

The 4th Degree Oath of the Knights of Columbus

5TH EDITION

*An Un-American Secret Society
Bound to the Italian Pope, By
Pledges of Treason and Murder*

By

THOS. E. WATSON

*Author of "The Story of France," "Napoleon," "Life and Times
of Andrew Jackson," "Life and Times of Thomas Jefferson,"
"The Roman Catholic Hierarchy," Etc.*

Published by

THE TOM WATSON BOOK COMPANY, Inc.
THOMSON, GEORGIA

1928

The 4th Degree Oath of the Knights of Columbus

5TH EDITION

*An Un-American Secret Society
Bound to the Italian Pope, By
Pledges of Treason and Murder*

By

THOS. E. WATSON

*Author of "The Story of France," "Napoleon," "Life and Times
of Andrew Jackson," "Life and Times of Thomas Jeffer-
son," "The Roman Catholic Hierarchy," Etc.*

Published by

THE TOM WATSON BOOK COMPANY, Inc.

THOMSON, GEORGIA

1928

Copyright, 1927

GEORGIA WATSON LEE BROWN
Thomson, Ga.

The 4th Degree Oath of the Knights of Columbus

WHAT IS THE TRUTH ABOUT THE 4TH DEGREE OATH OF THE KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS?

THE most convincing witnesses against popery are those who voluntarily left it. They are the men and women who were *on the inside*. They could see and hear with their own eyes and ears.

Thousands of these seceders from popery are people whose motives and characters are above suspicion.

They do not quit Romanism to gain a reward, or to make money. Oftener than not, the seceders shoulder a cross, rather than win a crown, when they turn their backs upon *the persecuting and murderous church of the Italians*.

One of the most notable seceders was the late James A. O'Connor, of New York.

Another was the late Baroness Von Zedtwitz, who inherited a part of the Caldwell fortune in Kentucky, and who, when a mere impressionable girl, was cajoled and flim-flammed out of the money which started the Pope's great university in Washington City.

She knew Roman Catholicism *from the inside*, and she wrote a book about it, "The Double Doctrine of the Church of Rome."

Another fact which the Romanist papers do not mention is, that one of the most powerful arraignments of popery was written by Anna Ella Carroll, of Maryland—a *member of that celebrated Catholic family*.

Rev. James A. O'Connor founded "The Converted Catholic Magazine," in New York, and he spent many years of unrequited toil exposing the rottenness and the dangers of Rome.

When he died from an accident several years ago, he was succeeded by Bishop Manuel Ferrando, who is also a seceder from popery.

In Open Letters to Cardinal Gibbons, this ex-priest whose character cannot be attacked, has said that he himself when a priest, had discovered conditions in convents that were fully as bad as those described by Maria Monk.

Cardinal Gibbons did not dare to deny the accusation, and no Romanist paper has dared to ask Dr. Ferrando to *name those convents*.

Now, it must occur to you, that here is a witness whose testimony about the secret oaths taken by priests on the inside deserves implicit belief. In the absence of denial, and impeachment, this witness ought to convince your reason.

What does he say about the disputed oath of *the Fourth Degree* Knights of Columbus?

(Mark you! in most all of the Romanist denials, no mention is made of the *Fourth Degree*.)

In his magazine for December, 1912, Dr. Ferrando said:

"Although it is repugnant to us, we are inclined to believe in the authenticity of the oath as it is quoted, or of something very similar to it, from the internal evidence we have of the workings of the Roman Church."

Dr. Ferrando uses the editorial "we"; but his statement amounts to this—

"From what I know myself, from having been on the inside of Romanism, I believe the Knights have just such a secret oath as has been published."

That's a mighty strong declaration: it was published *before* the oath was printed and circulated by Megonigel and Shade, of Philadelphia—the printer and the barber, both poor men.

Why didn't the brave James A Flaherty, Supreme Knight and Supreme Traitor and Supreme Coward, and Supreme Liar—why didn't Flaherty prosecute Bishop Manuel Ferrando?

Philadelphia is close to New York: and there are thousands of these valiant 4th degree traitors in New York: why didn't they pounce upon Dr. Ferrando?

Why is it that these brave Romanists have never dared to prosecute any man or woman who has been inside of popery?

They dare not do it!

The ex-priest knows too much! The ex-nun knows too much!

The foot-kissers will fling mud at the seceders, but they know better than to hale *them* into court.

Take my own case, for instance: I, an outsider, quoted some popish nastiness in Latin, and was arrested for it.

Ex-Priest P. A. Sequin not only published the same Latin, but translated the same Latin into extremely nasty English.

Yet, they did not dare to arrest Seguin, although I brought him to Augusta, and he sold his obscene books all over the town. He rubbed elbows with priests while he was in Augusta, and Seguin's wife was offered a thousand dollars if they would go back to Wisconsin.


When the brave old man and his fine wife stood their ground, and *showed that they meant to tell what they knew*, at my trial, the case was continued by the prosecution.

There I was under a criminal prosecution for publishing the very stuff that ex-priest Seguin was publishing and selling; yet, they did not dare to lay their hands on Seguin, *who had been on the inside of the Roman church, and who knew it for what it actually is*.

Continuing his editorial, Bishop Ferrando says—

"In my personal experience in convents and religious societies of all kinds, I have come across many oaths *embodying the same ideas*, and couched in equally *barbarous and repulsive language*; and it is not at all an uncommon thing that such oaths *should be signed IN BLOOD*."

That awful charge was published in December, 1912. It was in February, 1913, that the brave Flaherty picked out the printer and the barber, and jumped on them. *They* had no money, and the man without money may be a man without friends who are able to hire good lawyers.

Spoiling for a fight the ferocious Flaherty picked out the two men who were least able TO FIGHT BACK. " 

The barber and the printer did not vouch for the oath; Bishop Ferrando *did*.

The ex-priest had said in his December, 1912, magazine, that during the time he was on the inside of the Roman church he had seen many such oaths, with the same murderous ideas and the same barbarous language, and that it was not uncommon for these hellish oaths to be signed in the blood of those who took them.

The Philadelphia printer had not said anything like *that*. The barber did not say he had *seen* just such oaths inside the popish institutions.

But Dr. Ferrando did say that *he* had seen just such oaths, that he knew them to have been signed in blood, and that from *the knowledge he gained on the inside*, he believed that the 4th Degree Knights did swear to that devilish oath!

And the brave Flaherty and his Big Lawyer Gaffney, passed over Dr. Ferrando, *who knew*, and landed heavily on two poor workmen, *who did not know*.

Evidently, Flaherty and Gaffney know who to kick.

HAS THE ALLEGED KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS OATH BEEN PROVED A FAKE? HAS A LIBEL BEEN REBUKED?

FROM the Pacific to the Atlantic, from Maine to Florida, the Knights of Columbus have sent telegrams—or caused them to be sent and published—advertising the fact that *two obscure laborers*, who probably have neither money nor “pull”, *pleaded guilty*, when prosecuted for printing the alleged K. of C. oath.

The promptitude with which this glorious news has been flashed over the wires and published in such a number of States, so far apart, *at practically the same time*, would seem to indicate *a well prepared plan*.

First, of all, let us get the facts, as published by the Knights themselves. *The Catholic Citizen*, of Milwaukee, Wisconsin, will be a good paper to consult.

On its first page, it publishes, on Feb. 7, 1914, a picture of

Supreme Knight James A. Flaherty, and gives an account of the alleged trial of the Libel case. On the editorial page, appears a whoop of joy, under the headline—

"A Knock-out blow."

The knock-out, we learn from the editor, is given *to* all those who circulate the "skulking lie" about this K. of C. oath, and is given *by* the outcome of the Libel case in Philadelphia, *where these two poor laboring men lived.*

C. H. Shade and Charles Megonigel, were prosecuted for having printed and circulated the oath.

They were charged with *Libel and conspiracy.* They were arrested on Feb. 27, 1913, a full year ago. They gave bond, after a preliminary hearing on Feb. 29, 1913.

What delayed this case for a whole year?

What sort of sleight-of-hand work has been done while these two men were out on bond?

Didn't the valiant James A. Flaherty yearn for a speedy vindication? Didn't he know that he ought to strike while the iron was hot? Why did he so suddenly cool off, and then wait so long before pressing these cases?

The defendants must have known that they were entitled to a trial by jury. They must have known that they could compel the prosecution to produce the constitution, by-laws, ritual, &c., of that secret society.

Flaherty knew it, too. Flaherty was in court, but he did not produce any books, papers, documents, or ritual.

Joseph P. Gaffney, the big lawyer of the Knights of Columbus, was also present in court, but he had none of the Society's papers with him.

They dared not produce those papers and let the judge and jury inspect them!

The printers had acted in good faith and had taken the oath from *The Menace.* They had seen the oath in other papers. They had seen it circulated during a political campaign.

Therefore, in the absence of proof of *actual malice*, the defendants were certain to be acquitted.

But they had no money to hire expensive lawyers; and besides, they have become rattled by *threats.* That's one of Rome's ways—to silence enemies by threats.

However this may be, they pleaded guilty of Libel and Conspiracy.

What *was* the conspiracy? Nobody even claims that there was any. How could two ordinary laborers *conspire* against the Pope's American Army of 300,000 armed men, some of whom are the wealthiest and most powerful citizens of the country?

Nevertheless, the two laborers pleaded guilty of "conspiracy."

Little fiste, Trip, had conspired to bite the Army, for Trip says so himself.

I merely mention this absurd phase of the matter to strengthen my theory of a "*frame-up*" *between the defendants and the Supreme Knight Flaherty.*

The defendants having pleaded guilty, were not fined one cent, nor ordered to a single hour of imprisonment!

Flaherty told the Judge (Wilson) that the plea of guilty had vindicated the Knights of Columbus, and *that was all he wanted.*

Yet he asked Judge Wilson *to keep sentence suspended over the heads of these two men.*

If the plea of guilty was enough, why demand very much more, and get it?

Why keep the sword of vengeance hanging over the heads of these poor fellows?

Under the circumstances, could anything be less calculated to inspire confidence in the good faith of this prosecution than the fact that Supreme Knight Flaherty and his big lawyer virtually demanded that these two men be left in the power of the Knights of Columbus?

Flaherty and Gaffney told Judge Wilson that *they* would be satisfied "*if the court would discharge the defendants under a suspension of sentence.*"

As who should say, "These men have vindicated us, but we *want them kept in our power. Leave that sentence hanging over them, ready to come down upon them, and to smash them, any day we choose.*"

I don't think very much of a vindication like that, do you?

Judge Wilson allowed Flaherty to say in open court, *but not under oath*, the following words, vindicating the vindication:

"This alleged oath is a tissue of falsehoods from the first word to the last—absolutely false. This prosecution was brought simply to vindicate the Knights of Columbus, because of the wide circulation given to this vile and scurrilous circular. Its purpose was to breed strife and arouse religious bigotry. The alleged oath is absolutely baseless and of such a flagrant character, that it is indeed surprising that anyone would give it the slightest credence."

Now I hope Mr. James A. Flaherty and his big lawyer, Gaffney, will read a few words of mine and *then take such action as they may deem necessary and proper*.

(1.) When James A. Flaherty and Joseph Gaffney, side-stepped such publishers as The Menace, The Jeffersonian Publishing Co., Scarboro's Liberator, and various other publishers of that alleged K. of C. oath, *being afraid to prosecute these strong companies*, and chose, instead, to jump on two workmen who have to depend upon their daily labor for their daily bread, *the said Flaherty and the said Gaffney did a most cowardly and contemptible thing*.

(2.) Long before Flaherty and Gaffney jumped that printer, Megonigel, and that barber, Shade, the Augusta Georgia, Knights of Columbus had publicly pledged themselves, in *The Chronicle*, to show that 4th degree oath to three Protestant ministers, Revs. DuBose, Cree and Jones; and *after having published this pledge they backed down from it*.

I had scornfully and repeatedly defied Victor J. Dorr and his brother Knights to show that oath: Victor & Co. were afraid to do it.

(3.) The alleged oath is not a tissue of lies. *The alleged oath is substantially the true one*.

The alleged oath does not vary, *in any essential particular*, from the damnable Jesuit oath which Cardinal Gibbons took.

Every Jesuit priest takes an oath that contains all the venom, the murder, the ruthless persecution, and the blind obedience to the Pope, that were in the published Knights of Columbus oath.

(4.) *The foot-prints of the Jesuits, on the records of history, prove that they commit the crimes which they swear to commit.*

That's the reason so nearly all of *the Roman Catholic countries expelled these diabolical Jesuits.*

(5. The published oath of the Knights of Columbus *is in substantial accordance with the Canon law of Flaherty's church, in accordance with popish decrees, in accordance with the voice of Councils, in accordance with the dreadful and invariable practice in Roman Catholic countries WHERE THE JESUITS HAVE BEEN SUPREME.*

(6.) The Jesuits are *now supreme throughout the Catholic church.* They control the Pope—they would poison him if he defied them, *just as they poisoned Pope Clement XVI., who abolished their whole devilish organization.*

I hereby notify James A. Flaherty and his big lawyer, Gaffney, that I make these statements deliberately, and with a full sense of the responsibility involved.

The Pope's American Army, these traitorous 4th Degree Knights of Columbus, is fully armed, and its war-chest is doubtless full of ammunition for *those rifles which they have been threatening to use on us.*

Archbishop James E. Quigley of Chicago, publicly made that threat!

He declared that if we dared to use the popish church as it had been used in France and Spain, those soldiers of the Pope would be ready for us.

"We will answer ballots with bullets," said Quigley, the Archbishop who so worthily acts as spokesman for the Christ who said to Peter, in Christ's direct extremity, "Put up thy sword!"

The Brooklyn *Tablet*, the official popish organ for all that vast population of Roman Catholics in and around New York

City, boasted editorially of the manner in which these armed soldiers of the Pope meant to cut their way to the White House!

And Archbishop Blenk's paper, *The Morning Star*, New Orleans, has editorially denounced our "lying" *Constitution and Declaration of Independence*.

If the fight is inevitable, let it come; The sooner we know whether we are to have a *Papal Empire inside of our People's Republic*, the better for all concerned.

Let us not stop with "a suspended sentence" over two laboring men, one of whom would seem to be an Irishman, like the valiant Flaherty, and who may be doing James A. Flaherty a friendly service by acting as dummy in this queer libel case.

"Megonigel"—that sounds pretty good. Flaherty, Gaffney, Tumulty, O'Connell, O'Connor, Murphy, Quigley, Donoghue, Megonigel—how familiar the sound!

Is Megonigel a Catholic? Is Shade a Catholic? Did they play dummy for the valiant Knights, to accommodate those midnight conspirators, and to enhance the glory of Holy Church and the Virgin Mary?

The whole case bears a suspicious aspect.

If Flaherty wanted to act the Man and tell the Truth, *why did he not at least show the Fourth Degree oath to Judge Wilson and swear that it was the genuine oath!*

If the oath is what Flaherty said it is, why this unconquerable disposition TO HIDE IT?

THE OATHS OF TREASON AND MURDER. THE
 BISHOP'S OATH, THE CARDINAL'S OATH, THE
 JESUIT'S OATH, AND THE FOURTH DEGREE
 OATH OF THE KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS.
 CALLING THE BLUFF OF THE
 JACKSONVILLE KNIGHTS
 OF TREASON.

THE Knights of Columbus must be spending a large sum of money, scattering hand-bills, and buying space in the newspapers to circulate what they are pleased to call "THE BRAZEN CONFESSION OF FRAUD."

In these publications, the Knights of Columbus are denouncing those who publish the alleged Fourth Degree Oath of their Treason League.

They say the Oath is a forgery, and that the alleged Jesuit Oath is likewise a forgery.

The Knights are making the most of a letter, written by The Menace, to Mr. Leroy N. King, of Philadelphia, the date of the letter being March 5, 1913.

It will be remembered that a printer named Megonigel, and a barber named Shade, were arrested in Philadelphia at the instance of James A. Flaherty, Supreme Knight of the Treason League.

After the case had been on the docket for a year, the defendants consented to a perfunctory plea of guilt and were released without fine and without sentence to imprisonment.

They were charged with having printed and circulated the alleged 4th Degree Oath of the Knights of Columbus, a copy of which will be found elsewhere in this booklet.

Mr. Leroy King represented himself as having been employed by the defendants in the above stated case, and his letter to The Menace was written by him in that capacity: he virtually asks that The Menace furnish him with the evidence to prove that the 4th Degree Knights were bound by that kind of an Oath.

In replying to Mr. King, The Menace told him that it did not possess a copy of the oath, but "we believe we are in a fair

way to get it."

Unfortunately, The Menace added, "the statement in a recent issue of The Menace which led you to believe that we had it in our possession, while *somewhat of a bluff on our part*, was based on the fact that we know where it can be had."

Candor compels me to say that The Menace made a bad break in writing such a sentence. Our people do not like *bluffs*: they demand *SINCERITY*.

So far as I can see, no effort whatever was made to defend Megonigel and Shade. Virtually, Mr. King asked The Menace for ammunition; and when he did not get it, he threw down his gun.

Why did this case drag along for a whole year? Why did not Mr. King serve the Knights of Columbus with notices to produce their papers in court? Why did he not compel James Flaherty and the other head officials of the Treason League, to show their ritual, their pledges, their by-laws and *their 4th Degree oath*?

If the conduct of The Menace was a mistake, what must we say of the conduct of the lawyer who was employed to defend the printer and that barber?

The Menace is not a sworn attorney: The Menace did not take a fee to defend those men: The Menace had no right to compel the Knights to produce their oath of Treason. The Menace was not a party to the case at all. *The Menace had no standing in court.*

What kind of a lawyer is it that grounds arms and surrenders, when one supposed witness says he knows nothing of the facts?

What moral or legal right did Mr. Leroy King have to call upon The Menace to do what his clients employed *him* to do?

The fact that King threw up his hands and gave The Menace's letter to the Knights, *indicates a trap laid for The Menace.* ❧

That The Menace walked right into it, is not pleasing to us; but what will right-thinking Americans *suspect about the men who laid the trap?*

If Chief Knight James A. Flaherty was acting on the square, why did he not, at least, show the 4th degree oath to the presiding judge, and then ask the judge to announce that the oath was what this Treason League claims it to be.

Flaherty made a verbal, unsworn statement, but did not produce any evidence, written or verbal.

Five Knights, of Jacksonville, sign a "Challenge" to show the oath to three Protestant clergymen.

Only five? Why, in Augusta, Georgia, more than a dozen Knights published a signed pledge to show that oath.

BUT THEY HAVE NEVER SHOWN IT.

Those Augusta Knights named the three Protestant preachers—Cree, Jones and DuBose—to whom they would show the 4th degree oath. And *then*, were afraid to keep their word!

Now, I have no time to spend in Jacksonville, *where the Knights slap the face of a Methodist preacher who uses free speech in his pulpit*, and where Dixie reviles a Christian preacher for doing the same thing.

I have no lives to throw away among such brutes as Ben Burbridge; nor do I care to have my face slapped by the Jacksonville Knights.

Consequently, their challenge for someone to come to Jacksonville to meet them, is not accepted.

But I make this counter challenge.

I will put up the \$1,000 against their \$5,000—as they demand—if they will come to Thomson, Georgia, and submit to the arbitrament of the three Protestant ministers who live here, or of the three, who were selected by the Augusta Knights.

My proposal is to prove—

(1). That the oath taken by the three American Cardinals, *is an Oath of Treason and Persecution.*

(2.) That the oath taken by Romanist bishops *is an oath that logically leads to murder:*

(3.) That the Jesuit oath, as heretofore published in books, pamphlets and papers, *is an oath of treason, and of crime*—leading logically to just such persecutions, massacres, burnings, and outlaws as popery has practised for ages.

(4.) That the oath of the 4th Degree Knight *contains the elements of treason, of disloyalty to our free principles of Church and State, of ruthless boycott and persecution, and of the same horrible encouragement to murder, that is contained in Romanist theology, Romanist canon law, Romanist secret oaths and societies, and Romanist history.*

I will place a certified check for \$1,000 with the Bank of Thomson, the oldest and strongest of our local banks, and not connected with me in any way. Let those Jacksonville Knights put up their \$5,000. Then let it be agreed that the informal court of three clergymen *shall have the same authority to send for persons and papers*, that a Congressional Investigation Committee possesses.

My references are The Georgia Railroad Bank; Ramsey & Legwen, Cotton Factors; The McDuffie Bank, The Bank of Thomson.

The challengers are —P. J. D. Larmoyeux, A. N. O'Keefe, T. J. Golden, J. A. Wrigley, J. S. Keane.

Now, let them show *their honesty*, by coming to a town *where preachers are not slapped for preaching their own opinions in their own churches.*

If these Knights have nothing to hide, why so much concealment?

If they are not afraid to show that 4th degree oath, why is it that they resort to every dodge and subterfuge to keep from showing it?

Your brutal Ben Burbridge slapped the face of the Methodist preacher, John A. Hendry—cursed him and slapped him on the streets of Jacksonville, because he had, in his own pulpit, denounced popery.

Your brutal mobs have beaten up such fearless Protestants as William Loyd Clark, P. A. Seguin, Jeremiah Crowley, Otis L. Spurgeon, and Horace Bolles.

Your brutal mob attacked a peaceable Baptist congregation, assembled *in a Baptist church*, at Carbondale, Pennsylvania, because it was listening to a lecture against popery.

Your brutal mob kidnapped and maltreated a peaceable citizen at Anoka, Minn., *because* he was supposed to be the anti-papal lecturer, Dancey.

Your brutal organization boycotted my own business, tried to destroy it, and endeavored to send me to the penitentiary because I had published a chapter out of one of your devilish books.

There isn't a CRIME contemplated in the alleged 4th Degree Oath that you have not ATTEMPTED, OR COMMITTED.

Your 4th Degree men are armed members of a Treason League,—and the law ought to break you up—just as the law broke up the Mollie Maguires and the Ku Klux Klan.

Your Treason League is a more dangerous enemy to the general welfare of this country, than the Black Hand ever was—more dangerous than White Slavers are!

You are bound by oath as *vassals of a foreign potentate*—a usurper at that and the vilest of imposters—the deadliest enemy to democracy, to labor, to self-government, to Home Rule, to morality and true religion.

You have no legal right to vote, serve on juries, or hold office: by the oath you take, you voluntarily become aliens; and you should not be allowed to exercise any civil right, or political privilege, that other aliens are not permitted to enjoy.

If you were coming into this country from Italy, you would have to swear off that treasonous oath, before you could become naturalized citizens.

If you were Italians, living in Rome, and bound to the Italian pope as you are now bound, it would not be any of our business; and you would not be a menace to our liberties.

The fact that you are spies and traitors, inside our citadel, is what constitutes our danger from you, and gives us the right to know your plots and purposes.

What are you buying those rifles for?

Why are you doing all of this secret drilling?

Why this "Militia of Christ", which Archbishop Quigley boastfully declared was ready to fight, when the Italian pope gave the word?

Who is it your Italian boss wants you to fight?

When do you expect your orders from Italy?

What sort of Christianity is it that needs so many secret societies, so many secret oaths, so many secret drill-masters, so many swords and rifles?

Do you think we are blind? Do you imagine that we will allow these menacing preparations for war to continue indefinitely?

Do you fancy that the Italian priest, wearing the triple crown, can take his own time, and use his own methods to subvert our democratic institutions?

Already your brutal mobs have attacked our churches, beaten our speakers, threatened the lives of others, and shouted in the streets of such cities as Brooklyn, "DEATH TO THE PROTESTANTS!"

Already your Quigleys and your Phelans have insolently told us that your Italian boss has the right to "punish" Protestants, *for being Protestants*, just as the State has the right to punish criminals *for being criminals*.

And the Quigleys and Phelans tell us that your Italian boss *will use your swords and guns when he chooses to do so*.

In August, 1913, I wrote to priest, D. S. Phelan, whose *Western Watchman* is a great Romanist organ. Phelan himself is a strong man, and a brave one, a thoroughly typical Roman priest. He was educated under Pope Leo XIII., who enjoined it upon popish teachers to instill into the minds of clerical students the doctrines of St. Thomas Aquinas.

These doctrines inculcate every principle contained in the Jesuit oath, and in the alleged oath of 4th degree Knights of Columbus. Among other things, St. Thomas Aquinas teaches that heretics—all non-Catholics are heretics—may be punished in every way, even unto death.

Therefore, I was not surprised by Phelan's answer to my questions.

Let me quote two of the questions and his answers thereto:

Question: Do you say and maintain that the pope has the right to use physical force?

If, so, in what cases, to what extent, and upon what grounds?

Answer: The Pope, as the church's chief executive, has the right to use physical force. Who shall deny it to him? He has been given a mission by God, and whatsoever measure lawfully conduces to the success of that mission he can employ. Physical punishment is a lawful means of promoting justice and morality. The State uses them. The church can if she chooses.

Question: Do you approve the persecution of Protestants in Peru and other States controlled by your church?

If so, upon what grounds?

Answer: Protestants are not persecuted in Peru. **THEY ARE SUPPRESSED.** The grounds for suppressing them is: they are a nuisance.

Question: Do you approve religious toleration in this country?

If so, upon what grounds?

Answer: I do not approve of religious or immoral toleration. Blasphemy and indecency are rightly punished by fine and imprisonment.

Thus he classes Protestantism with blasphemy and indecency.

* * * * *

It's up to you, Messrs. Knights of the Pope's Treason League.

Toe the mark, now—*or back down!*

Advertising The Menace as a fraud, does not prove that your secret order is *not* a Treason League.

And when you say that the Jesuit oath is a forgery, *I know that you lie*, for that oath has been dragged into court, just as the Bishop's oath was dragged from concealment when the British Parliament got after your murderous hierarchy.

You had a mighty fine chance to show that oath in the Me-gonigel case, *and you were afraid to show it.*

Flaherty lied about it, *in a verbal unsworn statement*, just as you lie about it, in your newspaper advertisements.

Now, come and face the music; IF YOU DARE!

ALLEGED KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS OATH.

(Extracts— 4th Degree.)

"I———, now in the Presence of Almighty God, the Blessed Virgin Mary, the blessed St. John the Baptist, the holy apostles, St. Peter and St. Paul, and all the Saints, sacred host of Heaven, and to you, my Ghostly Father, the superior general of the society of Jesus, founded by St. Ignatius Loyola, in the pontification of Paul the III., and continued to be present, do by the womb of the Virgin, the matrix of God, and the rod of Jesus Christ, declare and swear, that his Holiness, the Pope, is Christ's vice-regent, and is the true and only head of the Catholic or Universal Church throughout the earth; and that by virtue of the keys of binding and loosing given his holiness by my Savior, Jesus Christ, he hath power to depose heretical kings, princes, States, commonwealths and governments that they may be safely destroyed. Therefore, to the utmost of my power, I will defend this doctrine and his Holiness' right and custom against all usurpers of the heretical or Protestant authority whatever, especially the Lutheran Church of Germany, Holland, Denmark, Sweden and Norway, and the now pretended authority and churches of England and Scotland, and the branches of same now established in Ireland, and on the continent of America and elsewhere, and all adherents in regard that they may be usurped and heretical, opposing the sacred Mother Church of Rome.

I now denounce and disown any allegiance as due to any heretical king, prince or State, named Protestant or Liberals, or obedience to any of their laws, magistrates or officers.

I do further declare, that I will help, assist and advise all or any of his Holiness' agents, in any place where I should be, in Switzerland, Germany, Holland, Ireland or America, or in any other kingdom or territory I shall come to, and do my utmost to extirpate the heretical Protestant or Masonic Doctrines, and to destroy all their pretended powers, legal or otherwise.

I do further promise and declare that, notwithstanding I *am dispensed with to assume any religion heretical for the propagation of the Mother Church's interest*; to keep secret and private all her agent's counsels from time to time, as they entrust me, and not divulge, directly or indirectly, by word, writing or circumstance whatever, but to execute *all that should be proposed, given in charge, or discovered unto me, by any Ghostly Father or any of this sacred order.*

I do further promise and declare that I will *have no opinion or will of my own or any mental reservation whatsoever, even as a corpse or cadaver* (perinde ac cadaver), but will unhesitatingly obey each and every command that I may receive from my superiors in the militia of the Pope and of Jesus Christ.

That I will go to any part of the world withersoever I may be sent, to the frozen regions of the North, to the burning sands of the desert of Africa, or the Jungles of India, to the centers of civilization of Europe, or to the wild haunts of the barbarous savages of America, without murmuring or repining, and will be submissive in all things whatsoever is communicated to me.

I do further promise and declare that I will, when opportunity presents, make and wage relentless war, secretly and openly, against all heretics, Protestants and Masons, as I am directed to do, to extirpate them from the face of the whole earth; and that I will spare neither age, sex or condition, and that I will burn, hang, waste, boil, flay, strangle, and bury alive these infamous heretics; rip up the stomachs and wombs of the women, and crush their infants' head against the walls, in order to annihilate their execrable race. That when the same cannot be done openly, I will secretly use the poisonous cup, the strangulation cord,

the steel of the poinard, or the leaden bullet, regardless of the honor, rank, dignity or authority of the persons, whatever be their condition in life, either public or private, as I at any time may be directed so to do, by any agent of the Pope, or Superior of the Brotherhood of the Holy Father of the Society of Jesus.

In confirmation of which I hereby dedicate my life, soul and all corporeal powers, and with the dagger which I now receive I will subscribe my name, written in my blood, in testimony thereof; and should I prove false or weaken in my determination, may my brethren and fellow soldiers of the militia of the Pope, cut off my hands and feet and my throat from ear to ear, my belly opened and sulphur burned therein with all the punishment that can be inflicted upon me on earth and my soul shall be tortured by demons in eternal hell forever.

That I will in voting always vote for a Knight of Columbus in preference to a Protestant—especially a Mason and that I will leave my party so to do; that if two Catholics are on the ticket I will satisfy myself which is the better supporter of the Mother Church and vote accordingly.

That I will not deal with or employ a Protestant if in my power to deal with or employ a Catholic. That I will place Catholic girls in Protestant families of the heretics.

That I will provide myself with arms and ammunition that I may be in readiness when the word is passed, or I am commanded to defend the church, either as an individual or with the militia of the Pope.

All of which I,———, do swear by the blessed Trinity and the blessed Sacrament which I am now to receive, to perform and on my part to keep this my oath.

In testimony thereof, I take this most holy and blessed Sacrament of the Eucharist, and witness the same further, *with my name written with the point of this dagger, dipped in my own blood, and seal, in the face of this Holy Sacrament.*

Signature_____

(Copied from Congressional Record of February 15th, 1913).

REASONS FOR BELIEVING THAT THE KNIGHTS
OF COLUMBUS (4th DEGREE) TAKE AN OATH
SIMILAR TO THE ONE PUBLISHED IN THE
CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF FEB. 15, 1913.

(A.) It is in line with the undeniable oaths of Bishops Cardinals and Jesuit priests. Those undeniable oaths have been proven in Court, have been published for generations, *have been practised for centuries*, and have never been denied by any representative prelate of the Roman Catholic church.

No American bishop, archbishop, or cardinal, or Jesuit priest, has dared to go before the public denying those damnable oaths.

The denials are made by laymen Catholics who may not know any better.

Only a few months ago, Priest D. S. Phelan, of *The Western Watchman*, wrote to me a letter for publication in which *he practically admitted that popery requires its votaries to do what the alleged Oath of the Knights binds them to do.*

Priest Phelan's letter was published in *The Jeffersonian*.

In substance, he said that his Church had as much right to put a man to death for heresy, as the State had to execute him for murder, arson, and rape.

The greater includes the lesser; therefore, if the Pope's church has the right to kill you for not being a Roman Catholic, it has a right to inflict lighter penalties—such as boycott, imprisonment, torture, ostracism, and other forms of punishment.

(B.) The alleged 4th degree Oath is in line with the dogmas of popish Councils, of popish decrees, of the popish theology, and of the popish canon law.

The Popes have claimed and exercised the right to imprison, torture, and kill. They have done so for hundreds of years. The claims of the Popes have not been withdrawn; and they are yet exercised wherever possible. Thus the Spanish teacher, Fer-

rer, was murdered a few years ago, because he was introducing secular education into priest-ridden Spain.

The Council of Trent, the canon law of the Roman church, and the official publications of the present Pope, as well as those of his immediate predecessors, all make to the same end, to-wit, the right of the Roman church to punish people for not becoming subject to the Pope.

They say that "persecute" is not the right word, but that "*punish*" is correct: to the heretic who is tortured, starved, boycotted, ostracised, or murdered, it matters little whether they call it "punishment" or "persecution."

But in the oath taken by bishops and cardinals the word is "persecute": in the Jesuit oath the word is "extirpate."

History shows that Popes persecute and extirpate; and the crime ranges all the way, from the assassination of a private individual to the massacre of a sect.

In the Canon law, *now of force in the Roman Catholic church*, we read—

"(6.) If any man say that *her intolerance* in the condemnation of all sects *is not divinely commanded* let him be accursed.

(12.) If any man say that the power of the church lies only *in-counsel or persuasion*, but not in legal commands, in *coercion and compulsion*, by external jurisdiction, and *in wholesome pains*, let him be accursed."

"The Bull of Pope John XXII. condemned John Gianduno and Marsilius of Padua as heretics, because they denied to the church the right of punishing by corporal pains, and it declared that she could inflict pains even unto death." (See "The Pope, the Kings, and the People," William Arthur, Vol. I., p. 23.)

"Princes . . . in ecclesiastical affairs have no laws to give, but humbly expect them from the Church. They have to hear and believe.

They have to obey and to make others obey." (Phillips II., 561.)

Father Scrader says: "The Allocution of Dec. 15, 1856, contains not merely the *CONDEMNATION OF FREEDOM*

OF WORSHIP, but also the condemnation of unrestricted FREEDOM OF THOUGHT, FREEDOM OF SPEECH, and FREEDOM OF THE PRESS."

It is Scrader who uses the small capital to emphasize *the papal law on those subjects*. Der Papst und die modernmen Ideen. Heft. II., p. 35.)

In the Syllabus which sums up the powers of the Roman church, we find—

"She has the right to require that the Catholic religion shall be the only religion of the State, to the exclusion of all others.

She has the power of requiring the State not to permit free expression of opinion.

She has the right to uphold the laws of religious orders against the civil authority; *the right to deprive the latter of power to aid any who, after having taken vows, should seek to escape from monasteries or nunneries.*

She has the right to hold kings and princes to her jurisdiction, and of denying that their power is superior to her own *in determining questions of jurisdiction.*"

In other words, the Pope will fix the boundary line of his own power, and the Civil Power must submit.

That makes the Pope the Supreme, universal Lord of the whole world.

"She has the right to *deprive the civil authority of power to sanction divorce, in any case.*"

All persons desiring a divorce must apply to the Italian priest who wears the triple crown at Rome. (Arthur's work already cited, Vol. I., p. 74-5.)

St. Thomas Aquinas is a favorite theologian with the Papacy. The late Pope Leo XIII. was particularly fond of Saint Thomas, and in the Encyclical or Scholastic Philosophy he directed the teacher to "make it their task to instill the doctrine of Thomas Aquinas into the minds of their scholars."

One of the great doctrines of Saint Thomas—a doctrine which the teachers were to instill into the minds of their scholars is, that the Roman Catholic church may boycott, ostracise, and starve the heretic—"excommunication," as proclaimed and prac-

tised by the Popes means just *that*. The person excommunicated is cut off from all human ties, intercourse and help: nothing is left him but to submit, or die.

But, Saint Thomas, going further, teaches expressly that the Roman church *may kill*, as well as excommunicate.

"With regard to heretics," he wrote, "two elements are to be considered; one element on their side, and the other on the part of the Church. On their side is the sin whereby they have deserved, not only to be separated from the Church by excommunication, *but also to be banished from the world by death*."

For it is a much heavier offense to corrupt the faith, whereby the life of the soul is sustained, than to tamper with the coinage, which is an aid to temporal life. Hence, if coiners or other malefactors are at once handed over by secular princes to a just death, much more may heretics, immediately they are convicted of heresy, be not only excommunicated, *but also justly done to die*.

But on the part of the Church is mercy in view of the conversion of them that err, and therefore she does not condemn at once, but 'after the first and second admonition,' as the apostle teaches. After that, however, if the man is still found pertinacious, the Church, having no hope of his conversion, provides for the safety of others, cutting him off from the Church by the sentence of excommunication; and, further, she leaves him to the secular tribunal to be exterminated from the world by death." (Aquinas Ethicus: or The Moral Teaching of St. Thomas." A translation of the principal portion of the second part of "Summa Theologica," by Joseph Rickaby, S. J., Vol., page 332.)

That is where Priest D. S. Phelan got the doctrine which he manfully announced in *The Jeffersonian*.

His teachers had instilled it into his mind, as Pope Leo XIII. had commanded them to do.

And I have some respect for a brave Romanist, like Phelan, who boldly tells the truth about the real law of his so-called church.

He gloats over the massacre of Huguenots, Waldensians, Dutch and English: he exults over Catholic intolerance in Peru and Spain: he courageously proclaims his allegiance to the Italian pope, and shouts, "*To hell with the Government of the United States.*"

I can respect a man of that sort; but for these sneaking, lying, treacherous Knights of Columbus, my scorn and contempt knows no limits.

The alleged oath is in exact keeping with the laws of their church and with the teachings of her most approved theologians—also with other oaths not denied, and a bloody record that cannot be obliterated.

For all the foregoing reasons, I declare my belief in the substantial correctness of the alleged Oath as it appears in "The Congressional Record."

I have confined myself to Roman Catholic canonists who have acted as professors at Maynooth College, or whose textbooks are in use at that Irish College of priestly education. I have other noted works on the subject before me as I write, which are equally insistent as to the necessity for Roman Catholic States to suppress Protestantism. One is by Dr. Joseph Hergenrother, professor of canon law at the University of Wurzburg, entitled, "Catholic Church and Christian State." It is generally known that the writer of this work was rewarded by the Pope for his labors by the presentation of a cardinal's hat. On page 309 of Volume II. we find the assertion that "it is not contrary to the spirit of Christianity to punish heretics with death by fire."

Professor Marianus de Luca, S. J., in the year 1900 A. D., wrote as follows:—"The good that is most necessary to the Church is the unity of the true faith, and that cannot be preserved unless the heretic be handed over to death So when heretics have been left to the secular arm the judges must inflict on them the penalty, not of death only, but of fire." (Public Ecclesiastical Law," pp. 58-60.)

(The above paragraph is quoted from a booklet, "Irish Protestant and the Fear of Persecution," by Arthur Walsh, published

by The Imperial Protestant Federation of London, England, in 1914.)

My countrymen! I beg you to ponder upon the solemn warning of the late Canon Melville, of the Church of England:

“Make peace, if you will, with Popery; receive it into your Senate; shrine it in your churches; plant it in your hearts; but be ye certain, as certain that there is a heaven above you, and a God over you, that the Popery thus honoured and embraced, is the very Popery that was loathed and degraded by the holiest of your fathers: the same in haughtiness, the same in intolerance, which lorded it over kings, assumed the prerogative of Deity, crushed human liberty, and slew the saints of God.”

FRIEND! God requires every one of His servants to resist soul-destroying Popery, which eventually ruins every land in which it flourishes.

TWO ROMANIST OATHS AS PRINTED BY EX-PRIEST
P. A. SEGUIN, AND NOT DENIED.

THE CARDINAL'S OATH.

"I,—————, Cardinal of the Holy Roman Church, do promise and swear that, from this time to the end of my life, I will be faithful and obedient unto St. Peter, the holy apostolic Roman church and our MOST HOLY LORD, the Pope of Rome and his successors, canonically and lawfully elected; that I will give no advice, consent or assistance against the Pontifical MAJESTY and person; that I will never knowingly and advisedly, to their injury or disgrace, make public the counsels entrusted to me by themselves, or by messengers or letters; also that I will give them any assistance in retaining, defending and recovering the Roman Papacy and the regalia of Peter, with all my might, and endeavor, so far as the rights and privileges of my order will allow it, and will defend them against all their honor and state; and I will direct and defend, with due form of honor the Legates and Nuncios of the Apostolic See, in the territories, churches monasteries and other benefices committed to my keeping; and I will cordially co-operate with them and treat them with honor in their coming, abiding and returning, and that I will resist UNTO BLOOD, all persons whatsoever, who shall attempt anything against them. That I will, by every way and by every means, strive to preserve, augment and advance the rights, honors, privileges, the AUTHORITY of the Holy Roman Bishop, our Lord the Pope and his, before mentioned, successors; and that, at whatever time anything shall be decided to their prejudice, which is out of my power to hinder, as soon as I shall know that any steps or measures have been taken in the matter, I will make it known to the same our Lord or his successors, or some other person by whose means it may be brought to their knowledge. That I will keep and carry out and cause others to keep and carry out the rules of the Holy Father, the decrees, ordinances, dispensations, reservations, provisions, apostolic mandates and constitutions of

the Holy Father Sextus, of happy memory, as to visiting the threshold of the Apostles at certain prescribed times, according to the TENOR of that which I have just read through. That I will seek out and oppose, persecute and fight (omni conatu persecuturum et impugnaturum) against heretics, schismatics who oppose our Lord, the Pope of Rome and his before mentioned successors, and this I will do, with every possible effort."

(Signature), ————— then sent to the Pope.

A PRIEST'S OATH

"I, —————, now in the presence of Almighty God, the blessed Virgin Mary, the blessed Michæl the Archangel, the blessed St. John the Baptist, the Holy Apostle St. Peter and St. Paul and the Saints and Sacred Host of Heaven, and to you, my Lord, I do declare from my heart, without mental reservation that the Pope is Christ's Vicar-General and is the true and only Head of the Universal Church throughout the earth, and that, by virtue of the Keys of binding and loosing given to his Holiness by Jesus Christ he has power to depose Heretical Kings, Princes, States, Commonwealths and Governments, all being illegal without his sacred confirmation, and that **THEY MAY SAFELY BE DESTROYED**. Therefore, to the utmost of my power, I will defend this doctrine and His Holiness' rights and customs against all usurpers of the Protestant authority whatsoever, especially against the now pretended authority and Church in England and all adherents, in regard that they may be usurped and heretical, opposing the Sacred Mother, the Church of Rome.

I DO RENOUNCE AND DISOWN ANY ALLEGIANCE as due to any Protestant King, Prince or State, or obedience to any of their inferior officers. I do further declare the doctrine of the Church of England, of the Calvinists, Huguenots and other Protestants, to be damnable and those to be damned who will not forsake the same.

I do further declare that I will help, assist and advise all or any of his Holiness' agents, in any place wherever I shall be, and to do my utmost to extirpate the Protestant doctrine and to de-

stroy all their pretended power, regal or otherwise. I do further promise and declare that, notwithstanding I may be permitted by dispensation to assume any heretical religion (Protestant Denominations) for the propagation of the Mother Church's interest, to keep and private all her agents' counsels as they entrust me, and not to divulge, directly or indirectly, by word, writing or circumstances whatsoever, but to execute all which shall be proposed, given in charge or discovered unto me by you, my most Reverend Lord and Bishop.

All of which, I, ———, do swear by the blessed Trinity and blessed Sacrament which I am about to receive, to perform, on my part to keep inviolably, and do call on all the Heavenly and Glorious Host of Heaven to witness my real intention to KEEP THIS MY OATH.

In testimony whereof, I take this most Holy and Blessed Sacrament of the Eucharist and witness the same further with my consecrated hand, in the presence of my Holy Bishop and all the Priests who assist him in my Ordination to the Priesthood.

THE JESUIT'S OATH.

The oath of the Jesuit, as Jesuitism does in every thing, transcends in intolerance and wickedness, all other. This oath came to light in the celebrated trial of Father Lavalatte, in Paris, in the year 1761, when the "Constitutions" of the Society and other holy things (?) were dragged from the secret councils of iniquity. The existence of such an oath, that the Jesuits take this oath, indeed, that they take any oath, has been denied in this country. But as well might the Jesuits deny that Loyola ever lived, or that there was ever an Order of Jesuits. Here is the oath:

I, ———, now in the presence of Almighty God, the blessed Virgin Mary, the blessed Michæl the Archangel, the blessed St. John the Baptist, the holy Apostles St. Peter and St. Paul, and all the saints and sacred hosts of heaven, and to you my ghostly fathers, do declare from my heart, without mental reser-

vation, that his holiness pope———, is Christ's Vice General, and is the true and only head of the Catholic or Universal Church throughout the earth; and that by virtue of the keys of binding and loosing given to his holiness by my Savior Jesus Christ, *he hath power to depose heretical kings, princes, States, common-wealths, and governments, all being illegal without his sacred confirmation, and that they may safely be destroyed.* Therefore, to the utmost of my power, I shall and will defend this doctrine, and his holiness' rights and customs, against all usurpers of the heretical (Protestant) authority whatsoever; especially against the new-pretended authority and Church of England, and all adherents, in regard that they and she be usurpal and heretical opposing the sacred mother church of Rome. *I do renounce and disown any allegiance as due to any heretical king, prince or State named Protestant, or obedience to any of their inferior magistrates or officers.* I do further declare that the doctrine of the Church of England, the Cavinists, the Huguenots, and others of the name Protestants, to be *damnable*, and they themselves are *damned* and to be *damned*, that will not forsake the same. I do further declare that I will help, assist, and advise all or any of his holiness' agents in any place wherever I shall be, in England, Scotland, and Ireland, or in any other territory or kingdom I shall come to, *and do my utmost to extirpate the heretical Protestant's doctrine*, and to destroy all their pretended powers, regal or otherwise, I do further promise and declare, that notwithstanding, I am dispensed with to assume any religion heretical, for the propagating of the mother church's interest, to keep secret and private all her agents' councils, from time to time, as they entrust me, and not to divulge, directly or indirectly, by word, writing, or in any circumstance whatsoever, but to execute all that shall be proposed, given in charge, or discovered unto me, by you, my ghostly father, or any of this sacred convent. All what I.———, do swear by the blessed Trinity, and blessed Sacrament which I am now to receive, to perform, and on my part to keep inviolably; and do call all the heavenly and glorious host of heaven to witness these

my real intention to keep this oath. In testimony whereof, I take this most holy and blessed Sacrament of the Eucharist; and witness the same with my hand and seal, in the face of this holy convent, this..... day of.....Ano Domini.....”

THE CANON LAW OF POPERY

The Canon Law, the undisputed fundamental code of Romanism, is utterly incompatible with the Constitution and laws of our Republic, as witness the following leading provisions, gleaned therefrom by Dr. G. F. Von Schulte, Professor of Canonical Law at Prague, viz :

“I. All human power is from evil, and must therefore be standing under the Pope.

“II. The temporal powers must act unconditionally, in accordance with the orders of the spiritual.

“III. The Church is empowered to grant, or to take away, any temporal possession.

“IV. The Pope has the right to give countries and nations which are non-Catholic to Catholic regents, who can reduce them to slavery.

“V. The Pope can make slaves of those Christian subjects whose prince or ruling power is interdicted by the Pope.

“VI. The laws of the Church, concerning the liberty of the Church and the Papal power, are based upon divine inspiration.

VII. The Pope has the right to annul State laws, treaties, constitutions, etc.; to absolve from obedience thereto, as soon as they seem detrimental to the rights of the Church, or those of the clergy.

“IX. The Pope possesses the right of admonishing, and, if needs be, of punishing the temporal rulers, emperors, and kings, as well as of drawing before the spiritual forum any case in

which a mortal sin occurs.

"X. Without the consent of the Pope no tax or rate of any kind can be levied upon a clergyman, or upon any Church whatsoever.

"XI. The Pope has the right to absolve from oaths, and obedience to the persons and the laws of the princes whom he excommunicates.

"XII. The Pope can annul all legal relations of those in ban, especially their marriages.

"XIII. The Pope can release from every obligation, oath, vow, either before or after being made.

"XIV. The execution of Papal commands for the persecution of heretics causes remissions of sins.

"XV. He that kills one that is excommunicated is no murderer in a legal sense."

These Canons are amply corroborated by the following paragraphs from the Syllabus of Pius IX., issued Dec. 8th, 1864, and subsequently by the Decree of Infallibility confirmed as truths eternal and equal in authority with the Decalogue, viz :

"The State has not the right to leave every man free to profess and embrace whatever religion he shall deem true.

"It has not the right to enact that the ecclesiastical powers shall require the permission of the civil power in order to the exercise of its authority.

"It has not the right to treat as an excess of power, or as usurping the rights of princes, anything that the Roman Pontiffs of Ecumenical Councils have done.

"It has not the right to adopt the conclusions of a National Church Council, unless confirmed by the Pope.

"It has not the right of establishing a National Church separate from the Pope.

It has not the right to the entire direction of public schools.

"It has not the right to assist subjects who wish to abandon the monasteries or convents."

Then in the same Syllabus the rights and powers of the Church are affirmed thus, viz :

"She has the right to require the State not to leave every man

free to profess his own religion.

"She has the right to exercise her power without the permission or consent of the State.

"She has the right to prevent the foundation of any National Church not subject to the authority of the Roman Pontiff.

"She has the right to deprive the civil authority of the entire government of public schools.

"She has the right of perpetuating the union of Church and State.

"She has the right to require that the Catholic religion shall be the only religion of the State to the exclusion of all others.

"She has the right to prevent the State from granting the public exercise of their own worship to persons immigrating into it.

"She has the power of requiring the State not to permit free expressions of opinion."

ONE HUNDRED AND TWO REASONS WHY I LEFT THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH.

By Ex-Priest J. Donnelly.

1. Because Roman Catholic Moral Theology teaches that her members may equivocate, dissemble, perjure, steal and even murder, if it be for the good of the Church.

2. Because she has corrupted the Holy Scriptures, denied them to her people for ages, and left out the second commandment of God entirely from the decalogue, that her image worship might not appear so culpable and blasphemous.

3. Because the law of the Church teaches that if the Priest learns in the confession from his penitent that the latter is about to plot the burning of a city, the destruction of all the inhabitants thereof, he must say, if interrogated outside the confessional, that he knows nothing about it; and if in a court of justice, he

is to confirm his statement by an oath.

4. Because her worship of any praying to saints is unscriptural, unreasonable and absurd. For saints to hear the prayers of all Roman Catholics, it is necessary that they be in all places at the same time and be omniscient. He is able to see the motives of the heart and hear all supplications—God, the Almighty One. “For thou only knowest the hearts of the children of men.” (II. Chron. 6:30.)

5. Because of the monstrous and idolatrous doctrine of the mass, in which she teaches that the Priest consecrates the water into the flesh and blood of Christ, and presents him to thousands of people, whole and entire, in thousands of places at the same time. This seems to me contrary to Scripture, reason and all experience. We have no instance of where Christ when on earth was ever in more than one place at a time. When teaching in the synagogue, He was not in the garden of Gethsemane. When in the temple, He was not walking with Mary and Joseph on the way from Jerusalem

The Lord’s Supper, of which the mass is a mockery, was not literal, but figurative of Christ’s body. It was to be a commemoration. For so often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord’s death till he come.” (1 Cor. 11:26.)

6. Because she teaches that the sacrament of baptism regenerates, makes people Christians and heirs to heaven. She, therefore, contradicts the Bible, which declares that we are justified by faith, and that faith and salvation are personal, and cannot be obtained by proxy.

7. Because she teaches that the infant which dies without baptism shall never enter into the presence of God; and on the other hand that the highway robber, the blasphemer, gambler, drunkard, thief and murderer who may confess to a Priest, and do penance, will possess the kingdom of heaven. Little children of whom Christ said, “Suffer them to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of heaven.” Think of these going into outer darkness, while the bloodthirsty assassin goes to

the Holy of Holies to enjoy the paradise of God forever!

8. Because confession to a priest is immoral, indecent and contrary to the Scriptures, which command us to go to God alone.

9. Because auricular confession dwells on thoughts and uses language so obscene that if uttered outside in ordinary society both Priest and penitent would be arrested and prosecuted for using obscene language.

10. Because the confessional box paves the way for an involuntary celibate and too often an intemperate man, to the moral ruin of his unsophisticated female penitent.

11. Because of the command of the Apostle to "Confess your sins, one to another," is violated by the priests, who insist on their enslaved victims to confess to them, but they themselves never in turn kneel down and confess to the people.

12. Because of her traditions and dogmas and bulls which contradict the word of God, and make it of no avail. There is no Scriptural authority for any of her sacraments as she teaches them. Especially is this true of the five bastard sacraments: Confirmation, Penance, Extreme Unction, Ordination and Matrimony.

13. Because of her perilous and wicked doctrine of "Intention," which teaches it to be lawful to steal if you form the intention of making restitution. According to that "intention," you may take a neighbor's article, provided you have not the intention of stealing it. If afterwards you consume the property or lose it, the real owner can get nothing if you have not wherewith to restore. In that case the law that obtains is, "*Necessitas non habet legem.*" (That is, "Necessity has no law.") He must put up with what he gets—nothing—on the principal of "What cannot be cured must be endured." But the thief rests at ease under the doctrine, in that he had not the "intention" of originally stealing the article, but just using it for a time for his own use.

14. Because no Roman Catholic is ever sure of salvation, as he is not certain of the Priest having the right intention when baptizing him. If the Priest had not the intention to do what

Rome does, the baptism is null and void, and consequently, all other sacraments are null. "If any one shall say that the intention of giving, at least what the Church does, is not required in ministers while they administer the sacraments, let him be accursed." Council of Trent, Canon 10, *De Sacramentis*.

15. Because a good and merciful God would not commit the salvation of souls to the intention or non-intention of an ecclesiastical body of men, who, for unholy living and impure lives, are hardly equaled by any other class of notorious sinners.

16. Because I found that nearly all the doctrines of Rome were unscriptural, and were never taught by Christ or His Apostles, or practiced by the early Christians.

17. Because Rome teaches that to be saved it is necessary to belong to the Roman Catholic Church. And Christ and His Gospel teach that salvation is by direct personal faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; and that he that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him."—(John 3:36.)

18. Because the Church of Rome interprets most of the Scriptures in a literal, material sense, where Christ speaks in a figurative and spiritual sense.

19. Because she impresses the people with a false idea of the word "Church."

20. Because I saw and touched the instruments of the Inquisition, by which multitudes of honest Christians were put to a slow, heart-rending death for the crime of being suspected of heresy. When I saw the tortures of "walling up," the "burning pile," the "red-hot ovens," the "deadly pulley," the "iron virgin," the cold "water-pressure" on the brain. When I obtained sufficient evidence that Priests, Bishops and Monks who claimed to be the representatives of the meek and lowly Jesus, helped to apply the torch to the limbs of their fellow men, I shed tears, and prayed God to show me the way out from a system that strangled, burned and murdered.

21. Because the confessional is blasphemy and a reproach to Jesus Christ, who invites the sinners to come for his mercy.

"If we confess our sins, He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." (I. John 1:9.)

22. Because Priests violate the secrecy of the confessional in speaking to one another about the sins they hear in the confession in such a way that the listeners know to whom they refer.

23. Because intoxication is the rule, rather than the exception, among all Priests.

24. Because of her idols and images, which are not only venerated, but worshipped. The blessed Apostle says: "Flee from idols." (I. John 5:21.)

25. Because she condemns marriage in Priests, Bishops and Monks, and thus conflicts with the word of God, which says: "A Bishop must be blameless, the husband of one wife." (I. Tim. 3:2.) And, "To avoid fornication, let every man have his own wife." (I. Cor. 7:2.)

26. Because of the Church's unscriptural doctrine of Extreme Unction, which teaches the departing soul to settle its thoughts on visible things, such as candles, oils, holy water, instead of looking to Jesus Christ, whose blood cleanseth from all sin." (I. John 1:7.)

27. Because, no matter how holy Roman Catholics may live, and no matter how many good works they may perform, the Church gives them no assurance of heaven on their departure hence, but presents them with doubts, fears and the certainty of a burning purgatory, even for the just, before they can enter Heaven. With them there is no "This day thou shalt be with me in paradise."

28. Because the Church teaches that sprinkling infants regenerates them, and makes them members of the Church, and children of God.

29. Because in the early Christian Churches, those only were baptized who believed. "Then Peter said unto them, repent and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins. Then they that gladly received his word were baptized." Acts 2:38-41.)

30. Because the Church receives into her membership the unconverted and baptizes them, where in the Church of Christ

in all ages those only were baptized who were previously converted. Even the Apostle Paul was first converted and then baptized, "And he received his sight forthwith, and arose and was baptized." (Acts 9:18.)

31. Because wooden instruments called crosses, also images of the virgin and saints, are retained, venerated and worshipped.

32. Because the second commandment forbids the making of any "graven image, or any likeness of anything that is in the heaven above or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water beneath the earth. Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them, for I am the Lord thy God." (Exodus 20:35.)

33. Because the Church admonishes the people to have recourse to the intercession of the saints, and to venerate their relics; and because the sacred Scriptures say: "There is one God, and one mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus." (I. Tim. 2:5.) "I am the way, the truth and the life. No man cometh unto the Father but by me." (John 14:6.)

34. Because I believe that purity is a holier state than celibacy; but the Church insists on celibacy for Priests, Deacons and Bishops.

35. Because enforced celibacy is radically wrong, and is contrary to the Word of God. "A Bishop must be blameless, the husband of one wife, vigilant, sober, of good behavior, given to hospitality, apt to teach, not given to wine." (I. Tim. 3:2, 3.)

36. Because in the ordinance of the Lord's Supper the Church teaches that the flesh and blood of Christ is present in a material, carnal sense, and the Scripture says: "It is the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh that profiteth nothing; the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life." (John 6:63.)

37. Because the Church demands the people to go to the Priest in the confessional to obtain pardon of sins, and the Lord Jesus Christ invites sinners to come to Him for forgiveness. "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." (Matthew 11:28.)

38. Because the Church makes the Pope its head on earth, whereas there is no head other than Christ Jesus. "For the husband is head of the wife as Christ is head of the Church." (Ephesians 4:23.)

39. Because the mass is a fraud, imposed on the implicit confidence of a credulous people, under the pretense that it is the same as Christ's sacrifice on the Cross, and that the Priest's mass liberates the souls of the dead from an imaginary purgatory. The Word of God declares that Christ offered one sacrifice for sins forever and then sat down on the right hand of God. (Heb. 10:11, 12.)

40. Because the Romish Church makes the Virgin Mary the refuge of sinners, the "gate of heaven," the "comfort of the afflicted," the "morning star," the "health of the weak," and the "help of Christians."

41. Because the Church's aim is to keep the people in intellectual, moral and physical slavery, and make them "hewers of wood and carriers of water" the world over.

42. Because an orthodox Roman Catholic owes allegiance to the ecclesiastical government of the Pope of Rome, who teaches his superiority over and above all secular powers; and, therefore, cannot be a legal citizen to any civil government.

43. Because a large number of the Popes have been the most immoral wretches who ever appeared in human form.

44. Because all the Popes interfere with politics and have been the greatest curses of the Nations on Earth.

45. Because the papacy teaches dogmas and human canons that contradict the teaching of Christ, and has persecuted unto death for conscience's sake.

46. Because Rome denies Jesus Christ to be our Advocate, our Redeemer and our Saviour, by exalting Mary to be "our most loving advocate," and "the protectress of all sinners."

47. Because the Church has persecuted the Bible, discouraged its reading and study among the people, and recommends instead thereof the Priest's prayer book and Bishop's catechism.

48. Because the Church has failed to bring the unconverted

to a holy life. Her members live and die unhappy in mind and conscience, always looking for some help they never find.

49. Because I have learned from long and careful experience that Priests and Bishops do not preach for the interest of Christ and His kingdom, but for Rome and the almighty dollar.

50. Because the apostles and disciples of Christ never dressed in royal vestments—never said mass in Latin or in any other language—never permitted man, woman or child to bend the knee to them in confession—never heard confession at all; never despised marriage in Priests or Bishops, but blessed it and recommended it as “honorable in all.” They never used wine, holy water, candles, wafers, incense, “*agnus dei*,” scapulars, medals, relics or pocket gods of any kind.

51. Because the mass offers an opportunity to a large majority of priests to mock and blaspheme the Lord Jesus by celebrating it in a drunken state.

52. Because the Church changes her doctrines so often that Catholics themselves for the most part do not know what their Church really believes or teaches.

53. Because the Romish teaching is nowhere established by the Bible.

54. Because I feel more secure to live by faith and the Word of God than by traditions and the alleged infallibility of men.

55. Because indulgences are held out by the Church and are indirectly and directly procured by paying out of the pocket hard cash.

56. Because purgatory seems to me to be established not for the purpose so much of drawing souls from the fiery pit, as for drawing the money from the pockets of a credulous people.

57. Because I firmly believe that it is of pagan origin, and devilish in the extreme for men to adore the host.

58. Because I believe that Priests and Bishops, instead of being vicars and ambassadors of the Holy One, are but microbes and human parasites, the farther from which we betake ourselves

the happier, holier and more successful in this life and the life to come we shall be.

59. Because I found more wicked men and seducers among the Roman Catholic clergy than among any other class of men of equal numbers.

60. Because, according to the Scriptural idea, the Roman Church is no Christian Church at all. All who believe in the Lord Jesus Christ are of the Christian Church, wherever found, and to them, and not a hierarchial body of men, is the commission given to preach and teach and to forgive trespasses against each other. To them is the promise made, and not to a Priest or Pope, that the Holy Spirit will abide with them all their days to comfort, to teach and to guide to the consummation of the world.

61. Because I am satisfied from history, and especially from my knowledge of the Bible, that neither Saints Peter, Paul, John, James, Thomas, or any other followers of Christ did what the Priests, Bishops and Pope of Rome do now.

62. Because long experience has taught me that the Church gives the people no equivalent for the immense sums of money she extorts from them.

63. Because the Church forbids a man to use his own reason, or be guided by the testimony of his own senses.

64. Because I prefer to be saved by the free grace of the Lord and Savior, promise to all who will, than to risk my salvation by proxy and purchase grace of men who have none to spare, even for themselves.

65. Because I will never give up a certainty for an uncertainty.

66. Because I want to use my own brains that God has given me to beget knowledge to prove all things, "and hold fast to that which is good."

67. Because I prefer to be condemned by the Priest for rejecting his expensive salvation, than to be condemned on the last day by the Judge of all the earth for rejecting free salvation purchased by the precious blood of Christ.

68. Because I prefer to read the Scriptures and judge for myself by the aid of the Holy Spirit, though I be called a "heretic," a "turn-coat" and "black sheep," than to receive the milk of the

Word from men who don't know it, and be called "a good, holy Roman Catholic."

70. Because I find in every land in which I traveled, that, for the most part, good Roman Catholics make bad Christians, and wicked Christians make good Roman Catholics. Of course, true Christians, converted men, cannot become Roman Catholics.

71. Because I believe the Pope, who refuses to be instructed in faith and morals, in that he knows it all, is anti-Christian, and the son of perdition.

72. Because I could not believe that the public schools, for the best interests of any Nation, ought to be under the control of the Church.

73. Because I could not be a true American citizen and take sides with a system that is a disgrace to the fundamental institutions of our country.

74. Because I do not believe that "education outside the Roman Catholic Church is a damnable heresy."

75. Because I cannot believe that Saints Patrick, Joseph, Peter, Bridget, or any of them, can be in different places at the same time to hear prayers, and, therefore, that they cannot help us in any way.

76. Because the Church has always opposed the liberty of the press, the liberty of speech, and even the liberty of thought.

77. Because I consider it blasphemy to call the Pope "King of Kings and Lord of Lords."

78. Because the Church that has used the chain, the thumb-screw, the virgin crib, the fagot to make people give up their religious convictions, cannot be the Church of Christ.

79. Because I believe that no Church has a right to make slaves of those who desire to worship God according to their own conscience.

80. Because I believe that civil laws are binding on the conscience of every subject of the Nation, whether these laws be comfortable to the teachings of Rome or not.

81. Because I cannot persuade myself to believe that the laws of the land are null and void, in that they do not agree with

the laws of the Roman Catholic Church.

82. Because, I believe that no Church has power to absolve its members from oaths and their allegiance to the civil government.

83. Because the Church teaches that she has the power to alter all civil laws that are opposed to equity.

84. Because the Church warns the people through the confessional to have no intercourse whatever with those who once belonged to her faith.

86. Because the Church loves authority better than truth; and form more than spirit.

87. Because through all history she has proven herself the mother of ignorance, intolerance and superstition.

88. Because she has added to and taken from the Word of God.

89. Because her teachings are calculated to encourage sin and induce to unholy living.

90. Because I never knew the Church to cut off a member for violating any of the ten commandments, but knew of her persecuting unto death those who persisted in worshipping God according to dictates of conscience.

91. Because I have been ashamed of Church history and the very immoral lives of a large number of the Popes of Rome.

92. Because I saw more light in the common people of the Protestant Churches than I have seen in the clergy of the Roman Catholic Church.

93. Because I have found in the Church as much—if not more—drunkenness, violence, deception, blasphemy, desecration of the Sabbath, and all manner of uncleanness, than I ever found in any equal number of people in the world.

94. Because I have found that forbidding to marry, to eat meat on Fridays, to abstain from honest industry on certain Church days—to discipline the holy with whips to make it obey the soul, etc., are pagan inventions and should be exterminated from civilized beings.

95. Because that I find wearing vestments, saying mass, blessing beads and water, bearing incense and candles, praying to

saints and angels are also of pagan origin, the same being practiced until this day by Indians, Chinese and aboriginal savages.

96. Because there is no Pope in the Bible.

97. Because the Pope's doctrine and Saint Peter's don't agree.

98. Because the Church teaches that no man has a right to choose his religion.

99. Because nearly all of the Roman doctrines are established by men, and of recent day, as anyone may see from history.

100. Because I find the Church to be a political organization, instead of an assembly embracing the people of God.

101. Because it is a secret society full of peril to the Nation.

102. Because the Roman Catholic Church is today what she always was—the intolerant blood-thirsty tiger. On her own testimony she cannot change—“*et semper eadem.*” That is: “She is always the same.”

We take this extract from a sermon preached in St. Louis, Mo., June 30, 1913, by Priest D. S. Phelan, editor of the well known Romanist Church paper, The Western Watchman, of that city. Father Phelan said:

“And why is it that the Church is strong; why is it everybody is afraid of the Catholic Church? And the American people are more afraid of her than any people of the world. Why are they afraid of the Catholic Church? They know what the Catholic Church means. It means all the Catholics of the world; not of one country, or two countries, but all the countries of the world.

“And it means more than that; it means that the Catholics of the world love the Church more than anything else, that the CATHOLICS OF THE WORLD LOVE THE CHURCH MORE THAN THEY DO THEIR OWN GOVERNMENTS, MORE THAN THEY DO THEIR OWN NATION, more than they do their own people, more than they do their own fortunes, more than they do their own selves.

“We of the Catholic Church are ready to go to the death for the Church. Under God she is the supreme object of our wor-

ship. Tell us that we think more of the Church than we do of the United States; of course we do. Tell us we are Catholics first and Americans or Englishmen afterwards; of course we are. Tell us in the conflict between the Church and the civil government we take the side of the Church; of course we do. Why, if the government of the United States were at war with the Church, we would say tomorrow, **TO HELL WITH THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES**; and if the Church and all the governments of the world were at war, we would say, **TO HELL WITH ALL THE GOVERNMENTS OF THE WORLD**.

"They say we are Catholics first and Americans decidedly afterwards. There is no doubt about it. We are Catholics first, and we love the Church more than we love any and all the governments of the world.

"Let the governments of the world steer clear of the Catholic Church; let the emperors, let the kings and the presidents not come into conflict with the head of the Catholic Church. Because the Catholic Church is everything to all the Catholics of the world; they renounce all nationalities where there is a question of loyalty to her. And why is it that hope is so strong? Why is it that in this country, where we have only seven per cent of the population, the Catholic Church is so much feared? She is loved by all her children and feared by everybody.

"Why is it the Pope is such a tremendous power? Why the Pope is the ruler of the world. All the emperors, all the kings, all the princes, all the presidents of the world today are as these altar boys of mine. The Pope is the ruler of the world. Why? Because he is the ruler of the Catholics of the world—the Catholics of all the world; and the Catholics of all the world would die for the rights of the Pope. He is the head of the Church, and they would die for the Church. And the Church is the Church of Jesus Christ, and they need not have any misgivings on that score; they need be no misconception there—the Catholics of the world are Catholics first and always; they are Americans, they are Germans, they are French or they are English afterwards."

Historical Works of Thomas E. Watson

On Sale at
The Tom Watson Book Co., Inc.
Thomson, Georgia.

THE STORY OF FRANCE

11 Vols.

Regarded as standard authority in France; has been translated into French, and used as text book in French colleges.

\$6.00 per set, delivered.

NAPOLEON

Sold in France as the best one-volume Life of the Emperor.

\$3.50 delivered.

LIFE AND TIMES OF THOMAS JEFFERSON

For several years the author owned a summer home within sight of Jefferson's home, and secured much of his material for this work from family records of the neighborhood.

\$3.50 delivered.

THE HOUSE OF HAPSBURG

One of the author's last historical works; states cause of recent European War; shows the origin of the House of Hapsburg, the growth of the Papal Power of Rome.

50 cents postpaid.

A Price List of Watson's Books and Booklets

IN PRINT FOR DISTRIBUTION

Story of France Complete (11 vols.)	\$6.00
Napoleon	3.50
Life and Times of Thomas Jefferson	3.50
Political and Economic Handbook	1.50
A Chapter on Socialism25
House of Hapsburg50
Roman Catholic Church25
Short History of Papacy and Popes25
Watson's Magazine (Supplement)25
Mr. Watson's Editorials On the War25
What Are Your Constitutional Rights?25
Maria Monk and Her Revelations of Convent Crimes35
Roman Catholics in America Falsifying History25
Watson's Jeffersonian Magazine (July-Dec.)	1.00
The Religion You Don't Want10
The Cordele Platform of the F. U.10
Socialists and Socialism	1.00
Prose Miscellanies	1.00
Fourth Degree Oath of the K. of C.50
Rome's Law or Ours Which?25
The Watsonian (12 months)	1.00
Arguments Against Conscription10
Is There a Roman Catholic Peril?	
Here is Proof of it25
Speech Against Conscription25
The Italian Pope's Campaign Against the Constitu-	
tional Rights of American Citizens25
What Goes On in the Nunneries and	
Is Your Brain For Sale.....	.25

THE TOM WATSON BOOK COMPANY, Inc.
THOMSON, GEORGIA

It is easy for me to understand the Scotchman who kneels on the site of the home of William Wallace; easy to understand the Frenchman who is thrilled by the "Marseillaise;" easy to understand the Italian who treasures a relic or a memory of Garibaldi; but it is impossible to understand the men who feel it an honor to kiss the hand of a crowned and sceptred fool, who inherited his kingship from another crowned and sceptred fool, and whose greatest aim in life is to hand down the royal office to a long line of crowned and sceptred fools.

—Thos. E. Watson.