

The Catholic Record

Price of Subscription—\$1.50 per annum. United States & Europe—\$2.00. Publisher and Proprietor, Thomas Coffey, L.L.D. Editors—Rev. James T. Foley, B. A. (Thomas Coffey, L.L.D.) (Rev. D. A. Casey, H. F. Mackintosh.)

LONDON, SATURDAY, AUGUST 22, 1914

NATIONALISM

Perhaps the term has no clearly defined signification commonly accepted. Nationalism is not national sentiment. National sentiment is a good thing, a necessary, vital element in national life; but it is proverbial that we can have too much of a good thing. In a country like Canada the development of a national sentiment is essential to the great work of assimilating diverse racial elements and unifying diverse, often conflicting, local interests.

When national sentiment has fused diverse elements into one people, when it has broadened and unified the common aims and aspirations its great work is done. There still remains of course, the important work of conservation and defence. Beyond this national sentiment ceases to broaden and unify. It degenerates into nationalism, and its influence is narrowing, its tendency is toward national egotism and aggression.

Since the Reformation there has been no great influence broad enough to take up and continue the unifying process where national sentiment necessarily leaves off and becomes a barrier to further progress. The universal Church alone could carry the work on toward the glorious Christian ideal of the brotherhood of man. The Catholic Church had built up the nations of Europe out of the ruins of the Roman Empire and the conquering hordes of barbarians. Elated, intoxicated with the wine of national consciousness, they broke with Christian unity and established national churches. Not only they lost the great broadening and unifying influence of the universal church, not only was religion degraded to the position of handmaid of the state, but national churches intensified hostile national sentiment which has degenerated into the nationalism that has plunged them all into a death-struggle.

In this ghastly death-grip, where millions will be locked with millions, there is no alignment of forces along racial or religious lines. There is no great principle involved on either side. It is nationalism stark mad and uncontrolled by any acknowledged power on earth or in heaven. That one group is on the defensive and the other the aggressors does not, for the moment, matter. Nationalism piled up armaments on land and sea until the people groaned under the staggering burden. This was not done for fun. The war was inevitable; many times in recent years it was imminent. A restless world protested; many advocated some international tribunal. The peace court of the Hague was the feeble attempt

to stem the tide that was carrying Europe on to Armageddon. Its futility was evident. Europe is reaping in the twentieth century what it sowed in the sixteenth.

LIFE ASSURANCE AND ACTIVE SERVICE

In the varied emotions aroused by the calling out of the militia for active service a very important consideration may be lost sight of. While life insurance is important at all times and in all conditions of life it is doubly so at this time. And though the Government of Canada will not fail to do its whole duty generously by the families of those whose patriotism responds to the call of duty, that is no reason why, through negligence or ignorance, any benefits of life insurance they may have acquired should be forfeited. We, therefore, think it well to draw attention to a clause in the Canadian Insurance Act, 1910.

Subsections (b) and (c) of Section 95 read as follows:

(b) "That the insured may, without the consent of the company, engage in the active service of the militia of Canada, notice thereof, however, to be given by or on behalf of the insured to the company within ninety days after the date of his so engaging in such service and such extra premium to be paid during the continuance of such service as the company shall fix in pursuance of the terms of the policy;

(c) That subject to the provisions of paragraph (e) of this subsection, the policy shall be incontestable after not later than two years from its date except for fraud, non-payment of premiums, or for the violation of the conditions of the policy relating to engaging in military service (other than such as mentioned in the next preceding paragraph) or naval service in time of war without the consent in writing of a duly authorized officer of the company.

It is worth emphasizing the fact that the foregoing is from the Insurance Act of Canada as recently revised.

Paragraph (e), referred to above, relates exclusively to the age of the insured and provides that, if the age is understated, the amount payable shall be such as the premium would have purchased at the correct age.

There may be some doubt as to the precise meaning of the clause in the Militia Act with regard to active service "outside of Canada for the defence thereof." The Government's course in making service over the ocean purely voluntary renders the question of military obligation an academic one. But in so far as it affects Life Assurance it is still a practical question which may have important consequences. If the Canadian militia are liable for service outside of Canada at such a time as this, then the whole question is covered by subsection (b) as quoted above. The fact that overseas service is voluntary would have no more bearing than if Ontario militia were asked to volunteer for service in Vancouver. If, on the other hand, the obligation of the Canadian militia is interpreted as confined, in the stricter and narrower sense, to the defence of Canada, then it would appear that those who volunteer for service abroad are "engaging in military service other than such as mentioned in paragraph (b)."

In any case one thing is clear. The friends of those who go into active service whether inside or outside of Canada should, in accordance with the provisions of the Insurance Act, notify the companies on behalf of the insured. They should also read the clause in their policies relating to military service if the policies contain such a clause. If obliged to do so they should then pay "such extra premium as the company shall fix in pursuance of the terms of the policy."

It may be that the companies as a matter of broad policy and patriotism may waive the extra premium to which they are entitled; but the only safe and sane course to pursue is to consider the question in the light of legal rights and obligations. Notifying the companies as required by law will not deprive any one from participating in any privileges that may later be accorded. And it is well to remember that though Tommy Atkins may be "an absent-minded beggar" in times of peace, and the rest of the people his very enthusiastic friends in time of war, when the war is over and financial re-adjustments are taking place he may find that the general public or at least the business public will have grown "absent-minded" to everything not included in business obligations.

If the Life Assurance Companies are disposed to be generous and patriotic now is the acceptable time.

While they must in justice to themselves and to policy-holders safeguard their financial standing, would it not be possible for them to assume such proportion of the financial risk as to make it possible for the Government to relieve the families of those who risk their lives at their country's call of the extra premium for active military service?

THE "IRISH AMERICAN" BOGEY

A few years ago we had the pleasure of listening to T. P. O'Connor, M. P., speaking on the question of Irish Home Rule. No man in the British House of Commons is more highly esteemed. The impress of his personality is recognized on English public life and on English journalism. He told of two young Englishmen who came to speak to him after listening to one of his addresses on the Irish question. They were typical English Tories. They expressed their surprise and gratification at the sense and moderation that characterized T. P.'s exposition of Irish aspirations and demands, and declared that if he represented Irish National feeling truly Home Rule might be a reasonable and satisfactory settlement. "Now," continued Mr. O'Connor, "I have been making that speech for thirty years, yet these young Englishmen, educated, intelligent and well-informed young men, acknowledged that it placed the Irish question in an entirely new light for them. But let an obscure Irishman, anywhere, make some silly blustering statement and forthwith it is blazoned forth to the whole world as representing Irish feeling and Irish sentiment."

The present situation should spare us the wildly exaggerated importance and prominence usually given to such "Irish-American" utterances. Irish Americans are numbered by millions. The "Irish American" bogeys of ante-diluvian Britishers can scarcely be counted by hundreds or even tens. Yet the Toronto Globe, fair and decently informed as it usually is, had a recent editorial inspired by the buncombe of some Irish American whose name we have forgotten, of whom we never heard before or since, and never expect to hear again.

Richard Croker former Tammany leader has forwarded John Redmond \$2,500 to be used for equipping the Nationalist Volunteers who are willing to enlist in the service of Britain. In an interview Mr. Croker said that he was going to the United States to rally Irish and Irish-Americans to enlist in the British forces. "I have a right to do this," he explained, "because representatives of foreign countries in the United States are rallying their reservists to the colors." Whether or not Mr. Croker has such a right we do not feel called upon to decide; but as he is reported to be politically opposed to his successor in office, Charles F. Murphy, and as his proposed action may be regarded with little favor by some Americans, it will not improbably be the occasion of some political language, perhaps not so venomous as we are accustomed to in Canada, yet sufficiently lurid to equip a whole army of Irish American bogeys.

In case this or something else should be the occasion of some irresponsible bluster in the States, we would ask the Mail and the News of Toronto, unless the exigencies of local politics positively demand it, not to scare dear old British women of either sex too recklessly.

HOME RULE CERTAIN

The factitious and factious opposition to Home Rule is dead and can never be revived. English Tories would not dare to return to their old desperate tactics even if they were dead to patriotism. But the Unionist party is far from being dead to patriotism. Toronto Tories are more impervious to the logic of events. The Mail and Empire, even after the outbreak of war, has time and space to denounce "Aequith's criminal folly," and, assuming that the status quo had been agreed upon as a temporary settlement of the Irish question, calmly suggests that such settlement be made permanent. The Mail and Empire has not yet realized that the question is settled. "Criminal folly" there was pending the settlement but there are few in the British Empire to-day who would attempt to saddle it on England's great prime minister.

The Ottawa Citizen rebuking the Montreal Star's war-mad hysterical

denunciation of "pacifism" makes these pertinent remarks:

"Particularly nonsensical is its reference to the unquestionable loyalty of 'the Conservative Opposition.' It may surprise the Star to learn that the disloyalty and treachery of the Conservative Opposition had much to do with bringing on the great European war. That this is not a party claim but a simple statement of fact is completely borne out by the arrival in this country of the last issues of influential German newspapers, published during the week which elapsed before the actual beginning of hostilities. The important Frankfurter Zeitung, the great Liberal journal of Germany, in a remarkably accurate forecast of the attitude which the various nations were likely to assume in the event of a war between Germany, on the one hand, and France and Russia, on the other, says of England: 'A country of which one great province is in open rebellion cannot be imagined to be desirous of incurring military dangers outside its own territory.'"

The Citizen interprets British feeling much more truly than the Mail and Empire or the Star. With no desire to revive party strife or party bitterness we quote the Citizen's common sense view of the recent "criminal folly" with regard to the struggle for Irish self-government. That "criminal folly," however, is dead and buried. Let us turn to something more pleasant, more edifying and more reassuring when lowering clouds and thickening dangers threaten the very existence of European civilization. T. P. O'Connor referring to John Redmond's great speech gives us this reassuring account of its effect on the House of Commons!

"No speech in modern times has created such immediate and tremendous effect. The House cheered till it was hoarse. The Tories as well as the Liberals, many with tears in their eyes, rushed to shake Redmond's hand, and the Tories especially declared that their hostility to Home Rule was now gone. 'Crowds waiting outside Buckingham Palace and Downing street to hear the declaration of war at midnight on Monday cheered Redmond. His photograph in all the moving pictures shows was received with wild cheers. From Ireland came an immense, universal, response, backing Redmond's words, and an astonishing and unprecedented scene was witnessed of volunteers and masses of people accompanying soldiers to stations with cheers as they took their departure for the war.'"

Ireland's immediate and universal endorsement of Redmond's stand is the fruit of the complete understanding and hearty co-operation of the democracies of the two islands. Even the classes who cling, so tentatively, so desperately, to their privileges can no longer pretend to doubt the loyalty of Ireland and Irishmen. Home Rule is won. Its final triumph has not been delayed but hastened by the war.

BISHOP BUDKA AND THE EMPIRE

Yorkton, Sask., August 7.—A very enthusiastic and largely attended meeting of citizens of Yorkton held to consider the manifesto issued by Bishop Budka, of the Greek Catholic Church, calling on the Canadian Ukrainians to return to Austria to fight for that country against Great Britain and a resolution carried by an overwhelming majority condemning Bishop Budka's action and directing the attention of Premier Borden to the same with the request that he take action in the matter.—London Free Press.

The foregoing press despatch calls for a few observations as it gives an entirely misleading account of the action taken by Bishop Budka.

War between Germany and England was declared on August 1st. The pastoral letter of Bishop Budka to his people was dated Winnipeg, July 27th. Hence His Lordship in writing his letter cannot possibly be quoted as the "patriots" of Yorkton apparently quoted him, as inviting his compatriots to "return to Austria to fight for that country against Great Britain."

When his letter was written Austria and Serbia were formally at war and signs pointed to Russia's early entrance to the quarrel. Few people thought at the time that England would so soon find herself in the midst of the struggle. The letter appealed to the Ruthenians to answer the call to defend their homes, their wives and country against the Serbians and possibly against the Russians. To read into the letter an appeal to fight against Great Britain is,

therefore, an outrageous distortion of facts.

The unbiased student of affairs will find nothing to condemn and much to applaud in the sentiments of Bishop Budka towards his motherland. The following extract from the Bishop's pastoral is full of patriotism that must command the respect of all lovers of their country.

"At the present time the situation is very bad. To all the calamities there is added one more—a war with Serbia at the present moment and possibly in a short time with Russia also. A war of incalculable consequences which can change not only the structure of Austria but also of the whole of Europe. A war which may affect especially us Ruthenians. 'The old emperor could not pass his life peacefully. He commenced to rule in 1848 and at the end of his long life the Almighty has not spared him from this tremendous calamity now befalling his subjects and he plunges into war. An official announcement reached Canada calling the Austrian subjects to return home and to be ready for the defence of the empire. God knows what may happen. It is possible that Galicia will have to be defended from the greed of Russia. It is possible that it will be necessary to defend our parents, wives, children, brothers and our country from the never satisfied enemy.'"

"It is possible that after the war we shall remain in Austria just as we are now, or maybe we will be reinforced by the millions of our brothers, who are now under Russian government, but it is also possible that we may find ourselves under the iron hand of the Muscovite despot. All this is in the hands of the Lord, we cannot foresee what the result will be. Anyhow all the Austrian subjects at home ought to be in a position to defend our native country, our dear brothers and sisters, our nation. Whoever will get a call to join the colors ought to immediately go to defend the endangered fatherland. All the deserters and those who did not show up for conscription are being pardoned by the emperor and will be free from any penalties providing they will immediately call on the Austrian consul and will go to defend the fatherland. Those who have decided to spend the rest of their lives in their adopted land, however, and are partly bound to take part in the present situation of Austria and our brothers. Our sympathy should not finish with the reading of papers to know the war situation, but we ought to help our old motherland.

The declaration of war by Great Britain has introduced a new factor into the situation and placed the Ruthenians and others in a particularly trying dilemma; and it is noteworthy that Bishop Budka's newspaper, the Canadian Ruthenian, makes it plain that his Lordship and his people are with Canada and the Empire where our common interests are at stake. To quote the Ruthenian's own words:

"We love our adopted country and will gladly, if necessity requires it, shed our blood in her defense."

The secular press which found space for the misleading despatch from Yorkton has had no room for the true version of the story.

A PROBLEM OF RACE

Some time ago in dealing with the sad state of affairs in Portugal the RECORD quoted a well known press correspondent who finds in the adulteration of the race by East Indian, Brazilian and especially by negro blood, a chief factor in the national decadence. In Lisbon at one time the proportion of slaves to freemen was as one to ten. In the sixteenth century the slaves formed one-sixth of the population. These slaves became merged with the native population. All over the South of Portugal the woolly hair, dark skin and other characteristics of the negro race are plainly visible. The contamination of the lower race took place centuries ago, the contamination of the upper classes is still going on. This admixture of negro blood has had a deleterious effect on the moral and physical fibre of the nation. It is held responsible for the lack of manly resistance to the tyranny and oppression of the past few years.

In the Southern States of America, where the negro slaves were very numerous, the commingling of the races has been slight and the nation has thus been spared the evils that have undermined the national character in Portugal. But it would seem that the condition of the colored population is even now such as threatens to give cause for real alarm. In a recent article in the Dublin Review Mr. Wilfrid Ward offers the following remarks regarding the negro in the States:

"The negro, in the Southern States, very prolific and the negro question is one of the great difficulties of the

day. From Northerner and Southerner alike I heard but one opinion as to the consequences of their sudden emancipation—that they had been for the most part disastrous. The negro is by long habit accustomed and skilled to obey, but incompetent to look after himself, still more incompetent to direct others. That the negro is singularly well drilled and, in many departments, skilful in carrying out the orders of white men, is evident even to the casual traveller who sees their remarkable efficiency as porters and waiters. The almost acrobatic skill with which the waiting in the dining cars is achieved aroused my enthusiasm. The work is most difficult, for meals are served a la carte and each passenger has a different menu, and as I could not express my appreciation by applause I used often to give double the customary tip. Their intelligence in explaining the very complicated arrangements which cross-country journeys often involve struck me equally. I was told that in the old days of slavery they were quite admirable as carpenters, blacksmiths, joiners and generally as handicraftsmen, always working under white masters. Now they have attempted to set up on their own account and have lost much of their former skill. They quarrel with each other and are quite unable to direct any business efficiently. More seriously than all is the moral transformation. A black slave was one on whose morality his employer could most absolutely depend. Now the negro is a by-word for immorality. Certainly if testimony, universal so far as my opportunity allowed of investigation, is to have its weight, the sudden and complete emancipation of the slaves was one instance added to the many which our age has witnessed of acting on a theory as to the value of liberty—without regard to the facts of human nature. The negroes are neither better nor happier in consequence, and they are far less efficient. If the colored men exercised the franchise which is now theirs by law their political power in the South would be very great. But public opinion makes this impossible. If a negro attempted to vote, I was told, he would infallibly be shot."

Disquieting symptoms surely. Will time solve the problem? It will if the agencies that co-operated in rescuing from barbarism the hordes that overran the Roman empire and brought Europe to its present stage of civilization can be effectually directed to the problem of saving the negro from the despotism of his own degraded instincts. In the teachings and sacraments of the Church, and in them alone, will the negro find the true emancipation of heart and soul that must be secured to keep the emancipation of body from degenerating into a "delusion, a mockery and a snare."

THE LOYALTY OF CATHOLICS At dinner at a well-known tourist resort on the Muskoka Lakes a very estimable old gentleman remarked to us how surprised and delighted he was at the loyalty of the Irish people at this time of crisis. "Do you know," he said, "I believe some Roman Catholics are just as loyal as anyone else." Evidently the admission cost him something.

Now why should the loyalty of Catholics be a matter of surprise? In these days, when the schoolmaster is popularly supposed to be abroad, surely one might expect a little clear thinking, at least among the educated classes. And yet how few non-Catholics we meet who seem to have grasped the distinction between spiritual and civil allegiance. The extraordinary ignorance of the Catholic position that passes for knowledge even amongst educated non-Catholics is simply astounding. We are subjects of a foreign potentate, they say, and therefore cannot be loyal to the national authority, since no man can serve two masters. The bogey of Papal sovereignty looks formidable, but it is only a bogey. In the minds of Catholics it leads to no confusion of thought. To us the distinction is clear-cut, and the most natural thing in the world. We simply believe in rendering to Caesar the things that are Caesar's and to God the things that are God's. Our allegiance in things spiritual is given whole and entire to the Pope as the representative of Christ, but not one jot or tittle of our civil allegiance do we yield to the head of the Church. If we could imagine an occasion arising when the Pope as a temporal prince made war upon the Empire, we Catholics, would be found arrayed on the side of the Union Jack. We

are proud to take our religion from Rome, but we will not suffer anyone to question our right to swear fealty to the freest flag that courts the breeze of heaven. Nor will that right of ours be ever challenged by this "foreign potentate." His kingdom is not of this world, and his ambitions are concerned solely with the souls entrusted to him by the Master. St. Paul enjoins us to be subject to the higher powers. The Catholic Church has ever inculcated loyalty to the civil authority. The Anarchists and Socialists who to-day threaten to destroy all authority are not the allies of the Church but her most bitter opponents. All authority is from God, and he who fears God must perform honor the king. When the Spanish Armada threatened the shores of England the persecuted English Catholics hurried to be enrolled in defence of the realm. Catholics have died for the flag in every quarter of the globe. Catholic blood has cemented the Empire wherever the Union Jack has braved the smoke of battle. Irish Catholics fought side by side with English Protestants under Wellington, in the Crimean War, in South Africa in our own day. Many an Irish lad is even now courting a resting place on the battlefields of Europe in defence of the same red flag of Britain. French-Canadians, no less than Ontario Protestants died fighting on the South African veldt.

Yes, Catholics "are just as loyal as anyone else." We will suffer no aspersions on our allegiance to the flag. No man dare forbid us "God bless the Pope," but because of that "God save the King" loses none of its significance when uttered by Catholic lips. COLUMBA

KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS VINDICATED In view of the bogus oaths in circulation it cannot fail to be of the keenest interest to Catholics generally to have the words of the obligation taken by members of the Fourth Degree of the Knights of Columbus, "I pledge myself, which has now for the first time appeared in the press, runs as follows: "I swear to support the Constitution of the United States." (Outside of the United States the name of the country is substituted for the United States.) "I pledge myself, as a Catholic citizen and a Knight of Columbus, to enlighten myself fully upon my duties as a citizen and to conscientiously perform such duties entirely in the interest of my country and regardless of all personal consequences. I pledge myself to do all in my power to preserve the integrity and purity of the ballot and to promote obedience and respect for law and order. I promise to practice my religion openly and consistently, but without ostentation, and to so conduct myself in public affairs and in the exercise of public virtue as to reflect nothing but credit upon our Holy Church, to the end that she may flourish and our country prosper to the greater honor and glory of God. A trial of the greatest interest to Knights of Columbus and to the Catholics of the United States and Canada as well as non-Catholics—and among them, to none more than to the small band of loud-mouthed bigots who rail against the Church—was held in Waterville, Minnesota, Wednesday, July 29. (We borrow this account mainly from the Bulletin of St. Paul.) This was an action of criminal libel brought by E. M. Lawless, editor of the Waterville Sentinel, against M. Morrison and G. E. Morrison, father and son, editors and publishers of the Mankato Morning Journal, of Mankato, Minn. The libel consisted in the charging of Lawless with having taken the bogus Knights of Columbus oath, which has been so largely circulated in the United States and in Canada during the past year and a half. We will not attempt to reproduce this oath, but suffice it is to say that it has been published as the Knights of Columbus oath and as the Fourth Degree oath, and is, in letter and insinuation, one of the foulest libels imaginable. It is in some respects a revamp of the old hoax which has for many years passed muster in the press of bigots as the Jesuit oath.

OBLIGATION PUT IN EVIDENCE The outcome of this trial is of more than local interest. It is of national and international importance. The Knights of Columbus have often been accused of taking an alleged oath which, if the charge were true, would forever condemn them to the merited execration of their fellow-men. But this was the first time that an individual knight was directly charged with the offence. It furnished the order the first opportunity it had ever had to put the real obligation of the Fourth Degree in evidence and make it a matter of court record which any citizen may read for himself. Herein lies the importance of the case which establishes a precedent in the history of the order.

In the trial the defendants made no attempt to establish the authenticity of the bogus oath, but threw themselves on the mercy of the

are proud to take our religion from Rome, but we will not suffer anyone to question our right to swear fealty to the freest flag that courts the breeze of heaven. Nor will that right of ours be ever challenged by this "foreign potentate." His kingdom is not of this world, and his ambitions are concerned solely with the souls entrusted to him by the Master. St. Paul enjoins us to be subject to the higher powers. The Catholic Church has ever inculcated loyalty to the civil authority. The Anarchists and Socialists who to-day threaten to destroy all authority are not the allies of the Church but her most bitter opponents. All authority is from God, and he who fears God must perform honor the king. When the Spanish Armada threatened the shores of England the persecuted English Catholics hurried to be enrolled in defence of the realm. Catholics have died for the flag in every quarter of the globe. Catholic blood has cemented the Empire wherever the Union Jack has braved the smoke of battle. Irish Catholics fought side by side with English Protestants under Wellington, in the Crimean War, in South Africa in our own day. Many an Irish lad is even now courting a resting place on the battlefields of Europe in defence of the same red flag of Britain. French-Canadians, no less than Ontario Protestants died fighting on the South African veldt.

Yes, Catholics "are just as loyal as anyone else." We will suffer no aspersions on our allegiance to the flag. No man dare forbid us "God bless the Pope," but because of that "God save the King" loses none of its significance when uttered by Catholic lips. COLUMBA

KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS VINDICATED In view of the bogus oaths in circulation it cannot fail to be of the keenest interest to Catholics generally to have the words of the obligation taken by members of the Fourth Degree of the Knights of Columbus, "I pledge myself, which has now for the first time appeared in the press, runs as follows: "I swear to support the Constitution of the United States." (Outside of the United States the name of the country is substituted for the United States.) "I pledge myself, as a Catholic citizen and a Knight of Columbus, to enlighten myself fully upon my duties as a citizen and to conscientiously perform such duties entirely in the interest of my country and regardless of all personal consequences. I pledge myself to do all in my power to preserve the integrity and purity of the ballot and to promote obedience and respect for law and order. I promise to practice my religion openly and consistently, but without ostentation, and to so conduct myself in public affairs and in the exercise of public virtue as to reflect nothing but credit upon our Holy Church, to the end that she may flourish and our country prosper to the greater honor and glory of God. A trial of the greatest interest to Knights of Columbus and to the Catholics of the United States and Canada as well as non-Catholics—and among them, to none more than to the small band of loud-mouthed bigots who rail against the Church—was held in Waterville, Minnesota, Wednesday, July 29. (We borrow this account mainly from the Bulletin of St. Paul.) This was an action of criminal libel brought by E. M. Lawless, editor of the Waterville Sentinel, against M. Morrison and G. E. Morrison, father and son, editors and publishers of the Mankato Morning Journal, of Mankato, Minn. The libel consisted in the charging of Lawless with having taken the bogus Knights of Columbus oath, which has been so largely circulated in the United States and in Canada during the past year and a half. We will not attempt to reproduce this oath, but suffice it is to say that it has been published as the Knights of Columbus oath and as the Fourth Degree oath, and is, in letter and insinuation, one of the foulest libels imaginable. It is in some respects a revamp of the old hoax which has for many years passed muster in the press of bigots as the Jesuit oath.

OBLIGATION PUT IN EVIDENCE The outcome of this trial is of more than local interest. It is of national and international importance. The Knights of Columbus have often been accused of taking an alleged oath which, if the charge were true, would forever condemn them to the merited execration of their fellow-men. But this was the first time that an individual knight was directly charged with the offence. It furnished the order the first opportunity it had ever had to put the real obligation of the Fourth Degree in evidence and make it a matter of court record which any citizen may read for himself. Herein lies the importance of the case which establishes a precedent in the history of the order.

In the trial the defendants made no attempt to establish the authenticity of the bogus oath, but threw themselves on the mercy of the

are proud to take our religion from Rome, but we will not suffer anyone to question our right to swear fealty to the freest flag that courts the breeze of heaven. Nor will that right of ours be ever challenged by this "foreign potentate." His kingdom is not of this world, and his ambitions are concerned solely with the souls entrusted to him by the Master. St. Paul enjoins us to be subject to the higher powers. The Catholic Church has ever inculcated loyalty to the civil authority. The Anarchists and Socialists who to-day threaten to destroy all authority are not the allies of the Church but her most bitter opponents. All authority is from God, and he who fears God must perform honor the king. When the Spanish Armada threatened the shores of England the persecuted English Catholics hurried to be enrolled in defence of the realm. Catholics have died for the flag in every quarter of the globe. Catholic blood has cemented the Empire wherever the Union Jack has braved the smoke of battle. Irish Catholics fought side by side with English Protestants under Wellington, in the Crimean War, in South Africa in our own day. Many an Irish lad is even now courting a resting place on the battlefields of Europe in defence of the same red flag of Britain. French-Canadians, no less than Ontario Protestants died fighting on the South African veldt.

Yes, Catholics "are just as loyal as anyone else." We will suffer no aspersions on our allegiance to the flag. No man dare forbid us "God bless the Pope," but because of that "God save the King" loses none of its significance when uttered by Catholic lips. COLUMBA

KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS VINDICATED In view of the bogus oaths in circulation it cannot fail to be of the keenest interest to Catholics generally to have the words of the obligation taken by members of the Fourth Degree of the Knights of Columbus, "I pledge myself, which has now for the first time appeared in the press, runs as follows: "I swear to support the Constitution of the United States." (Outside of the United States the name of the country is substituted for the United States.) "I pledge myself, as a Catholic citizen and a Knight of Columbus, to enlighten myself fully upon my duties as a citizen and to conscientiously perform such duties entirely in the interest of my country and regardless of all personal consequences. I pledge myself to do all in my power to preserve the integrity and purity of the ballot and to promote obedience and respect for law and order. I promise to practice my religion openly and consistently, but without ostentation, and to so conduct myself in public affairs and in the exercise of public virtue as to reflect nothing but credit upon our Holy Church, to the end that she may flourish and our country prosper to the greater honor and glory of God. A trial of the greatest interest to Knights of Columbus and to the Catholics of the United States and Canada as well as non-Catholics—and among them, to none more than to the small band of loud-mouthed bigots who rail against the Church—was held in Waterville, Minnesota, Wednesday, July 29. (We borrow this account mainly from the Bulletin of St. Paul.) This was an action of criminal libel brought by E. M. Lawless, editor of the Waterville Sentinel, against M. Morrison and G. E. Morrison, father and son, editors and publishers of the Mankato Morning Journal, of Mankato, Minn. The libel consisted in the charging of Lawless with having taken the bogus Knights of Columbus oath, which has been so largely circulated in the United States and in Canada during the past year and a half. We will not attempt to reproduce this oath, but suffice it is to say that it has been published as the Knights of Columbus oath and as the Fourth Degree oath, and is, in letter and insinuation, one of the foulest libels imaginable. It is in some respects a revamp of the old hoax which has for many years passed muster in the press of bigots as the Jesuit oath.

OBLIGATION PUT IN EVIDENCE The outcome of this trial is of more than local interest. It is of national and international importance. The Knights of Columbus have often been accused of taking an alleged oath which, if the charge were true, would forever condemn them to the merited execration of their fellow-men. But this was the first time that an individual knight was directly charged with the offence. It furnished the order the first opportunity it had ever had to put the real obligation of the Fourth Degree in evidence and make it a matter of court record which any citizen may read for himself. Herein lies the importance of the case which establishes a precedent in the history of the order.

In the trial the defendants made no attempt to establish the authenticity of the bogus oath, but threw themselves on the mercy of the