

# The Catholic Record.

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

VOLUME XVII.

LONDON, ONTARIO, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 1895.

NO. 882.

## The Storm.

The tempest rages wild and high,  
The waves lift up their voice and cry  
Fierce answers to the angry sky.  
Miserere Domine.

Through the black night and driving rain  
A ship is struggling all in vain  
To live upon the stormy main:  
Miserere Domine.

The thunder's roar, the lightning's glare,  
Vain is it now to strive or dare;  
A cry goes up of great despair,  
Miserere Domine.

The stormy voices of the main,  
The moaning winds and pelting rain  
Beat on the nursery window pane.  
Miserere Domine.

Warm comforted was the little bed,  
Soft pillow was the little head;  
"The storm will wake the child," they said,  
Miserere Domine.

Cowering among his pillows white,  
He prays, his blue eyes dim with fright,  
"Father save those at sea to-night!"  
Miserere Domine.

The morning shone all clear and gay  
On a ship at anchor in the bay  
And on a little child at play.  
Gloria tibi Domine.

—ADELAIDE PROCTOR.

## ESSENTIALLY WRONG.

A Seed of Evil—It can Never Prove a Blessing but by Its Barrenness.

Anent the grand encampment of Knights Templars in Boston, our esteemed contemporary, *The Sacred Heart Review*, recurs to the opinions of Masonry expressed by two Presidents of the United States. It is interesting reading for Catholics, in view of the position of the Church toward this organization, and the recent decree of the Holy See affecting kindred orders. The *Review* says:

John Quincy Adams, the sixth President of the United States, were he alive to-day, considering his well-known views of Freemasonry, could hardly be expected to look on this gathering with pleasure. We have been reading recently with great interest his "Letters to the Masonic Institution," published in Boston, 1817. From these letters it is clear that John Quincy Adams and his father, John Adams, the second President of the United States, looked with great disfavor on the Masons, and all their branches, including the Knights Templars. It appears that in 1831 during a fierce controversy on the merits and demerits of these organizations it was said that both father and son had belonged to the order.

John Quincy Adams, speaking for himself and his illustrious father, wrote a letter to the *Boston Press* dated August 22, 1831, in which he denied in very emphatic language that he or his father ever belonged to the craft.

In the same letter, he says: "The use of the name of Washington to give an odor of sanctity to the institution is, in my opinion, as unwarrantable as that of my father's name."

This information regarding Washington, in view of the claims made to-day that he was a member, is very interesting, as it comes from a man who had every opportunity of knowing the facts. He gives a peculiar and rather striking instance of the length to which Masons will go to claim illustrious men as members. He calls attention to "an affidavit sworn to before a Masonic Magistrate by Master Mason, that he sat with me (Adams) twice at meetings of a lodge at Pittsfield. Mr. Adams avers that this oath is false, and that he never entered a house in Pittsfield in his life. Again, writing to a friend, under date Sept. 22, 1831, he says:

"My dear sir, go to the records of the courts. You will find witnesses refusing to testify upon the express ground of Masonic obligations, avowing that they consider them paramount to the laws of the land. You will see them contumacious to the decisions of the Court, fined and imprisoned for contempt, suffer the punishment rather than bear the testimony. . . . You will find much more. You will find Masonic grand and petit juries, summoned by Masonic sheriffs eager to sit upon the trials, perverting truth and justice when admitted on challenge to the favor; and last of all you will find one of the men, most deeply implicated in murder, screened from conviction by one Mason upon his jury."

It appears that Mr. Adams wrote several friendly letters to Col. William L. Stone, a Mason in good standing who wrote a book in defence of Masonry. Mr. Adams argued from Col. Stone's admissions that no loyal citizen or Christian man could belong to the order. He copies and animadverts at length on the form of oath which Col. Stone admits was taken by the Entered Apprentice, the first degree of Masonry. He gives part of this oath, as follows:—

"I, A. B., do, of my own free will and accord, in the presence of God, and of this right-worshipful lodge, erected to God, and dedicated to holy St. John, hereby and hereon most solemnly and sincerely promise and swear, that I will always hail, forever conceal, and never reveal, any secret or secrets of Masons or Masonry which at this time or at any time hereafter, shall be communicated to me as such, except it be to a true and lawful brother within the body of a just and regular lodge,

etc. . . . All this I solemnly and sincerely swear, with a full and hearty resolution to perform the same, without any evasion, equivocation or mental reservation, under no less a penalty than to have my throat cut across from ear to ear, my tongue plucked out by the roots, and buried in the rough sands of the sea, a cable's length from shore, etc. . . . So help me God, to keep me steadfast in this my obligations of an Entered Apprentice."

Mr. Adams stated that this was a modified and less severe form of the oath usually taken. Yet he said and tried to show that even "this form of an oath and penalty is itself a violation of all religion and of the Constitution of the Commonwealth." He then formulates his objections to the oath in the following precise form:

"First, That it is an extrajudicial oath, and as such contrary to the laws of the land.

"Secondly, That it is a violation of the precept of Jesus Christ—swear not at all.

"Thirdly, That this oath pledges the candidate, in the name of God, that he will always hail, forever conceal, and never reveal, any of the secrets, parts or points of the mysteries of Freemasonry to any person, except it be a true and lawful Mason, or within the body of a just and regular lodge of such. . . . That the candidate when he takes the oath is kept in total ignorance of what these secrets of the craft consist. He knows not the nature or extent of the oath that he takes. He is sworn to keep secret he knows not what. . . . He swears to reveal the secrets of the craft to no person except a brother Mason. The single exception expressed is an exclusion of all others. There is no exception for the authority of the law, or for the confession enjoined upon the Catholic brethren by their religion. I use this illustration to show that the intrinsic import of the oath is incompatible with law, civil and religious."

Mr. Adams writes at length on the unnatural character of the penalty and the horrible ideas suggested by it. He says:

"It is an oath of which a common cannibal should be ashamed. Even in the barbarous days of antiquity, Homer tells you, that when Achilles dragged the dead body of Hector round the walls of Troy, 'it was a disgraceful deed, and Plato severely censures Homer for even introducing this incident into his poem. A mangled body, after death, was a thought disgusting even to heathens. . . . The Constitution of the United States, and of Massachusetts, prohibit the infliction of cruel or unusual punishment even by the authority of law. But no butcher would mutilate the carcass of a bullock or a swine as the Masonic candidate swears consent to the mutilation of his own, for the breach of an absurd and senseless secret."

He next shows the illegal character of the promise not to reveal any of the secrets or mysteries of Freemasonry to any person except a Mason.

"This promise," he says, "like the administration of the oath, is, in its terms, contrary to the law of the land."

"The laws of this and every civilized country make it the duty of every citizen to testify the whole truth of acts deemed by legislative bodies or judicial tribunals material to the issue of the investigation before them. It is also the duty of a good citizen to denounce and reveal to the authorities established to execute the laws against criminals any secret crimes of which he has in any manner acquired the knowledge. Now, there is nothing in the arts, parts or points of the mysteries of Freemasonry which, in the trial of a judicial cause, or in an investigation of a legislative assembly, may not be justly deemed material to the issue before the court or legislature. . . . Of its materiality the judges or the legislators, have exclusive right to decide. . . . The Entered Apprentice promises never to reveal to any person under the canopy of heaven that which the laws of his country may the next day after he makes the promise make it his duty to reveal to any court of justice before which he may be summoned to appear. The promise is, therefore, unlawful. The oath is therefore," continues Mr. Adams "a double violation of the law of the land and of the law of God. It is in its own nature a seminal principle of conspiracy."

"A more perfect agent," says this book, "for the devising and execution of conspiracies against Church and State could scarcely have been conceived. . . . He then enumerates the conspiracies hatched by European Masons against civil governments, mentioning Rome, Naples, Portugal, Spain and Mexico, and says:—

"An obvious danger attending all associations of men connected by secret obligations, springs from their susceptibility to abuse in being converted into engines for the overthrow of the control of established governments. The law of Masonry was to them more than that of civil government or of the Deity, even when it was known directly to conflict with them."

Regarding the only feature of Masonry for which any credit could be claimed, namely, the mutual assistance the members give each other, he says:—

"This argument, which has probably made more Freemasons than any other, would be good in its defence were it not for two objections. One of them is that the pledge to assist is indiscriminate, making little or no difference between the good or bad nature of the actions to promote which a co-operation may be invoked. The other is that the engagement implies a duty of preference of one member of a society to the disadvantage of another who may be in all respects his superior. It establishes as standard of merit conflicting with that established by the Christian or the social system, either or both of which ought to be of paramount obligation. . . . There have been men whose rapidity of personal and political advancement it would be difficult to explain by any other cause than this, that they have generally been understood to be bright Masons."

As to the age of Masonry it is claimed to have originated about the beginning of the last century. Mr. Adams' conclusion, very much out of harmony with the rejoicings now heard in Boston at the approach of the Sir Knights, is:—

"Masonry ought to be forever abolished. It is wrong—essentially wrong—a seed of evil which can never produce any good. It may perish in the ground—it may never rise to bear fruit; but whatever fruit it does bear must be rank poison; it can never prove a blessing but by its barrenness."

## WHO ARE THE JESUITS?

Barcelona, August 10.

What secret charm has the name of Jesuit to awaken always, whenever or wherever pronounced, the opposing affections of love or hatred. Symbol for some of virtue, of sacrifice, and of learning and of wisdom, it is for others the symbol of superstition, of hypocrisy and astuteness, of avarice and insatiable ambition. He who bears this name knows that he is subject to the espionage of the curious, to calumny, to persecution and to exile. And, nevertheless, the Jesuit passes through the waves of the entire world, often hostile, yet with a face serene and humble, but not dismayed; firm, yet not audacious; carrying wherever he wishes, without shame, without ostentation—the glorious insignia of his name. Is it necessary to scatter the seeds of the Divine Word in the hearts of a people buried in the lethargy of sin and of unbelief? There goes the Jesuit, unarmed and alone, without considering or knowing whether he meets death or victory. Solely animated by the great and unwarlike thirst for the conquest of souls for Jesus Christ, he even dares to traverse oceans and march through waterless deserts and inhospitable regions in order to carry the light of the Faith and of civilization to souls brutalized by ignorance and superstition. There goes also the Jesuit, dividing with the sons of other religious orders these difficult tasks of the Apostolate, to meet sooner or later certain death, now obstructed by the arrows of the savage, already wounded by the rigors of the climate, and the incessant labors of his heroic mission. Is there a necessity for soldiers who can fight bravely and faithfully beneath the banner of science, in order that they may extend and consolidate its conquests and increase the interests of truth in human intelligences? Well, there is the Jesuit, consuming in so noble an enterprise, his strength, his life, his health, without ever surrendering—nor wearied; not even then neglecting the painful exercises of meditation, of prayer and of study. Whilst instead, in vain will you search for him in the paths frequented by ambition, by riches, by pleasure, or the dissipation of public life. The day in which, after solemn and decisive proofs, he puts on the costume in which he glories, he made formal renunciation of all these things, promised to be poor as his Divine Master, and as Him, humble, chaste, and obedient, even unto death, although it should be the death of the Cross. He knows very well that only by maintaining firmly this promise could he remain incorporated with the holy order, that receives him into its bosom as an affectionate mother; and it would separate him from her as a severe and inflexible judge in that moment in which he should be unfaithful to the vows with which he freely bound himself.

Nevertheless, it is a rare case amongst religious orders. None more execrated, none more vilified amongst men, none more hated and feared than the Jesuit. When the winds of the Revolution had not been able to move the foundations of the temple, of the monastery and of the throne, when still their impetus was not sufficient to cut down the true Christian faith, whose roots were buried in the hearts of a Christian people, already the Jesuit was the first object of their hatred. He walked wandering, exiled, persecuted and marked out as a dangerous enemy of public tranquility, of public institutions and of the national laws. The special object of Lutheran hatred, pursued with the bitterest malice by the Jansenist generation, by the sons of the *regalismo* and the pupils of the Encyclopædia, by those monsters of '93 and those criminals of '48, as well as to-day, always

enveloped in the general persecution, which the Universal Church suffers, continuing to be the privileged victim of their hatred. But in opposition to this diabolical hatred of the Masons, of heretics, of the impious, of the unbeliever and of men deluded by them, is to be found ranged in their defence, the undeviating love of the Supreme Pontiff, of the hierarchy of all ranks, of the councils, provincial and national, of honorable writers, of the truly learned and of the larger portion of the most sound and select of Christian society in the old and new world. But is it not strange, high inexplicable at first sight, this contrast? Yet, nevertheless, this contrast is perfectly logical. The Jesuit is loved for the same reason that he is hated. He is loved for being an active instrument of Christian propaganda. He is loved as the educator of youth, as the defender and apostle of faith, as the avowed enemy of heresy, and of all classes of rebellion against the faith—these are precisely the foundations of the mortal hatred with which the revolution distinguishes and anathematizes him.

If you wish to discover this clearly, and even understand the entire extension of the roots and motives of this hatred,—if you wish to see in a few pages the machinations and malicious schemes of which especially the "La Compania" are the victims, you have only to read a small, cheap volume—one which will soon have its translations in the libraries of the States—styled "Who Are The Jesuits?" an apology, short but powerful, energetic and unanswerable. In the comparatively few pages of this golden book, there is not a word which is not to the purpose, nor one argument which is not solidly based on incontrovertible facts, with the valor and severity of which there is no fear that with the accompanying judgment and verdict, there does not go, passing in review, all the accusations directed against the order, even the most grave—even those which appear to some as unanswerable—without disfiguring or making little of them, but presenting them in all their nakedness, and such as have gone forth a thousand times from the lips of their enemies. Will it be necessary to say that all these are left completely vanquished, and there is thus demonstrated the bad faith of their authors. Who after reading this little book still persists in his hatred of the Jesuits, indeed, one can say, his heart is completely hardened against the truth, or his mind needs light to understand it.

Subjected to whatever test or trial, the cause of the Jesuits comes out triumphant, even when they have accumulated every class of accusations. One of the greatest proofs of the innocence of the criminal is the contradictions of the witnesses presented against them, because these contradictions stand out in relief in the second chapter of this little volume and serve to explain the origin and injustice which has inspired them. In the face of this testimony, discordant in itself, yet asserted against the Jesuits, the reader clearly sees successively appear the unanimous praise of saints, of founders of religious orders, of pontiffs, of prelates, of writers learned and illustrious. The proofs which proceed from these approbations are complete and obvious.

What in sound logic can one deduce from an institution hated by Jansen, by Voltair, by Pampal, and loved by St. Alphonsus Liguori, St. Philip Neri and St. Vincent de Paul; by De Maistre, by Pio Nonno? Who would draw from such premises that this institution was bad, execrable, rotten, and a dangerous enemy to society and the Church? Certainly he would merit to be sent to an asylum of lunatics, if already he was not worthy of occupying a prominent place in the ranks of these false friends of the public community.

There is a fact in the history of "La Compania" which is given as a pretext to carry to extremes these attacks, and that event is its suppression. Of it, and of the true attitude of Clement XIV., the ninth chapter of the book treats freely, and is therefore worthy of study, as much for the severe form and impartiality with which it is written, as for the decisive reasonings and conclusions with which the memory of the Pontiff is revindicated, although insulted and vilified by the praises of his enemies. Praise from such a source is the greatest and most terrible misfortune that could fall over the sepulchre of the Vicar of Jesus Christ. The conclusion of the work is a magnificent *resumé* of all that is previously asserted, and is at the same time remarkable, because it expresses the secret of the power and vital force of the society. We cannot do better than transcribe those valiant words, worthy of being written in golden characters: "Terrible is the trial the Jesuits have to sustain in this century of apostasy. Notwithstanding all this, they weary themselves and spend their very lives for the welfare of the people. They receive nothing in this world in return but curses, suspicions, envy, defamation, injustice, proscription, despoiled, insulted even unto death. It is well, in *hoc nati sumus*. To them it is of no importance, this terrible spectre of evil, nor will it ever be whilst God uses mercy with those who follow faithful to the grand motto,

which encloses within it the secret of the Christian strategy: 'He can die, but he can never surrender.' Although he loses all, even life itself, whilst he is not a traitor to the Church, to the Pope, to Jesus Christ, he loses nothing—always he goes out of the strife as a conqueror. Whilst on the other hand he would lose all—everything, here and hereafter—if through desire of popularity or worldly favors and preferences, he should surrender one single truth, one single right of his Divine Master, Jesus Christ, of the Pope or of the Church."

Such is the secret of the love and of the hatred which the Society of Jesus inspires; such, also, the secret of their unequalled force; such, too, of that heroic resistance against all her enemies. "He can die, but he can never surrender." Whilst he preserves this divine teaching he could be exiled, dispersed, but never will "La Compania" die. Such, also, is the teaching which one draws from the little volume, worthy of being meditated on, and everywhere read and known.—Juan Pedro, in Boston Pilot.

## A PLEA FOR CHRISTIAN FRATERNITY.

The Very Rev. James C. Byrne, president of St. Thomas College, St. Paul, Minn., contributes the following eloquent paper to the *Independent*:

A beautiful story comes floating on golden pinions from an islet of the Aegean. Year after year, on the island of Chios, in the city of the same name, the grand procession of the Greek Church, bearing the Eucharistic emblems, passed by the portals of the Catholic cathedral; but no sound of fellowship or of sympathy ever issued, on such occasions, from the cold, stern edifice. It had but its shadow to cast athwart a procession which kept alive the rebellion of the anathematized Photius. It mattered little that Catholics and Greeks equally believed in the Real Presence, and that for the Catholic, as well as for the Greek, Christ was just as adorable under the emblems of leavened as of unleavened bread. Persistent, unwavering and unrelenting opposition to everything Photian must be maintained. Such was the plain meaning of the Rubrics, and who would dare openly set aside a Rubric? An ordinary law has to take its chances with the vicissitudes of time and environment, but a liturgical law, written in red characters, and therefore called a Rubric, is the slowest to admit any weakening in its binding force. The Rubrics, therefore, forbade any recognition even of Christ while in the hands of schismatics. This year the procession, as usual, passed under the shadow of the old cathedral, when suddenly the joyous peal of the great bell fell on the ears of the startled worshippers. The silence of a thousand years is broken. Instantly every hat in the procession is doffed. The recognition so unexpectedly given is equally returned. Every inhabitant of that little island feels that a pall has been lifted from his heart, and even the stately Greek Bishop sends a note of thanks to his Catholic brother. Nor is this all. The sound of the Chian bell was heard in far-off Rome, and all, from the Pontiff down, rejoiced and commended the fraternal but un-rubricated act of the Catholic Bishop, who ordered this salute to the Greek procession.

Now cannot we strain our ear and catch one joyous note of that fraternity-proclaiming bell? We may not all believe in the Real Presence; but are there not other bonds of sympathy which appeal for fraternal recognition? Undoubtedly there are many. Let us take a glance at a few of them. Naturally we shall select the most obvious.

Bewildered by the tone of so much sectarian literature, is it possible, we sometimes ask, that we have been carried away so far in the heat of controversy that we have made no allowance for a Christian conscience in the majority of Christians? Yet such would seem to be the fact. We think of one another as if conscience did not exist. I refrain from mentioning those grosser charges which can be entertained only by fanatics or the wilful dupes of knaves. But may not Protestants think that it is easy for Catholics to commit sin, as all they have to do is to confess and be absolved; may not Catholics think that with private interpretation a similar case may be adduced from the Bible by Protestants to palliate any crime? Yet this reasoning makes no allowance for conscience. Do we habitually give one another credit for that clear insight into moral truth and that earnest endeavor to do right which, on reflection, we know that all possessors of a good conscience must have? Do we recognize that religious bias cannot for centuries darken the conscience concerning a thing intrinsically bad; and that, therefore, we may be certain that if any religious tenet has been held by a Christian denomination for centuries, conscience has not been adjusted to it, but it has been adjusted to conscience? What is this disunion among the members of the same denomination but an evidence that it is easy—very easy—to forget that our neighbor has a conscience?

No wonder that members of different denominations forget this obvious truth. Yet we know that Pagans had a conscience—read the burning words of Horace, Cicero, Juvenal, Seneca—and we should realize that Christians in general have one. The pure forces of the rational soul are the same for the Christian as for the Pagan, but the Christian has, besides, the guidance of the Decalogue and the light of the Gospel. Reason, then, revolts at the thought that the majority of Christians are conscienceless scoundrels. If now, we put aside a general distrust of our neighbors, what follows? The conviction follows that the world is not peopled by hypocrites alone, although there may be many, nor by criminals alone, although any cloth may cover one. It follows that in the majority of cases preachers are not working for their salary alone, priests are not merely gratifying their ambition to rule, evangelizing and charitable women are not merely seeking notoriety in their reform and relief work, nuns do not profess chastity, obedience and poverty merely to say, "I am holier than thou." On the contrary, there is good, sound, conscientious work going on around about us; and the cynic who imputes unworthy motives to the workers is hugging a delusion and digging his own eternal grave. In moments of fanaticism no doubt conscience has lost its bearings. Facts of history bear sad witness to this. But history likewise testifies that fanatical outbursts soon ran their course, and that conscience then assumed its normal sway. If, therefore, we not only acknowledge but realize that the majority of Christians have a conscience, a sensitive, God-fearing, sin-hating conscience, there would be one strong bond of sympathy between us. It would be a tie which would make us the defendant of one another's good name, and which would inspire us with mutual trust.

Another bond of sympathy is that we are the possession of Christ. I am far from advocating or conniving at indifference in religion. Those who take a smug satisfaction in the thought that one religion is as good as another have neither religious sense nor religious activity. The true religious mind and heart are active and ceaselessly at work along the lines of the truth they have. From day to day new vistas open before them, new lights dawn upon them, principles find new development and application, old truths are rediscovered, mists and prejudices are dissipated, there is a growth and development of the religious man so that he is not to-day what he was yesterday. This is all the more true of a Christian denomination that deserves the name. And among all these denominations, with their living members ever at work, there must of necessity be one which has a deeper insight into truth, a richer possession of Christian revelation, and a nearer approach to the top of the mountain of God than all the others. How can there be indifference in religion since Truth rises before us like a mountain up which we can make, at best, but a few steps; or spreads before us like an ocean on whose shore we can gather but a few pebbles? But in the meantime, while striving to do our best, I return to say that we are the possession of Christ. "Other sheep I have," He says, "which are not of this fold." They are His, and He claims them before the fold becomes one, the shepherd one. Nor, if I understand the Gospels aright, does He refuse all guidance and love to those who do not yet belong to that one fold. "Master," said John to Jesus, "we saw a certain man casting out devils in Thy name, and we forbade him, because he followeth not with us." "Hinder him not," replied Jesus; "for he that is not against you is for you." (Luke ix: 49, 50). Between the fulness of revealed truth and atheism there is a wide range and ample room for many a breakwater between. "Other sheep I have" which are not of this fold.

Finally, not to mention others, Christ Jesus Himself is a bond of sympathy between us. He is our Light, our Model and our Guide. It is to enlarge His Kingdom and not our own that we are at work. In His light our thoughts should follow the same groove, and in the warmth of His love our hearts should beat in unison.

It is while dwelling on these things that we catch sweet sounds from afar. They are bells proclaiming an end to antagonism and distrust, a beginning of Christian fraternity and love.

It is a period of sad doctrinal disintegration and of consequent weakening of morals. It is a period of vast social changes, which disturb principles and awaken passions. Thoughtful men are casting around for great forces by which society may be preserved and the flow of moral misery, stemmed. Those forces the Catholic Church owns in that rich abundance with which they came to her from her Divine Founder, and if Catholics are true to their Church she will be hailed as the savior of men and society. But to this end they must live true Catholic lives, and by their fruits prove the principles of their faith.—Archbishop Ireland.