become a "master musician": for does it not have a "conscience" or "knowledge" of every detail of the workings of a phonograph? Yet, to save its soul from purgatory, could not strike a chord on the piano! And could never join the Great Symphony Orchestra of the Universe to bless mankind.

St. Thomas, to whom Farrell and Newman referred, teaches that the papal institution has the right to remove dissenters from the earth by death; Leo XIII and Pius IX ordered this theology taught throughout the world, and all writers must accept his doctrine as a pattern for all their productions, so what does an individual Romanist *know* what is right in this matter except as

he is taught by the teachers in his church? Nothing—absolutely nothing; he *knows* or has a *conscience* concerning this that the Italian pope says he must have, that and nothing more: if he studies the subject, he must confine himself to those books issued by the papal church according to the Rules of the Index, therefore he is in conscience bound to believe black to be white, if his superiors so define it, to which he must give *internal* assent and *external* respect!

That Newman and Aquinas were not considering laymen at all in the premises—or if so, such was merely camouflage for non-Catholic consumption—is conclusively proved by Pope Leo XIII in his Encyclical on Human Liberty, p. 155 Great Encyclical Letters. After having condemned what Protestants term “liberty of worship,” liberty of speech and of the press, saying “there can be no such right,” he declares: “Another liberty is widely advocated, namely, *liberty of conscience*. If by this is meant that every one may, as he chooses, worship God or not, it is sufficiently refuted by the arguments already adduced.” Again he says “what we are *bound to believe*, and what we are *obliged to do*, are laid down . . . by the Supreme Pontiff,” p. 194. Compare this doctrine with Newman and Aquinas: they all agree on the definition of “conscience.” If, as Leo says, a Catholic is “bound to believe” and is “obliged to do” as he is *directed by the pope*, is it possible for such person to have a “conscience,” which means a SELF-KNOWLEDGE, of what is right or wrong? To me, it seems physically impossible; they may “make music”—on the phonograph!

Newman admits that the pope is infallible only in defining a dogma; that in all else he is liable to err, and Farrell also makes this admission; now, the same body of men composing the Vatican Council who *defined the doctrine of infallibility* as a matter to be believed also passed the decree which gave the pope COMPLETE JURISDICTION and authority “not only in things which pertain to faith and morals, but also in those that appertain to the discipline and government of the church throughout the world”—the decree of infallibility and authority by the same council; the power that created the one pronounced the other, so that when the pope says he alone can determine what a Catholic must do or leave undone, he is exercising the authority vested in him for that specific purpose. To this authority a Catholic must be obedient the same as he must believe what the pope proposes for belief. If Mr. Farrell or any one else could deny this proposition and maintain such denial, it would be giving the pope the right to define a dogma or promulgate a decree without the necessary power to enforce acceptance, which, on its face, would constitute a paradoxical absurdity, as well as make room for liberty of conscience,

paving the way for private investigation and the exercise of independent judgment regarding right and wrong—which would be the end of papalism, as Farrell well knows; hence, *the principle does not exist in that system.*

Those who are in conscience free are at liberty to investigate *any* subject without restraint; if they say white is white, or black is black, the declaration is based upon a knowledge of the scientific principles underlying their production so that they speak with a knowledge of the truth of the subject, being prepared to offer PROOF if necessary. This alone is an expression of a “free” conscience.

When the pope defines a dogma, it is accepted as being revealed by God through the pope, and if any one attempts to violate, destroy or question it, the *disciplinary* power of the pope requires the Catholic, as a matter of conscience, to believe it is “most impious, most foolish, and most inhuman” to let such “go unharmed.” The papal church can not allow the right to accept a dogma but reject authority, because they are interdependent principles essential to the life-principle of papalism.

A conscience that “knows” only what another—and he a foreigner—wants it to know, does not portend good to the American form of Government nor American institutions: the Constitution declares no one shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property except by due process of law, the “due process” being also explained, while the laws of the pope *abrogate every right of the Constitution* and make those rights dependent upon conforming in mind and conscience to the “thought” of a foreign temporal ruler under the guise of “religion.”

Augusta, Ga., Nov. 26, 1917.

Dear Sir: You will say, however, that though not infallible the pope is supreme in his commands, laws, etc., and therefore, Catholics are not in conscience free.

But Cardinal Newman meets this objection in his letter where he quotes Cardinal Gousset's Moral Theology (p. 24) as saying: “The divine law is the supreme rule of our actions, our thoughts, words, desires, all that man is, and this law is the rule of our conduct by means of our conscience; hence, it is never lawful to go against conscience.”

And Cardinal Gousset here quotes the Fourth Lateran Council as follows: “*Quidquid fit contra conscientiam, aedificat ad gehennam*” (He who acts against conscience, goes to hell).

Cardinal Newman adds the following: “The celebrated school of Salamanaca lays down the broad proposition that conscience is to be obeyed whether it tells truly or erroneously.”

He refers to St. Thomas, St. Bonaventura, Cajetan, Vasquez, Durandus, Navarrus, Layman, Escobar, and fourteen others as teaching to the same effect.

Very truly,

J. J. FARRELL, Mgr.

COMMENT

The first proposition claiming attention here is the quotation where Cardinal Newman cites Cardinal Goussset, saying: "The divine law is the supreme rule of our . . . conduct by means of our conscience." WHOSE conscience is referred to, the pope's, or the layman's? I will grant, as the pope alone has the right to interpret and construe the Bible, that he has a conscience "void of offense toward God and toward man" as far as he understands and correctly interprets the Word; but if the reference is even inferentially intended to lead me to believe laymen of the papal church are included, Farrell has attempted to deceive, for, as is well known, the Roman church discourages Bible reading, and even prohibits a priest from interpreting any text according to his private judgment, who swears, at ordination, to interpret the Bible as the popes direct, therefore we see, under the operation of this rule, the consciences of laymen are governed by what the priest says the pope has pronounced to be "divine law." As previously stated, this enables the pope to exercise a free conscience, but as priests and laymen are prohibited by the pope's decrees from exercising private judgment, and interpreting Holy Scripture, how can *they know* what is the "divine law" by which they are to shape their conduct by means of conscience, when the very word itself means *to know*—how can they have that SELF-KNOWLEDGE necessary for one to determine what is good or evil?

If the Bible is the rule and guide by which all men should shape their conscience—and it is—they will not understand or consult it where they are required to accept what another person says it teaches, which precludes the existence of a free conscience. He who accepts that principle is bound to him who acts as sole interpreter, and must depend on him to be ruled and guided. As illustrative of this principle in action, we have merely to consider the Brahmin woman who sacrificed her life on the corpse of her husband, permitting herself to be burnt to death in accord with the dictates of her "conscience"; but hers was not a *free* conscience: what she *knew* was taught by the priest; she was actuated by the "divine law" as it was interpreted for her by the SYSTEM in which she was born. We see this principle in action also in the massacres by the Roman church that caused Protestant sects to "fade from the earth," which is in the Canon Law, and in the bishop's oath: can a Catholic layman act otherwise?

Mr. Farrell cites authorities, quoting from the Fourth Lateran Council, saying, "He who acts against conscience, goes to hell." There is no inconsistency in my contention and this Lateran doctrine: after the pope declares to the Catholic conscience what is

"divine law" then, of course, he who goes against it "goes to hell"—unadulterated papal doctrine!

Mr. Farrell also cites from "the celebrated school of Salamanca": Obey conscience right or wrong; that's good papal doctrine: after the pope has *made* conscience, obey it, then, right or wrong! I quote from the school of the Salmanites: "A servant may, according to his *own judgment*, pay himself with his own hands more than was agreed upon as a salary for his own work, if he finds that he deserves a larger salary," and St. Liguori approves, saying "this doctrine appears just and good to me." Salm., D. 4, proe, N. 137.

"A poor man, who has concealed the goods and effects of which he is in need, may swear that he has nothing." Salm., N. 140.

"Saint" Liguori teaches: "If several persons steal from the same master, in small quantities, each in such a manner as not to commit a mortal sin, though each one knows that all these little thefts together cause considerable damage to their master, yet no one of them commits a mortal sin, even when they steal at the same time."

In the year 1910 the French Parliament secured copies of the text-books used in papal schools which taught this doctrine to the "children" of that church! France has given such schools a limited number of years in which to close out!

Many of the papal theologians teach this doctrine; in fact, Liguori and Aquinas are the patterns to be followed by all papal writers—all nothing but the "traditions of men" which do not ring true with the Word of God, yet this stuff must be accepted by papists as *the* "divine law" by which they are to regulate their conduct by means of conscience! God said, "Thou *shalt not steal*"; the pope says, "Steal a little at a time," leaving the *conscience* he has shaped to determine HOW MUCH to steal!

M. Georges Trouillot, former Colonial Minister, was made chairman of a Parliamentary Commission to investigate certain questions and report back to the French Assembly. Among other things presented in his report he read from the "*Theologia Dogmatica et Moralis*," a text-book then being used in sixty-seven Roman Catholic seminaries, the following: "The church has received from God the power to force or repress those who wander from the truth, not only by spiritual penalties, but also by temporal ones. . . . These are prison, flagellation, MUTILATION, DEATH." (*Pou l'idie laique*, p. 52, issue of 1899.)—From "France Under the Republic," by Jean Charlemagne Bracq, Professor of French Literature at Vassar College, 1916. This doctrine is based upon the decree of the Council of Trent.

From the French Roman Catholic text-book on morals: "How much must one steal so that there should be a mortal sin? From

a poor man, one franc; from a workingman, to the amount of a day's wages; from a rich man, no matter how rich he is, ten or twelve francs." *Ibid.*

Roman Catholicism boasts she never changes, and that she is the same, always, in all countries—what do you think of *that* being taught to American citizens—to your boys and girls? What's the matter with *our* Congress?

A "free" conscience implies, and in fact can exist only where there is, free moral agency, which is unknown in the papal system. God made of each soul a separate being—individual minds as well as bodies—and expects each one to choose or reject all things, as a free moral agent; but where this right to "choose" is denied, there can be no "free" conscience. And what a Catholic is supposed to know, he does not know for certain, as the "holy" fathers have disagreed on many essentials, while popes have revised the Bible to have it rejected by other popes: even now it is to undergo another "revision!"

Train a child from infancy in the "theology" of Rome, permit no thought to penetrate its mind except what the pope directs, and you will have a "conscience" hypersensitive concerning popery, but "seared as with a hot iron" relative to everything else.

Let us turn the pages of history; we are in Spain, a true daughter of papalism; Thomas of Torquemada is at the head of the "holy" Inquisition by direct authority of the pope; what is all that noise, that hubbub and gleeful shouts and banterings? Oh, that's nothing! just bringing to the "holy" office a "heretic" caught in the terrible act of attempting to escape from the country: follow him into the frowning "temple of justice" (?) where the "holy" men of the pope sit in august array to try the culprit. What! he refuses to embrace the "true" faith? Put his feet in iron boots, and pour melted lead in them! So faithfully is the wife bound in conscience to the Italian god that she reveals her dark suspicions of her husband to the Holy Inquisitors—she suspects him of heretical or Masonic tendencies: her papal heart swells with joy as she listens to the shrieks of pain wrung from him as hot lead is poured into his ears or his tongue is torn out with red-hot pincers! A true son of the church informs on his father: as the old man lies across the trestle-like bed and the ponderous wheel is rolled over him, breaking bone after bone, the son sees in that writhing form nothing but an "enemy" of "papa"! A mother thinks her daughter is guilty of the "CRIME" of heresy, and the holy Inquisition is given the case: that the tender body will be fastened to the rack and limbs torn, one at a time, from the trunk may be awful for the mother-heart to contemplate—but was she not attempting to exercise REASON, contrary to the

“divine law” of “His Holiness, the Pope”? But, behold! what have we here? A Mason? *A man who dared to join a proscribed society?* Away with him to the Iron Maiden! let his body be cut to shreds by a thousand knives! A bishop of the “true” faith goes into France armed with papal orders to “extirpate” heresy: men, women, children and babies seek refuge in caves—to be sealed up alive: the conscience of the Brahmin woman caused her to throw her living body in the flames to be consumed with her dead husband to please her religious superior, while the Catholic conscience caused the world to be blighted and blasted with the infernal Inquisition, **THE ROCK-BOTTOM PRINCIPLE OF THE PAPAL SYSTEM, TO-DAY**—it is in papal law and in the bishop’s oath, to which every Catholic “conscience” in Georgia and America is subject; their conscience is under the *same teachers* to-day that gave birth to the Papal Inquisition, when they were in the majority—which is the doctrine of that “angelic” doctor of the church, “Saint” Thomas, which teaches that the pope’s “faithful” have the right to remove heretics from the earth by death!

Many men and women of great intellect have left the papal church, prompted by a real conscience; Farrell says they were put out because they were “wicked”—and they were, if Catholic theology is the criterion by which they are to be judged, because the pope is the only man in the world who has the right to say what they must KNOW. Those men and women exercised REASON, which was a crime in the eyes of that church, while the following is taught as the “divine law” shaping Catholic conscience:

“Respecting heretics, we have two observations to make: In the first place they are guilty of a sin by which they deserve to be excluded not only from the church by excommunication, but from the world by death. . . . And if counterfeiters and other malefactors are justly put to death by the secular power, for the greater reason may heretics, when convicted of heresy, be not only excommunicated but justly killed. . . .

“Those coming back for the first time from heresy to the church” may be reinstated, “but when they relapse again into heresy . . . they are allowed indeed to do penance but are not free from the sentence of death.”—Saint Thomas, Summa, 2. 2., qu. XI, art. 3 and 4.

“The almost one in one hundred” Catholics in Georgia subscribe to that; the one in six forming the population of these United States—seventeen millions in all—endorse that doctrine; it is a vital part of the tenets of the Italian system of “religion” that many so-called Protestants are assisting to gain that supremacy which will enable its practice in this land by sending their chil-

dren to the papal school and putting them under the influence of papal teachers in our free public schools; they hear the hiss of the serpent in that doctrine—they know the poisonous fangs are there—concealed, but because they *are* concealed they “rush in where angels” should “fear to tread”!

The many millions of human beings who were murdered in accordance with the above doctrine preferred death rather than surrender their CONSCIENCE, while the Catholic conscience acted according to the laws of the papal church, and it will be noted that Mr. Farrell has not quoted any pope as even intimating a subject of the church has the right to exercise conscience respecting papal dogmas or authority. HE COULD NOT DO IT, for there is no such citation to be cited! The only time he attempted to quote a pope—citing Pius IX—was rendered beyond the comprehension of the finite mind.

A Roman Catholic has a conscience free, figuratively, to this extent: he may choose whether or not he shall go to confession once a day, once a week, once a month, BUT HE MUST GO ONCE A YEAR! The pope says so, and he goes—and every time he goes to the pope's church he is endorsing the doctrine of Aquinas and the bishop's oath!

And this is the “conscience” that many so-called Protestants are assisting to put in control of American politics, and the free public schools—because they have “so many sweet Catholic friends!”

Augusta, Ga., Nov. 27, 1917.

Dear Sir: Noting in the folder mentioned in a previous letter, and which I assume that you sent me, the quotation from a sermon preached by Father D. S. Phelan, in 1912.

I might parallel this with the utterance of Sovereign Grand Inspector General Wright in the allocution delivered at the October, 1915, session of the Supreme Council Scottish Rite, as follows: “Our Supreme Council is a hierarchy based upon the principle which makes that supreme government the most stable in the history of mankind. . . . The Constitution of our country does not bind us.”

Or the utterance of a deputy of the Supreme Council made about a year ago and quoted in the Masonic publication, *Light*, Volume 2, page 570, as follows: “The Scottish Rite is built from the head down. The grand commander is its head and is supreme. I am here as his representative and in my position I would violate the laws of the State before I would disobey an order of the Grand Commander.”

But what good would it do? Don't I know Masons are just like other people, some good, some bad, as citizens and as men?

Very truly,

J. J. FARRELL, Mgt.

COMMENT

Phelan's sermon, wherein he declared that if the Government of the United States were at war with the Roman Catholic church, Catholics would say, "To hell with the Government of the United States," and the subject-matter in paragraph two are not parallels: Phelan voiced papal LAW, the deputy gave rein to a flight of personal fancy.

Viewing Freemasonry from the outside, just as I do Roman Catholicism, by a consideration of available information; studying its laws, history and literature, I surmise its genius, so in this light, to say "the Constitution of our country does not bind us" may mean—and I am inclined to that opinion—that the organization is not bound together as such by a Constitutional act, as it has the right to exist under the law without being chartered, if preferred, and, unlike the Jesuit or other priestly orders in the papal system of government, it does not exist nor can it be abolished by law—unless it can be shown to be in conflict with the Constitution; my opinion is based on the fact that Constitutional Government is the outgrowth of the Masonic principle, if not its direct offspring.

It seems to me that the statement of the deputy is a safe assertion: the laws of the State (especially in America) usually reflect the spirit of Masonry, and a Commander of the Scottish Rite could issue no order conflicting with the laws of the land; first, to do so would be violative of its own laws, and, second, as Masons are taught to exercise Reason and FREE conscience in all things, such an order, if it were possible to be issued, would have to undergo the acid test of a thorough investigation by unfettered conscience, and if it appeared to conflict with civil law, the Commander's sanity would be investigated! As I understand the order, Masons will not obey the commands of those in authority which conflict with the laws of the State, or that they consider violate their duty to themselves or their fellowman, and these issues are determined by the exercise of *reason* which no one in the order has the power to restrict. An official in a Masonic order can not prevent his commands from being questioned by subordinates, nor prevent them from citing officials to appear before tribunals for un-Masonic conduct (quite a contrast from the *Motu Proprio* decree of Pius X in favor of his hierarchy). The sermon of Phelan, as published in the *Western Watchman*, was a true expression of papal law, while it can not be proved from Masonic law that the quotations in paragraphs one and two were not mere oratorical effervescence. To any one appreciating the objective of Freemasonry, those statements amount to nothing; a lawyer was pleading at the Macon bar: addressing the jury, he said, in answering a citation of law by the solicitor general, "I

care nothing about the law in the case." If the court had taken him literally, he would have been disbarred. I do not condone the deputy or the lawyer.

As far as my knowledge extends, the first three degrees of Masonry constitute what is known as the lodge of Master Masons, and the other degrees are taken in rotation, including the thirty-third, but they all have to begin at the bottom—no one can become a thirty-third degree Mason without being a Master Mason in good standing; therefore, it appears that Masonry builds from the ground up, regardless of what a deputy may say.

Augusta, Ga., Nov. 27, 1917.

Dear Sir: You seem so emphatically of the opinion that Catholics are not in conscience free that I am constrained to enlighten you further on this point. (1)

(2) The distinguished Jesuit theologian, Busenbaum, whose moral theology has been used as a text in Catholic seminaries for much more than a century, teaches as follows: (Mor. theol. T. I-p. 54): "A heretic, so long as he in conscience believes his sect to be more, or equally, deserving of belief, has to obligation no belief in the Church."

(3) I commend this teaching to your very thoughtful consideration, with the suggestion that most men would be satisfied with the liberty of conscience it predicates. Busenbaum even adds: "When men who have been brought up in heresy are persuaded from boyhood that we impugn and attack the Word of God, and that we are idolators, pestilent deceivers and, therefore, are to be shunned as pests, they cannot, while this persuasion lasts, with a safe conscience hear us."

(4) Does not this fairly convince you that Catholics are truly taught that Conscience is King of the Soul? Here is a plain and unmistakable teaching that you would do wrong even to come to our churches, hear our preachers or read our books, if you are thoroughly persuaded that our teaching is, in a word, unscionable. [?] If that is your view, we are told, you "CAN NOT, while this persuasion lasts, with a safe conscience, hear us."

(5) Naturally the converse is true for us; but there is no "tyranny" in this, as you presuppose, no narrow-minded principle. It simply carries into practice that the teaching that the faculties of the soul, intellect, will, and all, must be obedient to the dictates of Conscience its King.

For, as the Council of Lateran puts it, "He who acts against conscience, goes to hell."

Very truly,

J. J. FARRELL, Mgt.

COMMENT

(1) Where a question is argued by papal theologians, there is but one way to ascertain the truth of the particular issue: consult the decrees of the pope; he alone has the right to proclaim "truth" and legislate for its preservice. That there is no "unity"

in the teaching of the "fathers" I believe I have mentioned before, *which fact is substantiated by Farrell's citations*. Liguori and St. Thomas are the principal Doctors of the papal church—he will never be able to quote from *their* doctrines favoring free conscience for Catholic or Protestant!

A jurist may entertain an *opinion* of the law, but the opinion will be set aside if it is contrary to law; likewise, a Jesuit father may express an *opinion*, but it does not affect the law on the subject. Now, let us examine the LAW and see if Busenbaum is even approximatey correct, which I will accept—for the moment:

According to Canon Law, "A heretic is one who denies a defined and sufficiently proposed article of faith with error of intellect and pertinacity of will."

Taunton's Canon Law: "Pope Pius IX, Const. *Apostolicas Sedis*, 1869, decreed excommunication . . . against all and every heretic by whatever name; and also against their believers, receivers, favourers, and defenders." (Busenbaum being apparently a *defender* of heretics, is excommunicated, according to this!)

The Council of Trent, Sess. vii, can. 14, decreed: "If any one says that the *baptized* are not to be *compelled* to a Christian life by any other penalty save that they be excluded from the participation of the Eucharist and of the other sacraments, let him be anathema."

The Jesuit father, Taunton, incorporates in the Canon Law part of the Syllabus of Errors of Pius IX, *the authenticity of which Mr. Farrell denied on more than one occasion*: "N. 24. Pope Pius IX condemned the doctrine that the church had no right to coerce with penalties the violation of her laws; and he also condemned the proposition that the church had no power of inflicting punishment nor any temporal power, direct or indirect."

From all this we learn that a "heretic" is one who examines the "divine law" to learn how to regulate his conduct through "the means of conscience" and refuses to let an Italian pope in Italy interpret it for him—he's a "chooser." So antagonistic is papalism to this principle, that excommunication was pronounced against any one who even defends or favors a heretic! Mr. Farrell will note that the Tridentine decree *supra* is several hundred years old, that of Pius IX about fifty—*separately and jointly they nullify his citation from Busenbaum!*

The only real, fundamental difference between Roman Catholics and Protestants is found in the question of free conscience; Roman Catholics are required to see all things through the pope's eyes, while Protestants are called heretics because they use their own; this also involves the doctrine of free moral agency, teaching man's personal responsibility to God. Eliminate this, and

there would be no Protestants: leave every man to the dictates of his own conscience and reason and there would be no Catholic church. According to Liguori, the subject must obey his religious superior, and if there be any sin attaching, the superior alone will be answerable to God!

I have treated of this letter as if it related to free conscience, but as a matter of fact it is a treatise on religious toleration; and beautiful, only it is not supported by LAW!

It is a remarkable co-incidence that almost invariably the quotations by Farrell are so worded as to create the impression that he made errors, or that the citations are beyond human comprehension: does he try to say in the second paragraph, last clause, "has no obligation to belief," etc.?

The Busenbaum teaching is good Protestant doctrine, that no one should be forced to join any church, on the hypothesis that if God could sanction that means to convert the world to Jesus Christ, with the trump of angelic hosts He could announce that unless the people of earth turned to the Lord, He would strike them deaf, dumb, blind, or remove them from the earth by death. But the laws of the Roman church are against this doctrine of Busenbaum, which should be a matter of grave concern to Protestants. If every Catholic priest, bishop, archbishop, cardinal and pope were to teach unequivocally that all heretics are going to hell, it would not destroy or ruffle the serene indifference of Protestantism—but for the papal institution to proclaim it has the right to employ force—as it has done—to make the *baptized* submit to the will of the pope, is a serious question for Protestants to settle.

(1) "You seem so emphatically of the opinion that Catholics are not in conscience free," says Mr. Farrell; the decree of Hildebrand, or Pope Gregory VII, forbids priests to marry, to which decree they are, TO-DAY, obedient: are they governed in this by a free conscience, or controlled and directed by papal LAW? If one should say they are actuated by free conscience, then there was no need for the *decree*—and what shall be said of their conscience when they had wives before that decree was published? On the other hand, to say they are directed in the matter BY the decree is to acknowledge there is no free conscience with papal priests in the premises. In this connection, it may be impressive to again state that the "holy" fathers taught that, after the decree of celibacy was promulgated, it would be better for a priest to go wrong with a hundred different women than to marry ONE! Was that the utterance of a free or controlled conscience?

All that aside, however; the following is more to the point, from Bussambaum:

"A man who has been excommunicated by the pope may be killed anywhere, as Escobar and Deaux teach, because the pope

has an indirect jurisdiction *over the whole world, even in temporal things*, as all the Catholics maintain, and as Suarez proves against the King of England."—Bussambaum—Lacroi, Theol. Moralia.

The Encyclical of Pope Pius IX, August 15, 1854, is instructive: "The absurd and erroneous doctrines, or ravings, in defense of liberty of conscience, are a most pestilential error, a pest of all others, to be dreaded in the State."

Bussambaum and other "holy" fathers teach according to the decree of Gregory VII, that to kill an apostate, heretic, or excommunicated man, is not murder, but a Christian act.

Pius IX has excommunicated EVERY HERETIC IN AMERICA; the laws of that Italian institution teach that it is not sinful to kill those who have been excommunicated—certainly, Protestants should do all they can to advance the power of the papal church so its laws can be enforced against them and their children—some are doing this, aiding popery to the best of their ability!

The Jesuitical deceitfulness of Farrell's letter is exposed by history: if Protestants have the right "in conscience" to believe "his sect to be . . . deserving of belief," why did the Roman Catholics, being in the vast majority, kill so many of those who would not accept the papal doctrine? The facts prove that the early Protestant people preferred to die rather than submit to papal authority and dogma while the Catholic conscience demanded their death. What do we learn from the bishop's oath, *to-day?*

If a person is born a Roman Catholic or voluntarily joins that church, he is oath-bound to support the laws and dogmas of the papal church—support those things that gave the world the Dark Ages and set up the Inquisition which blighted Europe with papal domination for hundreds of years and made and unmade kings and controlled secular powers; the Inquisition was introduced into various countries by order of the "holy father," head of the "only true" church, under the immediate direction of papal priests and papal puppet rulers, like the King of Spain, who gathered wood in his arms with which to burn heretics—this crew of the pope, like a pack of hell-hounds chasing a rabbit, ferreted out heretics and tortured them by every means of cruelty which eclipsed anything the German Kaiser did during the Great War; Jews, Protestants, Greeks, all hounded to death and their property confiscated to be divided between pope and king! I repeat: if those murdered people had the right Farrell says Busenbaum taught, why were they killed like wild animals? They were slain by the Catholic conscience—has it changed since then? **THE LAW REQUIRES THAT RULE OF CONDUCT, NOW!** And if any Catholic in the world is subject thereto, every one in Georgia—in MACON—is!

In paragraph 5 Mr. Farrell says that the Busenbaum teaching regarding heretics applies also to Catholics—that “the faculties of the soul, intellect, will, and all, must be obedient to the dictates of Conscience its King,” which is untrue: for the *law* of the papal church requires the “intellect” to assent internally or externally to the pope’s laws and dogmas, as expressed by Leo XIII, who said there must be “complete submission of will to the pope as to God Himself.” If that does not make the *pope* “King of the soul” there is no pope.

If Roman Catholics were in conscience free, there would be no law prohibiting them from attending Protestant churches and reading Protestant religious literature; but there are laws governing these matters to which Catholics are obedient. I am still most emphatically of the opinion that Catholics are not in conscience free according to the meaning of the word, which is: “To know; a self-knowledge, by which one determines the issues of right and wrong.”

Augusta, Ga., Nov. 28, 1917.

Dear Sir: You may say, nevertheless, the pope rules the conscience and, therefore, the soul, of a Catholic. This is your final retreat, and now I shall drive you from that.

Some Catholic theologians have written straight to the point, and I venture to express the view that after reading their teaching on it, unless you can offer an acknowledged Catholic teacher who teaches the contrary, which I know you cannot, even you will be persuaded that you were mistaken.

The Franciscan teacher, Corduba, says: “In no matter is it lawful to act against conscience, even though a Superior or a law direct it.” (De Conscient., p. 138.) Surely, this must include the pope in its terms, so that, if even the pope directed an act against conscience it would not be lawful to obey. And this, even though a pope directed a right thing and the dictate of conscience on the matter was wrong, as is possible; still, it would not be lawful to go against conscience, for “who acts against conscience goes to hell.”

And so, the celebrated Dominican theologian, Natalis Alexander, wrote: “If, in the judgment of conscience, though a mistaken conscience, a man is persuaded that what his superior commands is displeasing to God, he is bound *not* to obey.” Here again, the word “superior” must include even the pope. Do you not agree?

Or, do you think, perchance, that you can somehow twist a knot into a language as plain as this and just possibly get a grip that will not slip? Do not think it, my friend, for such a knot need not even be untied; it could be simply cut, as we shall next see.

Very truly,

J. J. FARRELL, Mgr.

COMMENT

The “teacher” of a Roman Catholic is his priest, who gets his authority from the pope, and when he makes an assertion regard-

ing a question, he knows that is forever "closed" to Catholics, and does not seem to understand it does not have the same effect on Protstants.

In paragraph 3 we find that "Corduba says: 'In no matter is it lawful,'" according to Farrell, "to act against conscience.'" Where an issue is to be determined by law, it is necessary to know the law relating to it; if there is legislation pertaining thereto, then the **LAWFULNESS** of the question is decided by it, and all informed people know that there is a law which would **FORCE PROTESTANTS INTO** the papal church and in its operation **PREVENTS CATHOLICS FROM LEAVING**. After the pope **MAKES AND FORMS** the conscience, of course then, "who acts against conscience goes to hell."

That the papal church recognizes only the pope-made conscience is shown by the laws of the institution, and it is patent to even superficial critics that if the right of a private person to act according to conscience was true, **THERE COULD BE NO LAW COERCING INDIVIDUALS** in the matter of joining or leaving the Roman church.

Mr. Farrell says I cannot offer an acknowledged Catholic teacher in opposition to Corduba, but I can; here is the teaching that governs **ALL Catholics** in the world, from the Council of Trent; it says, Sess. vii, Can. 14, that "*If anyone says that the BAPTIZED*" (Protestants) "*are not to be COMPELLED to a Christian*" (papal) "*life by any other penalty save that they be excluded from the participation of the Eucharist and of the other sacraments, let him be anathema.*" This **LAW** nullifies the mere opinion of Corduba cited by Farrell, as he knew, and makes it sublimely ridiculous to contend that the Roman church grants a free conscience yet requires use of **FORCE** to make one subscribe to its *dogmas* and submit to the *authority* of the pope.

"In no matter is it lawful," says this writer, but the above is the **LAW** which **MAKES** it *lawful*. **WHO** is the *teacher* in the Italian institution, the *pope*, or some Franciscan *monk*? Other authorities could be cited, but every Catholic in the world is sworn by solemn oath to be ruled by the Tridentine decrees—that's enough in answer to Corduba.

If "conscience" rules the soul according to precepts of "the divine law," and the pope alone is the teacher of what is "divine law," then the Catholic conscience, logically, will reflect the law only as it is made known by the supreme teacher, the pope.

The consideration of this subject depicts Jesuit subtlety. If there is to be a true conscience, it must be secured through the Word of God, as it alone defines right and wrong. If this knowledge could have been secured otherwise, that would also be in the Bible, in which case, as we see, it would be absurd and presumptuous to say "In no matter will I act against conscience, even

though" God "directs it," as that would be making the human mind the equal of, if not superior to, the mind of God: the creature co-equal with the Creator: destroy the Eternal Trinity by making all men capable of being worthy of admission thereto—in other words, that doctrine followed to its logical and only conclusion would make each one a "pope," which would as certainly destroy the *papal* kingdom as it now destroys God's! Can a papist dispute this? No: and if it is admitted, he must also admit there can be no truth in the above citation by Farrell. (The papal church, like a great circus, has something which it thinks will please most anybody who attends!)

In the fourth paragraph Mr. Farrell opens up a new "ring" by presenting a *Dominican* theologian—one of the most ferocious types in the whole menagerie—and again I ask, WHO is the chief "actor" in this papal show, a Dominican theologian, or the pope? Who is the "supreme" director, a Dominican friar or the pope of Rome?

As I have remarked before, there is no "unity" in the teaching of the holy fathers which priests swear to follow in their preaching; and where we desire to know the truth, we must consult the law relating to the question, and its physical manifestations: To the Dominicans especially was committed the glorious work of the "holy" Inquisition; THAT fact buries the "celebrated theologian, Natalis Alexander" and his theology so deep Mr. Farrell will never be able to get him to the surface again; if he will turn to the "celebrated" guide-book for Inquisitors, the *Directorium Inquisitorium* of the "celebrated Nicholas Eymeric, the Dominican Inquisitor-General of Aragon," he will find there collated all the fiendish, un-Christian, anti-heretical laws of the papal church which authorized the hellish Inquisition, from which the following is cited: Gregory IX, Vicar of Jesus Christ (!) ordered: "If any of the aforesaid (heretics) refuse to perform condign penance after they have been apprehended, they are to be shut up in prison for life," also, "Let all understand that they are absolved from all allegiance to their civil ruler when he has fallen into manifest heresy, and from all service to any one, *no matter how sacredly pledged and promised.*" ("Keep no faith with heretics!") The legislation of Pope Innocent III therein: "We strictly forbid you lawyers and notaries from giving any assistance, counsel or favor to heretics, their supporters or defenders. . . . If you presume to act contrariwise to this regulation, we decree that you be removed from your calling and subjected to perpetual infamy"—and I have failed to learn of ANY ONE suffering "infamy" for violating any of these "regulations" in favor of the helpless victims who fell into the clutches of those Dominican hell-hounds! And I dare and invite Mr. Farrell and the whole Association of

Georgia to attempt to impeach those citations before any public assembly of citizens in this State!

All through life a Catholic is taught that the papal church is a divine institution, incorruptible and indefectible; from it he gets his conscience—and its manifestations will accord in all things with the will of the pope who has taught him what is right and wrong.

Canon 14 above cited is the law authorizing the pope to employ FORCE against the *baptized* to make them obedient to the church, so in one sense it may teach that "he who acts against conscience goes to hell" as it simply means, first, that *heretics have no conscience*, therefore it is the duty of the church to force them under the authority of the pope so they may secure it by which they are to distinguish between good and evil according to the "divine law" per his dictum, and if they refuse, the Catholic conscience is trained to make sure that heretics "go to hell" on earth. "Ask any ex-priest or ex-nun."

If the papal church has the right to COMPEL, then it exercises the rule of MIGHT instead of RIGHT; direction by force rather than by conscience—the iron-rule of the trenches! This rule forever precludes exercises of a free conscience, and is contrary to the laws of nature, human experience extending over a period of approximately two thousand years, and is in antagonism with the purpose of man's creation.

Christ said "Whosoever will"—that's free conscience;

The pope says "Everybody must"—a fetter to conscience.

While these principles are irreconcilably antagonistic, they are the rules by which Protestants and Catholics shape their conduct in regard to all matters affecting human society.

Protestants live or die in defense of their rule, Romanism is governed by expediency.

To say that they are obedient to the pope only in accepting his definitions of faith and morals—and "morals" covers everything pertaining to civil government and life—but they would act according to "conscience" and refuse to obey the pope's discipline and regulatory decrees puts Catholics in the position of a wife who says "In SPIRIT, I am obedient unto the will of my husband, but in BODY I am FREE to ANY MAN." When Farrell can name one contented normal man living under that rule, I will admit the Roman church permits free conscience.

To read "the writings of the holy fathers" is to become inveigled in a maze of confusing contradictions, from which there is no escape—unless you turn to the LAW, which will set you right! In concluding this discussion it is pertinent to ask why Farrell did not cite the LAW to prove that Catholics have a right to free conscience instead of confining himself to *creatures* of the pope? I asked him many times to prove his position by such au-

thoritative citations, but he would not—was it because they do not exist? Evidently!

Augusta, Ga., Nov. 28, 1917.

Dear Sir: Speaking of authority and obedience as viewed by Masons:

Dr. Oliver in his book of Science and Symbols, p. 264, says: "The Master's authority in the lodge is as the sun in the firmament." Section 2 of the Old Charges of Masonry declares it to be the attitude of every Mason "to pay due reverence to the Masters and to put them to work." Section 4 says, that the Masters are "to be obeyed by all the members with humility and love."

In Dr. Mackey's Lexicon, published in 1869, at p. 331, referring to these charges it is said, "This spirit of obedience runs through the whole system of Masonry," and in the Encyclopedia of Free Masonry, published in 1910, at page 541 of Vol. I, it is said: "The FIRST duty of every Mason is to obey the mandate of the Master. . . . This spirit of instant obedience and submission is the safeguard of the institution. . . . The Masonic rule is like the nautical imperative 'obey orders even if you break owners'."

Yet you complain that Catholics are like children.

Very truly,

J. J. FARRELL, Mgt.

COMMENT

Mr. Farrell "ought at least to get the main facts right, lest malice betray ignorance" in discussing matters of which he apparently has no "first-hand" knowledge, even though it could be secured for the asking; section 2 of "the Old Charges" seem to be erroneously quoted, as I do not see how they, the laymen of the lodge, can "put them" (the masters) "to work."

From the literature in hand I learn that the principal tenets of Masonry are Brotherly Love, Relief and Truth; that the presiding officer is called the "Master," whose relation to the lodge when it is in session is as that of a superintendent constructing a building: he must see that every officer ("foreman") under him is capable, and obedient to his orders, and that it is his duty and responsibility to maintain a strict oversight to insure the erection of a structure according to the plans, specifications, etc., of the architect: that the Word of God is used as the "plans and specifications" for the erection of a temple to please the Great Architect, God, and that when the day's work is done—when the lodge closes—this relationship to all intents and purposes terminates, to be resumed when work again begins. Freemasonry, as I understand it, works just like operative masons in erecting a building, the difference being that instead of building a material temple with wood and iron and stone the fraternity is erecting a Temple of Brotherly Love from which is to flow a desire for the Relief of human ills, whose word shall be accepted as the Truth by all men.

"The FIRST duty of every Mason is to obey the mandate of the Master" may be true, first, because "every Mason" assisted in electing him to that position in the lodge; second, because "every Mason" knows the principles, laws, rules and regulations of the order, and if the Master acts in violation of them, there is no "MOTU PROPRIO" decree to prevent his "inferiors" from citing him to trial nor to prevent them from haling him before "lay" tribunals when they "chance" to see him committing grave sins; they may also appeal from his decisions; these are a few of the differences between Masons and their Masters and lay Catholics and their Priests which any intelligent person can appreciate without an extended discussion; when the lodge adjourns, officers and members recognize no "inferiors" and "superiors," therefore I continue to "complain that Catholics are like children," as they must consider themselves inferiors who have no right to question commands issued by the priest which he may say come from the pope.

Masons may "obey orders" even if they "break owners"—but a Mason will not obey an order to break the necks of those who are not members; quite a difference.

Augusta, Ga., Nov. 28, 1917.

Dear Sir: And in reference to Loyalty and Obedience:

(1) In 1757 the Synod of Scotland declared, that: "All who fail to abstain from connection with Masonry shall be reputed under scandal and incapable of admission to stealing ordinances."

(2) The Synod laid five grounds for this action against Masons—1st, they take an oath; 2nd, administered before the communications (blind oath); 3rd, accompanied by superstitious ceremonies; 4th, attended by a penalty (even capital); 5th, considered, by Masons, as paramount to the obligations of the law of the land."

(3) At page 538 in Vol. I of the Masonic Encyclopedia, in reference to these grounds laid against Masons, it is said: "In replying to these statements, the conscientious Freemason . . . is at every step restrained by his honor from either denial or admission."

(4) Do you think anything is to be gained by incrimination and recrimination by Catholics and Masons? Do you not think that good citizens should be about a more edifying and peace-making work?

(5) We do, and that is the reason of our Plea for Peace, which we still urge.

Very truly,

J. J. FARRELL, Mgr.

COMMENT

(1) Again Mr. Farrell attempts to quote from an "acknowledged Catholic teacher," the Synod of Scotland; while he has no doubt "mutilated it beyond all recognition," yet as rendered I am fully persuaded it is correct in its "mutilated" form: I believe Masons

to be generally "incapable of admission to *stealing* ordinances." (No doubt he meant to say "sealing"?)

(2) These five charges against Masonry can be sustained by the pope to the satisfaction of a Catholic, for it is against the law of the church for a Romanist to *read or have in his possession any book defending or explaining Masonry*. This is the law of the papal Index and its Rules, and upon this rock the papacy wrecks free conscience; the pope declares Freemasonry is "essentially opposed to natural virtue"—(but its "superiors" do not teach that it is better for them to go wrong with a hundred different women belonging to other men than to marry one)—and every Romanist must sing, "I say so, too!" phonograph-like, while priest-editors keep them in tune; they have not learned, from a personal, individual study that Freemasonry is of the devil, but what knowledge they have they get from the pope—yet Mr. Farrell says in this as in all other matters Catholics are governed by "Conscience, the King of the Soul"!

Let us examine the five charges against Freemasonry, and see if they are true, and if the pope has something better to offer as a substitute for this Philosophy which he condemns:

Says the Synod: "1st, they take an oath"; there is no organization in the world—social, political, fraternal or religious—or business transaction, that does not exact some sort of pledge, promise, or oath. This fact is so universal, I merely mention it.

Where an institution exacts an oath of allegiance and obedience, its objective as an organization is to be found in its laws, rules, decrees, tenets, *history*, and its source of inspiration (directing power); from these the "intention" and ultimate result hoped for will be manifested.

In "Akin's Lodge Manual and Masonic Law Digest, the Standard for Georgia," published in 1895 (same year as my copy of *Pontificale Romanum* containing Catholic bishop's oath), by John W. Akin, a 32d degree Mason, officially adopted by the Grand Lodge of Georgia in 1894, I find in the Petition for Membership which the candidate signs that the first question propounded is, "1. Do you seriously declare, upon your honor, that, unbiassed by the improper solicitation of friends and uninfluenced by mercenary motives, you freely offer yourself as a candidate for the mysteries of Freemasonry?" Nothing here suggesting one may be "born" subject to Masonry, or that FORCE may be used to make non-Masons submit to its rules and authority, as in the papal system!

Akin further teaches: "The Three Great Tenets of a Mason's profession are Brotherly Love, Relief, and Truth," while the four cardinal virtues, "Temperance, Fortitude, Prudence, and Justice" are inculcated in the first lessons.

According to Akin's Manual, and that by George E. Simons and

Robert Macoy, the latter being a 32d-degree Mason of New York, the following is in the Charge delivered to Masons:

"In the State you are to be a quiet and peaceable subject, true to your government and just to your country. You are not to countenance disloyalty or rebellion, but patiently submit to legal authority and conform with cheerfulness to the government under which you live, yielding obedience to the laws which afford you protection," Simon's, p. 52.

"You are not to countenance disloyalty"—this duty is challenged by the bishop's oath!

Now listen to the supreme ruler of Catholics; said Leo XIII: "If the laws of the State violate . . . in the person of the Supreme Pontiff the authority of Jesus Christ, then, truly, to resist becomes a positive duty; to obey, a crime." Should the State refuse the papal church "due liberty of action," defined by the pope as being the rights of "a perfect society," then Catholics may seek a "change of government." Quite a difference between the teaching of the two institutions! (*To what extent did the Masonic charge influence "our" administration to bar Freemasonry from army cantonments?*)

Both Masonic Manuals say that when a man has been elected to serve for *one year*, he must assent in open lodge to the "regulations which point out the duty of the Master of a Lodge," and that he must answer affirmatively certain questions, among which are the following:

"I. You agree to be a good man and true, and strictly to obey the moral law?

"II. You agree to be a peaceable citizen and cheerfully to conform to the laws of the country in which you reside?

"III. You promise not to be concerned in plots and conspiracies against the government, but patiently submit to the law and constituted authorities?

"V. You agree to . . . *submit to the awards and resolutions of your brethren, in lodge convened*, in every case consistent with the Constitutions of the Fraternity?

"VI. You agree to avoid personal piques and quarrels, and to guard against intemperance and excess?

"IX. You agree to promote the general good of society, to cultivate the social virtues?

"X. You promise . . . to conform to every edict of the Grand Lodge THAT IS NOT subversive to the principles and groundwork of Masonry?

"XI. You admit it is not in the power of *any man, or body of men*, to make innovations in the body of Masonry?"

When a man is put at the head of a Lodge by his brethren he swears to be governed by these and similar laws of the order: can the Roman church prove a loyalty to God, man, and country as true as this?

These articles form part of the pledge the presiding officer of the lodge makes, while the "brethren" are required on their part to be obedient to him, so long as he is true to it; but they have a right, which they would not be slow to exercise, to question and even oppose his rule; can a Catholic layman question the rule of the priest? No, because he has nothing to do with his selection. To whom does the priest pledge allegiance, the pope or the country that protects him?

If the Grand Master should issue a decree, each Master of a Masonic lodge is bound, by Art. X, to resist it if in obedience thereto there would be an "innovation in the body of Masonry," and the matter would be carried up for review by the Grand Lodge at its next session: to whom may a Catholic layman or priest appeal against the decree of a pope? There is but one *appeal*: withdrawal from papal authority.

All Masonic Jurisprudence and Law reflect the influence of the Landmarks of Freemasonry as shown by the manuals; they temper its mandates and epitomize its law. With the Bible as its guide, Masonry lays a golden chain along the rugged pathway of life to assist travelers to keep in the right path on their journey in following the Light which leads the Creature back to its Creator; it is like fragrant flowers which beautify the landscapes and sweeten the air, offering cheer and refreshment when the burdens seem heaviest; like songbirds in trees and meadows and the fruits of vineyards and orchards affording joy, food and shelter to travel-worn pilgrims, Freemasonry fits in with the other good things of God's universe—not as a "religion," but her hand-maid: like the mother-eagle which feeds and protects her young till they develop the strength necessary to wing their own flights, soaring above storm-clouds, vanishing in heaven's blue or resting upon mountain peaks, so Masonry places the feet of man in the right way, assists him to recognize his duty to God and fellow-travelers, directs his vision toward the Great Architect and all His works, *aids him to break down every barrier* that would restrain the activities of the mind and intellect and keep them from soaring above the highest known heights of human knowledge and attainment, places in his hand the Master Key, FREEDOM OF CONSCIENCE, and teaches that he is at liberty and has an inherent right to unlock *any* door in his search for TRUTH and LIGHT: here, Freemasonry stops. To go further, it would be necessary to employ FORCE, then there would be no "FREE" Masonry.

As religion, Protestantism fosters Freemasonry, as their principles and aims are alike in all things except the former prepares the soul for time and eternity, while the latter assists its votaries for time and prevents restricting their right to choose beyond this.

"They take an oath," said the "holy fathers" of the Scotland Synod. Yes; Masonry is but a philosophy, with fixed principles and tenets upon which to work, Brotherly Love, Relief, and Truth; Temperance, Fortitude, Prudence, and Justice. With these principles as its foundation, what could be the nature of its oath? Dr. W. L. Pickard, former President of Mercer University, Macon, Ga., a Baptist minister and high degree Mason, a man of unquestioned veracity and integrity, said: "The penalty for its violation (the Masonic oath) is to be visited upon himself, never upon anybody else," which seems to comport well with the principal tenet of the order, FREEDOM, which makes it impossible for the order to exact a promise from a candidate to inflict punishment upon some one else, for I am sure the oath must be in line with the Articles above quoted from the Manual, wherein he *swears to benefit all mankind*. Furthermore, from the very nature of the institution, whatever oath is taken must be voluntarily assumed and could not possibly be a pledge to *inflict* a penalty according to the "INTENTION" of the order, but if there be a penalty, he must himself suffer it.

We will now look at papal oaths! When a pope is elected by cardinals to hold upon this earth the place of God Almighty, among other things he swears to wrest from the people the papal principedom: "We are moved to demand this . . . by Our sacred promise confirmed on oath," p. 15, Encyclical Letters.

The oath of cardinals, as printed in the *London Daily Telegraph* December 1, 1911, and confirmed by Monsignor Canon Moyse, in *The Tablet* (Catholic), December 16, is in part as follows:

"I . . . promise and swear . . . to be faithful and obedient to . . . our Most Holy Lord Pius X. . . . To be ever ready to . . . fight with all zeal, and all my forces" in behalf of papal agents, "to resist even to the shedding of blood whosoever would attempt anything against them. . . . To try in every way to assert, uphold, preserve, increase, and promote the rights, *even temporal*, especially those of *civil principality*, the liberty, the honor, privileges, and authority of . . . the pope. . . . To combat with every effort, heretics, schismatics, and those rebelling against our Lord the Pope. . . . To observe minutely each and all of the decrees."

The bishop's oath would be pertinent here, but I am reserving it for another place, where it will be quoted in full.

The Bible being the rule and guide, Freemasonry could promulgate nothing but humane principles, which renders it impossible to have an oath directed against any one except he who takes it, while Roman Catholicism sets up "the rules of the holy fathers, the apostolic decrees" as the guide and, where expedient, speedily consigns to purgatory all who will not submit to them.

Masonry requires a man to uphold the laws of the land—Catholics are taught to resist them where they conflict with papal law,

as in the United States; according to the Manual, it would constitute an offense against the order for a Mason to solicit members, while Romanism attempts to close every avenue and uses every device known to man and devil to make the human race travel the pope's highway, or be "extirpated."

Farrell says the next charge is "2d, administered before the communications (blind oath)"; just what the church of Rome presumes to charge here must be something awful! I fail to grasp it—perhaps because I am neither Catholic or Mason—so must resort to conjecture; but if Masons take a "blind oath," whatever that means, I am sure it does not require the candidate to consider it "most inhuman to let those go unharmed" who do not care to take it, neither have I found where Masonry claims the right to "employ force" to make men assume the oath; I am also equally sure it does not require its votaries to hound down the man who leaves the order. If Masons *do* take a *blind oath* and if it is something fierce, surely, surely it can not be more "blind" than that sworn by those who join the papal church, or more inhuman than that the bishop swears and to which every papist is subject!

Next charge: "3rd, accompanied by superstitious ceremonies." Just what may constitute "superstition" in a papal sense is quite difficult to determine, unless it declares the Bible to be a superstitious fabrication. But speaking of superstition: Masonry does not teach people to wear scapulars to prevent sickness and frighten evil spirits away, as Romanism does, getting good money for them; Masonry does not dispense candles and holy water to secure hard-earned money, to scare off evil spirits, as Romanism does; Masonry does not fondle dead men's bones and teach that to look upon them will cure disease and charge fancy prices for a peep at them, as Romanism does; Masonry does not sell indulgences which are as licenses to commit sin, as Romanism does; Masonry does not have several "true" dead heads of an ancient craftsman in several different places to be venerated, as Romanism does; Masonry does not teach its votaries to buy from "superiors" images representing dead people, and pray to them for special favors, as Romanism does; a Master of a lodge does not say he has been delegated with the power of making Jesus Christ condense Himself into a little piece of pancake and require the members to first bow down in worshipful adoration of the God of Masonry then eat Him, as Romanism does; etc., etc., and etc., as Romanism does, and when a Mason reaches the end of his journey he does not send for the Master of a lodge to grease his feet and place lighted candles in his hands according to the rites of ancient paganism and after death burden his survivors with purgatorial graft, as Romanism does, because the guide-book is open and available to all alike, so that if some "superior" should attempt

to perpetrate any of these things on the membership, a new superior would be needed in quick order!

In the "Catechism of Perseverance," published by Kelly & Peat, Baltimore, 1866, approved by "Martin J., Bishop of Louisville; Michael, Bishop of Mobile; Anthony, Bishop of New Orleans; John, Bishop of Galveston," will be found the following un-Masonic but Roman Catholic doctrine:

"Q. What are the effects of holy water? A. The effects of holy water are: 1st, to *chase away the devil*; 2d, to *aid in healing the sick*; 3d, to obtain help from God; 4th, to aid in the remission of venial sin.

"Q. Why is the sprinkling of holy water in the church? A. It is made to *chase away the devil* and to *purify* the faithful, so that they may assist at the mass with attention, innocence and piety," p. 360.

"Q. What is the scapular? A. The scapular is a devotion in honor of the Blessed Virgin, which was revealed to the Blessed Simon Stock, Superior of the Carmelites, in the *twelfth century*.

(TWELVE HUNDRED YEARS AFTER Christ said His work of redemption was "finished" the pope says that Mary the mother of God revealed to a monk that Christ was mistaken—that the scapular was needed to "*finish*" His work—and it *does*, with many.)

"Q. What did the Blessed Virgin promise to Simon Stock? A. She promised him: 1st, to obtain for those who should wear the scapular, extraordinary grace for obtaining a good death. *But this does not mean that all who wear the scapular are assured of their salvation.* (!) 2d, She promised to deliver from Purgatory, the Saturday after their death, all the departed members of the confraternity," p. 295.

(So Mary did not agree to assure salvation to *all* scapular wearers, but will at least get them out of purgatory; that helps some!)

"Q. What is the rosary? A. The rosary is a devotion in honor of the Blessed Virgin; which consists in reciting, each week, three pairs of beads of FIFTEEN DECADES . . .

"Q. Who established the rosary? A. St. Dominic was directed by the Blessed Virgin to establish the rosary at the commencement of the THIRTEENTH century. This devotion has been the means of gaining the greatest favors. . . . We should join in this devotion, for we have the most pressing need for the protection of the BLESSED VIRGIN," p. 396.

This Catechism certainly proves the existence of a purgatory:

"Q. What is the Fifth?

"A. The fifth proof of purgatory is the traditions of the pagans themselves. We see in their history that they offered sacrifices for the dead, and that they prayed for them; this usage is found even among savage nations."

(If Catholic laymen would scan pagan history, they would also find that they had a "Mother of God," "holy water," "scapulars"

to chase the devil or evil spirits away with, and to cure sickness, etc., as well as purgatory for themselves after death!)

So, the Roman church opposes Freemasonry because it practices superstition:

Superstition may be defined as belief of "idle fancies," "belief of what is absurd," or "belief without evidence." So far I have not been able to discover any foundation for this charge against Freemasonry in any of its literature or laws, nor evidences of it in members of the order. In this connection, bearing in mind what superstition means, I will put Leo XIII up as a witness, to prove that Freemasonry is not superstitious. In his Encyclical against Freemasonry he charges that Freemasons "allow no dogma of religion or truth which can not be understood by the human intelligence, nor any teacher who ought to be believed by reason of his authority," p. 90. Hundreds of years ago, the papal church would "extirpate" Masonry charging it with being superstitious, while in our day the pope says Freemasonry ought to be "extirpated" as a foul plague, and calls on Mary to help, because Masons *will not* believe what can not be proven, nor believe a thing to be so merely because some other man declares it is true. In this matter, I find the church at two different periods as far apart as the poles, the only point on which it always agrees is, that Freemasonry should be destroyed, and calls on all the faithful to plead with the heavenly hosts to help them do it!

In truth, I wish I could say that in my limited research I had not found evidences of superstition in the papal system—but I can not.

I discovered so much in that religion that seems to me to be superstitious: "idle fancies," "absurd," and "belief without evidence," as to be at a loss where to start to tell about it; I have decided, though, to present a few citations from a book called "The Glories of Mary" by "St. Alphonsus de Liguori, Doctor of the Church," printed by Benziger Bros., "Printers to the Holy Apostolic See," New York. (He was the inventor of the code used in the confessional.) He has been made a saint by the papal church, and his writings and teaching have been adopted as the standard along certain lines for the whole Roman church, so that what he teaches has the same weight with all Roman Catholics as that of Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, Paul or Peter with Protestants—in other words, the pope's church requires a Romanist to believe in Liguori's doctrines as much as they do in Christ's, so that he has been made "the Doctor of the Church."

As these citations are read, remember they are *not* nursery yarns or fairy tales for children, but were written for priest and layman alike, which *must* be believed. The following are selected from Vols. I and II of Liguori's work. Says he:

"I have endeavored to collect, from as many authors as I could lay my hands on, the *choicest* passages extracted from Fathers and theologians . . . and have put them together in this book, in order that the devout may . . . be able to inflame themselves with the love of Mary, and *more particularly to furnish priests with matter for their sermons*, wherewith to excite others to devotion towards this divine Mother."

(I note that his "choicest passages" were from fathers and authors beginning about the year 589 on through the Dark Ages—the darkest period furnishing the most glorious and choice passage.)

Says Liguori: "St. Bonaventure says that those who make a point of announcing to others the glories of Mary are certain of heaven; and this opinion is confirmed by Richard of St. Lawrence, who declares, 'that to honor this Queen of Angels is to gain eternal life'; and adds, 'that this most gracious Lady will honor in the next world those who honor her in this.'"

He says that "all graces are dispensed by Mary, and that all who are saved are saved only by means of this divine Mother, it is a necessary consequence that the salvation of all depends upon preaching Mary and exciting all to confidence in her intercession." (This dispenses with the Holy Spirit's office; the Bible says that the Spirit makes intercession for us with groanings which can not be uttered.)

That "when the Blessed Virgin conceived the Eternal Word in her womb and brought Him forth, she obtained half the kingdom of God; so that she is Queen of Mercy, as Jesus Christ is King of Justice," (!) and "that the Eternal Father gave the office of Judge and Avenger to the Son, and that of showing Mercy and relieving the necessitous to the Mother." (!)

He says that Mary appeared to "St. Bridget" and said: "I am the joy of the just, and the door through which sinners are brought to God," and that any one can return to God "and enjoy His mercy, if he invokes my aid."

As an example of Mary's power and care, Liguori tells of a woman who was so loathed that she had to live and die alone in a cave; four years after death, the suffering soul appealed to Sister Catherine and complained that she did not have compassion on and pray for her; that at the last moment before death she had called on Mary and had been saved, and Mary had secured a reduction of her time in purgatory which would require "only a few masses to be entirely delivered; . . . Sister Catherine immediately had the masses said," and the soul went on to paradise! (Masses cost money—do priests give value received? Anything absurd about this?)

A young man in England in 1430, so the next story goes, became a monk; later, left the monastery and became a very wicked man; he conducted an inn, and at night murdered many of those who put up with him; he was tried and sentenced to be hanged; when he was thrown from the ladder which was to break his neck, Mary "loosened the rope and then addressed him, saying, 'Go, return to thy monastery, do penance.'"

That Mary "was truly made a mediatrix of peace between sinners and God"; "the sinner's ladder."

"Mary is that happy ark in which those who take refuge will never suffer the shipwreck of eternal perdition."

A "widow woman named Ellen went to the foot of an altar of the Blessed Virgin. . . ." Mary addressed her from her image: "Ellen, thou hast already too much offended God and me . . . change thy life. . . . Before her death . . . Mary came herself, with her divine Son, to visit her."

"All the graces that God dispenses to men pass through the hands of Mary."

"Take away the sun, and where will be the day? Take away Mary, and what will be left, but the darkest night?"

"He falls and is lost who has not recourse to Mary."

"A bird was taught to say 'Hail, Mary!' A hawk was on the point of seizing it, when the bird cried out, 'Hail, Mary!' In an instant the hawk fell dead." (!)

"Modern heretics can not endure that we should salute and call Mary our hope: 'Hail, our Hope!' . . . The Holy Church OBLIGES ALL ecclesiastics and religious each day to raise their voices . . . and call Mary the sweet name of Our Hope:—the help of all."

Liguori says, "The Angelical Doctor, St. Thomas (Aquinas), says . . . 'The King of Heaven has given us his own Mother to be our mother and advocate; . . . and therefore he wills that we should repose our hope of salvation and of every blessing in her.'"

"Thou, O Mary, art the propitiatory of the whole world."

"Blessed Albert of Celles expressly declares 'that when we find Mary, we find all!'"

"A gentleman was tenderly devoted to the divine Mother . . . frequently during the night he rose for the purpose of honoring his Blessed Lady." His wife, thinking he was paying attention to another woman, committed suicide by cutting her throat; upon returning to bed on that occasion, the man found the bed bespattered and wet with blood; he returned to the image of Mary and called for help—returning at the call of a servant, he found his wife restored to life.

"Fly, O Adam and Eve, and all you their children, who have outraged God; fly, and take refuge in the bosom of this good Mother; know you not that she is our only city of refuge? The only hope of sinners?"

"Says St. Thomas of Villanona, 'O Mary, we poor sinners know no other refuge than thee, for thou art our only hope, and on thee we rely for salvation.'"

"Noah's Ark was a true figure of Mary."

A sinner, on his way to commit a crime, was met by Mary, who had THE "INFANT" JESUS IN HER ARMS, whose wounds were bleeding; the sinner "burst into tears; but the divine Infant turned His back on him"; but Mary "began to implore her Son to pardon this miserable wretch. Jesus continued to show himself unwilling to do so."

"The Holy Church carefully teaches her children . . . that all the faithful should salute this holy Mother of God three times a

day, at the sound of the Angelus-bell . . . in all public calamities she invariably invites all to have recourse to the protection of this divine Mother, by novenas, prayers, processions, by visiting the churches dedicated in her honor, and her images. And this is what Mary desires. She wishes us always to seek her and invoke her aid."

"St. Anselm, to increase our confidence, adds that, 'when we have recourse to this divine Mother, not only may we be sure of her protection, but often we shall be heard more quickly, and be thus preserved, if we have recourse to Mary and call on her holy name, than we should be if we called on the name of JESUS OUR SAVIOUR.'"

"When Mary, the ark of the New Testament, was raised to the dignity of Queen of Heaven, the power of hell over men was weakened and dissolved."

As to the pillar of cloud and of fire that went before the people of Israel, Liguori says that it "was a figure of Mary fulfilling the double office she constantly exercises for our good: as a cloud she protects us from the ardor of Divine Justice; and as fire she protects us from devils." (So, Mary protects man from God and the devil!)

"All devils, on hearing the name of Mary, filled with terror, leave the soul."

"At the command of Mary, all obey, *even God.*"

"God has placed the whole church, not only under the patronage but even under the dominion of Mary." (We will shortly have what appears to be evidence that at the time Liguori was telling what Catholics were to believe as to this, Mary must not have been on the job as Joseph was put in charge!)

EXAMPLE

"That Mary is an advocate full of compassion for poor sinners was manifested in the case of Beatrice, a Religious of the Convent of Fontevault," says Liguori. Now, Beatrice was portress of this convent, but fell in love with a young man and laying her keys down at the feet of an image of Mary, ran away. After spending fifteen years in sin at another place, where she was known as a bad woman, she met an agent of that convent one day, and asked him about Sister Beatrice; she was informed that Beatrice "was a holy religious," and mistress of the novices. Beatrice thought this worth looking into, so she set out, under disguise, for the convent. Arriving there, she was admitted, and the Blessed Virgin explained: that she, Mary, had assumed the appearance of Beatrice and carried on all her work during those fifteen years she was away (in sin). Beatrice re-entered the convent and took up her duties, and no one would have been the wiser if she hadn't told on herself, how the Blessed Virgin made it possible for her to spend fifteen years as a dissolute woman by holding her name and job intact!

A fellow named Andrew died impenitent. "Mary obtained that he should come to life again, that he might be pardoned."

"When the Emperor Sigismund" (the man who guaranteed safe-

conduct to Huss, and allowed the Council of Constance to murder him) "was crossing the Alps with his army, a voice was heard coming from a skeleton, asking for a confessor (priest), and declaring that the Mother of God, for whom he had had a tender devotion when a soldier, had obtained that he should thus live until he had been able to make his confession; and, having done so, the soul departed."

"The promise made by our Blessed Lady to Pope John XXII is well known. She appeared to him and ordered him to make known to all that on the Saturday after their death, she would deliver from purgatory all who wore the Carmelite scapular."

"In a city of Aragon there was a beautiful young lady, who was courted by two young men. Out of jealousy they one day fought and both were killed. Their enraged relatives, considering the young lady the cause of this sad event, murdered her, cut off her head, and threw it into a well." Several days later God directed St. Dominic to pass there, who called on her to come forth. "In an instant the head of the murdered woman came up, and remained on the edge of the well, and entreated the saint to hear her confession." The woman said she had died in sin, but on account of the rosary devotion, Mary had kept her alive. The head remained alive on the well two days, then the soul departed for purgatory.

Liguori also tells of a robber whose head was cut off by enemies and thrown into the ditch. This head called on Mary for the grace to go to confession. A priest after hearing his confession, asked "what devotion he practiced. The robber replied that all he had done was to fast once a week in honor of the Blessed Virgin."

"Blessed Francis Patrizi, who had the greatest devotion to the 'Hail Mary,' used to recite five hundred a day. . . . He died a saint. After forty years a beautiful lily grew out of his mouth, and on each of the leaves was written the 'Hail Mary' in letters of gold."

A REMARKABLE EXAMPLE

"A devout servant of Mary went one day, without telling her husband, to visit a church of Our Blessed Lady, and was prevented by a great storm from returning. She was greatly alarmed lest her husband be angry; she, however, recommended herself to Mary and returned home, where she found her husband very kind to her, and in quite a good humor. By her inquiries she discovered that the NIGHT BEFORE the divine Mother HAD TAKEN HER FORM and attended to ALL THE DUTIES OF THE HOUSEHOLD as a servant." (And the pope says he has the right to have all our children put under priests and nuns to be educated, and trained in "RELIGION," and our public schools are "Godless" because the Glories of Mary are not taught therein as an article of faith!)

A man was repeating prayers to Mary, when he fell into the River Seine and was drowned. Having died in mortal sin, devils appeared to take him to hell; but Mary came upon the scene about

that time, rebuked the devils, restored the man to life, who continued to praise her.

In the year 1228, a priest was saying mass in honor of the Virgin Mary, when some Albigensian heretics fell upon him and cut out his tongue; after a season "Mary appeared to him with a tongue in her hand . . . and with her own hands put the tongue in his mouth."

"God will not save us without the intercession of Mary."

"As a child cannot live without a nurse to suckle it, so no one can be saved without the protection of Mary."

"From the moment in which this Virgin conceived the Divine Word in her womb, she acquired a special jurisdiction, so to say, over all the gifts of the Holy Ghost; so that no creature has since received any grace from God, otherwise than by the hands of Mary."

"She is our mediatrix, through whose hands God has decreed that all that He gives to men should pass. . . Our Salvation is in her hands."

There are hundreds and hundreds of pages in these two volumes by Liguori extolling the Virgin Mary, which were first issued by him in 1750. He examined all accounts and writings of the "holy fathers" before his day; and all the marvelous works and manifestations of Mary, it seems to me, were, strange to say, confined to the period when popery was supreme—the Rosary and Scapular being devotions to Mary, and the product of the Stygian era in the world's history known as the "Dark Ages"!

Remember, that what the Apostle Paul or John is to Protestantism, Liguori is to Roman Catholicism: now, in their devotions Romanists must offer one degree of worship to the saints called *Dulia*; to Mary another degree, called *Hyperdulia*; to God or the pancake another, *Latria*. If, in their prayers, they should cross the imaginary line separating the three degrees of worship, and should offer to the saint that due Mary, idolatry has been committed; also, if in offering to Mary the worship due God or the "Sacred Host," they likewise sin! How may one know—especially the very illiterate, of which the papacy has its full share—when the imaginary line has been crossed? Impossible!

Using "The Glories of Mary" as illustrative: we can see in part why Romanism hurls anathema against a Romanist if he reads any book on religious or moral subjects that has not been o. k.'d by a priest; and also where the Roman church is leading humanity when a priest swears to interpret Holy Scripture only in accordance with the unanimous teaching of the "fathers."

As the pope claims jurisdiction over all the BAPTIZED in the world, and has the right under his law to force the BAPTIZED to take Mary as their Mediatrix, NO ONE CAN FAIL TO OPPOSE or PROTEST against popery, without such being an admission of the pope's jurisdiction—for in this matter "silence

gives consent"; and what is here stated as true in regard to the spiritual side of the question is also true as to the moral and political sides of it: for he who submits to the spiritual government of the pope must and will submit to his DIRECTIVE and LEGISLATIVE authority, which invades the political realm, over which the pope has a world-jurisdiction, because of his office as God's Superintendent.

The Bible says, "and they shall call His name JESUS: for He shall save His people from their sins." Matt. i:21. ("Jesus" means "Savior.")

"For there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved." Acts iv:12.

"Jesus saith unto him, I AM THE WAY, the truth, and the life; NO man cometh unto the Father BUT BY ME." John xiv:6.

"And I will pray the Father, and HE shall give YOU another Comforter, that He may abide with you FOREVER." John xiv:16.

"But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in MY NAME, He shall teach you all things, and bring ALL things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you." John xiv:26.

"Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that entereth not by the DOOR into the sheepfold, but climbeth up some other way, IS A THIEF AND A ROBBER." John x:1.

"I AM THE DOOR: by ME if any man enter in, he SHALL be saved, and shall go in and out and find pasture." John x:9.

"Thou shalt worship THE LORD THY GOD, and Him only shalt thou serve." Matt. iv:10.

Just as the pope's church reverses the Bible, substituting the pope and Mary for God and Christ and the Holy Spirit, so it reverses, in its laws, *every principle of the American scheme of government* and would place every institution erected by free people under the domination of Mary-worshippers; and because a disease has not become an epidemic is no reason why *any* one should not oppose it; do not wait until it has gained such headway as to make the fight uncertain in its outcome; IF THE CHURCH IN ITS fundamental law demands the right to reverse the present order and its laws show that IT WOULD and WILL when it gets in position to do so, shall we sit in idleness, with the facts before us, and wait until it has become powerful enough to make resistance uncertain or useless? IF ROMANISM IS RIGHT, then we should all embrace it; if it is WRONG, it must be opposed, and prevented from being "infused, as it were, into all the veins of the State," as Leo says.

In a preceding paragraph, we have shown where Liguori teaches, and the pope's church sanctioned it, that "God has placed the whole church, not only under the patronage, but even under the dominion of Mary": In the second volume of "Glories of

Mary" I find a decree which seems to discredit Mary (but a little thing like that never bothers a Romanist), which decree was issued by Pope Pius IX, in 1870, in which JOSEPH is made the Patron of the Catholic Church. When we recall the promise that the gates of hell should not prevail against the Church of God, and that the pope says he is in charge of that church, and after reading the foregoing showing how all powerful Mary is over the forces of heaven, earth and hell, and that at that time—1870—Italy was throwing off "the sweet yoke" of the papal church, the language of the decree is very impressive in which its protection is transferred *from Mary to Joseph*, as follows:

"Now, in these extremely sad times, as the church herself, attacked on all sides by her enemies, is weighed down by evils so great that wicked men are thinking they see that hell is finally prevailing against her, the Venerable Prelates of the whole Catholic world have addressed to the Sovereign Pontiff their prayers and that of the faithful confided to their care, asking that he might deign to make St. Joseph the Patron of the Catholic Church. . . . Moved by the deplorable state of things after the recent events, wished to fulfill the desires of the Venerable Prelates by placing himself and all the faithful under the very powerful protection of the Holy Patriarch, St. Joseph, and he solemnly decreed him to be the *Patron of the Catholic Church*."

Eighteen hundred and seventy years after Jesus made the promise to be with His Church, and after the popes had set Mary in the place of Christ, we find the pope's church getting in trouble with the Kingdom of Italy, in the matter of separating Church and State, and the pope is "moved by these deplorable things" to dethrone Mary and enthroned Joseph, as the Patron of the Church; that is to say, that, although he, the pope, holds the place of God Almighty in the world, he needed help, and after giving Mary a try-out for almost seventeen hundred years—my! how slow the popes are to recognize what all the worlds knows for hundreds of years!—he places the church under the protection of Mary's husband, Joseph!

Let us now quote Liguori, *as he sings the praise of Joseph*: "For me, it is enough to state what St. Teresa says . . . : 'The Lord gives us to understand that, as He wished to be subject to St. Joseph on earth, so in heaven He does whatever the saint asks.'" That "Gerson says that, with Jesus Christ, the prayers of St. Joseph have in a certain manner the force of a command." (!)

"The Venerable Sister Pudentiana Zagnoni, who was greatly devoted to St. Joseph, had at death the happiness of seeing the saint approach her bed WITH JESUS IN HIS ARMS." (Jesus ever remains as a-babe-in-arms in the papal system of religion!)

Joseph "has the special privilege of delivering dying persons from the snares of the devil."

From the foregoing citations from Liguori, we may readily understand why the papal church strives to keep the Bible out of the hands of all people; why Rome has made us throw it out of the public schools, although the children of Romanists are sent to papal schools. If the people would permit teaching the papal Catechism and worship of Mary, Joseph, etc., they would let their children attend, but for the present this is not permitted, so she sets up her own schools; and I most respectfully contend that those who belong to the Roman church can not be true to the public schools and should not be permitted to teach therein. Certainly, non-Catholics do not want *their* children brought up under the influence of ancient paganism where they learn to depend upon a creature rather than the Creator for guidance in life.

That the pope is the Anti-Christ seems proven by many facts; but when we realize every law in the papal code is aimed, not at Mohammedanism, Confucianism, Buddhism, or other pagans, but at those who have been *baptized*—holding that the pope is bishop not only of the Roman Catholic church, but of the Church Universal of God, and hence all the baptized are “separated brethren” who are to be compelled to return to the papal fold, using coercive measures if necessary, even to death, no doubt can remain as to whether the pope is the Vice-Gerent of Christ, or the Anti-Christ.

The late Priest Phelan, of St. Louis, once said that the Roman church would give no bond for its good behavior. Sure not. It can't. Its laws and doctrines as outlined in these pages show that it is impossible for the pope's church to give such bond—it guarantees but one thing, namely: to put such laws in force when it becomes possible—after getting entrenched in politics and as trainers of youth in our schools for a sufficient length of time.

American Protestants are spending millions of dollars every year to send the Gospel to the heathen of the world—and I assist in this—while the cancer of Romanism is being fastened into the system of our national life; the “sap” of Romanism is being infused into every vein of the State: how many converts to Christianity do the Protestants win in foreign lands each year? Rome claims to be winning about 500,000 in America annually—adults, at that! How has this been made possible? *Because the Protestant preachers have failed to protest*—have failed to teach the principles of Protestantism and Romanism, and in many cases, *the sons and daughters of Protestants are won from the so-called Protestant ranks* who have been taught to look upon Romanism as merely another Christian church. If Protestant Christianity is good enough to send to heathen lands, surely it is good enough to be taught *at home in our churches* and to our fellow-citizens; it is all right to send the Gospel to heathen lands, but those who take part in this, and refuse to evangelize their own land, but

permit their own flesh and blood to grow up in ignorance of papalism to become adherents of that system, to worship Mary and Joseph, et al., at the order of a foreign politico-ecclesiastical monarch, mock God, and are not the friends of American civilization! They by their silence, bow to the pope's claim of being their bishop!

The next charge is:

"4th, attended by a penalty (even capital)." If this is true, there was no law to force him to assume it; if he does, he is exercising his own free will, which carries with it the right at any time to say "Halt!" to anybody who transgresses what his conscience tells him is wrong, and he could arrest proceedings at that point.

"5th, considered, by Masons, as paramount to the obligations of the law of the land."

There are, according to Akin, Twenty-five Unchangeable Landmarks of Freemasonry; the 22d reads: "That a Book of the Law of God must constitute an indispensable part of the furniture of every Loge." Without the Book, there is no Masonic Lodge: one accepting the Bible as his guide as taught by Masonry, can not subscribe to or acquiesce in an oath that is paramount to the laws of the land and his obligation of obedience to such laws, from the obvious reason that the laws of the land, especially in non-Catholic countries, are based upon the Word of God; it would in that matter be just as logical to say one is guilty of drowning a fish by removing it from a fountain and placing it in the boundless ocean.

It is a matter worthy of note that Mr. Farrell has quoted five charges against Masons, which were made and promulgated by a papal church council, but he does not quote a single word from Masonic Law supporting these priests hundred of years ago, because they do not exist in fact (an open Bible frightens popery, which no doubt calls for its legislation against members joining the Masonic order), but we have sufficient evidence, from papal laws, to show what Romanism teaches as to the *fifth* charge against Masonry.

(3) That a Mason will not affirm or deny a charge against the order is but applying the rule of common sense, recognized long ago by the Arabs, who pithily paraphrased the rule by saying: "He who knows not, and knows not that he knows not, is a fool; shun him." One who knows nothing of Masonry and can not cite a single law showing it to be of evil intent, what's the use of entering into an argument with him? But I venture to assert no intelligent Catholic will say the Roman church has no authoritative literature counseling disobedience to the laws of the land.

(4) Critical analysis of evidence, and comparison of logical

deductions is not "incrimination and recrimination"—it's the exercise of a healthy mind and free conscience.

"Do you not think good citizens . . . ?" What makes one a "good citizen," in a non-Catholic community, as shown herein by the many citations from papal and Masonic law, I will leave the reader to determine.

(5) The pope, German and Austrian divine-right rulers made "Pleas for a Peace," too; but as long as they keep their men mobilized on the firing line, their pleas will fall on deaf ears: as long as there remains an indication that the Catholics in America are subject to the decrees of an Italian potentate, their pleas will receive little consideration.

Now for a distinctive comparison of the moral code of Freemasonry and Romanism, as I find them:

In the code of the Grand Lodge of Georgia, under caption "Trials," according to Akin, "The following are Masonic offenses subjecting the offender to Masonic discipline: 1. Violations of the moral law. 2. Violations of the laws of Masonry. 3. VIOLATIONS OF THE LAWS OF THE LAND involving moral turpitude."

Under sub-head, par. 4, the general law is cited as illustrative: "Mason's daughter's want of chastity does not prevent Mason's intercourse with her from being Masonic offense, he knowing her to be a Mason's daughter," while the "writings of the holy fathers" teach that it is better for priests to go wrong with a hundred different women than to marry one.

"Saint" Liguori asks if a woman, accused of adultery, which she has really committed, may deny it under oath, and answers: "Yes; provided she has been to confess and received the absolution, for then the sin has been pardoned, and has really ceased to exist."—Card. Disc. 19, V. 54.

Which system teaches the purest morality; which code of morality offers the greatest protection to society by throwing every safeguard around womanhood—Roman Catholicism, or Freemasonry? Under which influence would you prefer your wife or daughter to live, that of Romanism, or Freemasonry?

The papal church persists in classing Masonry as a "sect"—a religion: suppose the order *should* proclaim to the world that it has decided to be known hereafter as a religion, with the presiding officer of the lodges as priests and the Grand Masters as bishops, and the Grand Commander of the highest degree as pope; suppose then that this great organization should promulgate the doctrine that if a Mason should commit a crime—say, for instance, kill a woman, as was done by a Romanist a few months ago in New York who was, it is alleged, secreted by a priest who assisted him to escape to Italy—and if it was made known to the Master of a lodge, he has the right to swear that he knows noth-

ing about it, every Protestant preacher and newspaper editor in America would tear their shirt-tails off in their zeal to denounce the Masonic "religion," YET, and YET! all except a few of them are as silent as the grave while the pope teaches:

Question "28. May a priest in a court of justice make known what he has learned in the confessional?"

Answer: "No; and if he is questioned, he ought to declare to the judge, WITH AN OATH IF THAT BE NECESSARY, that he knows nothing of the subject in question," p. 447, "Manual of Christian Doctrine."

We have elsewhere observed that the pope teaches his subjects to resort to mental reservation and equivocation, while his priests are to swear outright to a lie. As a natural sequence to this doctrine, if papists are to be untruthful and conceal a crime, IT IS JUST AS REASONABLE TO SAY THE CRIMINAL MUST BE CONCEALED; and "like priest, like people": if the priest can swear to a lie, how shall we know that the layman does not emulate his priest? If one will conceal tenets which are criminal according to the Constitution of the United States, as McCreary and the Laymen's Association have done, is it unreasonable to presume they will, if occasion demands, protect a criminal?

Augusta, Ga., Nov. 28, 1917.

Dear Sir: Did you ever hear of Cardinal Jacobatius? Well, he is an authority on "Conscience." His works are among the famous "Labbe Collection," of which you may or may not have heard, but which is none the less famous.

(1) Now, in the fourth book of that collection, at page 241, Jacobatius, writing of the pope and conscience, says: "If it were doubtful whether a precept of the pope be a sin or not, we must determine thus: that if he to whom the precept is addressed has a conscientious sense that the precept is a sin, first it is his duty to put off the sense; but, if he can not, in that case it is his duty to follow his own private conscience."

(2) Does not that cut the knot and slip your last hold, and give a rule of action that though preserving order and law leaves the conscience free as God made it? If you ever saw a rule of human conduct more apt to cultivate a conscience in mankind while extending the utmost rational liberty to the individual as a last resort, I shall be forever indebted to you for giving it to me.

(3) Where now, are all the Pyrotechnics about the liberty of conscience, freedom of the soul and all that, as being rights that the Catholic church denies to her children? In the light of this clear teaching of Catholic theology you must see that they are free, as completely free as anyone with a will to do right can wish to be.

(4) You object that Catholics are "like children"; but there is good authority for saying that "Of such are the Kingdom of Heaven," and unless we are like unto them we shall hardly enter there.

Very truly,

J. J. FARRELL, Mgr.

COMMENT

(1) I thought we had exhausted this subject, but it seems not. Mr. Farrell cites another of the "holy fathers" who is a little different from the others; he is sure "Jacobatius" or "Jacobtius" will set me right. Now, I will admit that a cardinal theologian who has prepared a "famous" collection is entitled to some consideration; but as far as my investigation has extended, Jacob.... is not as "famous" as Loyola, the founder of the "famous" Jesuit society, which is the controlling factor to-day in the Roman church; therefore, I will put him up to answer the arguments of Jacob-a-tius, and back him with a pope or two, who will help me retain my "last hold."

(But first let me say that I think John Wesley has heard of the "L'Abbe" collection!)

Says Loyola: "No constitution, declaration or any order of living can involve an obligation to commit sin, mortal or venial, unless the Superior commands it in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, or in virtue of holy obedience."—Jesuit Const., Part VI, chap. V, sec. 31. Nicolini, p. 34. Loyola further teaches: "If it seems to me that the Superior has ordered me to do something against my conscience, or in which there appears to be something sinful, if he is of contrary opinion, and I have no certainty, I should rely upon him. . . . I must no longer belong to myself, but to my Creator, and those who govern in His name, and in whose hands I should be as soft wax, whatsoever he chooses to require of me." Further he says: "He must regard the Superior as Christ the Lord, and must strive to acquire perfect resignation and denial of his own will and judgment, in all things conforming his will and judgment to that which the Superior wills and judges." Part III, chap. X, sec. 5, Const. Jesuits.

Bartoli, the Jesuit historian, writing in defense of Jesuitism, in Vol. II, p. 93, expresses one of the Jesuit vows thus: "I should regard myself as a dead body, without will or intelligence, as a little crucifix which is turned about unhesitatingly at the will of him who holds it, as a staff in the hands of an old man, who uses it as he requires it, and as it suits him best."

Now, Loyola has been made a "saint" by popery because of his work, while Cardinal Jacobtius is yet a cardinal!

In Taunton's Canon Law, under the head of "Condemned Propositions," the 20th reads: "*Laxa*. A proposition is 'lax' when it too much *FAVORS freedom of conscience*."

In his famous Syllabus of 1864, Pope Pius IX condemned the following proposition: "Every man is free to embrace and profess the religion which his reason tells him is true."—Prop. 15. He also condemned as error the proposition that "The church has not the power of inflicting punishment, nor any temporal power, direct or indirect.—Prop. 24 (now incorporated in Canon Law).

Leo XIII is listed in Deharbe's Catechism as "Leo XIII, gloriosamente regnante"; in his Encyclical on Human Liberty, June 20, 1888, he says: "Another liberty is widely advocated, namely, *liberty of conscience*. . . . It is sufficiently refuted by the arguments already adduced."

Hear Leo further: "But the supreme teacher in the church is the Roman Pontiff. Union of minds, therefore, requires, together with a perfect accord in one faith, *complete submission and obedience of WILL* to the church and to the Roman Pontiff AS TO GOD HIMSELF. This obedience should, however, be PERFECT, because it is enjoined by faith itself, and has this in common with faith, that *it cannot be given in shreds*;—nay, were it not ABSOLUTE and perfect, it might wear the name of obedience, but its essence would disappear. Christian usage attaches such value to this perfection of obedience that it has been, *and will ever be*, accounted *the distinguishing mark* by which we are able to recognize Catholics. . . . What we are *bound* to believe, and what we are *obliged* to do, are laid down . . . by the Supreme Pontiff," pp. 193-4, Great Encyc. Lets. (If Farrell uses holy water, wears a scapular, or counts his beads, it is in obedience to the will of the pope.)

Leo seems to have been a close student and admirer of Loyola. There are no higher authorities in the Roman institution than these two; they both make it a condition precedent to being one of the "children" to bury their will and judgment in that of the superior. An individual, private *will* and judgment result only from the existence of a free conscience. "Conscience," to repeat, means self-knowledge of a fact, from which self-knowledge we use private judgment to determine if a proposition be good or bad, and that calls for the display of an independent will, by which we "choose" to accept the good or the bad; therefore, according to these the greatest of all Catholic authorities, a free conscience has as much chance to exist under popery as a lighted match dropped in the middle of the Atlantic ocean.

(2) "Does not that cut the knot and slip your last hold?" asks Mr. Farrell; no, not q-u-i-t-e; and if I felt my hold slipping, I would get a new purchase from Leo here: "Whatever the Roman Pontiffs have hitherto taught, or shall *hereafter* teach, must be held with a firm grasp of mind." This one sentence, based as it is on papal LAW, completely chokes the life out of a free conscience.

If I found my hold slipping, I would call Pope Gregory to my assistance, who would say (Encyclical, August 15, 1832): "If the Holy Catholic church so requires, let us sacrifice our own opinions, our knowledge, our INTELLIGENCE and the most sublime attainments of the human understanding." What becomes of the cardinal? First, his doctrine is condemned by his superior as "lax," and then completely abolished by the law of his church!

Mr. Farrell ought to acknowledge he can not defend Romanism. *That's why the pope forbids the "faithful" to debate with Protestants.*

In this paragraph he asks: "Does not that leave the conscience free as God made it?"

What is "Conscience"? Answered in a word, it is "KNOWLEDGE." One's knowledge, then, consists of what he has learned: we turn to the Canon Law on Censorship of Books and read as follows:

"9. The books that are bound to be submitted to ecclesiastical censure are: (1) Books on the Scripture; (2) Sacred theology; (3) Ecclesiastical history; (4) Canon law; (5) Natural theology; (6) Ethics; (7) And all writings treating of religious or moral subjects," so we see that if a Catholic desires *knowledge* on any one of these all-important questions concerning the Present and Future, HE MUST SECURE IT FROM THE POPE, through his priests; therefore, what he learns is only what the pope wills for him to know, and has no conscience "free as God made it," but fettered as the pope bound it with LAW.

Referring especially to Loyola's teaching, but in general to the principle, R. W. Thompson says: "The human mind is not fertile enough in invention to discover a lower depth of humiliation than this—a more complete surrender of all the ennobling qualities and instincts of manhood."

(3) The citation from the Law as to censorship of books could be repeated here, quoting from the Law decreed by Leo XIII, but as Taunton evidently copied that, I offer it as answering this paragraph.

(4) Christ said: "Suffer little children to come unto Me, for of such is the Kingdom of Heaven," and "except ye become as one of these (little children) ye can not enter the Kingdom of Heaven." Any well-read person knows that He is teaching that one must become as pure, faithful, true, loving, and HARMLESS TO OTHERS, as a little child to enter the kingdom, but not to remain so intellectually any more than physically, and to be as free in conscience as in body, which is corroborated by Paul, who said: "When I was a child, I thought as a child; when I became a man, I put away childish things," and desired to become "a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ," and nowhere in the whole of God's universe, except in the papal church, can a warrant be found to keep the human mind and conscience and intellect on the plane of a little child, to be for all time fed as it were from its mother's breast, or by a spoon at the hands of another, while the Theology of Dens, Liguori, etc., crowd their minds with more vileness than one would learn otherwise during his whole natural life, and to keep their minds occupied give them saint-images to play with, shinbones to rattle, holy-water sooth-

ing syrup to frighten away evil spirits, candles to keep them from being afraid of the dark, quenching their spiritual hunger by feeding them on the body of Christ, and scaring them into perfect quietness by holding before their vision the torments of purgatory, while robbing them of their "pennies" to get them out after they get in—but *not sure*. Christ also said: "Be ye as harmless as doves, BUT wise as serpents." Rome *may* be as wise as the serpent—but, is she as harmless as a dove?

If Romanists were satisfied to remain as little children, to be fed on papal dogma and directed by papal decrees, and also like little children and did not attempt to interfere with those who do not care to be fed out of the same spoon, we could all go our respective ways rejoicing; but their "conscience" does not permit the display of this childish characteristic; in conscience they are taught to pray to saints with one degree of veneration, to offer another degree of worship to Mary, and a third degree to the "Host" or pancake, and eat Him; and because others refuse, the SAME AUTHORITY teaches that the church has the right to remove them from the earth by death, when it becomes expedient.

In Taunton's Canon Law, cap. "Coercive Powers," it is taught: "What may be done lawfully under certain circumstances would be most unwise under conditions totally different."

That is not PRINCIPLE arising from a free conscience, but EXPEDIENCY: and an institution that is governed fundamentally by "expediency" instead of principle, can never make peace with an enlightened people; it is a constant menace to the peace of the world, and particular States, and is a challenge—for like a tiger, it but awaits the opportunity to display its true nature, which has marked the pathway of man with blood for hundreds and hundreds of years.

The Catholic Laymen's Association of Georgia, through its Manager, Mr. Farrell, recognized that Conscience plays an important part in worthy American citizenship (for those who exercise the right to *vote* become a *menace* to a democracy where they do not express *their own conscience* at the polls), and has devoted considerable space in the effort to establish the fact that Catholics possess this essential of good citizenship.

In concluding the discussion of this subject, I will sum up as concisely as possible:

Referring to the letter of November 25, 1917, Mr. Farrell quotes Cardinal Newman, who cites Cardinal Gousset's Moral Theology, saying: "The divine law is the supreme rule of our actions, our thoughts, words, desires, all that man is, and this law is the rule of our conduct by means of our conscience; hence, it is never lawful to go against our conscience."

I presume "the divine law" means the Word of God—the Holy Bible; evidently it would not help his case to say it means some-

thing the pope has said; now we turn to the official code of the church of Rome on the subject of "General Decrees Concerning the Prohibition and Censorship of Books," and in Chapter III, we read:

"7. As it has been clearly shown by experience that, if the Holy Bible in the vernacular is generally permitted without distinction, more harm than utility is thereby caused, owing to human temerity: all versions in the vernacular" (that means, in the language you speak), "even by Catholics, ARE ALTOGETHER PROHIBITED, UNLESS APPROVED BY THE HOLY SEE, or published under vigilant care of the bishops, WITH ANNOTATIONS TAKEN FROM THE FATHERS OF THE CHURCH AND LEARNED CATHOLIC WRITERS."

This decree is as binding upon Catholics as the decree of Priestly Celibacy; it's as binding upon them as the decree requiring a priest's presence at a marriage; all *Apostolic Constitutions* bind a Catholic in conscience—and this is from that of Pope Leo XIII, "*Officiorum ac Munerum*, Jan. 25, 1897."

Let us suppose there is a Catholic who desires to have "a conscience void of offense toward God and man" and turns to "the divine law" to ascertain what it requires; he goes to a book store and calls for a copy of "the divine law"; before it is wrapped, a priest standing there requests to see it; he turns to the fly-leaf and fails to discover the papal mark of censorship—it's a non-Catholic Bible, and he promptly informs the purchasing Catholic that he can not possess or read that book. Being asked why, the priest replies: "It has not been 'approved by the Holy See, or published under vigilant care of the bishops, with annotations taken from the Fathers of the Church and learned Catholic writers,' and because the Holy Father has decreed: '8. All versions of the Holy Bible, in any vernacular language, made by non-Catholics, are prohibited,' therefore, as a good and faithful child of the church you can not read it"; to perfect himself, he attempts to buy any of "those books which treat of Holy Scripture, sacred theology, ecclesiastical history, canon law, natural theology, ethics, and other religious or moral subjects of this character; and in general writings especially concerned with religion and morality," and the priest says to him, "You are transgressing the 'General Decrees' of the 'holy father,' and he has said, 'If any one shall so presume, let him know that he will incur the wrath of Almighty God, and of the blessed Apostles Peter and Paul!'" (49th Decree.)

This is the crucial moment with the Catholic: If he buys the books HE CEASES TO BE A CATHOLIC (or soon will); if he lays them down at the behest of the priest, he thereby acknowledges the sovereignty of the pope over, and the director of, his conscience.

Go into any Roman Catholic home—if you find there any book on the above list at all, it will have the papal censor's imprimatur; look at the mast-head of any Roman Catholic religious publication, it *must bear the mark of Rome's permission!*

I have endeavored to follow Mr. Farrell and his citations closely on the subject of conscience; it is really the most important question that has arisen in all these discussions, because in its last analysis it involves questions that are vital to this Republic, as the following will demonstrate:

The Fourteenth of the "General Decrees" reads as follows, in part:

"14. Those books, moreover, are prohibited which . . . treat of Freemasonry, or other societies of the kind, teaching them to be useful, and not injurious to the Church and to Society; AND THOSE WHICH DEFEND ERRORS PROSCRIBED BY THE HOLY APOSTOLIC SEE."

One of the "opinions" branded as false by Pope Pius IX in his Syllabus of Errors, quoted in the Great Encyclical Letters of Pope Leo XIII, and published by Benziger Bros., New York, Printers to the Holy See, reads as follows:

"Prop. lv. The Church must be separated from the State, and the State from the Church." (If this is a "false" opinion, then, obviously, the opposite must be true, *i. e.*, that the State *must* be united to the church.)

The whole scheme of American Civilization is based upon keeping the Church and State forever separate; it is a fundamental principle incorporated in the supreme law of the land—the Constitution of the United States—and in the laws of every State in the Union.

Under these State and National laws, "Freemasonry, or societies of the kind," are lawful, as "not injurious to . . . Society," but Catholics are forbidden to read such books, and are obedient; and EVERY TEXT-BOOK IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF THE LAND, which in any manner teach that "the Church must be separated from the State, and the State from the Church," *defend errors proscribed by the Holy Apostolic See,* and Catholics are forbidden to possess or read *them*. "OBEDIENCE of WILL" to the pope, says Leo, "has this in common with FAITH, that it can not be given in shreds," and "is the distinguishing mark by which we are able to recognize Catholics," hence, the parochial school!

"St." Thomas Aquinas, the "Angelic Doctor" of the whole church of Rome, teaches: "Human law is law only by virtue of its accordance with right reason; and thus it is manifest that it flows from the eternal law. And in so far as it deviates from right reason it is called an unjust law; in such case it is no law at all,

but rather a species of violence." There are over 20,000 Roman Catholic priests in America who studied this theology of Aquinas; there are some sixteen or seventeen million members under them; do these Catholics give "internal" or "external" assent to this doctrine of Aquinas, that the law of the land is a "species of violence"? If they do, they are unworthy of the rights of citizenship; if they give external or internal assent to the LAW of Pius IX, and believe it is wrong to separate Church and State, *they are unworthy of citizenship*. And if they remain in that "church" they endorse it.

To which principle are they true? Measure them by the yardstick used by Leo XIII: "Obedience . . . Faith . . . can not be given in shreds"; measure them by the yardstick of Christ: "No man can serve two masters," he will "hate the one and cling to the other"; to which are Romanists clinging?

Leo said, "We hold upon this earth the place of God Almighty," and that "if the laws of the State are manifestly at variance with divine law . . . to resist becomes a positive duty; to obey, a crime," and for a Catholic to ascertain whether or not such conflict exists, he must appeal to the pope through the priest; being a creature of the pope, the priest will teach as the pope directs; not having a free conscience, the true Catholic will accept what his superior, the priest, tells him the pope declares is "the divine law," **AND AS LONG AS HE REMAINS A CATHOLIC, HE WILL BE GOVERNED THEREBY.**

"The divine law" and "the eternal law," referred to by Gousset and Aquinas, means the Bible, and if a Catholic reads it at all, it must be the papal version, with notes by the fathers and learned theologians explaining how it must be understood—not even a priest can place a private interpretation on it: therefore, if the divine law molds the conscience of the Catholic, it has been interpreted for him by the pope, and there is no "free conscience as God made it" in that case; while any law that does not accord with "the eternal law," according to Aquinas, is *not law*, "*but a species of violence*," and as the pope only has the right to define what is "the eternal law," obviously the Catholic conscience is dependent upon the pope in determining whether or not a law of the land is in harmony with "the eternal law," hence, **THE POPE OF ROME, THROUGH THIS PRINCIPLE, REIGNS AS TRULY OVER MEMBERS OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES, AND DIRECTS THEIR ATTITUDE IN SPIRIT AND IN FACT, AS IF THEY WERE CITIZENS OF THE PAPAL STATES OF ITALY, or AS ABSOLUTELY AS THE SWAY OF THE GERMAN KAISER OVER HIS SUBJECTS!**

I have read the Bible and studied it, and given some consideration to learned writers and students; but in all this I have not

found where Christ or any of His Apostles taught a "DOUBLE DOCTRINE"—that is to say, they did not teach their followers one thing and those on the outside another totally different; that would be deception, and Christ did not rely upon deceit, which is of the devil, to make converts, or to gain TOLERANCE FOR HIS FOLLOWERS.

That there is a "Double Doctrine" in the Church of Rome, no more satisfactory proof could be demanded than is furnished by Mr. Farrell's ability to cite from the works of "cardinals" to show that Catholics have a conscience free as God made it. If a Protestant asks the Roman church if Catholics have a free conscience, she answers "Yes, here is what 'cardinals' say"; she shows that side of her face to me; but let a Catholic ask the question, and she says "No! the pope has even condemned any proposition that 'too much favors freedom of conscience'." That's the other side of her face!

It is generally understood that in defining a dogma to be proposed to belief, the pope must have sufficient evidence from the Bible to warrant teaching it; or, it must be founded upon Tradition, especially things that were said or done by the Apostles of Christ and handed down by word of mouth by the fathers of that church; now, the Dogma of Purgatory, for example, may be considered as illustrative of this double doctrine as applied to those inside of the church: there is the very slightest foundation for purgatory in the Bible—in fact, carefully considered, is rather a negation, taking the Book as its own commentary, which precludes the dogma being established thereon; but how about Tradition? To be based upon that, there must be an unbroken chain from the Apostles to warrant it. The doctrine was proclaimed as an article of faith by the Councils of Florence and Trent hundreds of years after the Apostolic age, yet we have an array of men as learned in the Roman church as have ever been, who did not believe in purgatory—never heard of it as being taught by, and handed down as, Tradition from the Apostles: among the early "holy fathers" of the Roman church we find St. Irenaeus denies it; he lived just one hundred and forty years after the Apostles—about 140-202—surely, if there was any Tradition upon which to base it, he would have known of it. Origen was a writer and teacher in the Roman church in the second century—he did not believe in purgatory. Tertullian, an early Latin scholar of the Roman church, objected to the doctrine in the second century, and as late as the beginning of the seventh century after the Apostles we find such a man as St. Augustine saying, "Such a belief is not incredible, BUT ITS EXISTENCE is certainly DISCUSSABLE." (NOTE—After adoption, "The Council of Trent warns preachers not to enter into curious and subtle points in their sermons on purgatory."—Canon Law, by Taunton.)

So, we see that in regard to purgatory, as in the matter of free conscience, a Catholic could use the "writings of the fathers" Irenaeus, Origen, Tertullian, or St. Augustine to establish a fact *when dealing with a non-Catholic*, while to those on the inside, if a Catholic should believe the matter "discussable" and ask concerning it, the priest would only have to say "*Creda*"! "The pope through his church has said so!" and to a Catholic he "knows that purgatory is a fact and does not have to investigate!"

The only conclusion is, that as Divine Revelation ended with the Apostles, Tradition fails to disclose the Apostles held the doctrine, and the Bible does not teach it, purgatory is purely of human origin and invention, which, like all other successful human inventions, is a wonderful source of revenue to the Italian Institution.

As Revelation closed with the Apostles, and as they did not institute the use of scapulars and rosary beads, these are also human inventions.

Augusta, Ga., Dec. 1, 1917.

Dear Sir: (1) This will conclude my comments on your long letter, except as to the debate and as to the publication of our exchanges and saving the matter of the folder about which I wrote.

(2) We have covered considerable ground in this discussion, and tried travelers, you know, are not always agreeable talkers. But if I have said anything throughout that you think ought to have been said in a different and more kindly way, then, I wish I had said it that way.

(3) You have very courteously not attempted to sidetrack the matter on your part and this does not go unappreciated, I can assure you; but now, if there is any part of your letter I have not covered, I shall be glad for you to call my attention to it.

(4) I shall not say you must be satisfied about the many questions treated, but do venture to think that you must have a better understanding of many if not all of them. Sufficient at least not to doubt that Catholics and non-Catholics, if they will try—and we *are* trying—can live together in peace.

There are difficulties, yes; but a wise man once said that a thousand difficulties do not make a single doubt.

Very truly,

J. J. FARRELL, Mgr.

COMMENT

(1) In the Appendix I believe it will be made clear that the Catholic Laymen's Association of Georgia never contemplated entering into a debate; as to joint publication, the utter disregard of my oft-repeated request that answers to my questions be supported by competent authority—that means, citing from popes or general councils—to show the attitude of Catholics toward moral, civil and political matters, and viewed in the light of the

letters exchanged as to the debate, I am satisfied we could never come to a satisfactory conclusion; as the folder referred to, from the information asked for, it appears that it has assumed a personal aspect, and I am in no way making any phase of the question personal.

(2) Perhaps we have both evinced a little spirit, at times; however, as we have not been dealing with individuals, but principles of a system, no apology is craved, none offered.

(3) All the correspondence has been faithfully copied; if there is any letter missing, as per the files of Mr. Farrell, no doubt it was the fault of the mails, not mine. Also, I have endeavored to treat all subjects in that plain, straight-forward manner as becomes one who desires to be honest with himself and his fellow-man, and just as I would treat the same subjects with any other sect or class if they had the aspirations and ambitions as I believe actuates the Roman Catholic church through its HEAD.

(4) I am sorry, and regret to have to make the admission, that the answers to my questions have proven a disappointment in general as touching matters concerning important issues.

Mr. Farrell says that "Catholics and non-Catholics, if they will try—and we *are* trying—can live together in peace": yes, as long as non-Catholics do not question the religion of Catholics, while the laws and doctrines shown in this book are impressed daily on the minds, hearts and consciences of Catholics; "*we are trying*": some months ago (I think it was the issue under date of July 7, 1918), I saw a copy of *Our Sunday Visitor*, reputed to have the largest circulation of any Catholic publication in America; on its front page was a large cartoon: spanning a deep Ravine representing Time, was a suspension-bridge, narrow, the planks unsecurely fastened to the stays, many entirely missing, while the end that was supposed to have been anchored on Eternity's Shores *did not reach there*, but was suspended over the chasm, and at about its middle was a man supposed to represent a Protestant preacher; close beside this characature was another bridge, symmetrical in its proportions, and of durable composition—

"*We are trying to live together in peace*," says Mr. Farrell; but to my mind, that one cartoon epitomizes official Romanism as it is taught in dogma and decree of the Roman church to its followers, which has the official approval of the present pope, Benedict XV, John Bonanzo, Apostolic Delegate from the Pope to Washington, D. C., and H. J. Alerding, Bishop of Forth Worth, Ind.

Benedict XV says in part: "There are two things which, among others, commend to us the Catholic paper, *Our Sunday Visitor* . . . : the first is, the task proposed by you so to spread and explain Catholic doctrine that you might attach *Catholics* more closely to it. . . ."

John Bonanzo: "The nature of your work tends to supply, in a popular and practical way, the religious needs of both Catholics and non-Catholics. . . ."

H. J. Alerding: "Your work . . . is truly an apostolic work. . . ."

With the history of popery before me, covering almost two thousand years; with the law of the church in my hands; with current, world-wide events, especially in regard to the Great War, the attitude of Catholics in Canada, in Ireland, in Australia, and many in America, to the Governments, before me; with a full knowledge of the un-American influence and power exerted in political circles to secure special favors in this country during the war which have a sinister bearing on the peace of the nation; that Masonry was originally barred from the cantonments while the church of Rome had access thereto through the Knights of Columbus (Masonry permitted to enter under restrictions later; Protestantism as such was barred, all ministers having to work, if at all, through the Y. M. C. A., which is merely a club for general moral work—though composed of Protestants is not Protestant neither a religion); when I know that the public press is closely scanned and censored; when I know that almost every picture that is thrown on the movie screen that has any suggestion of religion in it presents Catholicism as Catholic priests would have the people see Romanism, while other religious suggestions resemble in effect the *cartoon in the Sunday Visitor*; and when I believe Jesuitism is directing the Roman church throughout America and has centered all Catholics under one head in the Federated Societies; and when I read the teaching of the pope as to popular education and see that as far as practicable his children are obedient, I must confess I see no hope for Roman Catholics and non-Catholics in America to live together in that peace which makes for the best interest of the country, until they themselves show adequate proof that the laws and decrees of the church which stand in the way of this desired end have been nullified.

I am looking facts in the face, fully comprehending my responsibility in the matter, both to Catholics and non-Catholics; I would be glad to say, "Come, let us reason together," *but they will not*; I would say, "Explain this question to me fully in the light of what the church requires of you," *but they will not*; I say that I believe the Roman church has declared war against American institutions, Protestantism, fraternal orders, and to keep the Catholic conscience trained in the dogmas and decrees of the Dark Ages sets up its parochial school, which also segregates the youth of the land who should grow up with each other, learning together the lessons that will perpetuate the liberties purchased with blood for all of us, all to become co-workers for the common good and to esteem each other as citizens of a common country, and instead

of disabusing my mind of this opinion, subtle arguments are presented that render the issues more opaque. Therefore, I must stand for what I conceive to be my duty, and leave the results to Him who holds the destiny of the nations in the hollow of His hand.

Augusta, Ga., Dec. 8, 1917.

Dear Sir: Regarding a Plea for Peace:

In the instruction of General Albert Pike given to the "Intimate Secretary" in his "Morals and Dogma" (p. 123), is the following splendid paragraph:

"Only the base and ungenerous delight in discord; it is the poorest occupation of humanity to labor to make men think ill of each other. The duty of the Mason is to endeavor to make man think better of his neighbor; to quiet instead of aggravating difficulties; to bring together those who are estranged; to keep friends from becoming foes and to persuade foes to become friends."

I commend this to you as setting forth the spirit and purpose of the Catholic Laymen's Association. Will you endorse and stand by it?

I reach you my hand.

Very truly,

JJF/LH

J. J. FARRELL, Mgr.

COMMENT

Has Mr. Farrell a proscribed book in his possession? Did he secure permission from the bishop? If not, he has violated a decree of the church, and is not a true Catholic; it's a "book which treats of Freemasonry."

I believe that paragraph portrays Freemasonry; and I believe if the individual Catholic was left to himself, as a free American citizen, to shape his conduct without regard to the influence of a pope in Europe, peace and harmony would prevail; but LAYMEN can not speak for the church of Rome; that is the prerogative of the priest, who speaks as he is instructed by his bishop, the bishop getting his orders from the pope; and as to Freemasonry, that has been discussed. Now, we read a Roman Catholic paper and learn what priests teach Catholics: "Why don't somebody in Congress or Legislature introduce and pass bills to investigate and destroy these secret Masonic lodges and societies? After these Masonic societies get through arousing prejudice and bitterness against Catholic citizens and their church and religion, they will direct their efforts against the Government of the United States. That has been their program in Europe; it is the program followed in Mexico, and it will be followed here in due time."—*The Roman Catholic Review*, Baltimore, October 7, 1916.

General Pike spoke officially as a Mason; the priest-editor spoke officially as a Catholic: which comports best with what Mr. Farrell says the LAYMEN desire?

THE BISHOP'S OATH

In a booklet entitled "An Appeal to Fair Minds," the signature to its "Foreword" being "Joseph B. Frankhauser, S. J., Pastor of St. Joseph's Church, Macon, Ga., February, 1916," the following is the first information it presents, on page one:

"This booklet is offered to the public in the hope that it will serve as an antidote to the slanderous attacks upon the Catholic Church, her priests, and her people, so recently made in lectures in the City Auditorium, Macon, Ga., February 2-7, 1916.

"For the sake of those who have borne false witness against us, the following text from Holy Scripture is appended:

"A DECEITFUL WITNESS THAT UTTERETH LIES, THE LORD DETESTETH' (Proverbs vi:19)."

On page 23, under the heading, "Do Not Catholic Bishops and Priests take an Oath to Exterminate Protestants?" this truth-loving, Scripture-quoting Jesuit said:

"No. The oath taken by Bishops as found in the Roman Pontifical is as follows:

"I, ———, elected to the Church of N., from this hour henceforward will be obedient to Blessed Peter the Apostle, and to the Holy Roman Church, and to our Holy Father, Pope N., and to his successors canonically elected. I will assist them to retain and defend the Roman Papacy without detriment to my order. I shall take care to preserve, to defend, increase and promote the rights, honors, privileges and authority of the Holy Roman Church, of our Lord, the Pope, and of his aforesaid successors. I shall observe with all my strength, and shall cause to be observed by others, the rules of the Holy Fathers, the Apostolic decrees, ordinances or dispositions, reservations, provisions and mandates. I shall come when called to a synod, unless prevented by a canonical impediment. I shall make personally the visit *ad limina apostolorum* every ten years, and I shall render to our Holy Father, Pope P., and to his aforesaid successors an account of my whole pastoral office, and of all things pertaining in any manner whatsoever to the state of my church, to the discipline of the clergy and the people, and finally to the salvation of the souls which are entrusted to me: and in turn I shall receive humbly the apostolic mandates and execute them as diligently as possible. But if I shall be detained by legitimate impediment, I shall fulfill all the aforesaid things through a designated delegate having a special mandate for this purpose, a priest of my diocese, or through some other secular or regular priest of known probity and religion, fully informed concerning the above-named things. I shall not sell, nor give, nor mortgage the possessions belonging to my mensa, nor shall enfeoff them anew or alienate them in any manner, even with the consent of the chapter of my Church, without consulting the Roman Pontiff. And if through me any such alienation shall occur, I wish, by the very fact, to incur the pun-

ishments contained in the constitution published concerning this matter.

"So help me God, and these Holy Gospels of God."

By actual count it will be found that the 'Rev.' Frankhauser OMITTED almost TWO-FIFTHS of the oath and circulated it to prove to the Protestants of Macon that the Roman Catholic bishop, who directs all the "faithful" in a diocese, does not swear an oath against Protestants!

I will now quote the oath as it is in the "*Pontificale Romanum*," and invite Latin scholars to translate it for themselves.

FORM OF THE OATH

From "*Pontificale Romanum, Summorum Pontificum. Jussu Editum a Benedicto xiv. et Leone xiii. Pontificibus Maximis, Recognitum et Castigatum. Pars Prima. Mechliniae. H. Dessain. Summi Pontificis, S. Congregationis de Propaganda Fide et Archiepiscopatus Mechliniensis Typographus. MDCCCXCV.*"

Next page contains:

"APPROBATIO

"*Revisione diligenter peracta, omnia in hac editione reperta sunt apprime concordare cum Originali in Secretaria Sacrae Rituum Congregationis existente. In fidem, etc.*

"*Ex eadem Secretaria hac die 1 Januarii 1895.*

"*Pro. R. P. D. ALOISIO TRIPEPI,*
"Secretario.

{ Seal }

"*ANTONIUS SARDI, Substitutus.*"

From the next page we learn when this book was first authorized:

"*Omnibus has Visuris Salutem in Domino.*

"*Cum juxta Constitutionem Urbani PP. VIII de die 17 Junii 1644...*"

This Ritual was also approved in our day by Pope Leo XIII. The book is printed in Modern Latin, by "H. Dessain," Mechlin, Belgium.

Mr. Farrell has shown that he is in possession of, or has access to, information not generally permitted laymen; no doubt, therefore, he can read the "*Pontificale Romanum*"; let him refer to that ritual of his church and see if the following information as to the book is not true, and compare my transcript of the oath with that contained in the *Pontificale*, and say if it is not a true copy:

Under the head of "*De Consecratione Electi in Episcopum*," Part I, p. 82, is the following:

"FORMA JURAMENTI.

"Ego N. Electus Ecclesiae N. ab hac hora in antea fidelis, et obediens ero beato Petro Apostolo, sanctasque Romanas Ecclesias, et Domino nostro, Domino N. Papae N. suisque Successoribus canonicis intrantibus. Non ero in consilio, aut consensu, vel facto, ut vitam perdant, aut membrum, seu capiantur mala captiones, aut in eos violenter manus quomodolibet ingerantur, vel injurias aliquae inferantur, quovis quassito colore. Consilium vero, quod mihi credituri sunt, per se, aut Nuntios suos, seu litteras, ad eorum damnum, me sciente, nemini pandam. Papatum Romanum, et Regalia sancti Petri, adjutor eis ero ad retinendum, et defendendum, salvo meo ordine, contra omnem hominem. Legatum Apostolicae Sedis ineundo et redeundo honorifice tractabo, et in suis necessitatibus adjuvabo. Jura, honores, privilegia, et auctoritatem sanctae Romanae Ecclesiae, Domini nostri Papae, et Successorum praedictorum, conservare, defendere, augere, et promoveri curabo. Neque ero in consilio, vel facto, seu tractatu, in quibus contra ipsum Dominum nostrum, vel eandem Romanam Ecclesiam, aliqua sinistra, vel praepudicialia personarum, juris, honoris, status, et potestatis eorum machinentur. Et si talia a quibuscumque tractari, vel procurari novero, impediam hoc pro posse: et quanto citius potero, significabo eidem Domino nostro vel alteri, per quem possit ad ipsius notitiam pervenire. Regulas sanctorum Patrum, decreta, ordinationes seu dispositiones, reservationes, provisiones, et mandata Apostolica, totis viribus observabo, et faciam ab aliis observari. Haereticos, Schismaticos, et rebelles eidem Domino nostro, vel Successoribus praedictis, pro posse persequare, et impugnabo. Vocatus ad synodum, veniam, nisi praepeditus fuero Canonica praepeditione. Apostolorum limina singulis trienniis personaliter per me ipsum visitabo; et Domino nostro, ac Successoribus praefatis, rationem reddam de toto meo pastoralis officio, ac de rebus omnibus ad meae Ecclesiae statum, ad cleri et populi disciplinam, animarum denique, quae meae fidei traditae sunt, salutem, quovis modo pertinentibus: et vicissim mandata Apostolica humiliter recipiam, et quam diligentissime exsequar. Quod si legitimo impedimento detentus fuero, praefata omnia adimplebo per certum Nuntium ad hoc speciale mandatum habentem, de gremio mei Capituli, aut alium in dignitate ecclesiastica constitutum, seu alias personatum habentem: aut, his mihi deficientibus, per dioecesanum Sacerdotem; et clero deficiente omnino, per aliquem alium Presbyterum saecularem, vel regularem, spectatae probitatis, et religionis, de supradictis omnibus plene instructum. De hujusmodi autem impedimento docebo per legitimas probationes ad sanctae Romanae Ecclesiae Cardinalem proponentem in Congregatione sacri Concilii, per supradictum Nuntium transmittendas.

"Possessiones vero ad mensam meam pertinentes non vendam, nec donabo, neque impignorabo, nec de novo infeudabo, vel aliquo modo alienabo, etiam cum consensu Capituli Ecclesiae meae, inconsulto Romano Pontifice. Et si ad aliquam alienationem deve-

nero, poenas in quadam super hoc edita constitutione contentas, eo ipso incurrere volo.

"Sic me Deus adjuvet, et haec sancta Dei Evangelia."

Practically the same oath is used in "*De Benedictione Abbatis, Auctoritate Apostolica,*" Part I, p. 135.

In conferring "*De Pallio,*" Part I, p. 122, the above oath is administered.

In "*De Consecratione plurium Electorum in Episcopos,*" Part III, p. 288, the only difference to be found in the oath is in regard to making the personal visit to the pope: "*trienniis, vel quadrienniis, vel quinquenniis, vel decenniis,*" and:

"Et Ego, N. Electus Ecclesiae N. juro in omnibus, et per omnia, ut supra, in forma juramenti jam lecta, facere, et observare pro Ecclesia N. mihi commissa."

December 13, 1919.

To Whom It May Concern:

This is to certify that I, the undersigned, have read the above oath, in the original Latin, in the "*Pontificale Romanum,*" an official Ritual of the Roman Catholic Church, and declare it to be a true transcript of the same.

(Signed) T. W. CALLAWAY,
Pastor, Tabernacle Baptist Church,
Macon, Ga.

For the benefit of those who can not read Latin, I present the following

TRANSLATION OF BISHOP'S OATH

"I, N., Elect of the Church of N., from henceforward will be faithful and obedient to St. Peter the Apostle, and to the holy Roman Church, and to our Lord, the Lord N. Pope N., and to his successors canonically coming in. I will neither advise, consent, or do anything that may lose life or member, or that their persons may be seized, or hands anywise laid upon them, or any injuries offered to them under any pretense whatsoever. The counsel which they shall entrust to me withal, by themselves, their messengers, or letters, I will not knowingly reveal to any to their prejudice. I will help them to defend and keep the Roman Papacy and the Royalties of St. Peter (saving my order), against all men. The legate of the Apostolic See, going and coming, I will honorably treat and help in his necessities. The rights, honors, privileges, and authority of the Roman Church, of our Lord, the Pope, and his aforesaid successors, I will endeavor to preserve, defend, increase and advance. I will not be in any counsel, action, or treaty in which shall be plotted against our said Lord, and the said

Roman Church, anything to the hurt or prejudice of their persons right, honor, state or power: and if I shall know of any such thing to be treated or agitated by any whatsoever, I will hinder it to my power and as soon as I can I will signify it to our said Lord, or by some other by whom it may come to his knowledge. The rules of the Holy Fathers, the Apostolic decrees, ordinances or disposals, reservations, provisions, and mandates, I will observe with all my might and cause to be observed by others. HERETICS, SCHISMATICS, AND REBELS TO OUR SAID LORD OR HIS AFORESAID SUCCESSORS I WILL TO MY UTMOST POWER PERSECUTE AND WAGE WAR WITH. I will come to a Council when I am called, unless I be hindered by a canonical impediment. I will by myself in person visit the threshold of the Apostles every three years, and give an account to our Lord and his aforesaid successors of all my pastoral office, and of all things anywise belonging to the state of my church, to the discipline of my clergy and people, and lastly to the salvation of souls committed to my trust; and will in like manner humbly receive and diligently execute the Apostolic commands. And if I be detained by a lawful impediment, I will perform all things aforesaid by a certain messenger hereto specially empowered, a member of my chapter or some other in ecclesiastical dignity or else having a parsonage; or in default of these, by a priest of the diocese; or in default of one of the clergy (of the diocese) by some other secular or regular priest of approved integrity and religion, fully instructed in all things above mentioned. And such impediment I shall make out by lawful proofs to be transmitted by the aforesaid messenger to the Cardinal proponent of the holy Roman Church in the Congregation of the Sacred Council. The possessions belonging to my table I will neither sell nor give away, nor mortgage, nor grant anew in fee, anywise alienate, not even with the consent of the chapter of my church, without consulting the Roman Pontiff. And if I shall make any alienation, I will thereby incur penalties contained in a certain constitution put forth about this matter. So help me God and these Holy Gospels of God."

A black rule has been placed under all that Frankhauser left out, one sentence being in italic capitals for emphasis.

Now, don't let any one get the impression that the Reverend Jesuit Frankhauser thinks he lied, or was a false witness for the pope's church; no, indeed! He merely adhered to certain fixed principles of the papal church, such as "keep no faith with heretics," "conceal your faith when among heretics," or so state a proposition as will let the other party "deceive himself" as to matters concerning which he has no right to know; you will observe that in his translation Bro. Frankhauser did not say it was the COMPLETE oath; no doubt he resorted to papal mental res-

ervation when he was writing it; in his first paragraph he mentally reserved the words "in part" just as they occur in parenthesis, thus: "The oath taken by Bishops as found in the Roman Pontifical is (in part) as follows."

(It was said that, as a result of the lectures mentioned, a prominent Roman Catholic of the city stated he was going to investigate certain phases of his faith and practices, and if found to be as charged by the Rev. E. A. Jordan, ex-Catholic, he would quit the system; no doubt he went to his priest for information, or to papal "history" written by priests, where he got the "TRUTH" of the matters just as J. B. F. gave Protestant Macon the "true" bishop's oath! Anyway, said party is still in the fold.)

A "lie" is defined as being the utterance of a falsehood with the intention to deceive: to prove to the "heretics" of Macon that the papal church has no sinister designs against Protestants, the Rev. Frankhauser published and circulated the oath as above. In my translation a black rule is placed under each word and sentence which this Jesuit left out of his printed copy. To those who have eyes to see, ears to hear and brains to think, those BLACK RULES eloquently speak volumes: they picture the very essence of popery when dealing with the rest of the world; they indicate the manner in which facts of history are written by papists for their own, and for non-Catholic, consumption; *those black rules speak in flaming words to every American citizen against committing the interest of city, state or nation into the hands of any follower of the pope*, especially the interest of the public school system, because all members of the Roman church are creatures of the pope who made that oath to which *all Romanists are subject*; if ANY one says he does not agree with this irreformable law of that church, such person is *better* than the system to which he is in *conscience* bound; however, as long as one adheres to it, he is SUBJECT to said oath, as Farrell said, Catholics are willing to "stand up and be counted": *he must assent to it.*

To understand how laymen of that church are joined to the pope through the bishop's oath, we must know just what relation the bishop sustains to the pope. Pope Leo XIII clearly furnishes this information, saying:

"In defining the limits of the obedience owed to the pastors of souls but most of all to the authority of the Roman Pontiff, it must not be supposed that it is only to be yielded in relation to dogmas of which the obstinate denial can not be disjoined from the CRIME OF HERESY. Nay, *it is not enough* sincerely and firmly to assent to doctrines which, though not defined by any solemn pronouncement of the church, are by her proposed to belief, as divinely revealed, in her common and universal teaching, and which the Vatican Council declared are to be believed with *Catholic* and divine faith. *But this likewise must be reckoned*

amongst the duties of all Christians, that they allow themselves to be RULED AND DIRECTED BY THE AUTHORITY AND LEADERSHIP OF BISHOPS, and above all by the Apostolic See." (Page 194, Enc. Lets.)

Again he says:

"The like disposition and the same order should prevail in every Christian state by so much the more that the political prudence of the Pontiff embraces diverse and multiform things; for it is his charge not only to rule the church, but generally so to REGULATE the actions of Christian (papal) citizens that they may be IN APT CONFORMITY to their hope of gaining eternal salvation. Whence it is clear that in addition to the complete accordance of thought and deed, the faithful (i. e., laymen) should imitate the practical political wisdom of the ecclesiastical authority. Now the administration of Christian affairs *immediately under the Roman Pontiff* APPERTAINS TO THE BISHOPS, who, although they attain not to the summit of pontifical power, ARE NEVERTHELESS TRUE PRINCES IN THE ECCLESIASTICAL HIERARCHY; . . . they have members of the clergy (priests) to share their duties and carry out their decisions. EVERY ONE has to regulate HIS MODE OF CONDUCT according to THIS CONSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH WHICH IT IS NOT IN THE POWER OF ANY MAN TO CHANGE. Consequently, just as in the exercise of their episcopal authority the bishops ought to be united with the Apostolic See, so should the members of the clergy and the laity live in close union with their bishop," 202 *lb.*

Are there Catholic laymen, priests, bishops? Is there a pope? If so, they are all bound together in their several relations BY THE BISHOP'S OATH. That oath is anti-social, anti-American, which makes the system exacting it UNLAWFUL, and the Congress of the United States must so declare. Like an individual, a nation has a temporal and a spiritual essence, so set out in the Constitution and defined as inalienable rights to life, liberty, property, civil and religious liberty. Every drop of blood and every dollar in the country would form the barrier placed between those rights and invasion by alien hosts: now read again that inhuman oath of the bishop; analyze every word, especially those that Jesuit Frankhauser omitted in *his* "version"; now think of the history of Romanism covering the past fifteen hundred years under the spirit of that oath—and remember Rome boasts she "never changes": is there one single vestige of the United States Constitution left? NO, NOT ONE.

To comprehend just how broad and sweeping is that oath, we must remember that every citation from Leo XIII in this book, from the Catechism and other authoritative sources, is based on "the rights, honors, privileges, and authority of the Roman Pontiff," or on some of "the rules of the holy fathers, the apostolic

decrees, ordinances, or disposals, reservations and mandates" of the pope, to which every member must assent and be obedient, which makes every one of them an enemy of the Constitutional rights of free conscience, free press, free speech, right to assemble, as also of the free public school system.

Does this oath cause you to think of the Lowly Nazarene as you read it, or the Prussian Militarist?

Does that oath appeal to you as the "rules" of a "well-regulated family," or mandates of feudal clansmen?

The oath was copied and translated from the "*Pontificale Romanum*," one of the four principal Liturgical books of the Roman Catholic church, a ritual by which bishops, priests, abbots and abbesses are governed in their work for the pope. A copy was secured indirectly through the aid of Cardinal Gibbons, as per letter on the subject printed elsewhere, from Benzinger Bros., New York—\$8.50, while another was secured indirectly by the aid of Bishop B. J. Keiley, of Savannah, Ga., from Kenedy & Sons, New York—\$9.50; both of these houses are publishers, importers and dealers in Catholic goods. They will be kept in safe places to back up a certain challenge.

Let papal apologists destroy, if they will or can, every scintilla of evidence in this book: let them deny the history, intention and spirit of papalism as presented in these pages from many authentic sources if they can, even then the NATURAL SPIRIT of the PAPAL CHURCH, forever as long as there is a pope to direct it, is disclosed by the bishop's oath; to admit the oath, *forces admission of all correlated evidence*. The murderous doctrine of St. Thomas and that oath form the foundation upon which the Papal Empire rests: the dust of ages may obscure them from the eyes of those who, "having eyes to see, see not," but they are there, just the same, like hidden charges of dynamite to be exploded for the destruction of all not subject thereto, WHEN EXPEDIENT!

Mr. Farrell has manifested a spirit of levity in his letters—especially where I failed to catch a typographical error in stating a fact; or where I used language or terms that were more ambiguous than they would have been if I had at the time given more care and attention to reviewing verbiage; he also alleges that I use "particular cases to establish a general principle": the oath is a "particular case," from a "particular" book issued for the "particular" use of "particular" men who are "particularly" selected and "particularly" sworn to perfect a "particular" system of government in America to which "PARTICULAR" Americans object!

I tender, as evidence to the jury—the American people—the Catholic bishop's oath, to prove my charge that the papal church is a gigantic conspiracy against the human race, which sustains

the evidence hereinbefore adduced. Taken alone, it proves that no member of the papal church can be a loyal citizen of a democratic government; it also proves that papalism is not Christianity—is there any kinship between it and the Sermon on the Mount?

In view of Mr. Farrell's hilarity, and the supercilious attitude of papal apologists, I make the following offer and proposition:

I will pay to any Roman Catholic the sum of \$5,000 who can prove that I have not presented a true transcript of the bishop's oath. I also agree, that if they earn the money, I will reimburse the publishers for all expenditures that may be made to that date and get them to discontinue sale of my book.

No one is barred! Romanists, pro-Romanists, and papal apologists should pocket that money or—become True Americans and oppose that foreign, alien power that exists only to *destroy* FREEDOM.

If that oath is true, every subject thereto is a foe of the Government of the United States. Considerable has been said in regard to the alleged oath of the Knights of Columbus, Hibernians, and other papal secret societies; logically, it is immaterial whether those societies exact an oath or not (but the presumption is, they do); they exist as creatures OF THE CHURCH—no society can be formed among Catholics without the approval of some one in authority, hence the right to exist as a society can not be secured UNLESS the objects which it seeks to obtain are in strict conformity with the objective of the CHURCH itself; in other words, a *bona fide* Catholic society must be “chartered” by the church of Rome—must get authority from the SUPREME LAW OF THE CHURCH, and remain under said law. Catholic laymen CAN NOT form an association for any purpose not conformable to papal supreme law. Those societies bear the same relation to the Catholic church as the various States sustain to the Union, which have the right to make laws or rules, and prescribe OATHS OF ALLEGIANCE to the State, but every law enacted by a State must be in harmony with the Constitution of the United States, else it is void; every city in a State may legislate for its own government, but such legislation must not conflict with the laws of the State nor the Constitution.

Laymen are subject to whatever form of oath the bishop swears and it may be presumed the pattern of all oaths of papal societies; this fact, therefore, eliminates any plea set up by members of such societies; *they need not take a special oath*—the supreme law of their church has prescribed what they must do to be its true “children,” and that supreme law is epitomized in the bishop's oath: to “persecute” and “fight” or “wage war” against heretics (that is, those baptized but not subject to the pope).

"Persecute!" "Fight!" There is no crime too heinous, no deed too foul, no torture too severe that is not warranted among the "rights" and "mandates" of the pope to "*PERSEQUAR ET IMPUGNABO*"! Every evil deed committed anywhere during the Great War was covered by those words. We heard of people being separated from their families, stripped almost naked and marched many long miles through the bleakness of European winter—that was "*persequar*"; those too young or too old to march were shot or bayoneted in the presence of their friends and relatives—that was "*impugnabo*"!

Every bishop is required to report in person to the pope at the end of stated periods, when he makes a complete report on everything that pertains to conditions where he rules, and through the bishop he can learn more relative to secrets of State than any other man in the world: with Catholics confessing those things to the priest which he believes will serve the church, and the priest passing information on to the bishop, a great world-wide spy system is created that renders Catholicism a menace to all nations in time of war; when put to the actual test, Catholics must view matters as Priest Phelan said they would if they thought war was being waged against the pope—and the pope alone would determine the case: "We would say, 'To hell with the Government'."

THE ALLEGED K. OF C. OATH

In his "Appeal to Fair Minds," Priest Frankhauser devotes over six columns to prove that "The Notorious K. of C. Oath" is suprious, citing several minor court cases and the findings of several high degree Masons of California. In this pamphlet he said:

"When the attention of the Knights of Columbus was called to this false oath, they immediately put forth vigorous denials. This, however, was not sufficient to convince many Protestants; and so two other steps seemed necessary.

"First—To exhibit the entire ritual of the K. of C. to leading Protestant gentlemen and have them pronounce upon it.

"Second—To bring the matter into court, in some manner, by action against those circulating the oath that it might be denied under the form of sworn testimony, and those engaged in diffusing it obliged to either submit proof or to admit the falsity and fraudulent character of their work"

"The first step was taken in a number of localities" by instituting actions for libel.

I assert that the Knights of Columbus are subject to the bishop's oath as Catholics, under which they are empowered to carry out and execute every provision contained in the alleged oath of their society; to "persecute and fight" all who reject popery is the supreme command of the Roman church, and those

words warrant every vicious, inhuman suggestion contained in that oath which they abjure: membership in the Roman church carries with it the obligation to believe and perform *whatsoever is proposed*—and all Knights of Columbus, as well as all other members of papal societies are under the bishop as members of that church, from which fact arises my charge that the papal church is a menace to American, Christian, Democratic civilization and, as laymen of said church constitute in part the “power” which the bishop swears to use contrary to Christian precepts and our Constitution, I most earnestly invite the Knights of Columbus, the Jesuits, or any other society of laymen or clerics, or their combined power in the American Federation of Catholic Societies, to enter suit against me in any court of competent jurisdiction; I will even dare them, individually or collectively, “*To bring the matter into court, in some manner*” so that I will be “*obliged to either submit proof or to admit the falsity and fraudulent character*” of my work relative to the oath of the bishop.

To remove, as far as I can, all obstacles to that end and to make it more interesting, I will agree to co-operate with them and carry the oath of the bishop up to the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia, and if I lose the case, will pay all costs, and also pay to the other party a sum, to be previously agreed upon, at the ratio of two to one; but if I win the case, they to pay all costs and one-half the amount of my forfeit—they to agree in writing to these terms before going to trial.

Could any proposition be fairer?

That oath is from the heart of the papal system, which indicates how bad and dangerous the system is, if true; and it is up to the papal church to prove it is untrue as to these United States, so “stand up and be counted,” gentlemen—especially members of the Catholic Laymen’s Association of Georgia!

I have intimated several times that Catholics were either ignorant of what their church requires of them, or that knowing, they studiously strive to conceal what they know; if they are sincere, and desire to be true citizens of this Republic, they should learn all that the bishop’s oath requires when they are politically or numerically strong enough—as in the matter of the Council of Trent marriage law which was put in operation here after there were “a sufficient number” of priests on the ground—that oath is the predicate of the “INTENTION” of their church under the pope and bishops. If they know it, and remain subject thereto, they are avowed enemies of our form of government and the Constitution which should automatically annul any claim to the rights of American citizenship; for it is evident, that if they would destroy the Constitution which gives the rights of citizenship, if they were numerous enough, they should not be permitted to come in contact with it in any manner.

That there are many members of the papal institution who are ignorant of what they may be called upon to do, I readily believe; but they are in the same category as were the subjects of the German Kaiser, who were kept in ignorance of what they would be required to believe and perform, yet they did all that was required of them; whether they knew or were ignorant of the intention of their kaiser, the world at large learned they were obedient subjects.

Ask any Roman Catholic about the bishop's oath: no doubt he will deny it; *the teaching of the church advocates that*; but if he is sincere, he will prove it by going after my \$5,000. This may be brought to the attention of a Catholic who is not prepared to affirm or deny; he may go to his priest with the question, and the priest has only to say to the "faithfull," "Creda!" ("It is of faith?"), or "That does not concern or become you," or "It is a falsehood, a calumny by the enemies of Holy Mother Church" (as to all intents and purposes Frankhauser answered), and to his dying day that "child" of the church will believe his priest. He will also contend that this illustration of his attitude to all grave questions affecting our civilization does not disqualify him from being a custodian or guardian of DEMOCRACY! Democracy—people who rule themselves!

The spiritual side of a man or nation determines the conduct in relation to others, while it finds expression in the laws of the scheme of government set up; compare the benign laws of American civilization with the laws of Italian popery! The laws of the papal church reflect the NATURE of the institution, which affects the spiritual and governs the physical and political spheres of man, all of which CONFLICT WITH THE SUPREME LAW OF OUR LAND—THE CONSTITUTION.

I plead with every one: read and study the Constitution, then read the bishop's oath, and imagine yourself living under a Flag that exists only to protect the "rights" of the Roman church and to enforce the "rules" of the "holy fathers," and then assume that attitude toward papalism and the Constitution as will advance *your preference*.

In making certain charges against the Roman church, the burden of proof was on me—I am willing and prepared to meet the issue; *for the papal church to remain silent now, and refuse to follow the same course with me as the Knights of Columbus pursued in their case, will be that silence which acknowledges inability to meet the issue, in court or in debate.*

In St. John iii:14-15 we hear the Redeemer saying, "And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up: That whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have eternal life. For God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in

Him should not perish, but have everlasting life." This is a beautiful picture of Christianity, indicating the work of His ministers! now turn to the papal rituals and theologies and hear the pope, who says he is holding God's place on earth and is Christ's vice-gerent and is the head of the only "true" Christian church established by Christ, wherein he says all those who have been baptized and profess to be Christians but will not submit to his authority are "heretics, schismatics and rebels" who are to be "persecuted to the limit" of his power and "fought," and if they do not become and remain submissive they should be "removed from the earth by death." The spirit of this doctrine has made a bloody trail fifteen centuries down the corridors of time—is this fair land to be marked by that crimson stain? The answer to this question is with the freemen of America; and to work out the answer requires—INDIFFERENCE.

The Jews and the great mass of non-church people of America may erroneously look upon Romanism and Protestantism as being two opposing sects, and that it would be immaterial which predominated; but if they would conscientiously consider the nature and objectives of the two forces, they would realize that they are vitally concerned. If Protestantism and Freemasonry were destroyed, the papal religion would be taught to your children in the schools by clerics and nuns *if they were taught at all*; they would be made Catholics, as was the "intention" of the Roman church in signing that concordat with the Austrian Archduke, to put all those Greek children under Roman Catholics in parochial schools, which fact was so resented by the non-papal Greeks to the extent that some of the students assassinated the Catholic ruler who bartered away their rights—and THAT fact was the starting of the World War.

If education was in the hands of Rome, what assurance does that church give that this country would not become as illiterate as every other country where she was in power? Of course, the Jews may not appreciate, for instance, the Protestant Prohibition program and all such reforms—but it's that, or the Papal Inquisition; and *Jews* certainly ought to know what that means; the loss of "easy money" is not near so bad as being the principal fagot in a bonfire, or being teased by having red-hot poker thrust into your eyes, or having you put on iron boots filled with melted lead! It is understood that the Jew is combining with the Catholic for political purposes. *Watch your step, Judah!* The American people will resent your lining up with the enemies of the only real haven the world offers YOU; I caution you in all kindness, and without prejudice: forget not the plight of the Jew under papalism yesterday, and to-day!

Those who belong to no church owe a debt to Christianity; it is through the influence of Protestant Christianity that the Ameri-

can Government was perfected; the Declaration of Independence, Constitution, and all institutions of the land reflect the King James Version of the Holy Scriptures, which makes life with you different from that with the Mexican or Spaniard, or any papal country; all the freedom and rights you enjoy rest upon Protestant Christianity—freedom and rights such as no other people in the whole world can boast; and if you value them, it is as much your duty to defend them as it is to defend your country against any other foreign invasion.

Those who style themselves Protestants, and those who are members of the great Masonic fraternity, who have been drinking the pope's soothing syrup especially prepared for them, that "there are not enough Catholics in this country to constitute a danger," should see a menace in the fact that this small, one-sixth Catholic population exerted an influence in some manner sufficient to give the papal church preference and special privileges in army cantonments while Freemasonry and Protestantism were restricted almost to exclusion! That was a practical demonstration of papal power; and it is strong enough to wreck this Government by concentrating efforts along the lines of the bishop's oath, if the other 83 per cent. of the people remain indifferent and continue to swallow papal dope.

A word to the Protestant ministers of America: As watchmen on the tower, you are traitors to God and country and unworthy of support if, after reading the bishop's oath you do not, in your Sunday Schools and pulpits, instruct the people as to the intention of Catholicism, the difference between that religion and Protestantism, and teach them their duty to the country and the church regarding this issue. Spain tells you what the bishop's oath means—in fact, every Latin nation under the sun, or any other where Rome has been in power, tells the same story—shows the "finished" work of the oath: and he who refuses to do his duty to his fellowman in this matter is either criminally ignorant, guilty of simony, or is a moral and physical coward; the purpose of the Anti-Christ is to destroy the influence of Christ in the world: the hatred of the papal church is directed only against those who have been baptized in other churches, as shown by that oath, *and if that oath be Christian, YOU are not.*

Because our ministers and other educational factors have been recreant to their duty the people of this country have grown up in almost utter ignorance of Roman Catholicism, large numbers embracing that "faith" not knowing what the oath really meant.

The press, generally speaking, being merely lashes in "party" whips with the handles held by Rome, is a lost cause to American civilization, and will remain so until there is a counter-organization to bring them back into line with Americanism.

Because the one-in-six papal population go after what they want as one man while the other five-sixths are indifferent, there is no wonder that the press panders to Catholicism, but, like Samson, shorn of his power for good, sleeping in the lap of the papal Delilah, it may wake up some day to find it is no longer a power with the people it once was and as it should be.

"I reach you my hand," says the Catholic church through its Catholic Laymen's Association of Georgia, but I can not accept it: looking as it were beyond the countenance wreathed in smiles I gaze into the HEART of the SYSTEM; there I behold the same spirit of hatred and intolerance that kindled the fires of Smithfield, the diabolical spirit of hatred that has made a bloody trail across fifteen hundred years and festooned the pathway of man with scenes of horror beyond description; I listen, and catch the bitter wail, borne on the winds that blow from every quarter of the globe, from the seventy million human beings who were put to death by fire and sword and rack and tortures unspeakable to please him who would dethrone the Eternal God; I hear the sigh, as the moaning of many trees in pine forests, of the hundreds of millions who have been born and kept in slavery to that man-god on the Tiber—a world-wide political conspirator masquerading under the livery of heaven—hundreds of millions who lived and died in ignorance of their Creator, because of that system that can exist only as it may enforce its blighting, withering "right" to exist as a "society characterized as by right divine," to "legislate, judge and punish," and I involuntarily recoil as one would from the contaminating presence of a leper!

"If you can show me," the skeptic may say, "just one tangible result of this oath on Catholics in America—in Georgia—I will be convinced." Very well! But, like some ponderous machine, it would be impossible to describe in detail the functions of each part in a treatise of only several hundred pages; but I will point out certain "gearings" and demonstrate their functions which, in conjunction with the whole, produce certain, positive effects: the bishop swears, "The Apostolic (papal) decrees, ordinances, dispositions, reservations, provisions, and mandates, I will observe with *all* my might, and cause to be observed by others"; we turn now to the Catechism, which is taught daily in parochial schools, and we learn Catholics are taught, from early infancy, that "By Silence" they become guilty of the sins committed by another; these parts or "gearings" from the oath and Catechism function with the positive result that a Catholic MUST resent his "religion" being questioned or discussed in newspapers, in Protestant pulpits, or in public halls by lecturers, and they must resort to any means to prevent it that "expediency" will warrant; so, we see the result of the bishop's oath and the Catechism exemplified in those Knights of Columbus going into the private hotel-room of

Rev. William Black, in Marshall, Texas, and shooting him down in cold blood because he would not surrender his Constitutional right of free speech, cease his lectures on popery, and leave the city; one of the "mandates" of the pope prohibits free speech, so we have the mandate of the pope, the bishop sworn to enforce it, the Catechism-trained Knights of Columbus who would not be guilty of Black's "sin" against the pope by remaining "silent," and there was a dead man!

"I will to my utmost power persecute and wage war with" those who oppose the pope, swears the bishop, and a part of his "power" is the LAYMEN of his church, who, on their part, have sworn "I am ready to obey ALL that she (the Roman church) commands"; and in Haverhill, Mass., we see a mob of LAYMEN attacking the City Hall to prevent a man from discussing the question of appropriating public funds to sectarian schools! The Rev. Otis Spurgeon, a lecturer, was bodily taken from the room of a downtown hotel in Denver, Colorado, carried twenty miles into the country by a mob of LAYMEN, beaten almost to death, and left naked, beaten and bruised to die as some beast by the roadside. Many instances of recent demonstrations of papalism in action in America could be recited, but these will suffice.

On more than one occasion the people of Macon, Ga., have felt the "power" of the bishop's oath in the efforts made to close halls against lecturers on popery; in fact, so great was the pressure of this power, that a Protestant City Council went so far as to cancel a lease of City Auditorium after money had been paid for it, although it had been recently rented to negroes for some sort of display! But the American people, seeing what was being done, exerted a greater "power" over the Council, and the lectures were delivered per schedule.

How well the bishop and laymen work in harmony was shown in Spain in 1914, when the Christian Endeavor held a convention; the Spanish Government had to furnish protection to prevent a massacre; the spirit of that oath was demonstrated in Macon, Ga., a few years ago, when Rev. Gypsy Smith, Jr., came here on the invitation of the Macon Ministerial Union, for a series of meetings, lasting three weeks (about first of 1915, according to my recollection); the Knights of Columbus had secured the City Auditorium for a lecture by one Pete Collins, to be delivered on Thursday night of the last week of the Smith meetings; the Ministerial Union made the Knights of Columbus a proposition, to the effect that the Union would rent the Grand Theater at a cost of about one hundred dollars, and let the Knights meet there; they flatly refused, the statement being made that they had rented the City Hall, and intended to have it; the Hall cost only ten dollars!

A signed letter to Rev. Mr. Callaway, printed elsewhere, is of interest in connection with the above facts.

If the foregoing does not convince one as to what Catholicism is, such person is good material for that institution!

All property held by the Roman church in America is owned by the pope of Rome: the bishop swears he will not sell or in any manner dispose of anything of value without consulting the pope and gaining his consent, therefore, such property belonging to a foreign power that declares itself to be a "perfect" government, is, to all intents and purposes, "foreign territory" which can not be "invaded" by the State, therefore, it was the duty of Bishop B. J. Keiley, of Savannah, according to his oath, which makes him a "Prince" in the Papal Government, to prohibit the inspection of papal institutions in defiance of the Laws of the State of Georgia—and as far as I know, there has been no inspection. Is the bishop's "power" effective?

CIVIL AND RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

There are people who think that, because the Constitution provides for civil and religious liberty, the papal church is within her rights under the Constitution, and can not be reached by law; this opinion is fundamentally wrong, as I shall attempt to prove, by illustration: the Constitution provides also, for instance, for the ownership of fire-arms, but forbids their use where it would unlawfully jeopardize or destroy the life of another; a man may possess a high-power rifle according to law, but if he thinks he has the right to fire it, because he is on his own premises, and does so, killing another person, either on the same premises or elsewhere, he is a murderer under the law, and would be tried as such; so, we see at once that while the Constitution gives the right to "bear arms," it also prohibits doing so if another person be illegally deprived of his right to life. Likewise, the guarantee of religious freedom gives no one the right to practice a religion if in its exercise it would destroy that right for another. This is so clear that it seems unnecessary to argue it at length.

The papal church construes the Constitutional right of religious liberty to be a license to destroy that right and its enjoyment by non-Catholics. Under the plea that religious tolerance is a legal right, the pope sets up his parochial schools in opposition to the State free school, in which he teaches the autocratic theory of government to children who should be trained in the principles of democracy, using the legal right of tolerance to undermine and destroy the principle and law which permit the existence of that church on an equal basis with other denominations.

If it can be maintained under the law that one has the right to "practice" his pistol with the avowed purpose of killing out the

community after becoming an expert, then, and only then, can it be contended that Rome has the right, under the law, to "practice" her religion which means destruction to those who will not subscribe to her laws and dogmas, which have been sufficiently presented in these pages, and substantiated by the bishop's oath.

With the bishop's and layman's oaths in mind, read the following from the "Manual of Christian Doctrine," which is taught to people in America in the papal schools:

Qu. "45. What are the errors against revelation?"

Ans. ". . . 2. Protestantism and all heresies which attack any one of the revealed truths.

"46. What is the source of these errors?"

"It is the *criminal result of reason* against the divine teaching; a revolt which is the outcome of the **PRETENDED RIGHT OF PRIVATE JUDGMENT.**" Page 6.

Lay that doctrine by the side of the Constitution; according to it, Protestants and Masons are guilty of heresy, while papists are under oath to "persecute and make war" on, notwithstanding the fact that the Supreme Law of our land gives the right to what the pope declares is "CRIMINAL." This doctrine, being an arraignment and condemnation of the right of religious liberty, is an attack upon the Constitution, which fact outlaws the papal church and denies that institution the right to "bear arms" and "practice" her pistol, because the evidence above shows that when Catholicism becomes expert (secures power and numbers sufficient), the "criminal" use of "reason" and "private judgment" will come to an end.

That doctrine is founded on the basic law of the Roman church; without it, there could be no Catholic church; and the same law that makes that doctrine exacts obedience to it by those who are themselves created by that law. Every Romanist is a creature, not by faith, but by law; therefore, those in America who value their rights under the Constitution may as well face the issue first as last: the "rights" of the papal church are in direct conflict with the "rights" guaranteed by the Constitution; the papal law and institutions thereunder must end, or the Supreme Law of the land and American institutions thereunder must cease—which shall it be?

We hear much about the "small" number of Catholics in our country; but that number had sufficient power to throw the national orbit out of its sphere during the Great War so that Freemasonry and Protestantism were limited around army cantonments, made up of such "large" numbers of non-Catholics, the result of Jesuitical "courtly intrigue" with politicians in power, and it's just as easy for the pope's "small" number in America to destroy the Constitution if the people remain as indifferent in the future as they have been in the past.

SECRET SOCIETIES CONDEMNED

Keeping in mind the bishop's oath, and the alleged oath of the Knights of Columbus, the following legislation of the papal church should appeal to Masons—they are partial excerpts from Taunton's Canon Law on "Secret Societies":

"1. Secret societies have been condemned by many popes. The main grounds for the condemnation have been the *OATH* of secrecy; the *BLIND OBEDIENCE* due to the leaders; and the naturalism which is set forth instead of the Christian revelation confined to the church. Another cause has been the war against Religion as well as against the State which has marked so many of those societies, and the substitution of Masonic benevolence for the Christian virtue of charity.

"2. Clement XII condemned Freemasonry by name April 28, 1738, in Constitution '*In eminenti*'; Benedict XIV (one of the popes who instituted the *Pontificalo Romanum*, with the bishop's oath), in Bull '*Providas*,' March 18, 1751; Pius VII in Bull '*Ecclesiam a Iesu Christo*,' Sept. 13, 1821; Pius VIII, in Encyclical '*Traditi*,' March 20, 1820; Leo XII, in Apostolic Letter '*Quo gravissima*,' March 13, 1826; Gregory XVI in Encyclical '*Mirari vos*,' August 15, 1832; and Pius IX, by one Encyclical, '*Qui pluribus*,' November 9, 1846; this pope also, by his Constitution '*Apostolicæ Sedis*,' of 1869, renewed the excommunication *latæ sententiæ* reserved to the Roman Pontiff against all who become Freemasons, *Carbonari* (Italian order), or sectaries of this kind; also against those who favor them and do not denounce their leaders.

"3. Leo XIII, Encyclical '*Humanum genus*,' April 20, 1884, renewed all that his predecessors had done.

"5. The condemnation of secret societies is absolute, and no exception is made for any country. If in some countries it may be said that Freemasons are only a benevolent body, it still remains that they are in communion with, and recognize as brethren, other Freemasons whose warfare against religion is undisguised."

Now, if there is anything in the Masonic oath that binds one to the purpose of persecuting and making war on those who will not join the order; or if it requires a candidate to agree to do things which are unknown to him—as when one joins the Roman church, to swear to be governed by all the laws and decrees promulgated a thousand years ago that he has never heard of, along with the provisions of the bishop's oath—then I can understand why a Mason can not consistently oppose Roman Catholicism: laymen of the papal church are bound under the bishop's oath as well as their allegiance through confirmation, to the pope, to do all he commands; and if Freemasonry does not exact a similar oath in the matter of forcing others into the order and making them subject to Masonic leaders therein, and if the bishop's oath is the pope's interpretation of "Religion," then I am glad that secret societies, especially that of Freemasonry, oppose such "Religion" and pray the tribe may increase.

Of course, a Mason must compare the bishop's oath with that which he swears, and be governed in his attitude to papalism as truth may suggest.

"WHO STARTED THE WAR?"

Under the above caption the *Literary Digest* for October 7, 1916, has this interesting news item:

". . . The Budapest *Kepes Hirlap*, the organ of the Catholic Party in Hungary, offers its readers this information as to the real instigators of the war:

"The cause of the present terrible war must not be sought in the murder of the heir-apparent; this murder was only the final signal for many other murders past and to come. . . . It has been proved that the Archduke and his wife were murdered at the instigation of the Freemasons. The murderers themselves were Freemasons, and the society of Freemasons supplied them with advice, encouragement and arms. For our present misery neither British pride, nor Slav armies, nor Servian insolence, nor Grey, nor Pachitch are responsible, but wholly and solely the spirit, the conduct, and the aims of Freemasons. They have conquered the world with their diabolical power. Freemasons have kindled the fire over our heads. Freemasons are operating with knife and bombs. Freemasons are making the present war as inhuman as it is."

Notwithstanding the fact that Cardinal Manning predicted the overthrow of the pope's temporal power in Italy would result in a great world war, wherein the "enemies" of the "church" would destroy each other, after which the pope would again be a temporal king; and although the bishop's oath and layman's oath prove that the papal church will always be a fomentor of wars, great and small, for the purpose of advancing the interests of the Roman church (as was demonstrated by the advantages and special privileges accorded that institution in our country during the war), yet if a priest-editor says Freemasonry caused the war, that is an established fact, and becomes a closed question to Catholics, the world over.

Mr. Farrell quoted from Pike's "Morals and Dogma"; the following two paragraphs are quoted from Albert Pike, Grand Commander of the Supreme Council of 33d Degree Scottish Rite Masonry, replying to Pope Leo XIII's attack on Freemasonry. As to Freemasonry Pike said:

"Its complacent sense of security may be rudely disturbed by and by"—Remember, Masonry was at first barred from the cantonments—"It seems to me that an organized crusade against it by all the Roman Catholics in the United States, an anti-Masonic movement organized and directed by the papacy, and engineered by priests, bishops and cardinals, is not a thing to be made light of by the American Masonry, treated with indifference and regarded with a lordly and sublime contempt. And it is very cer-

tain that its protestations that it has no political or religious opinions, and no sympathies with the revolutionary tendencies of the Masonry of the Continent, will neither placate nor win for it respect anywhere.

"If, in other countries, Freemasonry has lost sight of the Ancient Landmarks, even tolerating communism and atheism, it is better to endure ten years of these evils than it would be **TO LIVE A WEEK UNDER THE DEVILISH TYRANNY of the INQUISITION AND OF THE BLACK SOLDIERY OF LOYOLA.** Atheism is a dreary unbelief, **BUT** it at least **DOES NOT** persecute, torture, or **ROAST MEN** who believe that there **IS A GOD.** Freemasonry will not long indulge in extravagancies of opinion or action anywhere. It has within itself energy and capacity to free itself in time of all errors: and he greatly belittles Humanity who proclaims it is **UNSAFE** to let **ERROR** say what it will, if **TRUTH** is left free to combat and confute it. But Freemasonry will effect its reforms in its own proper way; and would **NOT** resort, if it could, not even to save itself from dissolution, **TO MEANS LIKE THOSE WHICH THE PAPACY HAS HERETOFORE EMPLOYED,** and **WOULD GLADLY EMPLOY AGAIN,** to extirpate Judaism, Heresy and Freemasonry."

Albert Pike delivered this Allocution in 1864—and it seems his prediction that Freemasonry would have "its complacent sense of security . . . rudely disturbed" was fully realized during the Great War, among other things, being the specialty, it appears, of appointing Romanists to great positions of trust, etc., while all non-Catholic forces were considered only secondary.

"I reach you my hand—" Knowing that all laymen are subject to the oath of the bishop, that they are bound together into one solid body in the Federated Catholic Societies, I believe that oath will sow the seeds of discord in any land—array father against son, son against father at the instigation of an alien whose lust for supremacy is insatiate and far transcends the requirements of natural law—sowing to the wind to reap the whirlwind: planting dragon's teeth in fertile soil to fructify and rend every tie of friendship, and destroy the peace and harmony of a great nation and plunge it into intestine strife at the ballot box and otherwise, I can not take his hand; to do so would be an endorsement of the oath to which he is bound: an oath which makes him desire to destroy all that I hold most dear and sacred: **HOW CAN AN AMERICAN CITIZEN FELLOWSHIP HIM WHO IS SWORN TO "PERSECUTE AND WAR" ON HIM AND HIS COUNTRY?** (Of course, it is understood, that if Mr. Farrell or any other Roman Catholic should approach me as a private individual in *any manner*, I would extend the same courtesy and treatment accorded any other person; I have the utmost sympathy for the average Roman Catholic, because I am sure very few know what

is required of them by their system. *This friendly attitude is toward the individual, not the system.*)

I have this to say to those who read the bishop's oath: You see that it provides for the annihilation of the Constitution; I had brothers in the Great War; American blood and money were expended in foreign lands, first to establish its principles there, but especially, we were told, *to preserve it at home*; it was "popular" to "cuss" the Germans, so every man, particularly those who would not be called on to *fight them*, "whooped" for war—*very few* cried "Come on, Boys!" but the very air was filled with the shouts, "Go on, Boys!" *And the boys went*; those who did not want to go were termed SLACKERS: any man who questioned anything pertaining to the *modus operandi* of the Administration were "slackers": IF THE GERMAN FLAG WAS FLYING FROM THE CAPITOL'S DOME IN WASHINGTON THE CONSTITUTION WOULD NOT BE BURIED AS DEEP AS THE PROVISIONS CONTAINED IN THE BISHOP'S OATH REQUIRE: and he who does not DISPROVE THAT OATH IS A SLACKER and A COWARD UNWORTHY TO BE THE KAISER'S BOOT-BLACK, if he does not resist it!

If *you* did not "whoop" for war for the money *you* would get out of it; if *you* did not "cuss" the Germans—and they needed "cussing" if untrue to America—BECAUSE YOU BELIEVED YOU WOULD GET "CUSSED" IF YOU DIDN'T, and will not put your soul and pocketbook in the fight to preserve the Constitution against a foe a thousand times more dangerous than the German Kaiser, YOU will be recorded in a certain book with a YELLOW BACK—whether you be layman or preacher, President or street-sweeper; for the bird that *can* sing and won't sing will be made to sing—*some* sort of song—and your own brother may be a "book-keeper!"

To the man in any walk of life, it matters not who, that does not stand as an AMERICAN CITIZEN against ANY foe of the Constitution because he fears the papal boycott will cost him a few dollars, while our young manhood had to face death on foreign battlefields in behalf of the Flag, REMEMBER! *remember*, there are but few games at which two can not play!

And to the *papists* in America—know this: *the keepers* of that "YELLOW BOOK" understand and appreciate the suggestion, which was so remarkably successful in keeping the papal Irish out of the Great Conflict; it looks good; *and it is well known* that no member in the pope's army will act *unless directed by his captain, the priest! Verbum sat sapienti.*

APPENDIX

LETTERS ON THE PROPOSED DEBATE

In concluding my objections to Mr. Farrell's answers to the Thirty-two Questions, I challenged the Catholic Laymen's Association of Georgia to debate certain propositions indicated elsewhere, and the following are the letters passing between us on the subject:

CATHOLIC LAYMEN'S ASSOCIATION OF GEORGIA

Augusta, Ga., Oct. 24, 1917.

Mr. C. A. Yarbrough,
American National Bank Building,
Macon, Ga.

Dear Sir: You probably are somewhat impatient for me to take up your questions in proper order, so I shall defer further preliminary observation for the time being.

Noting that you have united Questions 1 and 2 and further that you propose to debate the subject matter of 2 along with 6, 7, 8, 9, and 19 in a series of lectures before an audience in your city, which I hope we can arrange to bring about.

Now about the debate: The idea appeals to me very much, I could not consent, of course, to your paying the expenses of our representative; we shall take care of that. We would prefer not to have any admission fee, each bearing half of all necessary cost.

We will, of course, have to agree on the moderators, although I would agree to your selecting them, say three or five, provided they do not belong to any denomination or order of which you or your representative is a member.

The main thing would be to have all the citizens of Georgia represented. Inasmuch as the person appearing for us would represent all the Catholic people of Georgia we would expect the person you select as his opponent to be a representative of all the "non-Catholic" people of the State.

If you can arrange this in the near future I shall be very glad, and the Catholic Laymen of Georgia will rejoice, for nothing could be more to their purpose to bring about a more friendly relation among all citizens, regardless of creed.

Very truly,
J. J. FARRELL, Mgr.

JJF/MC

To that letter I answered:

Macon, Ga., Nov. 3, 1917.

Catholic Laymen's Association,
Mr. J. J. Farrell, Mgr.,
Augusta, Ga.

Dear Sir: I have received many communications from you recently regarding questions submitted, none of which, except in

remote instances, comply with my oft-repeated request that answers must be based on cited highest church authority—popes and general church councils—therefore have given the correspondence no attention.

Your letter of Oct. 24th, however, offers something tangible and interesting: I am pleased to note that the idea of a debate appeals to you.

As to time, how would about the first week in January suit you? I understand, of course, that in all minor matters you have the decision.

The expense of this, for seven nights, will cost, for hall rent and advertising, about \$220, half of such expense, as you suggest, to be taken care of by each party, as well as each side providing for its own representative's expenses.

As to umpire or moderator, I am of the opinion that the audience should be its own umpire; the objective being educational, each hearer will arrive at conclusions regardless of an umpire's decisions.

I think there should be a joint chairmanship to maintain decorum and cause adherence to such rules as may be agreed upon.

I would be glad to have you outline and submit a plan of procedure.

Respectfully,
C. A. YARBROUGH.

Augusta, Ga., Nov. 10, 1917.

Mr. C. A. Yarbrough,
American National Bank Building,
Macon, Ga.

Dear Sir: Your letter of Nov. 3d in reply to ours of Oct. 24th, regarding your challenge to debate, does not mention what we specified as "the main thing" in arrangements, namely, that your speaker should represent all the "non-Catholics," as ours would represent all the Catholics, in the State, in order, as was stated, "to have all citizens of Georgia represented," in the matter.

This may be accounted for by your statement that you have given our letters "no attention"; but if you will give attention to the fifth paragraph of this one letter you answer, you will discern that the matter of whom your speaker would represent, is, "the main thing" as we said; for it goes to the very core of our purpose, "to bring about a more friendly relation among all citizens, regardless of creed," to accomplish which in our opinion scarcely anything would do more than an even tempered public discussion in which the Catholic and non-Catholic people, through their accredited spokesman, would meet, shake hands and talk things over.

"If you can arrange this," I told you, "the Catholic Laymen will rejoice, for nothing could be more to their purpose," and therefore, you can imagine my disappointment when you suggest arrangements about most everything else but "this"; although, I might suppose that the omission, if not inadvertent, is due, perhaps, to the arrangements in this respect not being near completion, and in that case you doubtless will advise me in due course,

giving me the name of the "champion," together with the exact terms of the proposition he will think sufficient to cover the subject-matter in the premises.

Until then, we can not, of course, fix the time. As to the expense, the amount you name seems only reasonable, and as to moderators, our views coincide. The rules to govern the discussion, however, should properly be submitted by you as the challenging party, I believe, but all these matters are clearly subordinate to "The main thing," about which I await your advice.

Very truly,

JJF/MC

J. J. FARRELL, Mgr.

Macon, Ga., Nov. 25, 1917.

Catholic Laymen's Association,
Mr. J. J. Farrell, Mgr.,
Augusta, Ga.

Gentlemen: Replying in particular to yours of Oct. 24-Nov. 10, regarding what you are pleased to consider "the main thing" in order to have a debate: If you will carefully consider what you request, that the person I put up must "be a representative of all the 'non-Catholics' of the State," you will readily observe that the restrictive qualification completely blocks the game; I had about concluded to drop the matter entirely, but the receipt of other letters from you seem to open up better possibilities, therefore I call your attention to "the main thing":

I am sure your association will select a man whom you consider capable of handling any subject we may debate and adequately represent the Roman Catholics of Georgia, but as there are infidels, agnostics, Jews, socialists, etc., and a very large number of non-church people in Georgia, there is not an intelligent man in America who would undertake to represent "all the non-Catholics of the State."

Roman Catholicism and Protestantism represent two world-wide principles, and the man I put up will undertake only to represent the Protestant mind relative to any question under debate.

As to who your representative may be does not interest me— if you will be satisfied with your selection, I will raise no objection; the man I put up will present subjects from the Protestant angle, and of course, who he may be is likewise a matter of no interest to you.

You express a desire in several letters, to broaden the scope of the debate: very well; to offer you an unbounded latitude, I present the following, and challenge you to debate thereon:

"Resolved. That the Roman Catholic Church Is Not a Christian Institution."

If you accept this, I will proceed to arrange a list of perhaps six or more topics, each of which will offer a field as broad as the challenge.

Now, as to the various questions asked in your several communications: when you signify that you have finished writing, I intend to take up your letters and present a sort of compendium

in reply, which will, no doubt, disabuse your mind of some erroneous impressions and at the same time explain a Protestant layman's reasons for conclusions and deductions.

I am pressed for time, and can not give each letter and subject the daily attention necessary for a satisfactory consideration.

It is my purpose, if we can arrange this debate, to have it pitched on a high plane: each party dealing in facts to the utter exclusion of personalities.

Yours truly,

C. A. YARBROUGH.

N. B.—How about having the debates stenographically reported, and published? That would be much better than what either of us have suggested so far.

Augusta, Ga., Dec. 3, 1917.

Mr. C. A. Yarbrough,
American National Bank Building,
Macon, Ga.

Dear Sir: Replying to your letter of Nov. 25, in reference to debate:

Had you not completely misunderstood the aim of our association—"to bring about more friendly relations among all citizens, irrespective of creed"—you must have seen that so far as our purpose is concerned there are only two classes of citizens. We are the united Catholic citizens of Georgia speaking with one voice to all non-Catholic citizens and asking only that we be respected while we respect all others.

Now, a public debate in which all of one class is represented on one side and only part of the other class is represented on the other, must prove disappointing at best. For this reason we hoped, in spite of the apparent difficulties, that you might be able to secure a representative of non-Catholics to follow up your challenge. Nor did we mean for you, or any one, to "undertake to represent" them, as you suggest; there has been entirely too much of this *undertaking-to-represent* business already. What we wished, and do still wish, is that non-Catholics, by selection and choice, would designate a spokesman, the same as ourselves. You speak of our association selecting a capable man; but that is not the point. The point is, that whether or not he was capable he would represent the Catholics of Georgia, and that is the kind of standing his opponent ought to have with the other side. Then we could get somewhere.

Since you seem unable to get a representative of all non-Catholics, however, and inasmuch as Protestants in Georgia compose a majority of the people, a half-loaf being better than no bread, we shall modify "the main thing" somewhat and agree to debate with any accredited representative of all Protestants in Georgia. I should say, perhaps, to avoid further confusion, that your man who "will undertake to represent the Protestant mind," will not do unless he represents not merely the Protestant mind but the Protestant people, and is, not merely an "undertaker" but the accredited spokesman of the Protestant people, same as our

spokesman would be as to Catholics. I hope this will remove all difficulties in the way of the debate.

As to broadening the terms, even though the Catholic church were not a Christian institution, as you challenge, there are many institutions not Christian that have rights in Georgia and that debate would get us nowhere; but this and the other matters you mention can be determined after we have named our respective spokesmen, their representative character being still "the main thing."

JJF/LH

Very truly,

J. J. FARRELL, Mgr.

Macon, Ga., Dec. 9, 1917.

Catholic Laymen's Association of Georgia,

Mr. J. J. Farrell, Mgr.,

Augusta, Ga.

Dear Sir: Replying to yours of the 3d instant, subject, debate:

You seem to be unduly troubled regarding what I can or can not do in the matter of securing a man to represent Protestantism for the debate; to ease your mind on this score, will state that no definite arrangements will be contemplated with any man until you and I have come to a definite understanding and agreement as to every other phase involved in the question of the debate (one of the stipulations being, a forfeit of \$500 or more); after the arrangements have been perfected between us, then I will in ample time announce who will represent the non-Catholics in the debate. I have, in a polite way, endeavored to give you to understand that the man I select will be satisfactory to me as a Protestant and stands duly accredited among non-Catholics—one who will know whether your man will be dealing in facts or fiction, and meet any issue which may be injected, and as I am engineering this end of the matter, I absolutely refuse to make known to you the names of the men whose services I may use in the debate (until agreement between you and I is perfected and signed): under no circumstances will I allow you a censorship of the men I may have in mind. I am impressed with the idea that "the main thing" with you is, to assist me in selecting your *opponent*.

You select your man, I will select mine. Now, if you want to debate, cut out word-splitting and juggling of words.

Shall I go ahead and outline the plan and subjects of debate, or do you care to submit an outline? Tentative, of course.

Respectfully,

C. A. YARBROUGH.

Augusta, Ga., Dec. 14, 1917.

Mr. C. A. Yarbrough,

American National Bank Building,

Macon, Ga.

Dear Sir: Your letter of Dec. 9, in reference to debate, is only going back over covered ground.

You issued the challenge for the debate, you outlined the subject-matter, you included the number of arguments, you picked the audience, fixed the place, selected the hall, and suggested the

time. We did not object to anything. We even agreed to you selecting moderators, we agreed to your stenographic reports, we agreed to the cost you estimated, we agreed to practically everything you mentioned and only requested on your part that you name a champion who would represent the non-Catholic people in the same way that ours would represent the Catholic people. At first you ignored this one request of ours, though we told you at the start it was "the main thing." Next, you demurred to it, admitting that you did not represent the non-Catholic people. Then we agreed to meet a *bona fide* representative of the PROTESTANT people, and told you to name him. Now, you refuse to do that, and take refuge in unimportant matters of detail. You mention a forfeit of \$500 or more; but you put up nothing. You speak of a signed contract; but you offer none, signed or unsigned. The only thing you say certain is that you will not tell us whom you put up as a representative of the Protestant people of Georgia. You refuse to comply with the one condition that makes a debate possible, for you know there can not be a debate without a debater; and you ought to know there can not be a challenge made in good faith by one who purposely conceals his party, whether through fear, shame or cunning. You issued the challenge; but you refuse to make it *bona fide*. There is only one conclusion. But if you wanted to back out, why didn't you do it straight and not try to side-step your own frankenstein?

No harm done, however, and no hard feelings, for we realize your predicament: The Protestant people of Georgia do not altogether share you views; so, to relieve the situation, we shall just consider no challenge made.

Very truly,

JJF/LH

J. J. FARRELL, Mgr.

Macon, Ga., Dec. 23, 1917.

Catholic Laymen's Association,
Mr. J. J. Farrell, Mgr.
Augusta, Ga.

Dear Sir: Answering yours of the 14th inst.:

First, I wish to say very emphatically that your letter is literally "running over" with "half-truths" or erroneous statements: you have practically *agreed* to nothing regarding the debate—merely acquiescing in suggestions in the main modifying some of your requirements in my efforts to *reach* an AGREEMENT with you, as there can be no debate until an *agreement* as to details exists, and is signed by each party.

As an American citizen and Protestant, believing from what information I have, that the religion of the Roman Catholic church is inimical to popular government and institutions as we have in America, I challenged you to debate, for general enlightenment, certain politic and civic questions affecting the nation; you desired along with this to inject a religious phase, and also discuss priestly orders—and in order to give both sides an equal right to discuss any phase of the question, I suggested modifying the subject, and debate whether or not the Roman Catholic church

is a Christian institution. To this, you replied in effect that there were other institutions that had a legal right to exist that were not Christian!

It is useless to thresh over this old ground of secondary preliminary details: the bald fact remains, that you seem to be dominated by the fine foreign influence of the Vatican which will not allow you to meet these questions in the forum.

Having issued the challenge, as above stated, the burden of meeting you in case of acceptance was on me, to either meet you or your representative myself or secure a substitute to do so—a matter in which no parliamentary rule can give you a voice, and it was sheer presumption on your part to demand the name of the one who would meet you. The force of this will dawn on you, especially in the light of your letter of the 3d inst., wherein you declare: "Now, a public debate in which all of ONE CLASS is represented on ONE side and only *part* of the OTHER *class* is represented on the other . . . we hoped . . . that you might be able to secure a representative of NON-CATHOLICS to follow up your challenge." Speaking for the Catholics, you classify the people—there are only TWO *classes*: Roman Catholic, and non-Catholic, which means that to a Roman Catholic all non-Catholics look alike—the Jew and Gentile, Greek and barbarian, bond and free, the Hottentot and the Mongolian, the Turk and the Red Man: all mankind is divided into TWO classes, the Catholics are in one boat, and you put all non-Catholics in the other, THEREFORE, this fact being generally understood by non-Catholics, you could not refuse to meet ANY person I should select from the boat of NON-CATHOLICS without such refusal being accepted as an acknowledgment that you are occupying untenable ground; having issued the challenge, it was my prerogative, if I saw fit, to put up a Hottentot, or a Protestant bishop, if I thought either one of them well versed in polemics.

Your position now, in the eyes of the public, is as that of a defendant with a case in court who refuses to appear before the tribunal of justice and have the question aired because he could not find out who would represent the cause of the complainant! In such cases I believe judgment is rendered in favor of the complainant.

There can be but one conclusion reached in your refusal to debate, and that is that you entertained a wholesome "FEAR" of having to meet a man whom you know knows all you know, and then some more, and the "*shame*" of it forced you to resort to Jesuitical "*cunning*" to find a means of escape via the route of technicalities.

From the first stroke of my pen to you in all this matter it has been my purpose to secure information or "evidence" if you please, proving or disproving allegations for and against your church, whether direct or indirect; and from the time you first signified a willingness to debate, from your letters I have seen the ultimate conclusion—a "back-down"—and just "played" you all along to see how you would work out of a tight place.

Now, that you have declared the debate off, there is "nothing before the house"—we are just where we were at first, and I will submit a new challenge, tentatively as follows:

"Resolved, That the Roman Catholic Church IS a Christian Institution," and give you the affirmative. I will take care of the negative.

Seven topics for debate to be discussed, one each night for seven consecutive nights or as close together as may be possible in securing hall, said topics to consist of the Seven Sacraments of your church.

Debate to be in City Auditorium, Macon, Ga. (time to be agreed upon).

You and I each to select a moderator, who together shall act as master of ceremonies.

Admission tickets printed covering seating capacity of the hall—about 2,000 or 2,300; you to receive one-half of tickets and I half, and to insure against either side "packing" the house admit only by ticket up to within about fifteen minutes of speaking hour, after which, seats to be open to any one who may want them.

An agreement to be drawn up and executed in triplicate embodying these stipulations and also demanding each side put up a forfeit of \$500 against non-appearance, same to be deposited with a responsible person or bank, payable to the party who appears for debate and is not met by the other party in person or by proxy at the appointed time and place, and upon failure to carry out the several debates as may be scheduled. Debate to take place at a date mutually agreed upon within six months from time agreement is executed.

Now, in accordance with you dictum, dividing the people into two "classes," I will secure a man or men who is or are recognized by NON-CATHOLICS as belonging to our "class"—I will probably get Hon. Gilbert O. Nations, Vice-President of the Free Press Defense League, to represent the non-Catholics, using as "state's evidence" probably Dr. Joe Slattery or Rev. P. A. Seguin, ex-priests, as witnesses to verify or deny allegations as may be necessary; or, in connection with one of these witnesses, may put up Dr. A. E. Barnett, Rev. Guy Fitch Phelps, W. C. Bibb, or any other man equally accredited by NON-Catholics as being such.

Shall I proceed to have agreement drawn along the lines as above stated?

Yours truly,

C. A. YARBROUGH.

Augusta, Ga., Dec. 31, 1917.

Mr. C. A. Yarbrough,
American National Bank Building,
Macon, Ga.

Dear Sir: Referring to your letter of Dec. 23:

None of the parties you name, so far as my information goes, is a resident of Georgia, and this compels me to ask you point blank, do you hold out that the non-Catholic or Protestant citizens of Georgia have really given to the non-resident, professional propogandists you name, or to anyone of them, the authority to

speak for them in the debate you propose, and I shall await this information from you before considering your challenge to debate.

It is not so much a matter of who these persons are—I know them by reputation well enough—or of whether a gentleman would be unwilling to have his name coupled with theirs in a public way; but it is simply a question of their credentials; if they have been designated by the non-Catholic or Protestant citizens of Georgia notwithstanding they are interlopers here, we shall upon assurance of this fact, promptly take up your challenge to debate. Without this assurance we can have no way of knowing that the non-Catholics or Protestants of Georgia desire to debate any question with their Catholic citizens.

And this is the main thing.

Very truly,

JJF/LH

J. J. FARRELL, Mgr.

Macon, Ga., Jan. 6, 1918.

Catholic Laymen's Association of Georgia,

Mr. J. J. Farrell, Mgr.

Augusta, Ga.

Dear Sir: Answering yours of Dec. 31, 1917:

As the parties I named are not residents of Georgia, before considering my challenge to debate you demand to know if non-Catholics or the Protestant citizens of Georgia have given any one of them the authority to speak for them. You ought to know that in all matters of this nature neither non-Catholics or Protestants have to abide by nor consult some one in "Authority," neither do they have to run to some one who has been delegated with AUTHORITY by some one else, to get the *authority* to act. Here is one of the great fundamental differences between Protestantism and Romanism, that is, an exercise of an individual, God-given mind and conscience as taught by Bible Christianity.

In raising that issue—the matter of residence—you should remember that the Catholic church is a purely foreign corporation, whose interests are managed and looked after by agents who are themselves mainly foreigners, all of whom have assumed an oath or pledge of allegiance to the foreign, Italian head of the concern, under whose rules or laws no priest-agent can really be termed a "resident" of any State in the true sense of the word, but merely a transient agent whose sojourn in a State is dependent upon his activities in behalf of those who gave him the *authority to speak for them*, and not then until his superiors have defined upon what and when he may speak

Furthermore, you have previously admitted that the Roman Catholics of Georgia are affiliated with the National Federated Catholic Societies, which fact and admission is sufficient to destroy any geographical line of demarcation you may attempt now to draw, showing that whatever may be the will, intention or purpose of the Vatican all Romanists in America are prepared by such federation to act in concert to carry out the same.

You say "It is not so much a matter of who these persons are . . . or whether a gentleman would be willing to have his name

coupled with theirs in a public way; but it is simply a matter of their credentials."

Permit a few observations here:

The definition of what constitutes a *gentleman* varies according to the school of thought in which one is trained: some hold that no *gentleman* would use obscene, lascivious language in the presence of a woman and, hence, any man who follows the law of your church by using "Saint" Liguori in the confessional box with women is no gentleman; while, on the other hand, others would say he is no gentleman who opposes the gentleman in the box with women using Liguori's doctrine as the topic of conversation or consideration—the mere printing a part of which, in Latin, came near putting Hon. Thos. E. Watson in the penitentiary, on the charge of sending obscene matter through the mails—a doctrine so obscene that it is said the trial court would not permit the charge containing the matter to be spread upon the court record. (It would seem to one who has no "credentials" that if Uncle Sam considers it a felony to send "St." Liguori through the mails in a DEAD tongue, he may "get his back up" when he discovers that the same thing is being sent through his *females* by a LIVE tongue.)

Again, as to the question of their "credentials" you ought not to demur on that point, you being estopped by your own division of the people into two classes—Catholics and non-Catholics, and it is childish on your part to "stall" around on imaginary lines of habitat.

Further, your church asserts it is the custodian of all truth with an infallible head directing his many sub-heads, all of whom partake of his nature even as he is "Christ veiled in the flesh," as was declared by one who was subsequently elected pope; and if your priests, under your pope are as gods among men, and your whole outfit claims to be literally following Him whom your pope says he holds the place of on earth, the servant being no better than his master, you should be like Him whom you say you follow—Christ—who did not trouble Himself about the "credentials" of those who approached Him, whether saint or sinner, man or devil; the OPPORTUNITY was all Christ wanted; He did not say to the devil, "You were kicked out of heaven, and unless you show your credentials wherein the non-residents of earth as well as the inhabitants thereof have given you 'authority' to meet Me, I will not discuss matters with you." No, He did not do as you are now doing; He took advantage of the opportunity and gave mankind some of the greatest religious truths.

As to MY "credentials" I am a FREE-BORN American citizen, a Baptist by selection and choice—these are all the credentials and authority an American to the manner born needs as his authority to challenge anything or anybody that he has reason to believe it or they have, are, or would run counter to the PRINCIPLES of American democracy and institutions.

Of course, you must not get the idea that you will confer a favor on me or others by a debate; the benefit of such would be

felt at the polls; if you can maintain certain positions, your cause can not suffer; if you can not, that is your misfortune, and the voters who hear you will act at the polls in the light as they have it: if you are satisfied not to turn on the light, that suits me; but you can not blame non-Catholics for opposing that which seeks to keep in the dark.

Notwithstanding I consider the "main thing" you are demanding as entirely a non-essential and frivolous, yet to please you, I will ask you to divest himself of your equivocal tendencies for one time, and answer the following "point blank" as an American citizen:

(1) There are approximately twenty-five Protestant ministers in Macon; if the majority of them should say they are willing for any one of the parties I may name to speak for Protestantism of Georgia, would this satisfy you?

(2) If not, would you be satisfied if the leaders of the several denominations—bishop, president, moderator, etc.—should say they are satisfied with my selection?

(3) Do you expect me to put the matter up to the thousand or more preachers in Georgia and ask them to bring it to a vote by their respective congregations?

(4) What man or men in Georgia among non-church people would you have me submit the proposition to for ratification?

(5) Do you think a man who would be acceptable to you would be fully qualified to speak for non-Catholics?

Awaiting your reply, I am,

Respectfully yours,

C. A. YARBROUGH.

Augusta, Ga., Jan. 25, 1918.

Mr. C. A. Yarbrough, D. D. S.,
American National Bank Building,
Macon, Ga.

Dear Sir: Noting your letter of Jan. 6:

You asked me several questions; why did you not answer the one I asked, and either say that your "debaters" had the authority to represent the Protestant people of Georgia or admit they had not and you had proposed them without authority?

No, I do not expect you to put the matter up to the Protestant congregations; I do not expect you to do anything; but your question here shows that you have a very keen appreciation of what ought to be done; of what, in fact, most persons, with a becoming sense of modesty, would have wished done before they presumed so far as to speak in the name of the non-Catholic people, especially the Protestant people.

And while I did not exactly expect it, I did hope, for a little while, till you began to clutter around so much, that something like this, if it had not been, would be done; for, as a casual reader could see from the very beginning, I consider it the main thing, not only because it barred any personal exploitation of irresponsible individuals, but also, because it frustrated all self-serving projects.

If you have been disappointed, you should not abuse us for it, and now that you seem finally to have absorbed the idea, it is up to you, in expressive parlance, to put up or shut up.

Very truly,

J. J. FARRELL, Mgr.

Macon, Ga., Feb. 4, 1918.

Catholic Laymen's Association of Georgia,

Mr. J. J. Farrell, Mgr.,

Augusta, Ga.

Dear Sir: Replying to yours of the 25th ult., and terminating the question of debate:

You did not answer the *point blank* questions asked you, but again raised instead the matter of my "authority," which was clearly disposed of in my last letter.

At the beginning, I agreed to provide a hall for the debate, and give you an audience composed of those people in the main you have so assiduously circularized—people too intelligent to question any matter pertaining to arrangements for debate, being interested only in the subjects thereof.

An answer to one or all of my five questions was necessary, before I could definitely reply to your hypermetric "main thing." While not specifically answering any of the questions, your highly developed sense of "modesty" (?) prompted you, however, to convey a broad hint probably as an answer to Question 3—which, most assuredly later, requirements would be extended, judging from past experience, requiring each individual signature to be confirmed by notary's seal. I would be pleased, though, to take up this task (merely to satisfy you) if I possessed the patience of Job, could stay Time in its flight, had at my command the resources of the United States with the facilities of the Census Bureau, and KNEW you would get Benedict XV as your champion to speak for the Romanists of Georgia.

In the correspondence as to debate, you have furnished both enlightenment and amusement: your seeming desire to take up the gauntlet thrown down by me, reveals the fundamental duplicity inculcated by your system of religion, while it has been ludicrous to observe how you could not get to it from stumbling over technicalities! Therefore, will close the subject with the following pertinent statements:

You refuse to debate, advancing the specious plea that I have no "authority" to challenge you or put up a man to debate, while at the same time you know, as well as I know you know I know, that if I had a power of attorney duly executed by every non-Catholic in the State of Georgia authorizing me to select a man for the above stated purpose, YOU WOULD NOT, NEITHER COULD YOU, meet him in debate on the issues submitted for debate; very emphatically did your infallible pope, Leo XIII, say, in his Encyclical Letters (p. 133): "In mere matters of OPINION it is permissible to *discuss* things," while as to LIBERTY of SPEECH that would be necessary in a DEBATE, he said (p.151): "THERE

IS NO SUCH RIGHT," while another of your infallible popes estops all subjects of the papal church from debating: in his *Motu Proprio* orders, Pius X, Sept. 10, 1910, forbids even priests of the Roman church to congregate for the purpose of discussing questions of modernism, presbyterianism, or laicism. This I knew when you first acted as if you wanted to take up my challenge; I knew that if the priests of Rome could not even enter into discussions they **COULD NOT DEBATE** where the public at large and possibly papal subjects (a term used by Leo XIII in reference to Romanists) would form the audience; but I did hope you had absorbed enough of the spirit of Americanism to cause you, for once at least, to defy your **RELIGIOUS SUPERIORS**—in this only am I disappointed.

You would make it obligatory on me, and as a condition precedent, to get the authority or endorsement of all Protestants of Georgia before going into a debate, while on your part you would **PRESUME** to put up a man to speak for the Catholics of Georgia: from whom would he get **HIS** authority; certainly not from a practical referendum such as you would burden me with, but he would get it through a long chain of "religious superiors" from the **POPE**—from **ONE MAN** (if such was secured at all): so you will see at once, I as *one man* have as much right and authority in the premises as you have; this is so apparent, I do not see how you could have overlooked it all the way along. But to test the abject subserviency of papal subjects to their foreign head the pope (a sort of Religious Kaiser in the Vatican) copies of the original questions were mailed to Mr. A. J. Long, this city (the present presiding officer of your association), and to Hon. A. D. Daly—two prominent Roman Catholics; the foreign papal laws prevented them from attempting an answer, and our debate-correspondence has been very illuminating, showing the influence of the above cited papal orders on individuals as well as associations.

Personally wishing you and all Roman Catholics well, and as to debate: *ne plus*, I am,

Respectfully,

C. A. YARBROUGH.

I believe the above letters will convince any one that the Laymen's Association did not have the remotest intention to debate the questions proposed, from considering the sophisticated reason advanced as "the main thing," unless they were satisfied my selection was unlearned in Jesuitical casuistry, in which case a dispensation to debate could have been secured, and they would have entered into it with unbounded pleasure; for, always, "The end justifies the means"; the manner in which Mr. Farrell treated the various subjects discussed herein shows how Rome trains her clerics in subtleness, especially when dealing with "heretics"—all apt pupils of Talleyrand, one of Rome's greatest French bishops, who said "Language is the art of concealing one's thoughts."

If any doubt remained as to the sincerity of the Laymen's Association, the following, quoted from the Canon Law of the church of Rome would dispel it. This law was discovered subsequent to the above letter, which reads, under the heading of "Heretics":

"Public disputes with heretics on matters *de fide* (of faith) is forbidden under excommunication *sententiae ferendae*," which means, "Let the transgressor be excommunicated."

The evidence is conclusive that the "main thing" which prevented the association from debating was the above law, and not a question as to my "authority" in issuing the challenge, or the "credentials" of the man I should choose to meet them; the iron grip of the LAW held the conscience bound in this as in all things that pertain to faith and morals, and faith and morals encompass the soul through life as water surrounds an island.

While I knew it was impossible for Rome to meet her doctrines and laws and defend them on the rostrum before the people, I did not know at the time of the above correspondence that such had been legislated against. From reading all the letters, it will be seen that the Decree of the Council of Constance, "Keep no faith with heretics," is a principle as vital to the Roman Catholic system to-day as when it was first promulgated.

In his letter of September 20, 1917, Mr. Farrell says: "Most all you say has been argued to us in much the same way by other correspondents." Did he answer "in much the same way" as he did mine?

If what they said was similar to what I wrote, then there was a "poison stream" running through their papers, which shows that all who investigate this subject are suspicious of Italian popery; he says also that my paper "furnished a helpful index to the non-Catholic mind," which was my object in the beginning: an honest statement, so he would understand the reason for this "suspicion" and on his part furnish a remedy by explaining or proving this suspicion to be unfounded. Has he been as honest with me as he says I have been with him?

My questions were presented twice for review by him; they showed the cause of my suspicion and distrust of Catholicism, and although his association was organized ostensibly for the sole purpose of answering questions as to the faith, practice and rights claimed by Catholics, he has not treated any one of the questions of moment in a way to dissipate suspicion; would it be presumptuous to say HE COULD NOT? And if that be true, what is the object of his association, if not to keep people from learning what the pope teaches?

MISCELLANEOUS

PAPAL "ARGUMENT"—FIRE

In 1914, the Rev. T. F. Callaway delivered a series of sermons on political Romanism in his church, the Baptist Tabernacle. He received the following letter from one "John J. McCreary," which I will present, paragraph at a time, with comments:

"Macon, Ga., July 14, 1914.

"Rev. T. F. Callaway, Macon, Ga.

"Dear Mr. Callaway: I have had the extreme pleasure of hearing three of your sermons against Catholicism, and beg to call attention to a few 'errors' you have made in your addresses. I feel sure that you will rectify same after they have been refuted to your entire satisfaction. I am sending you, under separate cover, this month's issue of *TRUTH*, and would thank you to refer to the passages I have marked, and which will discuss these misstatements."

Comment: Mr. McCreary sent Mr. Callaway a marked copy of *Truth*, instead of pointing out by argument the "errors" himself—I just wonder if this *Truth* is the organ of the Catholic Truth Society, of which Jeremiah O'Leary was president, who is to be tried for conspiracy against this Government in favor of Germany during the Great War?

"You made a mistake in saying that the Catholic church opposed the public schools on account of the parochial schools. This question is answered on page 35 under the title 'Catholic Opposition to Godless Schools,' and there you will find the *true* explanation of the matter."

Comment: I do not know what Mr. Callaway charged—but whatever it was, was "answered on page 35 . . ." A priest-editor can solve any question to the entire satisfaction of a Romanist; I do not know what "page 35" contained, but I do know that because Rome is not permitted to teach "The Glories of Mary" in the public schools, she sets up her own parochial schools, and says all others are "godless" and tries to fill them up with her teachers to rectify this "error." This principle was at the bottom of the Great War's beginning.

"In your attack on the Jesuits, you made a statement to the effect that their motto was 'The End Justifies the Means.' Perhaps you don't know, Mr. Callaway, that this calumny is nearly as old as the Jesuit order itself, and has been refuted time and time again. If you have means of *proving* this statement, you stand in line for a snug fortune. Of course, it must be earned. By referring to the article on page 38 you will find that you are not the only original calumniator, and that smarter men than you

have been made to eat their words. Therefore, my dear Mr. Callaway, it would behoove you to swallow soft words rather than hard, so please govern yourself accordingly."

Comment: From time to time elsewhere I have treated the "motto" referred to, and believe the truth of the matter has been made clear except to those who look to the priest for an answer, as did Mc. One thing is sure—Mc is not a Jesuit—else he would have been too wise to have signed his letter—and therefore he does not know anything about the Jesuit order except such as he learned from members of it! I venture to say Mc has never read how Jesuits disguised themselves as heathen priests in order to fool the native pagans so as to get a chance to baptize some of them, acting on the theory that "The End Justifies the Means."

He stated a truth, though, when he said that "smarter men than you have been made to swallow their words"—was he thinking of Galileo, Bruno, Savonarola, Huss, Wycliffe, the many millions who were murdered by Rome's Inquisition, in efforts to make THEM swallow popery! But how was Mr. Callaway to be made to swallow his words, and by whom, by a priest or layman in joint debate on the subjects, or by boycott or Inquisition? Why does papalism always strive to make one swallow his words, instead of answering them? Is that why the Catholic Laymen's Association of Georgia failed to answer any of the important questions I put to them?

"You also dwelt a long time upon discussing the relative rights of Church and State, and said that some clergyman had said that the 'Government of the United States could go to hell,' which you said was a very popular and 'favorite expression of Romanists.' Please understand, my dear sir, that you have no right to render the Catholic church accountable for the actions of its members, than we have to blame the Baptist church for the deeds of every notoriety-seeking minister who chooses to attack the Catholic church in a fit of bad temper. You will find this subject discussed on page 32 of the magazine I am sending you."

Comment: The spirit that actuates every priest of Rome—and the spirit that actuates every member of the pope's church—is to be found in the laws and doctrines of that institution; Priest Phelan's "To Hell with the Government of the United States" was a reflection from the papal law, while McCreary's letter is a reflection of the papal spirit derived from the priest: a Romanist being governed by the pope through the priest can not answer any question, but what he does is based on what some priest has said or written—note how often he refers to some page of *Truth*, while the general tone of his letter is as that of the system under which he lives—Mc is a member of the "Hearing Church" who knows nothing except what the "Teaching Church," the pope, wants him to know.

"According to your claim, Mr. Callaway, the Catholic church does not recognize the second commandment of God. According to your actions, sir, the Baptist church does not observe the eighth. As I said before, however, we will not judge the Baptist church by the actions of its irresponsible ministers, so we will not discuss the matter longer. But, my dear sir, you are playing with fire, and you may be seriously burned before you have finished your childish prank. Suits for libel are still tried, you know."

Comment: The only point worth noticing in this paragraph is the threat that Mr. Callaway may be "seriously burned before" he has finished his "childish prank." As an "irresponsible" person playing a "childish prank" can never be the basis of a suit in court for libel, and as no one can be "seriously burned" in such suits, Mr. Mc should not complain if this threat is interpreted according to the laws and history of his church, from which that spirit is engendered and put in action, which burnt and roasted human beings, not to make them swallow "hard words" but "HARD DOCTRINES"; and the general tenor of this letter shows Mr. Mc to be a true child of his church—an institution that has the right according to its laws to roast Mr. Callaway for objecting to the encroachments of Political Romanism on the free institutions and rights of a free people, in her efforts to get that power which would enable her to force him to call on Mary for salvation—and other things. I am informed that Mr. Callaway's deacons were approached on the subject, to have him suppressed in his own pulpit. How does this comport with Farrell's assertion that Catholics would pay no attention to the pope if he were to interfere with our Constitution, and that Romanists in this country were opposed to union of Church and State?

"Too bad the newspapers don't give you some publicity through their columns, isn't it? Self-respecting papers care too much for their reputations to dirty their pages by such filth. Perhaps Tom Watson would do so, as he runs one of the other kind. So you can't get notoriety except at advertising rates. 'Awful, aint't it?'"

Comment: There are few, if any, preachers or speakers in America who could get the newspapers to print the facts relative to Romanism; if they should expound the Marriage Law of the Council of Trent, which declares that marriage is not valid unless contracted with the presence of a papal priest, which Leo XIII paraphrased by saying such marriage is only "legalized concubinage," "filthy concubinage," etc., and even if the editor was not married according to papal law, he would not give such sermons or addresses much space.

Should a preacher expound the laws of papalism which show that a Romanist can not be true to this Government and his church, newspapers would not print it as a rule, not because they "care too much for their reputations to dirty their pages by such

filth," but because they know Rome perhaps as no other set of men know her! They know that this political machine has a clipping bureau in America, the sole purpose of which is to scan every page of every paper, and set the papal Inquisition in action against editors in such cases. That such bureau exists in Georgia I assert, and defy any Romanist in the State to deny it! Does Mc know of this bureau?

As to Tom Watson: he published in his magazine, in Latin, several pages of Liguori's and Dens' "Moral Theology" and other doctrines of Rome's "holy fathers" that are used in the confessional with women and girls, and the papal element had the United States Government prosecute him five years in an unsuccessful effort to send him to the pen. for "SENDING OBSCENE MATTER THROUGH THE MAILS." Yes, Tom Watson will print what the newspapers will not—because many of them are controlled or muzzled by the boycott.

Is the bishop's oath "filthy"? According to Mc it must be, as no one has ever seen it in the columns of the press; neither will it ever get in the newspapers except at ad. rates.

If certain things do not get in the papers because they are "filth," then the bishop's oath, the doctrine of Aquinas, Liguori, Dens, and others must be an aggregation of "filth" as they never get in the press, and even the Roman Catholic press will not admit the oath and the like to its columns! How about it, Mc? Have you ever seen that oath in your *Sunday Visitor* or other papal sheet?

If "John J. McCreary" can disprove the bishop's oath, I will give him \$1,000; that's a "snug" sum, Mc; it's yours—but you must earn it by proving the oath untrue before the people of Macon in the City Auditorium assembled; Mc should also capture that \$5,000, as he has *so much* information and is *so* well versed in things papal as to command a Protestant minister to CORRECT HIS "ERRORS." If the Honorable John J. McCreary, an attorney at law, makes no effort to win this case, papists should not blame the people for believing the oath is so true and *filthy* to Americans that even a lawyer will not accept the case, even at "lawyer's rates!" (Because he can not disprove it.) Think it over, Mc, and as you walk the streets of Macon, and as the others subject thereto go in and out among true Americans, they will say in their hearts, "THERE GOES ONE WHO IS SWORN TO PERSECUTE AND FIGHT ME!" Better make some effort to win that money, Mc.!

"Now, Mr. Callaway, before you rave and rant any more about lack of patriotism of Catholics, and that 'The Government of the United States can go to Hell,' suppose you read up and find out how many Catholics fell at Vera Cruz, and what proportion they were to the total number of casualties. It would also benefit you

to read some church history, and thereby find that there never has been any 'Pius XI'."

Comment: I have read the history of papists by papists in the Great War—it must be true, being written by priest-editors, that Romanists had the greater number of boys in the ranks than all the others combined: that although there are only one Roman Catholic to every six people in this country, in some manner in the draft more Catholics were conscripted than others; of course it is an easy matter for a priest to explain how one-sixth papal population could under the Draft Act furnish more men than the other five-sixths! "Two plus two equals four," you know—if the pope's priest said a thing is true, it is true, and to a Romanist it becomes a "closed" subject! In the matter of Pius' number, Mc did point out an error!

"I trust, sir, that you will accept this in the spirit in which it is offered, and, as I said before, rectify the errors. I am, sir,

"Yours for fair play,

"JOHN J. MCCREARY, L. H. S."

Comment: "Fair play," what does a Romanist consider *fair play*? To hand you the "TRUTH" as defined by a pope or priest, and threaten to make you swallow hard words or be burned if you refuse to believe it? To an American, "fair play" means, *let each side be heard*, and any public non-Catholic speaker will divide time with any priest or layman who desires fair play for the discussion of any issue of law presented in this book; but this interpretation of fair play is the one thing Rome fears more than any other.

Mr. McCreary says the Roman church should not be held responsible for the acts of its members; NO? WHY? One government holds another responsible for the acts of its subjects: the Roman church claims to be an independent society or state or government, "chartered as of right divine" with the right to protect herself according to her own laws—and the only way she strives to protect herself from destruction is, to prevent those on the outside from knowing what she stands for, even using "FIRE" and sword to prevent criticism; and every priest and layman of that institution being its subjects, what they say or do will be charged against the system from which they receive their inspiration. This is also fair.

Here is another letter written about two years later. It is copied just as written; the effort to disguise the handwriting is very good, but does not conceal the fact that it is the work of a well-trained penman; the spelling, punctuation, capitalization, etc., show a studied effort to appear illiterate, but one who can write such a hand, and use the word "literature" is well up in things Catholic:

"Macon ga Aug 4th, 1916.

"Dear Mrs Callaway

"Why can you not persuade your husband not to take part in the Guardians banquet on the 7th inst it will mean a lot of sorrow and trouble, do you know the roman catholics have over 3,000 (three thousand) right here in our city? Why what is he—Glynn or any one else thinking of to attack them at a time like this? further more I have been married to a catholic man for 16 years, and never hear him or any other one make an attack on protestantism, they only pray for us, I am a methodist and am going to write to Bro. Glynn in regards to the matter I think we have war close enough, (in Mexico) the catholic prays for peace and it seems as if the ministers pray's for and advocates war, I am thoroughly disgusted with protestant faith, stop and ask yourself, where is and in what church is the right religion as old John, R, says the catholic has its first time to scandilize they pray for their enemy show me where your preachers pray for anything but trouble. Where is their christianity they will be like old man Huff a staunch Guardain go to hell faster than the Dixie Flyer can carry him to Hawkinsville, bear in mind they better go slow. Why not read catholic literature? they have no secrets and why do your husband and others accuse them of things they are not guilty of? Who keeps up the door of hope? Who keeps up all of the low down places, it is not the catholics or for catholic women take my advice and tell him to stay out See?"

This epistle was received by Mrs. Callaway a few days prior to the banquet and speaking by the Guardians of Liberty, at which time Mr. Callaway and Dr. J. M. Glenn, Presiding Elder of this district, among others, were to speak.

As this letter speaks for itself, no comment is necessary—I will dwell a few moments on the question of history, when written by Catholics: the writer of this letter who failed to sign her name, intimates that among the soldiers at Camp Harris at that time, there were 3,000 Roman Catholics, who were likely to cause sorrow and trouble: now there were about 5,000 men in all out there according to my recollection—all of them Georgia boys; and as there is only ONE Roman Catholic to every one hundred non-Catholics in Georgia, it is certainly wonderful how there were 3,000 Romanists among them!

THE McCREARY LETTERS

On November 3, 1919, the following notice appeared in *The Macon Telegraph*:

"At a meeting of the Catholics of Macon held in the Knights of Columbus Hall last night the Catholic Laymen's Association of Macon was formed with the following officers: M. J. Callaghan, president; Miss Amelia Horne, first vice-president; Dan Horgan, second vice-president; Mrs. W. D. Wills, third vice-president; J. J. McCreary, fourth vice-president; J. E. Morgan, secretary,

and H. M. Sowers, assistant secretary. Executive committee: W. H. Mitchell, chairman, A. J. Long, T. F. Sheridan, Mrs. Cecil Morgan, Miss Annie Mc Kervey. Frank Donnelly was chosen treasurer.

Bishop B. J. Keiley was present and addressed the meeting at the close, speaking warmly of the good work done by the State association in removing prejudice and spreading correct information about Catholics. Other speakers were P. H. Rice, of Augusta, who is State president; J. J. Farrell and Miss H. H. Hynes, of the publicity committee; J. J. Haverty, of Atlanta, vice-president; J. J. McCallum, State secretary, Atlanta; Peter F. Clarke, president of the Atlanta association; Rev. Fr. Wilkinson, the new pastor of St. Joseph's, and Ed Sheridan of Macon."

Observing that "J. J. McCreary" was an officer in the *local association*, I wrote him:

Macon, Ga., Dec. 6, 1919.

Mr. J. J. McCreary,
Attorney at Law,
Macon, Ga.

My Dear Sir: In the columns of the press I noticed your name among the officers of the recently-formed Catholic Laymen's Association of Macon.

I am submitting herewith a copy of an oath contained in a pamphlet which alleges it to be the oath of a Roman Catholic bishop.

I would thank you to state whether or not it is the true, complete oath of the bishop of the Roman church. If not, kindly furnish me a transcript.

Thanking you for your attention, I am,

Very truly yours,

C. A. YARBROUGH.

ALLEGED CATHOLIC BISHOP'S OATH

"I, _____, elected to the Church of N., from this hour henceforward will be obedient to Blessed Peter the Apostle, and to the holy Roman Church, and to our Holy Father, Pope N., and to his successors canonically elected. I will assist them to retain and to defend the Roman Papacy without detriment to my order. I shall take care to preserve, to defend, increase and promote the rights, honors, privileges and authority of the holy Roman Church of our Lord the Pope, and of his aforesaid successors. I shall observe with all my strength, and shall cause to be observed by others, the rules of the Holy Fathers, the Apostolic decrees, ordinances or dispositions, reservations, provisions and mandates. I shall come when called to a Synod, unless prevented by a canonical impediment. I shall make personally the visit *ad limina apostolorum* every ten years, and I shall render to our Holy Father, Pope P., and to his aforesaid successors an account of my whole pastoral office, and of all things pertaining in any manner whatsoever to the state of my church, to the discipline of the clergy and the people, and finally to the salvation of the souls entrusted

to me: and in turn I shall receive humbly the apostolic mandates and execute them as diligently as possible. But if I shall be detained by legitimate impediment, I shall fulfill all the aforesaid things through a designated delegate having a special mandate for this purpose, a priest of my diocese, or through some other secular or regular priest of known probity and religion, fully informed concerning the above-named things. I shall not sell, nor give, nor mortgage the possessions belonging to my mensa, nor shall enfeoff them anew or alienate them in any manner, even with the consent of the chapter of my Church, without consulting the Roman Pontiff. And if through me such alienation shall occur, I wish, by the very fact, to incur the punishment contained in the constitution concerning this matter.

"So help me God and these Holy Gospels of God."

JOHN J. MCCREARY
MACON, GA.

December 9, 1919.

Dr. C. A. Yarbrough, Macon, Ga.

Dear Dr. Yarbrough: This morning I have your favor of the 6th inclosing copy of an oath contained in a pamphlet which alleges it to be the oath of a Catholic bishop.

I regret that I am not in a position at present to enlighten you in regard to this matter, but am to-day making inquiries and hope before long to be able to give you authentic information in connection with what you seek.

I am glad to see you avail yourself of the service afforded by the Catholic Laymen's Association, and hope you will consult us at any time you may desire information regarding the tenets and practices of our faith.

With personal regards, I am,

Very sincerely yours,

JOHN J. MCCREARY.

Macon, Ga., Dec. 19, 1919.

Dr. C. A. Yarbrough, Macon, Ga.

Dear Dr. Yarbrough: With further reference to your inquiry of December 6.

I have located in the "*Pontificale Romanum*," published by Benziger Brothers and by Fr. Pustet, Publishers, of New York, the real obligation taken by bishops of our church at their consecration. I am having a copy made and will forward it to you in a very short while. The "*Pontificale Romanum*" is on sale by the above publishers.

This letter is to let you know that you have not been forgotten.

Wishing you a very happy Christmas and a prosperous New Year, believe me to be,

Very sincerely yours,

JOHN J. MCCREARY.

Macon, Ga., Dec. 30, 1919.

Dr. C. A. Yarbrough, Macon, Ga.

Dear Dr. Yarbrough: With further reference to your inquiry regarding the oath alleged to be taken by bishops of the Catholic church on the occasion of their consecration.

I am advised by the Director of the Publicity Department, Catholic Laymen's Association of Georgia, whose office is at No. 107 Ninth Street, Augusta, Ga., that he has investigated the subject about which you wrote and has almost completed his research.

Due to the fact that my library is not very extensive and this Publicity Department has more adequate facilities for making investigations of this kind, I forwarded your inquiry some time ago to Mr. J. J. Farrell, Director of the Publicity Department, with the request that he give it attention. I was prompted in this by your reference in your first letter to the fact that I held an office in the local association.

I suggest that you anticipate Mr. Farrell's completion of his research by writing him direct and asking him to advise you the result of his study as soon as he has it in final shape. This will enable you to get the desired information without the delay occasioned by using me as an intermediary. I want to assure you that Mr. Farrell and his assistants are always willing and eager to answer any sincere questioner about matters concerning our faith, and I'm sure that you will obtain satisfactory service from this Publicity Department.

I trust that you had a most enjoyable Christmas season, and that the coming year will bring to you the realization of your fondest hopes and desires.

Cordially yours,

JOHN J. MCCREARY.

Macon, Ga., Jan. 3, 1920.

Mr. John J. McCreary,
Attorney at Law,
Macon, Ga.

Dear Mr. McCreary: Your favor of the 30th ult. to hand.

In your communication of December 9, 1919, you expressed pleasure that I had availed myself of "the service of the Catholic Laymen's Association," and requested me to consult you at any time I desired "information regarding the tenets and practices" of your faith; in your letter of the 19th ult. you said:

"I have located . . . the real obligation taken by bishops of our church at their consecration. I am having a copy made and will forward it to you in a very short while."

In view of that statement, and promise, I could not be interested in the result of a research conducted by any party in another city; and I fail to grasp the import of your reference to the extent of your library.

I sent you copy of an oath alleged to be that taken by Catholic bishops, and simply asked you to state whether or not it was true, and if not, to furnish me with a correct copy; you advised that

you were having a copy of it made which you would send in a short while; just why you ask for a "change of venue" after the evidence is all in pertaining to the "case" placed in your hands, of course, is not exactly clear to me.

I applied to you for information, because of the fact you are not only a member of the Catholic church, but also an officer in an association formed, as advertised, for the purpose of giving information to inquirers concerning Catholicism. I have no objection to your securing assistance in the "case" from whatever source you may choose, if you deem it necessary after admitting you were in possession of the desired information; but I prefer not to take the matter up with any other parties, and trust this will be satisfactory to you. As to delay, a week more or less will not make any difference.

Very truly yours,

C. A. YARBROUGH.

Macon, Ga., Jan. 24, 1920.

Dr. C. A. Yarbrough, Macon, Ga.

Dear Dr. Yarbrough: Your letter of January 3 is received.

After writing you as in mine of December 9, 1919, promising later to forward you "the real obligation" taken by Catholic bishops, and thereby implying that the purported copy of the "alleged oath" which you sent me was not, at least in every particular a true and exact copy, I was informed that you had previously been in correspondence with Mr. Farrell, who has charge of the Publicity Bureau of our Laymen's Association. The circumstances of your correspondence with him, as related to me, prompted me, both out of courtesy due our Association as such and as a matter of straightforward dealing, to refer you to Mr. Farrell as in my letter of December 30th last.

Presuming my information to be correct, it appears that you previously asked Mr. Farrell a number of questions and later, in objection to the answers he made, wrote him a voluminous letter which he undertook to answer in piecemeal, as it were, sending you separate letters dealing with the separate points of your objections; that before he had concluded his letters to you, notwithstanding they were uniformly courteous, brief and to the point, you stopped the matter, returned his letter unopened and marked so as to indicate you would not receive any more.

It appears, also, that during the course of this correspondence you published detached portions of it in a leaflet which you sent broadcast through the mail, and on Mr. Farrell's asking that you and he jointly publish the whole correspondence, or such parts of it as you jointly agreed on, sharing the expense equally, you would not reply, although it is difficult to see how this fair proposition could be ignored by any one wishing at all cost to be fair.

Apart from any question that these circumstances naturally inject into your motives in now addressing an inquiry to one who is merely an officer in the Association, instead of to the Publicity Bureau whose business is to answer questions, the fact that you

originally approached Mr. Farrell on various matters, and that his office still is the advertised source of information to all inquirers in Georgia concerning Catholicity, makes me feel that you cannot object, if you really desire to know the truth about the obligation that Catholic bishops take, to addressing your inquiry to him.

Indeed, I should think that you, more than any one, would be anxious in this way to anticipate any possible suspicion arising in the minds of those to whom you intend to exhibit your correspondence, as to your open and disinterested purpose of seeking true information from first-hand sources in respect to the premises.

I hope, therefore, you will write Mr. Farrell, who will, I am sure, promptly give you the information desired.

Very truly yours,

JOHN J. MCCREARY.

Mr. John J. McCreary,
Attorney at Law,
Macon, Ga.

Macon, Ga., Feb. 2, 1920.

My Dear Mr. McCreary: Referring to your favor of 24th ult.: Your reasons assigned for referring me to your Mr. Farrell are noted.

In the second paragraph of your letter you say you have learned that I had previously asked questions of Mr. Farrell, but "that *before he had concluded* his letters to you, notwithstanding they were uniformly courteous, brief and to the point, *you stopped* the matter, returned his letter unopened and marked so as to indicate you would not receive any more."

In the third paragraph you say "it is difficult to see how this fair proposition could be ignored by any one wishing at all to be fair."

In four you say that if I "really desire to know the truth about the obligation that Catholic bishops take," you could see no reason why I should not address my inquiry to Mr. Farrell, as you suggest—

In a letter from your Mr. Farrell, dated Dec. 1, 1917, are these words: "*This will conclude my comments on your long letter, except as to the debate and as to the publication of our exchanges, and saving the matter of the folder about which I wrote*"; approximately *two months* passed, devoted to correspondence regarding the *debate*, which contained no intimation that he desired to reopen comments upon my long letter, and in concluding his letter of January 25, 1918, subject of debate, he said it was up to me "to put up or shut up"—I acknowledged its receipt, and agreed to "shut up."

Yes, I had considerable correspondence with your "Publicity Bureau"; my experience with you and the Catholic Laymen's Association of Georgia was a parallel, substitution of technicalities for truth—and you know as a lawyer that where a case is decided on that principle, Truth and Justice weep!

having returned the said answer letter bearing request of association, across which was written: "As to debate, *ne plus*"? Just what other reasons why I would not let him waste more of his valuable time with me is not pertinent; if so inclined you may draw your own conclusions; but your fifth paragraph calls for consideration: After reviewing our correspondence fully, are you prepared to state that *your* letters would tend "to anticipate any possible suspicion in the minds of those" who may be interested in the subject of the bishop's oath? In a letter from Mr. A. J. Long, in regard to getting information "first-hand," he said that "every Catholic will welcome and assist you any way you may desire."

In seeking information, I have followed the general rules of our courts: putting up such witnesses as I thought were in possession of the facts in the case; before you were called to testify, I had your "Publicity Bureau" on the stand. While on the stand did you verify Mr. Long's assertion? I think not, *but like him, indeed*, you seemed determined to make me secure information, if at all, *second-hand* in referring to others! Such information, as you know, would not then be "true information from first-hand sources in respect to the premises."

As an American citizen I asked you, as another, a plain question relating to the tenets and practices of an institution to which you belong; instead of answering, you referred me to another body, knowing at the time that there had been a "breach" severing "diplomatic" relations between us; so, under these circumstances, "I should think that you, more than any one, would be anxious in this way to anticipate any possible suspicion," if the ostensible purpose of said association is to really give information, by seeing to it that my question to you had a prompt, correct answer.

There may be binding rules and regulations within your institution governing the *modus operandi* in all these things; but you know I am not subject to nor bound thereby, recognizing that rule only which should govern and establish truth among men generally; therefore, in this matter I reserved the right as investigator to choose my witnesses and examine them in my own way—and you appreciate the novelty presented for a witness to acknowledge, on the stand, that he is in possession of certain facts germane to establishing the truth in the case, but having learned other witnesses had been questioned, as to dissimilar points, *and discharged*, yet the court would have to rely upon said discharged witnesses because of some sort of understanding among themselves.

Your concluding paragraph expresses the hope that I "will write Mr. Farrell, who will, I am sure, promptly give you the information desired." You promised to do this—the above citations from Mr. Farrell's letters should convince you that "information" from that source would not be reliable.

In concluding this subject with you, will state that I understand that principle of the law relating to witnesses, and, although you have placed yourself in the category of a "sworn" witness in the case, I shall not object to your invoking said rule, if indeed you wish to do so or feel that it is necessary; but considering the promptness of the Knights of Columbus in taking up the question of the oath alleged to be theirs, and manner of you and your Laymen's Association concerning this question, you must recognize you are falling far short of the understood and advertised purposes of said association.

I shall not expect you to take up any more of your valuable time with the subject, unless you decide to "make good" the promise contained in a former letter.

With best personal wishes,

C. A. YARBROUGH.

Macon, Ga., Feb. 10, 1920.

Dr. C. A. Yarbrough, Macon, Ga.

Dear Dr. Yarbrough: Your favor of the 2d instant received.

While I noted your hint that my reply would not be welcome unless it would conform strictly to your views, it is a rule with me to answer all letters, as in my opinion there are times when this simple courtesy comes very near being a fundamental. Indeed, although I do not seem to have made myself clear to you, this is the ground of my insistence that for any information you desire from the Laymen's Association you should write Mr. Farrell, head of our information bureau, with whom you have had previous correspondence which, it seems to be conceded, was uniformly courteous on his part.

That I did not first suggest this to you when you asked me for information was due to the fact that, although you wrote me as an officer of the Laymen's Association, you failed to state that you knew Mr. Farrell was in charge of our information bureau; that, in fact, you had previously asked him for information in regard to matters Catholic, but had returned his last letter to you without doing him the courtesy to open it. I may be mistaken in thinking that it would have been more straight-forward for you to have given me this information when writing me as an officer of the same organization and seeking information on the same general subject, but I am not mistaken as to my proper course after I had learned the facts which you failed to disclose in regard to your previous dealings with one of my colleagues.

You say that you have "followed the general rules of our courts" in seeking information, but I hope you will pardon me if I suggest that it would have been more to the point to observe the ordinary usages of correspondence obtaining among gentlemen; and, in passing, I beg to remind you that even the rules of our courts usually require one to "come with clean hands."

As to your prolix effort to tax me with impropriety for referring you to Mr. Farrell when I knew that there had been a "breach of diplomatic relations," what do you think, since the

breach was on your part, of the propriety of trying to renew relations in an irregular way without disclosing the circumstances or even the existence of the previous relations which you severed?

As to your insinuation that Mr. Farrell's bureau is "unreliable," I take this to be merely an expression of your pique, as you will not, of course, say frankly that Mr. Farrell gave you information that is incorrect.

Under the circumstances, Dr. Yarbrough, I see no other course, if you really desire to procure from our association a true copy of the obligation that our bishops take, except for you to resume the "diplomatic relations" which were so incontinently and unceremoniously severed by you.

Since you wrote me in the first place expressly because I am an officer in the Laymen's Association, you will understand, of course, that there is nothing personal in my attitude or in what I have written. With kindest regards, I beg to remain,

Very sincerely yours,

JOHN J. MCCREARY.

Macon, Ga., Feb. 16, 1920.

Mr. John J. McCreary,
Attorney at Law,
Macon, Ga.

My Dear Mr. McCreary: Yours of the 10th instant to hand and contents carefully noted; while quite lengthy, two pertinent observations will suffice relative thereto, which please permit me to offer—

First. You consider it a fundamental principle to answer all letters although they may pertain to a subject some "superior" must attend to;

Second. While you evidently deem it fundamental to answer *letters*, you do not consider it necessary to answer *questions*—even after going so far as to "locate" the desired "answer" and after promising to render it, offering in lieu the specious plea that the "courtesy" owed to some "bureau" prompted the disregard of said promise, even after being notified that "information" from said source would not be considered reliable.

Excepting your first two letters, your correspondence is replete with insinuations respecting what *you* consider "straightforward" and what "gentlemen" would do under certain circumstances; therefore, in view of your rule to answer letters, I respectfully submit the following hypothetical question (and you will please remember that it is not within the province of a *witness* to examine the *hands* of any person in court):

Question: Do you, as an American citizen, consider a person "courteous" and "straightforward" and a worthy citizen of this, the greatest nation in the world, and that he is exercising that fundamental spirit of Americanism which has made America what she is, who, upon learning that some man—a Protestant minister, we'll say—was discoursing upon those principles of

Americanism as set out in the Constitution, and their antithesis, would get together, as a Roman Catholic a lot of "Jesuitically"-prepared "information" and present it to said person as "*Truth*," strongly intimating that said *information* be assimilated in order to remove the scales from his metal optics, at the same time convey threats of suits for libel, or that if he did not cease such discussions he would likely get "burnt" bad, or have to "swallow hard words," etc., even when the person delivering said "*Truth*" had no means of ascertaining whether or not what the said preacher stated or if said "information" was the truth in the case?

Very truly,

C. A. YARBROUGH.

Macon, Ga., March 9, 1920.

Dr. C. A. Yarbrough, Macon, Ga.

Dear Dr. Yarbrough: This will acknowledge receipt of your favor of the 16th ultimo.

Your hypothetical question has received from me some thought and study, and I find that, figuratively speaking, you have put the cart before the horse.

You will understand that the courts have established certain modes of procedure and practice therein, and one of the subjects touched upon is that of "Reasoning by Witnesses." The normal position of a witness is that portrayed in the Year Books; he must be *oyant et voyant*, he who hears and sees. His function is that of observation; the tribunal is to hear through his ears, and see through his eyes. His duty is to testify to facts, and let the jury draw the conclusions.

It is, however, provided that a witness may, under certain circumstances, testify to conclusions. It is in this connection that hypothetical questions are treated. The reasoning may be explained in the following propositions:

a. Testimony in the shape of inferences or conclusions rests always on certain premises of fact.

b. These premises, a consideration of which is essential to the formation of the conclusion or opinion, must somehow be supplied by testimony.

Consequently, you will see that there may be two distinct subjects of testimony—premises, and inferences or conclusions; that the latter involves necessarily a consideration of the former; and that the tribunal must be furnished with the means of rejecting the latter if they determine to reject the former, that is, of distinguishing conclusions properly founded from conclusions improperly founded.

There are two fatal defects in your hypothetical question, or your foundation for the same: first, there is not one scintilla of evidence to support the premises you laid for the consideration of the witness; and, second, you have not qualified your witness as an expert.

Until you have laid the proper foundation for your hypothetical question the same is open to objection, and I am confident that the court would decline to permit it to be put.

I feel perfectly free to take exception to this question as above, appreciating your desire to give your investigation judicial characteristics as far as is possible, though you may, of course, discount my opinion from considerations of youthfulness and lack of experience.

With personal regards and best wishes, I remain,

Very truly yours,

JOHN J. MCCREARY.

Very little comment is needed regarding these letters. There is nothing in the *Telegraph's* news item to show that "the Catholic Laymen's Association of Macon was formed" as a part of the Farrell aggregation, and it is very amusing to observe how often, after his first two letters, Mr. John J. McCreary insisted that I write Farrell, which I consistently refused to do, and then read where he says I was trying "to renew relations in an irregular way."

Mr. McCreary says that there are "two fatal defects" in my hypothetical question: to maintain the first, *he would have to disclaim American citizenship*, while the second relies only upon establishing his membership in the Catholic church, and whether or not he is an officer in an association formed for the express purpose of acting as a witness for Rome—of furnishing "information" to outsiders; that he is a Roman Catholic is not denied, while serving as a vice-president of the local Macon Catholic Laymen's Association, establishes his status as an "expert" witness.

He would plead youth and inexperience for the Callaway letter: *it shows a true snapping "cub,"* while the above letters depict the panther-like tread of the full-grown Jesuit!

I respectfully ask the American Jury to note well Mr. McCreary's "manner on the stand" as a "witness":

He "located" the information; was having a copy made to be tendered at an early date; he acknowledged having the information and that the "Publicity Bureau" of the Catholic Laymen's Association has the information; he has admitted that the copy of the oath printed and circulated by his former spiritual father, Frankhauser, was "NOT TRUE" in every particular; he evidently discovered something somehow, somewhere, after his second letter to me which changed "his manner on the witness stand"—his tongue, like Farrell's, seemed to have become electrocuted, or lock-jaw set in, and he **COULD NOT UTTER A WORD** further pertaining to the oath! But the point I am leading to is this: if that oath is in the hands of the Catholic Laymen's "Publicity Bureau" they have kept it among Catholics to the exclusion of all others, and having a knowledge of that oath—which means **DEATH TO EVERY THING AMERICAN AND EVERY**

THING PROTESTANT AND EVERY THING MASONIC, by the very fact that they conceal it—they are condemned, and condemned out of their own mouths.

That Frankhauser deliberately uttered a lie should cause every Romanist in Macon to blush with shame; that they are subjects of an institution requiring that oath will make every one of them an object of suspicion and distrust as they mix and mingle with the people; that they are sworn to persecute citizens in this land and institute pope-made law in the place of the civil law of the country should bar every one of them from all rights of citizenship in the United States! We read in the Canon Law that the pope will excommunicate any Catholic who appeals to the laws of the land against the execution of any decree issued by him, and even if such a decree required a massacre according to the tenor of the bishop's oath, they would have to abide by said law: Messrs. Farrell and McCreary are typical Roman Catholics: if they would conceal the oath to which laymen are subject, could we expect them to violate the pope's law by revealing **ANY COMMAND** issued for their execution? **HE WHO CONCEALS THE CONSPIRATORS AND THEIR PLANS WILL BE A PARTY THERETO!**

Note how McCreary runs up to Mr. Callaway, as it were, with a copy of "*Truth*," a Jesuit magazine—but when I applied to him for the truth of the papal oath, my! how he squirmed and twisted on the stand, when he received the hypothetical question, knowing to answer would damn him and his church while to refuse such a "fundamental" principle of his would make him contemptuous in the opinion of "straight-forward" people.

ARE Catholics "satisfied with our Constitution as it stands?" Farrell said they were, from the highest prelate to the lowest layman!

SOUTHERN "BIGOTRY"

The following circular is by an Alabama priest:

"A HOTBED OF ORGANIZED BIGOTRY"

Gadsden, in North Alabama, located seventy (70) miles northeast of Birmingham, in a rich mineral section, is materially a prosperous and beautiful town of 18,000 inhabitants, and with the two adjoining towns of Alabama City and Attalla, has a population of over 30,000. It has a large steel plant, furnaces, car works, cotton mills, pipe shops, etc. Gadsden belongs to the diocese of Mobile, which comprises the entire State of Alabama and Northwest Florida.

Two years ago a non-Catholic doctor built a hospital in Gadsden. When the hospital was almost ready to be opened, this doctor had financial reverses, and was obliged to sell the four-story brick building just as it was being completed. It being a wonderful opportunity of doing good, the Sisters of Divine Providence, of Pittsburgh, Pa., bought the hospital and equipped it at a cost of close to \$60,000. On the Sunday previous to the opening of the hospital, the Rev. Dr. Purser, pastor of the First Baptist Church in Gadsden, preached a most vitriolic sermon against the Catholic Church on the text "Beware of

taken to that Catholic hospital. The hospital was opened by the Sisters under the name "The Gadsden General Hospital" and greatly appreciated by the doctors in town, none of whom are Catholic, because the hospital offered first-class service especially in surgical cases. With great difficulty the doctors persuaded their patients needing hospital treatment, but being filled with deep prejudice against Catholics to come to the hospital. Some of these patients when leaving the hospital stated they would slap anyone's face who would repeat to them the filthy lies about Catholic Sisters and convents. The bringing into the hospital of these prejudiced people for professional services, had the beneficial effect of opening their eyes and weakening their prejudice by personal observation, but it also fanned bigotry into flame. A very wave of bigotry swept over the town and holds it in its grasp, especially through the agitation of some of the preachers and the members of the Junior Order American Mechanics.

The "T. A." which stands for "True Americans," posing as a so-called patriotic society, is in fact solely an anti-Catholic secret organization, which has worked with dire success in Birmingham. This society was now established in Gadsden. They claim to have gotten a membership of over a thousand men in a few days. The city is now in the hands of the "T. A.," whose object is to close the hospital, school, and church. Preachers in Gadsden not only joined the "T. A." but went actively on a committee to join the "T. A.," asking the doctors who brought patients to our hospital to join the "T. A." and when the doctors refused, they were told that if they brought any more patients to the Catholic hospital, the "T. A." would see to it that nobody would require the services of these doctors in the future and so they would have to leave town. The same threat of breaking up his profession in Gadsden was made to the lawyer representing the hospital. The doctor who at the time was bringing the greatest number of patients to our hospital, received threatening letters that he would be horsewhipped and tarred and feathered if he brought any more patients into this Catholic hospital, "where every dollar is used to make the pope fat." The "T. A." even influenced people, who for many years had been completely satisfied with the professional services of these doctors, to tell the doctors not to use the hospital under the penalty of losing their old practice. Some of the doctors lost heavily and were forced to abandon the hospital to retain their business. One of these doctors has just bought property to open a forty (40) room hospital of his own. The "T. A." canvassed the town and got the people to sign pledges that no one of their families would be taken to this hospital, and as far as they could, keep their friends from going there, if necessary helping them to go to hospitals in Birmingham or Anniston. By this underhand trick the hospital was emptied entirely and boycotted effectively for the only reason that it is operated and owned by Catholic Sisters. There is a trial in court now to tax this hospital, although during its short existence it has done over \$1,700.00 worth of purely charity work for thirty-five (35) Protestant and non-Catholic patients, not counting part pay patients and bad pays, and according to law such an institution is a charity institution, not subject to tax.

At the same time these bigots boasted they would wipe out Catholicity in Gadsden and break up the only Catholic parish in Gadsden and the surrounding four counties by taking away the dinner bucket from every Catholic man. By concerted, organized action, men of our faith were thrown out of employment on account of their religion and my best and most influential members were driven away one after another. Over the advertising signs of one of my Catholic men, in business for himself, the bigots put in big black lettering, "Don't patronize this man; he is a Catholic"; other signs they obliterated entirely. Another man of my parish running an electric grist mill and supplying a number of grocers, was told they could not use his goods because he was a Catholic. Rents were raised on Catholics to force them to move and after they had moved, the previous rate of rent was charged to non-Catholics moving in. New Catholics coming to Gadsden rented rooms which they kept till it was found out that they were Catholics when an excuse was found to make them leave. St. James, the only Catholic parish in Gadsden, had two masses each Sunday, both well attended, now we have only a mere handful left, most of the men had to seek work and home elsewhere. The parish has been shattered—the effective work of organized bigotry.

In order to keep pouring oil into the fire of bigotry and hatred of everything Catholic, the most notorious anti-Catholic lecturers are brought to Gadsden. In widely advertised public meetings in parks, etc., these lecturers let loose a deluge of lies about the Catholic church. They are very loud on patriotism, that the Catholic church is a foreign political organization trying to get control of this Government, that the church hates our flag and forbids it being displayed in the church, that the Catholic members of the Federal Government and admirals of the navy when going to confession during the war, were drawn out by the shrewd questioning of priests who thus obtained war secrets and sent these war secrets to Rome and the pope gave them to Germany. It would fill a book to enumerate all their lies.

BRUTAL BIGOTRY IN THE SOUTH

Few Catholics in other sections of the United States have the faintest idea of the cruel bigotry practiced against Catholics in many sections of the South. An almost unbelievable persecution is suffered by Catholics continuously in their daily lives, purely on account of their faith. A real American in the large cities of the North and East would hardly believe it possible that such a condition could exist in this, our "Land of the Free, and the Home of the Brave."

In North Alabama, bigotry is rampant, most vigorous and aggressive. Alabama is one of the most illiterate States of the Union. Illiteracy is the most fertile soil of bigotry—bigotry born out of ignorance. Protestants are in the overwhelming majority. Many of the preachers try to put some pep and sensationalism into their sermons by attacking the Catholic church in the most hateful manner as a hideous monster. These preachers for many years back, have jealously nourished this bigotry among the Protestants, and have built a solid, massive wall of bigotry and prejudice by unceasingly denouncing, misrepresenting, and most outrageously slandering the Catholic church, so that the mass of native people drink in with their mother's milk, a fierce and undying hatred of everything Catholic. Constantly repeated distortions and direct lies in their churches, at revivals, and open mass meetings, are their unflinching ammunition. They tell their people that the Catholic church is made up of the most ignorant people, who are priest-ridden, that the priest forgives ordinary sins for one dollar, stealing for five dollars, and real juicy sins for ten dollars; they call the Catholic priests bachelor libertines, who make gods out of pancakes; that they sell "Indulgences"; that the Catholic church preaches that if a Protestant man marries a Protestant woman and is not married by a Catholic priest, these Protestants are not married at all and are living in adultery, their children being bastards, and that if a Protestant asks a Catholic priest if the Catholic priest really teaches this, the Protestant could not find out the real truth because every priest is a privileged liar, for the reason that his church teaches him that if he tells a lie for the benefit of the Catholic church it is not a sin, etc., etc.

During the war many of the young men from these Southern bigoted sections who had never heard a good word about the Catholics, were drafted into the army, and "over there" these men found that their uniform was all that was necessary to make them recipients of the many kindnesses and whole-hearted services of the K. of C. huts, where "Everybody welcome and everything free" greeted all soldiers irrespective of their religion. Many of these boys wrote back home that they found two classes of white people "over there": The American Red Cross and the Knights of Columbus. They repeated their good experiences with the K. of C. when arriving back home. To counteract this breaking down of prejudice, a monster union meeting was held in Gadsden in the large Methodist church, in which the largest congregations of Baptists, Presbyterians and Methodists joined with their pastors to hear the Rev. Dr. Holmes, of Birmingham, a former Y. M. C. A. secretary for a year in France, who was brought to Gadsden to counteract the good impression made by the K. of C. work. The next day the two daily Gadsden papers on the front pages glaringly reported "Dr. Holmes scathingly denounces the Catholic church," and had whole columns of how the great big assembly in this prayer-meeting had been carried away by Dr. Holmes in his assault on the Catholic Church, so much so that he was frequently interrupted by stormy applause.

The lies of these so-called lecturers against the Catholic church are freely published on the front pages of our two daily papers, but if we attempt to defend ourselves by answering these attacks, the columns of the same papers are closed against us, unless we pay full advertising rates, with the exception

of one time when our answer to an attack was published free under the heading "Letters to the Editor," and the defense even then will not appear on the front pages. The first time we put in an answer to some slanders, at the regular advertising rates, an editorial told that we paid full advertising rates and that that paper did not employ any Catholics.

Tons and tons of such vile anti-Catholic sheets like the *Menace*, *Yellow Jacket*, *Rip Saw*, and tons of pamphlets containing the bogus K. of C. oath with millions of other lies, are scattered broadcast in homes and openly placed on file in business places and greedily devoured by these ignorant people, who believe, because these lies are printed they must be true. A parade of the Junior Order American Mechanics, headed by a Congressman and other prominent politicians, was stopped in front of our school and a stack of the meanest issues of the *Menace* distributed to our small school children.

CATHOLIC CRUSADERS IN GADSDEN

We had taken all the abuse and slander heaped upon us as Catholics for years in Gadsden, but when the dagger of persecution was placed right at our hearts and our very existence was threatened, we had to organize the few men left into a defense league. We took whole pages in both daily papers, paying at regular advertising rates and answered the lies, slanders, misrepresentations, and insinuations, and showed how un-American this anti-Catholic crusade is. At the same time we are mailing pamphlets regularly to the people of the whole town. We do not deceive ourselves into believing that we will be able to convert the leaders of this hellish bigotry. Christ Himself could not convert the Pharisees. But by not letting up to nail the lies and correct the misrepresentations, we will finally bring the public opinion of the mass of misinformed people and of broad-minded business men in Gadsden (many of whom are now afraid to take a public stand for fear of their business being boycotted) to that stage where they will unite in action through some organization like the Rotary Club, or Chamber of Commerce, to take a decided stand against any and every kind of bigotry. It is a hard and tedious work, but we know not the word quit, and we know we will finally come out victorious, the same as the first Catholics did from the Catacombs, for the fifth mark of the True Church is persecution, but never annihilation.

ST. JAMES PARISH IN GADSDEN HAS A HARD, HARD ROAD TO TRAVEL

When a stranger comes here, the first question he is asked is: "What church do you belong to?" and if he says, "I am a Catholic," he is at once ostracized socially in every possible way by the great mass of the natives, and boycotted in business, just as though he were a criminal and had served a term in prison—the only stain, however, is that of being a despised Catholic. When a stranger inquires for the Catholic church, he is told there is none here.

Forty years ago a little Catholic frame church was built here as a mission church, where holy mass was offered occasionally. Gradually a little flock came together which grew into a good sized parish, with a resident priest. The little original church had been repaired time and again but is now a shack almost unfit for the use as the house of God, whereas the various Protestant denominations have beautiful, substantial, costly church buildings; even the colored have two brick churches. But even though our Catholic pioneers realized that a new church edifice was badly needed, still they thought it most essential first of all to build a parochial school without delay. They made heroic sacrifices, built a good school and got five Benedictine Sisters as teachers. These loyal Catholics, who did not own their own homes, without help from anyone outside of parish members, each year paid off a part of the debt. But now the once vigorous parish through persecutions has been shattered and made helpless, only a few Catholics are left with a \$10,000.00 debt on St. James Parish. We would not have been able to keep above the water and pay the interests, if the good Sisters of Pittsburgh had not helped us through the pennies collected by little mission bands of school children in the East.

It makes your red American blood boil to think of the injustice and totally un-American spirit of this anti-Catholic crusade. One of my parishioners, who has lost his position in Gadsden on account of his religion, had moved to Chicago and presented my case to his parish priest who took up a collection in church for us. This enabled me to come to Chicago to seek funds to make my good fight in a campaign of refutation of slander of the true church. I am

a Knight—where would I go but to my own kind? So I visited and spoke before thirty-three councils of the Knights of Columbus in the short time I had in Chicago. Not to one council have I appealed in vain. My appeal in each council went directly to the hearts of all men present, and every council visited, has vied with the others to help to the utmost ability.

If I can reach the hearts of a sufficiently large number of individual Knights of Columbus to pledge themselves to give us a dime a month for twelve months, I will be able with God's help, to fight this anti-Catholic crusade in Gadaden to the last ditch, and receiving the small gifts of so many, it will accumulate sufficiently so that I will have enough left to pay off the \$10,000.00 debt of a now helpless parish, and to give the best answer to this anti-Catholic agitation by building in place of the shack now used as a church a small but substantial brick church, a permanent house of God, and raise the cross of Holy Mother Church, the true church, higher than ever in the midst of this persecution and vile bigotry. A neat substantial church building will greatly help in giving a favorable outward impression to these people. Even the small contributions of so many individual Knights will make my cause invincible, and the "T. A." noticing the help from so many men, will lose their aggressive spirit, knowing they are too small to succeed to wipe us out. In union there is strength. The Catholics will gradually come together again and regain employment, our institutions will remain intact, and the parish will grow to the honor and glory of God and the salvation of immortal souls.

This dime a month for twelve months will be no hardship on any one Knight, but each ten cents will do ten dollars' worth of good in the South. Each one pledging himself to this help is doing the work of an apostle and missionary. It will be a great moral help to me, knowing that I am not alone in this fight, but have the moral and financial help of so many brave Catholic men.

WHAT I ASK OF YOU

Give me a dime a month for one year—you will not miss it. Sign the enclosed slip, pledging yourself to give a dime a month, or more if you wish, for twelve months. Pay as you can, either monthly, quarterly, or in full, sending directly to me.

When your payments are completed, do not destroy the pledge slip, but return it to me as I want to place the slips in an iron box in our altar as an historical monument of this bitter persecution and a memorial of Catholic unity, and also for mementoes in Holy Mass for these benefactors; this will bring you immeasurable spiritual blessings during your whole life.

BE GENEROUS, BROTHERS!

Can you spare a dime a month to help this Catholic cause? This small amount from many will help in showing these bigots how Catholic gentlemen stand back of their faith. This campaign, soliciting aid, will be to launch a counter campaign against the slanderers of our Holy Faith and open the eyes of many in this section to the fact that the Catholic church is not what they had been taught it to be. Brother, you are a member of the same mystic body of Christ of which also St. James Parish is a member, we are all united by the universal bond of Catholicity—you will not hesitate to sign the enclosed slip, if you remember what it means to you as a Catholic and as a Knight of Columbus. Brother, as a true Knight of Columbus, are you going to have it said that the Catholic church has been vanquished in this case? Brother, you are not going to let the Catholic church lose this battle. Being animated with the true spirit of Catholic Knighthood, you will be anxious to further the honor and glory of God and His true church in a bigoted land, to help the weak and unjustly oppressed, to assist a brother Knight, to help a priest in distress. The whole sacrifice consists of a dime a month, a total of \$1.20 for one year. This is a voluntary donation and need not be limited to above amount. Won't you join in this noble work the brothers of the thirty-three councils in Chicago who have enthusiastically taken up my assistance in this dire distress? ARE YOU WITH ME? I could not stay away any longer from my parish to speak personally to other councils. I had to go back to my battlefield, so I am appealing to YOU by this messenger to help me win with your mite in the crusade against this worst form of bigotry.

I appeal to you in the name of the Divine Master, Who said, "Whatsoever ye have done unto the least of My brethren, ye have done unto Me."

The Heavenly Father seeing in secret will reward this act done purely for

His glory. He is never outdone in generosity and charity. May God bless you and your family. Pray for my people and me.

If convenient, show this circular to other Catholics, not K. of C. members, who might wish to help. Will gladly send you more pledge cards if you will drop me a line requesting them.

REV. HERMAN J. B. SCHMEDTNER.

St. James Church, 622 Chestnut Street, Gadsden, Ala.

KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS

"If I may single out one society without prejudice to the merits of the others, I will name in particular manner that splendid organization, the Knights of Columbus. They are our joy and crown. They are the glory of Jerusalem. They are the joy of Israel. They are the honor of our people. Wherever calumny raises its foul head, they are ever ready, like true knights, to smite the enemy. Whenever an appeal is made in the cause of religion or charity, they are always foremost in lending a helping hand."

His Eminence, JAMES CARDINAL GIBBONS.

Bishop's Residence
400 Government Street
Mobile, Ala.

August 26, 1919.

Rev. H. J. Schmidtner

Reverend and Dear Father: Your favor of August 21st came to hand recently. I am pleased to see you take advantage of Father Benedict's visit from Cullman to take a little vacation. You have earned it.

I sympathize with you deeply in your difficulties in Gadsden. The bigots have, for the time being, done the parish no little harm by driving away your best and most influential members. It is hard to make progress in face of such persistent opposition. It is hard to pay debts when our enemies resort to such underhand tricks to cripple us. The organized efforts of the bigots in Gadsden seem to have done more harm there than anywhere else, unless possibly in Birmingham. It is difficult to understand the spirit which is behind this anti-Catholic movement.

You need help and need it badly to continue your fight against iniquity, and to keep your parish alive. I sincerely hope you will secure some aid from outside, during your vacation. If our brethren in the North and East realized what fierce battles we must fight from day to day, in some bigoted towns in the South, they would be generous in their efforts to help us.

I return Mr. Dalton's letter and I wish you would tell him how much I appreciate his kindness and generosity to you in your difficulties. Wishing you every blessing,

I am, Reverend and Dear Father,

Sincerely yours in Christ,

† EDW. P. ALLEN, Bishop of Mobile.

In the first three pages of this circular Rev. Mr. "Schmedtner" describes conditions as he sees them in Gadsden, Ala.; I can not say that he is right or wrong, so place it before the reader as information.

On page four we find a letter from the Bishop of Mobile; he says "The bigots have . . . done the parish no little harm. . . ."

It is difficult to understand the spirit which is behind this anti-Catholic movement . . ."

So! the bishop is at a loss, and I will take the liberty of advancing a few ideas from which he may have an understanding of this "anti-Catholic movement" in Gadsden and elsewhere: if he will be so kind as to again read the oath he swore which made him a "PRINCE" in the Papal Government it may prove of some assistance in enlightening his understanding. Of course, he may not act upon my suggestion, therefore for the understanding of all who may be in his condition, I will cite from an Encyclical of Leo XIII, "Chief Duties of Christians as Citizens," January 19, 1890, as a peg upon which to hang a few ideas:

"Hence it follows that not only is the church a perfect society far exceeding any other . . . but she is to contend *as an army drawn up in battle array*. (Italics Leo's.) The organization and constitution of Christian society can in no wise be changed, neither can any ONE of its members live as he may choose, nor elect that **MODE OF FIGHTING WHICH BEST PLEASES HIM.**"

The papal church is like an army drawn up in battle array against every right granted man in Holy Writ and the Constitution of these United States.

As in an army, Catholics can not live as they choose, nor elect that mode of fighting which best pleases them. The purpose of a soldier is to take the objective indicated by his commander-in-chief: in the army will be found commanders, captains, privates—all bound by an oath of allegiance to the supreme commander; an army requires spies and other secret agents, who are dispensed to become "dear, sweet friends" of those from whom they expect to receive information or assistance. To "Make America Dominantly Catholic" is the great objective of the papal army; to take this objective the forces have been federated into one great body which the pope directs through his "generals" who place soldiers where they can best serve the "army" so that to-day, of a truth Leo XIII correctly boasts: "We are but of yesterday . . . yet we swarm in all your institutions, we crowd your cities, islands, villages, towns, assemblies, the army itself, your wards and corporations, the palace, the senate, and the law courts," p. 132, Encyc. Lets. He could now include the public schools as teachers, on the press as censors, and everywhere else a "shot" may be fired at FREEDOM.

All soldiers are not on the firing-line: some may be sitting as loyal members of private council boards directing the war; some may be at the head of war-work; some may be in charge of the manufacture of war necessities.

If the Alabama circular was read by some hair-brained Protes-

tant, that tale of persecution by papal soldiers would cause "its" soul to flame with righteous indignation against his own "army" while he would give both aid and comfort to the "enemy"—which would be "taking" the objective in *his* case!

But let us get to the point for the benefit of the bishop: To gain its objective, an army will employ direct or indirect means; if a direct assault appears to be best, that is made; if conditions seem to indicate strategy would be more successful, strategy is the command. If the pope should command his "army" in America to attempt a direct assault with arms, it would have to obey—but as that does not seem "expedient" for the present other means must be resorted to—indirection. To accomplish its objective, Leo said no "fixed rule" could be followed, that means adopted must suit "times and places," but the "aim" or "objective" sought **MUST BE UNIFORM**; to one squad of "soldiers" he may command the death of William Black; another, maim Otis Spurgeon; wreck the Baptist church at Carbondale, Pa., where the "enemy" was holding discussions; order ten thousand men to report for duty and prevent free speech in Haverhill, Mass.; break up the Slattry lecture in a Masonic Temple of Chicago and beat up those in attendance. To another division of his army, he orders pickets to be placed in every political party, become members of all committees, preside as officers—but before voting-day they will be correctly informed which party offered the highest bid, and they will know how to vote; to another division of his army he issues orders that they run for every office; become private secretaries of Congressmen, Senators, Presidents, to secure or suppress information as the case may require; others must become Congressmen or Senators, judges, etc.; to his captains, the priests, he orders representation at all civic league gatherings, Y. M. C. A. or other work of that kind; to other soldiers is committed the duty of mixing and mingling wherever possible among non-Catholics hoping that their presence alone will prevent discussions of papalism; to another division of his army he orders an ingratiating attitude: beg from the enemy funds and erect costly "H. O. G. S." into which defenseless girls and women can be enslaved for our "army"; beg money and build magnificent "non-sectarian" hospitals in every city and get the philanthropic work out of the hands of the State thereby weaning those you aid from the community theory; in these hospitals papal soldiers must appear as angels of mercy: every hated "heretic" restored to health therein means a "spiked gun" ever after if it does not mean an open purse and a "recruit" for the papal army—they are at least inclined to "slap the face" of one who refuses to be "spiked."

As a soldier of the pope, whatever a Catholic does—whether it be murdering a William Black or going through winter's bleak-

ness to feed some poor member of the human family—is in obedience to orders of the commander-in-chief; he alone has the right to *reason*, therefore he rules and directs how the army shall fight: if, in order to “take the objective” it requires the bullet, ballot, or a smile, a Catholic must obey!

Speaking of hospitals: suppose I should become sick or injured in some city and placed in a hospital under the supervision of that division of the pope’s army called “sisters” and they should learn who I am?

Suppose like fate should befall a leader of the Scottish Rite Masons?

Or a Guardian of Liberty should meet with that misfortune?

AS SOLDIERS COMMANDED TO OCCUPY THIS POSITION BY THEIR SUPERIOR OFFICER, with unconscious EXCOMMUNICATED HERETICS in their hands, what would they do? And papal hospitals usually have *Papal Physicians!*

WHO SHALL HAVE CHARGE OF THE HOSPITAL, a division of the pope’s army or the STATE?

“If our brethren in the North and East realized—” WHEN THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES “REALIZE” THE DEADLY MEANING OF THE PAPAL “INTENTION” OR OBJECTIVE AS DEFINED IN THE BISHOP’S OATH, THE STRUGGLE OF THAT ARMY WILL BE OVER IN AMERICA!

Cardinal Gibbons says the Knights of Columbus are the “joy and crown” of the Roman church: “Wherever calumny raises its foul head, they are ever ready, like true knights, to smite the enemy”: now, Sir Knights, if the bishop’s oath is not true, it’s “calumny”—“go to it!”

LETTERS BY THE REV. JOHN WESLEY

Mr. Farrell presented an Englishman, Cardinal John Henry Newman, a “convert” from the English Episcopal church, to prove that Roman Catholics have a free conscience. (That they can not discuss or debate Roman Catholicism is sufficient to prove that their conscience is directed and controlled by the papal LAW and the regulatory decrees of the pope.) Having cited an English authority, I shall quote from one who is as well known as Newman, John Wesley of the Methodist church; he lived in a period—1703-1791—when papalism could be seen and felt, which required a Protestant to be true to his convictions, that has given the world that freedom from that influence which it continues to enjoy, and which will be retained only as long as men called Protestant protest indeed. (Newman, 1801-1890.)

The quotations which I shall use are cited from Vol. V of a book, "The Works of the Reverend John Wesley, A. M.," "published by J. Emory and B. Waugh, for the Methodist Episcopal Church, at the Conference Office, 14 Crosby Street, J. Collord, Printer, 1831," New York.

The section from which I quote is

"TWO LETTERS TO THE EDITORS OF THE FREEMAN'S JOURNAL, DUBLIN

"To the Reader.

"Several months since, Father O'Leary, a Capuchin friar in Dublin, published Remarks upon this Letter in the *Freeman's Journal*. As soon as these were sent to me, I published a Reply in the same paper. When I read more of his Remarks, printed in five succeeding journals, I wrote a second Reply; but did not think it worth while to follow, step by step, so wild, rambling a writer.

"Mr. O'Leary has now put his six letters into one, which are reprinted in London, with this title, 'Mr. O'Leary's Remarks on the Rev. Mr. W.'s Letters in Defence of the Protestant Associations of England; to which are prefixed Mr. Wesley's Letters.'

"Is it by negligence or design that there are so many mistakes even in a title page?—1, 'To which are prefixed Mr. W.'s Letters.' No: the second of those letters is not mine. I never saw it *before*. 2, But where are the two letters published in the *Freeman's Journal*? Why is a spurious letter palmed upon us, and the genuine ones suppressed? 3, 'Letters in Defence of the Protestant Association in England.' Hold! In my first Letter I have only three lines in defence of a Tract published in London. But I have not one line 'in Defence of the Associations,' either in London or elsewhere.

"If Mr. O'Leary will seriously answer the two following letters, he may expect a serious reply. But if he has only drollery and low wit to oppose to argument, I shall concern myself no farther about him.

"London, Dec. 29, 1770.

"LETTER I.

"Gentlemen—1. Mr. O'Leary does well to entitle his paper 'Remarks,' as that word may mean anything or nothing; but it is more an answer to my Letter than to the Bull *Unigenitus*. He likewise does wisely in prefacing his 'Remarks' with so handsome a *compliment*: this may naturally incline *you* to think well of his judgment, which is no small point gained.

"2. His manner of writing is easy and pleasant; but might it not as well be more serious? The subject we are treating of is not a light one: it moves me to tears rather than to laughter. I plead for the safety of my country; yea, for the children that are yet unborn. 'But can not your country be safe unless the Roman Catholics are persecuted for their religion?' Hold! Religion is out of the question: but I would not have them persecuted at all; I would only have them hindered from doing hurt. I would not put it in their power (and I do not wish that others should) to

cut the throats of their quiet neighbors. 'But they will give security for their peaceable behaviour.' They can not while they continue Roman Catholics; they can not while they are members of that church which receives the decrees of the Council of Constance, which maintains the spiritual power of the Bishop of Rome, or the doctrine of priestly absolution.

"3. This I observed in my late Letter. Whoever, therefore, would remark upon it to any purpose, must prove these three things: (1) That the decree of the Council of Constance, publicly made, has been publicly disclaimed. (2) That the Pope has not power to pardon sins. And (3) that no priest has the power to pardon sins. But has Mr. O'Leary proved these three points? Has he proved any one of them? He has, indeed, said something upon the first: he denies such a decree was ever made.

"4. I am persuaded Mr. O'Leary is the first man that ever made the important discovery. But, before he is quite sure, let him look again into Father L'Abbe's '*Concilia Maxima*,' printed at Paris in the year 1672. The last volume contains a particular account of the Council of Constance; one of whose decrees (p.169) is, 'That heretics ought to be put to death, *non obstantibus salvis conductibus Imperatoris, Regum, &c*, notwithstanding the public faith engaged to them in the most solemn manner.' Who then can affirm that no such doctrine or violation of faith with heretics is authorized at this council? Without putting on spectacles, which, blessed be God, I do not wear, I can read a little Latin still. And, while I can, I must fix this horrid doctrine on the Council of Constance.

"5. But, supposing the Council of Constance had never advanced this doctrine, or the Church of Rome had publicly disclaimed it, my conclusion stands good till it is proved, (1) That no priest has a power of pardoning sins; and (2) That the Pope has neither a power of pardoning sins or of dispensing with oaths, vows, promises, &c.

"Mr. O'Leary has proved neither of these: and what has he proved? It is hard to say. . . . 'The Catholics all over the world are liars, perjurers,' &c. Nay, I have never arraigned one of them. . . . I arraign the doctrines, not the men. Either defend them, or renounce them.

"I do renounce them,' says Mr. O'Leary. Perhaps you do. But the Church of Rome has never renounced them. . . .

"4. 'Does Mr. Wesley intend to sound Alecto's horn, or the war-shell of the Mexicans?' All this is cruel aspersion indeed; designed merely to inflame! What I intend is neither more or less than this—to contribute my mite to preserve our constitution both in Church and State.

"6. . . . 'His Letter contains all the horrors invented by blind zeal, set forth in the most bitter language.' Is this gentleman in his senses? I hope not. Else I know not what excuse to make for him. Not one bitter word in my Letter. . . . But still this is wide of the mark; which of those three points does it prove?

"The whole matter is this. I have, without the least bitterness,

advanced three reasons why I conceive it is not safe to tolerate Roman Catholics. But still, I would not have them persecuted: I wish them to enjoy the same liberty, civil and religious, which they enjoyed in England before the late act was repealed. Meantime, I would not have a sword put into their hands; I would not give them liberty to hurt others. Mr. O'Leary, with much archness and pleasantry, has nibbled at one of these three reasons, leaving the other two untouched. . . .

“JOHN WESLEY.

“Manchester, March 23, 1780.”

The following are extracts from—

“LETTER II.

“Gentlemen—Some time ago, in a Letter published in London, I observed, ‘Roman Catholics can not give those whom they account heretics any sufficient security for their peaceable behaviour.’

“1. Because it has been publicly avowed in one of their General Councils, and never publicly disclaimed, that faith is not to be kept with heretics; 2. Because they hold the doctrine of priestly absolution; and, 3. The doctrine of papal pardons and dispensations.

“Mr. O'Leary has published ‘Remarks’ on this letter; nine parts in ten of which are quite wide of the mark. . . .

“Close argument he does not attempt; but he vapors, and skips to and fro, and rambles to all points of the compass, in a very lively and entertaining manner.

“. . . I have now only to do with what he advances in your Journal of March 2. Here we read: ‘For Mr. Wesley’s second letter, see the last page.’ I have seen it; but I can find no more of the second letter in the last page, than in the first. It would be strange if I did; for that second letter was never heard of, but in Mr. O’L.’s ‘Remarks.’ . . .

“My argument was: . . . those who receive this Council can not be trusted by those whom they account heretics. This is my immediate conclusion. And if the premises be admitted, it will infallibly follow.

“On this Mr. O’L. says, ‘A Council so often quoted challenges peculiar attention. We shall examine it with all possible precision and impartiality. . . .

“But to the Council: ‘Huss strikes at the root of temporal and civil authority. He boldly asserts, that all princes, magistrates, &c, in the state of mortal sin, are deprived, *ipso facto* (by the fact itself) of all power and jurisdiction. And by preaching these doctrines, he makes Bohemia a theatre of intestine war. See the Acts of the Council of Constance in L’Abbe’s Collection of Councils.’

“I have seen them, but I can find nothing of all this therein.

“‘He gave notice that he would stand his trial; but he attempted to escape.’ No, never; this is pure invention. ‘He is arrested at Constance . . . and confined. The Council then declared, “No safe-conduct granted by the emperor, or any other

princes, to heretics, ought to hinder them from being punished as justice shall require. And the person who has promised them security shall not be obliged to keep his promise, by whatever tie he may be engaged."

"And did the Council of Constance declare this? 'Yes,' says Mr. O'Leary. I desire no more. But before I argue upon the point, permit me to give a little fuller account of the whole affair:

"The Council of Constance was called by the Emperor Sigismund and Pope John XXIII. . . . Before it began, the Emperor sent some Bohemian gentlemen to conduct John Huss to Constance, solemnly promising that he should 'come and return freely, without fraud or interruption.'

"Before he left Prague, he waited on the Bishop of Nazareth, Papal Inquisitor for that city and diocese, who, in the presence of many witnesses, gave him the following testimonial:

"We, Nicholas, do by these presents make known to all men, that we have often talked with that honorable man, Master John Huss, and in all his sayings, doings, and behaviour, have proved him to be a faithful man; finding no manner of evil, sinister, or erroneous doings in him, unto this present.'

"This was attested by the hand of the public notary, named Michael Pruthatietz.

"After this, Conrade, Archbishop of Prague, declared before all the barons of Bohemia, that 'he knew not that John Huss was culpable or faulty in any crime or offence whatever.'"

(Here Mr. Wesley relates the trial of Huss by the Council; that in all one hundred and nine charges were made against him, *every one of which related to the Church, not one to the State.*)

"In the seventeenth session, the sentence and condemnation of John Huss was read and published. . . .

"But says Mr. O'Leary: 'This regards the peculiar case of safe-conducts granted by princes to heretics.' If you mean, they took occasion from a particular case to establish a general rule, this is true; but what then? If the public faith with heretics may be violated in one instance, it may be in a thousand. 'But can the rule be extended farther?' It may; it must; we can not tell where to stop. Away then with your witticisms on so awful a subject! What! do you sport with human blood? I take burning men alive to be a very serious thing. I pray, spare your jests on the occasion."

Mr. Wesley then goes on to say that Sigismund should have gone before that Council and said: "My own honor, and yours, and that of the empire is at stake. I will not upon any account suffer the public faith to be violated. I will not make myself infamous to all generations. My name shall not stink to all future ages. I will rather part with my empire, my life.' . . . He would have done it, had he been an honest man; had he had either honor or conscience. I ask Mr. O'Leary, Would not you have done it, had you been in Sigismund's place? If you say,

'No,' a Protestant ought not to trust you, any more than he would a wild bull.

"What security then for my life can a man give me, till he utterly renounces the Council of Constance? What security can any Romanist give a Protestant, till this doctrine is publicly abjured? . . .

"Would I then wish the Roman Catholics to be persecuted? I never said or hinted at any such thing. I abhor the thought: it is foreign to all I have preached and wrote for these fifty years. . . . I wish them to stand just as they did before the late act was passed; not to be persecuted or hurt themselves; but gently restrained from hurting their neighbors.

"JOHN WESLEY.

"Chester, March 31, 1780."

The following quotations are from a letter written by Mr. Wesley:

"A Letter to the Printer of the *Public Advertiser*.

"Sir—Some time ago a pamphlet was sent me, entitled, 'An Appeal from the Protestant Association to the People of Great Britain.' A day or two since, a kind of answer to this was put into my hands, which pronounced its style contemptible, its reasoning futile, and its object malicious. On the contrary, I think the style is clear, easy, and natural; the reasoning in general, strong and conclusive; the object or design kind and benevolent. And in pursuance of the same kind and benevolent design, namely, to preserve our happy constitution, I shall endeavor to confirm the substance of that tract by a few plain arguments.

"With persecution I have nothing to do. I persecute no man for his religious principles. Let there be as 'boundless a freedom in religion' as any man can conceive. But this does not touch the point: I will set religion, true or false, utterly out of the question. Suppose the Bible, if you please, to be a fable, and the Koran to be the word of God. I consider not, whether the Romish religion be true or false: I build nothing on one or the other suppositions. Therefore, away with all your common-place declamation about intolerance and persecution for religion! Suppose every word of Pope Pius' creed to be true; suppose the Council of Trent to have been infallible; yet I insist upon it, that no government not Roman Catholic ought to tolerate men of the Roman Catholic persuasion.

"I prove this by a plain argument: (let him answer it that can)—That no Roman Catholic does, or can, give security for his allegiance or peaceable behaviour. I prove thus: It is a Roman Catholic maxim, established, not by private men, but by a public council, that 'no faith is to be kept with heretics.' This has been openly avowed by the Council of Constance; but it never was openly disclaimed. Whether private persons avow or disavow it, it is a fixed maxim of the Church of Rome. But as long as it is so, nothing can be more plain, than that the members of that

church can give no reasonable security to any government of their allegiance or peaceable behaviour. Therefore they ought not to be tolerated by any government, Protestant, Mohammedan, or Pagan.

"You may say, 'Nay, but they will take an oath of allegiance.' True, five hundred oaths; but the maxim, 'No faith is to be kept with heretics,' sweeps them all away as a spider's web. So that still no governors that are not Roman Catholics can have any security of their allegiance.

"Again: Those who recognize the spiritual power of the Pope can give no security of their allegiance to any government; but all Roman Catholics acknowledge this: therefore they can give no security for their allegiance.

"The power of granting pardons for all sins, past, present, and to come, is, and has been for many centuries, one branch of his spiritual power.

"But those who acknowledge him to have this spiritual power can give no security for their allegiance; since they believe the Pope can pardon rebellions, high treason and all other sins whatsoever.

"The power of dispensing with any promise, oath, or vow, is another branch of the spiritual power of the Pope. And all who acknowledge his spiritual power must acknowledge this. But whoever acknowledges the dispensing power of the Pope can give no security for his allegiance to any government.

"Oaths and promises are none; they are light as air; a dispensation makes them all null and void.

"Nay, not only the Pope, but even a priest, has power to pardon sins! This is an essential doctrine of the Church of Rome. But they who acknowledge this can not give any security for their allegiance to any government. Oaths are no security at all; for the priest can pardon both perjury and high treason.

"Setting then religion aside, it is plain, that upon principles of reason, no government ought to tolerate men who can not give any security to that government of their allegiance and peaceable behaviour. But this no Romanist can do, not only while he holds that 'no faith is to be kept with heretics,' but so long as he acknowledges either priestly absolution or the spiritual power of the Pope . . .

"JOHN WESLEY.

"City Road, January 21, 1780."

Mr. Wesley presents his case in a way that needs no interpretation by another to understand it; the similarity of the tactics of Mr. O'Leary and Mr. Farrell, though one hundred and thirty-nine years and the Atlantic separate them, shows that in spirit or "Intention" the Roman church is "always the same." Where there is not absolute exterior similarity, that is because of expediency; internally, there has never been, and indeed can never be, a change.

The decree of the Council of Constance, like many other laws of that church, is not dead, but is sleeping under expediency; like the marriage law of the Council of Trent, promulgated hundreds of years ago, but was enforced in America in this twentieth century.

But if there had never been such a decree as that of Constance, the decrees of more recent popes and councils would force the same conclusion as that of Mr. Wesley: the Canon Law says the pope has the right to absolve from any sin, and from any oath; that the church of Rome has the right to use force to compel obedience to her decrees; that it is a "perfect society" which has the right to remove heretics from earth by death—and every member is bound by an oath of allegiance to the pope to promulgate and defend the laws and decrees of the institution.

In answer to Question 12, Mr. Farrell said that in such case, Catholics would pay no attention to the pope; but as long as one remains connected with the system, he is bound to observe its rules; and in this connection, let us hear William E. Gladstone, English statesman, in his book, "Vatican Decrees in Their Bearing on Civil Allegiance," wherein he shows from the Vatican decree that a Catholic must be obedient to the regulatory authority of the pope in the same degree as he is faithful to the pope's infallibility in matters of faith; says Mr. Gladstone:

"Even therefore, where the judgments of the pope do not present the credentials of Infallibility, they are unappealable and irreversible: no person may pass judgment upon them; and all men, clerical and lay, dispersedly or in the aggregate, are bound truly to obey them; and from this rule of Catholic truth no man can depart, save at the peril of his salvation. Surely, it is allowable to say that this Third Chapter on universal Obedience is a formidable rival to the Fourth Chapter on Infallibility. Indeed, to an observer from without, it seems to leave the dignity to the other, but to reserve the stringency and efficacy to itself. The Third Chapter is the Morovingian Monarch; the Fourth is the Carolingian Mayor of the Palace. The Third has an overawing splendor; the Fourth, an iron grip. Little does it matter to me whether my superior claims infallibility, so long as he is entitled to *demand* and *exact conformity*. This, it will be observed, he demands, even in cases not covered by his infallibility; cases, therefore, in which he admits it to be possible that he may be wrong, but finds it intolerable to be told so. As he *must* be obeyed *in all his judgments*, though *not ex cathedra*, it seems a pity he could not likewise give the comforting assurance that they are *all certain to be right*."

The Third Chapter of the Vatican Decree is the BODY, while the Fourth is the SOUL, of the Catholic system—can Mr. Farrell separate soul and body? He says he can: "we would pay no

attention to him," the pope, as to his mandates involving Obedience!

As to an individual, this rule of conduct may be followed: but does the system allow it? No.

When shall we believe one is truthful, when he says he will act a certain way under given circumstances, or when he SWEARS on the Bible that he will be obedient to *all* that is required of him? To be truthful, honest, and convincing in the first instance, he would have to "come out from among them," while to confirm the oath of allegiance only requires adherence to the system.

CONCLUSION

In the spirit of Mr. Wesley, I would say, safeguard religious and civil liberty by keeping the means of their destruction out of the hands of their enemies.

When Romanism is in the minority, the cry of "persecution for religion" is raised, when one discusses these things; where the pope has a sufficient majority, all these things are enforced.

Many so-called Protestants—preachers, jurists, professional men, etc.—say they do not, will not, believe any thing against the Catholic church: Christ warned Jerusalem, wept over His people—they nailed Him to the tree, but they perished; long, long before His time, a man warned his people: as he hammered day in and day out, year in and year out, he was mocked as a harmless fanatic; he kept hammering away on the Ark, and when the deluge came, floated away in safety, the others perished; many of these so-called Protestants would think a lot of people were mistaken as to the date, and were celebrating the Fourth of July out of time, if they should look out on the street and see the Massacre of St. Bartholomew re-enacted before their very eyes. And right here I will repeat: such men are either Romanists in disguise or are the tools of the system, and should receive the same consideration at the hands of non-Catholics as Bavarian Jesuits—or worse

The pope teaches Catholics that it is better for them to die rather than sever their connection with him; we would not have them die—let them live, but sever their connection with the affairs of the City, County, State and National Governments of America.

To this end, every man who believes in his Country and in God, must strive; those not connected with the Catholic church yet "love her so" should aid in this, as a means of finally aiding the Catholic church to become a religious instead of a political machine.

To every inhabitant of American soil—to every one who lives and enjoys the blessings protected by the Stars and Stripes, I say in the words of one of old, "Choose ye this day whom ye will serve," and that Faith in, is shown by Obedience to, it; *and such can not be given in shreds!*

A man of unquestioned veracity informed me that he never heard but one sermon from the pulpit of his church for forty years on Romanism, and that one was forced: the pastor learned that a certain member refused to say "I believe in the Holy Catholic Church," *and in a single sermon* endeavored to show the difference between the "Holy" Catholic Church and the "Roman" Catholic church!

Is this not typical of all non-Catholic churches? Is not this the reason why the present generation looks upon Romanism as it does any other church, and knows nothing about the laws and doctrines of the papal church?* Roman Catholicism has fostered this condition, as well as turned it to advantage; because the Protestants have not pointed out the evils of the system, the people as a whole have been indifferent, while Rome has concentrated her forces toward keeping the people asleep, at the same time injecting the "sap" of papalism "into all the veins of the State" and minds of the people, through the public schools and politics; militantly battling to make America dominantly Catholic, she is putting her minions in our public schools as teachers—but keeping our teachers out of hers, the parochial school; through political chicanery and a solid vote in national politics to be delivered to the highest bidder, almost every office within the gift of a political party is given to the "faithful"—judgships, postmasters, special agents, Indian schools, appropriations for papal institutions, army and navy posts; as illustrative, before America entered the war, Mr. Wilson put a Roman Catholic in every office he could create, while during the war, the most important and strategic positions of war work activities were put into papal hands—war

*In this connection I offer for consideration the following from the "Bureau of Information" of *Our Sunday Visitor*, April 20, 1919:

"Could you give me some reasons for Catholics pledging that their children will be reared as Catholics in the case of a Catholic and Protestant marrying? Reasons that seem valid to us sometimes fail to convince Protestants."

"The requirement on the part of the Church that a non-Catholic party to a mixed marriage consent in writing to have his children baptized and brought up Catholics can be made to appear most reasonable. In fact, the Catholic Church, believing as she does that she is God's representative on earth, must do what would protect God's interests, and safeguard His Faith. The average Protestant believes that one religion is as good as another; hence he can not reasonably object to having his children brought up Catholics. But the Catholic does not believe this; hence, she would sacrifice principle in permitting her children to be brought up outside her Faith. The non-Catholic who is not affiliated with any church usually believes that it is better to have his children brought up in some religion; why not in the Catholic religion then, whose teachings and principles and Sacraments tend to establish a stronger spiritual foundation than any other religion can lay?"

boards, head of naval work, ship building, aeroplane construction, Red Cross; the Masonic fraternity was barred from the cantonments as such, as were all Protestant denominations (the bars being lowered a little, under pressure), while Rome was given a free hand; in the spring of 1918 the Knights of Columbus wanted \$8,000,000 to carry on their work, and had to get non-Catholics to send out begging letters for aid: in the fall, Mr. Wilson ordered a combined drive for war activities, and Rome was allotted \$30,000,000 as her share!

A cardinal, Farley, died in New York—newspapers carried the story that among the dignitaries present were representatives of Secretary of War Baker and Secretary of the Navy Daniels. On his fiftieth anniversary jubilee, Cardinal Gibbons received congratulatory letters from President Wilson and Secretary McAdoo; it would take a book the size of this almost to recount all the special favors the papal contingent has received at the hands of politicians to win the solid vote.

I witnessed the "Field Mass" at Camp Wheeler, when Bishop Ben. J. Keiley officiated, using a number of the soldiers and shooting guns "to the greater glory of God"—while any Protestant preacher would have been ordered out of the camp if a purely sectarian sermon should have been delivered by him; even on the Mexican border Protestant preachers were forbidden to preach evangelical sermons, while Rome was in full evidence!

So adroitly has Rome worked, and schemed, that the most unconstitutional measures can be introduced in Congress, and the press makes no mention of it, while the ministry appears to have been chloroformed—some resenting the effort to get them to Protest

The papacy has hurled anathema against the printing press: that is really the only weapon Rome fears—PUBLICITY. She will come out victorious from every battle, if she can control the press. By intimidations, threats, boycott, mob and murder, Rome has endeavored to prevent publicity—she can not live if the Light is turned on her religion or politics, and here is where non-Catholics must concentrate their efforts: not especially in the matter of breaking Rome's grip on the secular press, but use the printing press: the different denominations should force their respective Sunday School Boards to parallel every lesson or text used in the Sunday School with the papal dogma or decree concerning it; institute an educational campaign as to Romanism just as was done in the matter of the pet business of Romanists, the liquor traffic; this work should be supplemented by sermons at least once a month from every Protestant pulpit, while every man and woman who values our civilization and does not want to see America become as Spain or Ireland under priest-and-politician rule should

join an organization or organize one, to combat political Romanism in the political field.

Rome is organized to the man, woman, boy and girl, and papalism is constantly drilled into them.

If Protestant preachers believe in their faith and church, they should evidence the fact by *protesting*, or go over into the papal camp and cease to be hypocrites or secret Romanists; if Americans value the Constitution, they should organize to protect it, or get into the ranks of the Italian Dictator of human affairs, the papal church!

That the American people are as uninformed as to Rome's politics as they are as to her "religion" is patent to every one; I feel sure there are not two people in every one hundred non-Catholics, not excepting Protestant ministers, who have ever read before what I have presented from "The Glories of Mary," hence, non-Catholics are indifferent, and would as soon see their children going to the parochial or convent school as to the public school; the fact is, many parents, in their blindness, send their children to these schools, putting them within the subtleness of Catholicism at the impressionable age—the age when the tender twig may be twisted and distorted to grow up leaning the wrong way if not absolutely an advocate. Sure, Rome promises not to interfere with the religion of pupils, and, according to Jesuitical sophistry, they do not interfere with the religion of such children because—they had no religion to begin with! so, to make Romanists of them is violative of no pledge.

Mr. Wesley was writing in 1780. Mr Gladstone in 1875: in 1914-1918 England, "a heretical" nation, was at war—beaten to her knees; with her "back against the wall" she called on her subjects for assistance in this crisis when national existence was in the balance: "Defend the Flag, Men of Ireland!" We "keep no faith with heretics," replied the Catholic Irish; "Stand by your Country, Men of Canada!" We "keep no faith with heretics," responded the Roman Catholics in Canada; "Your Country Calls Yqu, Men of Australia!" We "keep no faith with heretics," answered the Roman Catholics in Australia: ("We would pay no attention to him," said Mr Farrell!) If England had heeded such men as Wesley and Gladstone, and many others of that class of students and statesmen, *all men under the British Flag would have been a unit against her foes*, and the Great War may have been terminated victoriously *without involving the United States!*

That Romanists are bound by the Law of Obedience as well as Papal Dogma, I believe has been established beyond question; that the pope has the power to release his members from any oath of allegiance, not even a Catholic will deny: **AND IF THE WHOLE "HERETICAL" WORLD HAD BEEN BEATEN TO**

ITS KNEES DURING THIS GREAT WAR WITH ITS "BACK AGAINST THE WALL," WITH HIS AGENTS AND THE PRIESTS IN EVERY REGIMENT AND EVERY BATTERY AND EVERY BATTLESHIP AND IN EVERY STRATEGIC GOVERNMENTAL POSITION AND IN CHARGE OF ALMOST EVERY GREAT WAR MANUFACTURING INTEREST AND IN CHARGE OF RED CROSS FUNDS AND IN CHARGE OF SHIP BUILDING AND SHIPPING AND IN COMMAND OF ARMIES AND FLEETS, like a flash of lightning the order to enforce that old decree, "KEEP NO FAITH WITH HERETICS," COULD HAVE BEEN SOUNDED THROUGHOUT THE WORLD, and a nation's own guns have been trained on its own flag!

To admit that the pope has the power to do this, is to prove the conclusion that he would, if "EXPEDIENCY" should ever warrant; for the very existence of a right or power is *prima facie* evidence that it is to be used when best suited for its exercise; therefore, no Roman Catholic should enjoy the right to vote, sit on juries, or be elected or appointed to any public office, or have the children of the country under their influence in public or private schools.

The Canon Law by Taunton is a presentation of the Law as found in about one hundred and seventy-five volumes written by other canonists on the same subject, covering different periods from about the year 1504 and ending 1905, in which are all the decrees, issued by popes and councils, from the earliest ages of the Roman church: under the subject of "Civil Court," he says:

"Those who have recourse to the lay power to impede the letters or any acts emanating from the Apostolic See or from any of the Legates or delegates of the same, and preventing, directly or indirectly, their promulgation or execution, or on account of these hurting or terrifying either the parties or others, incur excommunication reserved in a special manner to the Roman Pontiff. Hence, those who appeal to the CIVIL COURTS AGAINST THE ORDERS OR DECISIONS OF THE HOLY SEE FALL UNDER THE CENSURE," p. 191.

Now, by the Constitution "*Apostolicas Sedis*" by Pius IX, 1869, cited elsewhere, THE ENTIRE NON-CATHOLIC WORLD HAS BEEN EXCOMMUNICATED: and should the pope in person or through his agents deem it expedient to issue letters calling on the "faithful" in any country, or all over the world, to fall upon, and make war against, heretics, to "extirpate" "the filth of heresy" from the face of the globe, THE SAME LAW THAT MAKES ONE A ROMAN CATHOLIC, PREVENTS HIM FROM APPEALING TO THE CIVIL COURTS or to the LAWS OF THE LAND to arrest such orders of the pope, or to stay his agents in their transmission. This law, coupled with the above decree, stig-

matizes every Roman Catholic AS A POTENTIAL TRAITOR to the country that gives him protection; and the suspicion, if there is nothing here but suspicion, that he would be disloyal to the country where he lives and hence is a "bad" citizen remains with him till the crucial test is made, and he proves that he would disobey the LAW that MAKES him a Romanist and gives him his "religion."

The right of the pope and his priests to absolve from any sin or to nullify any oath is the same "Right" the German Kaiser exercised during the Great War, the Delbruck Law, by which a German citizen of America could go before the Kaiser's agent anywhere in America or in the world, and cast off his obligation to his adopted country and re-assume an oath of allegiance to the German Empire; and from the exercise of this "right," many of those who up to the war were looked upon as "such nice, kind, lovable neighbors" became the most bitter enemies of this Government, numbers being interned, put in prison, etc., to prevent them from doing damage to the country and people who thought they were loyal citizens. A person should not be admitted to citizenship where the laws of his native land provide for this; and no one should be made an American citizen or given any of the political and civil rights of citizenship who adheres to any theory of government that teaches this "right."

Suspicion and distrust must attach to those who belong to a system that propagates such tenets. This is especially referred to Mr. Farrell regarding his letter on "Trust" and "Suspicion," and to Mr. A. J. Long as to what may constitute "bad" citizenship.

RETROSPECTIVE

In his letter of November 10, 1917, Mr. Farrell says that the purpose of the Laymen's Association is "to bring about a more friendly relation among all citizens, regardless of creed," which in itself is an acknowledgment that unfriendly relations exist because of creed—the creed of papalism. Where estrangement seems to exist, to bring about "more friendly relations" requires an understanding and adjustment of that which was the cause, looking to its removal; with this general view in mind, I submitted a number of questions, thirty-two in all, which appear to have been answered by a priest or cleric who made little if any effort to remove misunderstanding, considering a question as being presumptuous or impertinent, and has absolutely failed to make satisfactory answers to Questions 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, and practically 32, although they all pertain to matters which vitally

concern all non-Catholics, and the general welfare of the country.

Being an association organized supposedly for the sole purpose of informing non-Catholics what are the faith, practices and rights of Roman Catholics, I had a right to expect true, clear, authoritative answers to all of those questions on the part of the Laymen's Association; instead of making such answers, the letters will show equivocation and evasion in almost every instance.

In his letter, October 3, 1917, Mr. Farrell said that "suspicion" was "running like a poison stream" through my paper; that I was suspicious of the Roman church is evidenced by my questions, **AND IT WAS HIS BUSINESS**, as spokesman for the Catholic church in Georgia, **TO AT LEAST MAKE AN HONEST EFFORT TO PURIFY THIS "POISON STREAM" BY SUCH ARGUMENT AND PROOF AS AN INTELLIGENT PERSON WOULD ADVANCE IF HE WAS SINCERE IN HIS PROFESSIONS.**

DOUBLE-DEALING OF THE CHURCH OF ROME

In hurriedly scanning the Laws of the Church of Rome, I find the following:

"The work of preaching can be committed to a cleric, even if not in sacred orders, but never to laics."—Cf. V, Lateran Council. Do the many letters herein from the association appear to be the work of a "laic" or "cleric" (layman or priest) ?

To preserve a government "of the people, for the people, and by the people," it is necessary that those who are to perpetuate it be educated to an appreciation of such a State. Recognizing this, our forefathers provided for the maintenance of the free public school system; it was their purpose to have the youth of the land to come up together in that school, all having an eye single to the welfare of the democratic form of government they had established. If the free school should ever be destroyed, down goes the Constitution before Autocracy, therefore every necessary means should be employed to safeguard the free school system and through that the safety of the Government, first, by Congress or the various States passing a law making it illegal to employ any person in an official or teaching capacity in the free public school system who is a member of any society or organization whatsoever the tenets of which are opposed to the principle of said State school system of education, or if said tenets of a society or organization is opposed in any manner to the principles of the Constitution of these United States; it should also be unlawful for any private school to exist unless it is under the supervision of the Board of Education of the respective counties, which should see that the same curriculum is provided in private

as in public schools, and require the same degree of efficiency in teacher and pupil in the private as in the public school in all grammar grades.

If it would be illogical and suicidal to place enemies in the army and navy during war times, it is just as illogical to place enemies of the free school and of the Government where they can strike at the most vital point—education.

It should also be unlawful for the State or National Government to furnish money or supplies to any school not under the control of the public school system, and no school except the public should be permitted to give military training.

These suggestions are offered to all who are interested in "Americanizing" America—and there can be no compromise.

When I submitted the original thirty-two questions to Mr. Farrell, there was no means of knowing the great task before me—great, when one considers the limited time at the disposal of a busy man. From the nature of the work, which suffered from almost interminable interruptions, attending to it a little to-day, a little from time to time, as I had to do, the literary critic will be disappointed; but as to that, I have made a special effort to place every subject before the "jury" in the simplest manner so that all questions would be fairly well understood by laymen generally.

This is a question which should engage the mind and heart of every true American citizen, and every political party, and every man who serves the Nation in the capacity of lawmaker.

That it can no longer be brushed aside has been recognized by a number of representative lawyers and Protestant ministers, who have, with the assistance of others, perfected organizations which are becoming national in scope, amalgamating not only all non-Catholic BAPTIZED for such action as will meet the enemies of the Constitution—white or black, native or foreign—*anywhere* they may choose to pitch the battle, but will admit all who love that LIBERTY AND DEMOCRACY which gave us the Great Constitution; literature of various kinds will be issued under the auspices of certain organizations, the purposes of which are to maintain the Constitution and destroy any politician who would even consent to its nullification in any particular except by the process made and provided therein.

While the Roman Catholic church is a mighty organization, yet it is composed entirely of secret societies which are oath-bound to the Pope of Rome—societies that no one can join except Catholics, and of which almost every one is a member—and that the specific purpose of each is to further the cause of the pope is proven by the fact that they would not be sanctioned by the hierarchy or be permitted to exist for any other purpose.

Although this purely foreign cult is thoroughly organized and ruled by laws which propose to set up a perfect government exclusive of all other governments, it is militantly opposed to other secret societies; this antagonism has so permeated the public mind that even intelligent citizens have absorbed Rome's insidious propaganda to the extent that some say they do not believe in organizations being formed by American citizens to oppose this institution which seeks to destroy the Constitution. This self-same foreign influence has also succeeded to some extent in making it very unpopular to speak of upholding the Constitution, defend the free school system, or other rights guaranteed by the supreme law of the land; but the day will soon come when it will be unpopular *not* to be open and above board in favor of the Constitution and the institutions thereunder, as individuals or political parties.

There are really only three classes of people who oppose organizing to resist the encroachments of the pope as defined by dogma and law: first, diseased-brained individuals who, if they were to have their own throats cut, would gurgle with their dying gasp, "You play too rough!" second, people who are so loyal to the Constitution themselves and so honest-minded that they can not conceive of any one belonging to a "church" whose sole aim is to destroy American laws and institutions and substitute those of a foreign ruler as are presented in these pages—good people, who have not considered what the papal church intends and expects to accomplish, as epitomized in the bishop's oath; third, a class composed of *secret members of the foreign "army,"* who may be camouflaged under the garb of Protestant ministers filling Protestant pulpits, sitting in the editorial chairs of newspapers, or holding the highest positions of honor and influence in various fraternal secret societies.

Like Mr. Wesley, I would not countenance harming Catholics—merely make it impossible for them to harm other people or the principles of this Government; therefore, I say to the men of America: Our greater number constitutes the real danger, where each person believes there are enough men "on the job" to make it unnecessary for them to devote time or money to the cause, forgetting the true saying that "What's everybody's business is nobody's business," and without organization we are as a mob, helpless before well-drilled forces which, while inferior numerically, are resistless and will become supreme unless met with *organized resistance.*

Not only is the Roman church in control of almost the whole foreign element and keeps it segregated as far as possible, rendering proper assimilation out of the question, but she is now concentrating upon the negro, establishing parochial schools for them

deplored the lynchings which had occurred in the South, but had no word in behalf of the victims who were criminally assaulted. Imagine—if your brain is active enough—the negro imbued with the doctrine and law and rights which they expect to enjoy by becoming Catholics, coupled with his natural resentment against the people of the South because of his previous servitude and restless disposition, and taught that he is doing God's will to "persecute and fight"—what is to be expected from this combination? By way of parenthesis, I will ask, WHY is the papal church so concerned about the Negro and Indian in America—*where they may vote*—but gives no attention to the education of the various races of all colors where education is in the hands of her priests? There is absolutely no possibility of federating the Protestant forces, because preachers and editors are usually too preoccupied with their own little affairs, or afraid it would injure their "popularity" to espouse the cause of Americanism. It is said that nature abhors a vacuum: because those voices are silent which should ring out as bugle-calls at the approach of the enemy, other means are being adopted to accomplish that which should have been the first thought of those who presume to mould public opinion but have refused to function: there are now several powerful organizations disseminating information along this line, some of which *WILL* preserve the Constitution, and make its enemies very, *very* conspicuous; and if Americans would preserve the God-given, blood-bought heritage of freedom made possible by the sacrifices of their forefathers and written in the greatest human document ever written, the Constitution of these United States, they must organize! *organize!* ORGANIZE!

"Where duty calls or danger,
Be never wanting there."

One of the greatest enemies of American civilization, one of the most powerful forces for evil in the land, the liquor interests, challenged Protestant Christianity and was buried recently; and just as it required time to get the forces awake to that terrible scourge, so will it require time, money and labor to comprehensively present the PAPAL QUESTION, but when it is fully understood in America then indeed we will see

"THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH CHALLENGED"

AUG 1 1938

