

Cath. Ch. in U.S.A. - Anti-Cath. Mov. BX
1770
AEK 5290
958403

THE ROMAN CATHOLICS OF AMERICA AND THE KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS

SPEECH OF HON. JAMES A. GALLIVAN OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FEBRUARY 4, 1915

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, let it never be said that within less than 150 years of the Declaration of Independence a Congress of the United States, so far forgetting the foundations of our own America, gave the lie to the hopes and to the aspirations of people struggling under the absolutism of Europe and other countries and who, yearning for opportunities for improvement for themselves and those that came after them, found closed upon them the doors of a country which in the providence of God had been reserved as a haven for the struggling aspiring manhood wherever found on earth. [Applause.] "The earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof." All men are His creatures. Shall we dare to say that man, the image of the Creator, shall not have a share in the fruits of the fairest land which the sun shines upon?

Mr. Speaker, I can see influences back of this proposed legislation other than those exercised and controlled by organized labor; I can see influences which dare not come out into the light of day, but which, under the cover of an inky, slimy darkness, masquerading in the guise and garb of so-called "patriotic" orders, are ceaselessly endeavoring to divide the great body of American citizenship along lines of racial and religious prejudice. I ask every fair-minded man in this body to listen to this extract from one of these so-called "patriotic" publications, and when you have heard it ask yourselves whether there be even the shadow of truth in its base references to "Rome and its lobby."

This paper said in its last issue:

WHAT THE MENACE SAID.

On January 14 the Senate agreed to the conference report on the Burnett immigration bill without a record vote. Senator REED, of Missouri, after four weeks of talk and filibuster in opposition against this meritorious measure, finally tired of talking and allowed the Senate to take the vote resulting in agreement.

Among other things inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as part of his remarks on the subject were telegrams and letters from Cardinal Gibbons; Edward Cummins, S. J. (supreme Jesuit); John Cavanaugh, C. S. C., president of the Roman Catholic University at Notre Dame, Ind.; John J. Glennon, archbishop of St. Louis; and the like. (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Jan. 14, pp. 1606 and 1607.)

From this it is apparent who pulled the string that kept Senator REED's tongue in motion day after day under the endless-talk privilege by which a Senator may talk a measure to death.

Rome's spokesman in the House seems to have been RUFUS HARDY, of Texas. HARDY's speech in the House (see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 1531) contains HARDY's declaration that he is against this bill and against all kindred legislation. We are informed that his remarks on the floor were more severe and harsh than they appear as revised in the RECORD.



The 60-page bill, containing the reading test and 300 other additional amendments to existing immigration laws, went to the White House January 15. The President has 10 legislative days, excluding Sundays and the day he received it, in which to sign the bill or return it to the House without his signature. Failure to do either results in the bill automatically becoming a law.

It is expected that President Wilson will veto the measure; but it can be passed over the veto if all the supporting Senators and Congressmen are present and counted on the final vote. Rome's lobby is there in force, and friends of this bill should not delay in writing their Congressmen and Senators and urge them to do their duty at the critical moment.

Mr. Speaker, may I call to the attention of this House that it would be well worth the time of those who seek the light to read some extracts from an article from the pen of Rev. Washington Gladden, recently published in Harper's Weekly. It represents the viewpoint of a broad-minded, courageous, and well-known Congregational clergyman. Dr. Gladden writes:

THE ANTIPAPAL PANIC.

It is evident that we are in for another fierce anti-Catholic crusade. These visitations are periodic; the term has not perhaps been calculated, but we shall be able one of these days to give the formula. The period is probably a little longer than that of the 17-year locusts. Whether the pupa of the Cicada papaphobiana burrows in the earth during the time of its disappearance is not known; there are those who think that it goes deeper. * * *

To those to whom the happiness and peace of their native land is dear these visitations of religious rancor and intolerance are most unwelcome. An epidemic of small-pox or yellow fever is a light affliction compared with these seasons of religious contention and suspicion and enmity. What we are going to see during the next few months is something like this: The great mass of the Protestant Christians of this country arrayed against the great mass of the Roman Catholic Christians, each party thinking and saying hard and bitter and violent things about the other; each party cherishing the worst suspicions about the motives and purposes of the other; each party believing that the other is plotting to take away its liberties, and perhaps to exterminate it by assassination or carnage. Not all the Protestants and not all the Roman Catholics will give room in their hearts to such dark thoughts and fears and enmities, but most of them will; and the mob mind, which always dominates these epidemics, will reduce to silence the majority of those who know that this is mainly insanity.

The first mutterings of this eruption of mud and slime are audible already. Those of us who have passed through this misery two or three times know what to expect. It is being whispered now in Protestant circles that the Catholics are meeting by stealth from night to night in the basements of their churches to drill for the impending insurrection. If the church has no basement, it matters not; the story is just as freely told and just as readily believed. * * *

Here is the program of "Six Sunday evening lectures on Roman Catholicism" recently delivered in a church in the heart of the best residence district in my own city:

"1. Why preach against the Roman Catholic Church. (A shotgun load.)

RIFLE BALLS.

"2. Popedom. This lecture will expose the most palpable fraud of human history.

"3. The priesthood. Testimony of history, ex-Catholics, and first-hand information.

"4. The auricular confession. An iniquity that ought to be prohibited by law.

"5. Rome's bloody hands. No man-eating tiger ever thirsted for blood as has the Roman Catholic Church.

"6. Romanism and American institutions. If red blood flows in your veins the Pope's ambition to rule our beloved country and reduce it to the level of Italy and Spain will set your nerves ajingle and cause you to engage in the great fight that is on."

This is the sort of entertainment sheet which will soon be offered in many American cities.

Rumors will be heard of consignments of arms being delivered by night to Roman Catholics; they are apt to come in coffins.

Forged documents of various sorts will be printed and privately circulated—documents purporting to have been issued by the Roman Catholic hierarchy, giving instructions to the faithful, in which they are authorized and instigated to commit various crimes against their Protestant employers and neighbors, and intimating that mother church will absolve them from the guilt of all such offenses.

Old bulls and decretals of the Dark Ages will be dug up and exploited, and it will be insinuated, or perhaps boldly asserted, that the policy indicated in them is still

ruling the Roman Catholic Church. In the last of these epidemics a forged papal encyclical, with all the formal phrases belonging to these documents, and signed by the name of Pope Leo XIII, was kept standing for weeks in the columns of many of the papers representing the anti-Catholic crusade and was published in leaflet form and circulated broadcast. In this stupid fabrication Pope Leo was represented as saying:

"We proclaim the people of the United States to have forfeited all right to rule said Republic, and also all dominion, dignity, and privileges appertaining to it. We likewise declare that all subjects of every rank and condition in the United States and every individual who has taken any oath of loyalty to the United States in any way whatever may be absolved from said oath, as also from all duty, fidelity, or obedience, on or about September 5, 1893, when the Roman Catholic Congress shall convene at Chicago, Ill., as we shall exonerate them from all engagements; and on or about the feast of Ignatius Loyola, in the year of our Lord 1893, it will be the duty of the faithful to exterminate all heretics found within the jurisdiction of the United States. * * *"

FIENDISH DOCUMENTS FORGED.

It is an astounding fact that such a fiendish document could be forged and published by Protestant Christians in the United States of America; it is more astounding that they should believe that it would impose on any considerable number of Americans; it is most astounding that thousands and thousands of the members of our Protestant churches, including many ministers, should accept it as genuine and aid in its circulation. In Toledo, Ohio, the "councils" of the secret anti-Catholic orders united in ordering several hundred Remington rifles to protect themselves against this threatened slaughter; on the night named in the "encyclical" numbers of them were up all night in the engine houses, waiting to give the alarm by which the Protestant hosts were to be rallied to resist the massacre. In the meantime their Roman Catholic neighbors were sleeping soundly in their beds, all unaware of the carnage which was expected of them.

In how many other places such vigils were kept I do not know; but in Toledo there was a dispute about the payment of the bill for these Remington rifles, which brought the business into court, and the facts related above are a matter of court record.

Such hysterical fears will soon be agitating hundreds of thousands of breasts in this enlightened land. It is quite impossible for anybody to forge a tale of horror or treachery or villainy which will not be eagerly believed by millions of Christians in this country concerning their fellow Christians, when these religious lunacies begin to be epidemic. * * *

The demand for instances of the enmity of our neighbors becomes inappeasable, and imagination is busy inventing them. Most of these harrowing tales will come from other communities; the dreadful things that are happening in your own community you will learn about through letters of inquiry from distant places. Intelligent persons from other towns in Ohio wrote me 20 years ago that the report was current among them that all the police in Columbus and all the school-teachers and all the county officers were Roman Catholics; the truth at that time was that 5 out of 20 county officials, and 45 out of 112 policemen, and 12 out of 349 school-teachers were of that faith. But Columbus at the same time was believing similar tales about many other towns and cities.

PROTESTANTS AND CATHOLICS FRIENDS.

The fact is that we have got to learn to live together in this country—Protestants and Catholics. If either party should undertake to exterminate the other, the process would be somewhat difficult. The only question is whether we shall live together in peace or in enmity. If we are to have peace, we must study the things that make for peace; each party must be ready to see the good side of the other; must learn to put the best and not the worst construction on the words and deeds of the other; must avoid all bitter and uncharitable judgments; must put away all thoughts of domination. We must be friends—Protestants and Catholics. No other relation is conceivable. And there is no worse enemy of Christ or of his country than the man who seeks to inflame and poison the minds of either Protestants or Catholics with suspicions and fears and resentments and enmities toward the other. * * *

This conflagration of hate is already well started, and it will probably sweep over the land. No argument could extinguish it. There are millions of Protestants who are incapable of believing anything but evil of Roman Catholics. Traditional rancor colors all their vision wherever the name of the Pope is mentioned. But there are a good many other Protestants, I trust, who are capable of reason and justice, and to them I venture to make two or three suggestions:

1. Whenever you hear any of these harrowing tales about the sinister and sanguinary plots of the Roman Catholics never let one go unchallenged. Insist that the narrator give his authorities and furnish his evidence. See that the matter is thoroughly investigated, and publish the facts with the names of those who have reported the charges.

2. Take every opportunity you can get to talk with your Roman Catholic neighbors and friends about the relations of the churches. Don't shun them or cast suspicious glances on them when you meet them; don't treat them as if they were spies or emissaries of some malign power; shake hands with them; get acquainted with them and talk over the whole situation in a friendly way. We may have some difficult problems to settle in our relation with them, but let us meet them not as enemies, but as friends.

3. Instead of listening to horrible tales of what the Catholics are doing in distant places sit down and make out a list of all the Catholic men and women you know in business, in professional life, in the philanthropies, in society, in the shops and factories, in the kitchens; put down their names and think them over, and see whether you will be able to convince yourselves that these men and women are capable of doing the kind of things which these tales attribute to them. How many of these people, do you think, are plotting to rob you of your liberties or to murder you in your beds? These are Roman Catholics, the Roman Catholics not of the dark ages of the sixteenth century, but the Roman Catholics of to-day. And whenever you talk about Roman Catholics in public or private remember that these are the people you are talking about. * * *

4. It might be well for people who are capable of putting two and two together to remember that the danger of the clerical domination of this country, whether by Congregationalists or Catholics, is not imminent. The last Roman Catholic paper I opened alleged that there are 75,000,000 of non-Catholics in the United States. That would mean that there can be no more than 20,000,000 or 25,000,000 of Catholics. In any attempt to impose clerical rule the Protestant forces would find themselves strongly supported by the great majority of the secret orders and by the entire socialistic contingent of our population. There does not appear to be any adequate reason why 75,000,000 should be shuddering with fear that 20,000,000 are about to subjugate or exterminate them. The mood which yields to such a panic is the reverse of heroic. * * *

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to read here the appreciation of an eminent Catholic layman, Prof. Condé B. Pallen, who recently carefully and honorably analyzed Dr. Gladden's article in the Columbiad. Prof. Pallen says, among other things:

We have but to read over the program of the "Six Sunday evening lectures on Roman Catholicism," quoted by Dr. Gladden, as recently delivered in a church in the heart of the best residence district of his city (Columbus, Ohio), to appreciate the character of the people for whom they were intended and the turpitude of the expounder. Their folly, their falsehood, their viciousness would seem incredible, were not the damnable evidence vouched for by Dr. Gladden himself, and were not similar evidences scattered broadcast throughout the land in a number of periodicals through the United States mail, whose officials seem impotent to rectify so flagrant an abuse of a great national agency, whereby 15,000,000 American citizens are daily vilified and calumniated. * * *

ANTICATHOLIC AGITATION WIDESPREAD.

That this anti-Catholic agitation is widespread and maliciously active is evident enough. Is its influence as a disturber and disrupter of the peaceful relations between Catholics and Protestants and of the amity, which sane and liberal men entertain toward each other as citizens of the same fatherland, as malign and weighty as Dr. Gladden predicts? Will it bring about that mutual suspicion and distrust, that hard, bitter, and violent feeling which Dr. Gladden depicts and deplures?

It is here that we take issue with Dr. Gladden. We believe that the vast majority of American citizens are above the sinister influences of a propaganda so vile in its methods, so base in its principles, so contrary to the basic character of our Constitution, so flagrantly stupid in its accusations, and so wanton in its purpose. Our faith in the integrity and intelligence of the American character is based upon the history of the past. The American people, as a whole, have triumphantly resisted such vicious agitation for the past 125 years, and this when they were much less better prepared to yield to the iniquitous influence than at the present day. In the decade between 1850 to 1860 it manifested itself in its most virulent form and crystallized in the Know Nothing Party, which went down to shame and a just oblivion under the sturdy repudiation of the American people. The noxious growth could not live in the open air. Under the form of APAism in the nineties, the scorched reptile again raised its venomous head, to be crushed again under the heel of real Americanism. APAism was repudiated by the great political parties, and evoked strong denunciations from prominent leaders, such as Theodore Roosevelt; Speaker Henderson; United States Senators Hoar, Vest, Hill, and Vilas; Gov. Peck, of Wisconsin; Gov. Altgeld, of Illinois; and Gov. Stone, of Missouri. Its influence was limited to a few localities and that evanescent. By the year 1900 the A. P. A. agitation had practically ceased, and as a political factor disappeared from the horizon. * * *

CATHOLICS HAVE SHED THEIR BLOOD FOR AMERICA.

Each successive manifestation of anti-Catholic bigotry in this country has shown itself weaker and weaker, and with good reason. Catholicity has constantly demonstrated itself as in perfect congruity with American principles and institutions. Non-Catholics have mingled with Catholics in every-day life, and learned that the latter have neither horns nor tails. There have been no Catholic conspiracies to seize the Government and place it under the domination of the Pope. The often-reiterated charges against them have proved silly bogies. They have never stored arms in the basements of churches with which to massacre their Protestant fellow citizens. The accusations against them have invariably evaporated in their own weltering silliness. There is even a certain sense of humor in the situation. To imagine that a small minority of citizens even contemplated turning over the Government of the United States to a feeble old man in the Vatican, who has neither army, navy, nor funds is more bizarre than opera bouffé, and ought to move wild laughter in the throat of death. What must be the mental condition of the people who are prepared to swallow such a concoction of bedlam?

Beyond all this, Catholics have been living side by side with their non-Catholic fellow citizens for a century and a half, engaged in the same pursuits and enterprises, and have been clearly discerned to be ordinary, normal human beings. In the professions they have, just as others, left their mark and demonstrated their achievements; in business they have contributed their quota of success and failure as others around them have done. In the Army and the Navy, both in rank and file, they have served as others have served, and their record has been clear. They have rallied to the flag when occasion required it and shed their blood as freely as others have done. In the fields of industry, invention, and enterprise they have not been laggards; in short, they have been citizens as others have been and just as human as others have been. The others have recognized all this, and with American sanity and honesty seen for themselves that Catholics are just as keen for their country's welfare and glory as they themselves are; just as ready to defend it, work for it, and shed their blood for it as any in the land. The others have realized all this by constant daily intercourse, and as they are not fools, they are not going to swallow the foul and silly accusations against Catholics by which fanatics and knaves would destroy the mutual trust and understanding between citizens of a common country and with a common cause. * * *

ANTICATHOLICISM A PROPAGANDA OF LUNACY.

We do not believe that there is any reason for alarm. Dr. Gladden's apprehension that the present anti-Catholic agitation is going to lead to bitterness, estrangement, and mutual misunderstanding has no justification on the Catholic side. We Catholics are not going to cherish the worst suspicion about the motives and purposes of our Protestant fellow citizens. We never did and we are not going to begin now, for we know that the vast majority of our Protestant fellow citizens are level-headed enough to see through a doughnut, especially when it is a political doughnut. There are, of course, the agitators and their deluded followers; these we pity or despise. But they are a constantly diminishing minority. They are fewer and count less and less in value year by year, and the American public has grown tired of bogus encyclicals and false oaths, which would strain the credulity of imbeciles. Our civic and social and business integrity has become too well established to be injured by a propaganda of lunacy. Dr. Gladden believes that "there are millions of Protestants incapable of believing anything but evil of Roman Catholics." We hesitate to estimate so many of our fellow citizens at so low a grade of intelligence and honesty. At any rate, we believe that there are tens of millions of Protestants whose mentality is still sound and whose hearts are in the right place. We harbor no suspicion against them, and the bigots are not going to rouse us to recrimination, resentment, and enmity. We are not going to be made fools by the folly of some fools nor malicious by the malice of some knaves. We believe with Dr. Gladden "We must be friends, Protestants and Catholics. No other relation is conceivable." * * *

FALSE OATHS CIRCULATED BY KNOW-NOTHINGS.

Far be it from me, Mr. Speaker, to charge any Member of this House with being under the thumb or under the heel of these "patriotic" organizations which are spreading the gospel of hatred and religious anarchy. But every man within the sound of my voice has been either petitioned or threatened by these very organizations or their agents or their publications that his action on this immigration bill will be watched and his political future has been dangled before his eyes should he dare to incur the wrath of the "antipapal" press—

this press, Mr. Speaker, which has so wickedly, yes, so foully, within the recent past given wide circulation to a most heinous, ungodly, un-Christian, yes, a murderous and illegal oath as the one required by the Knights of Columbus from its members. It is an attack against the Catholic and his church, a creation of Know-Nothings, A. P. A.'s, and their allies and successors.

Bigots have read this foul libel and gloated over its expected destruction of the Knights of Columbus; they have passed it to others, circulated it, approved it.

Some honest men have read it and been sorely troubled in consequence. It seemed unlike the Knights of Columbus they knew as honest men; yet would men dare publish such a thing if it was untrue? If untrue, would not the Knights of Columbus prosecute their defamers?

What, then, was the duty of the society to itself, to its members, to the host of men who were in doubt?

HOW THE K. OF C. ANSWERED.

Mr. Speaker, permit me to quote from a recent publication issued by the commission on religious prejudice of that great, truly American order just what actions have been taken to expose these libels. May I ask the Members of this House to give these lines most careful consideration?

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Before giving the history of the various prosecutions and activities above referred to for criminal libel in printing or publishing or defaming by means of the alleged oath, we want to answer the foul charge intimating that the Congressional Record of the United States is authority for its genuineness.

Much has been printed by those circulating the bogus "oath" tending to mislead the public into the belief that in some way Congress had found it to be true. So they have referred to the Congressional Record of February 15, 1913, for proof of the genuineness of this "libel."

THE FACT.

In the Congressional Record of February 15, 1913, pages 3215 et seq., appears a report of the Committee on Elections No. 1 on the contested-election case of Eugene C. Bonniwell v. Thomas S. Butler. The contestant had alleged that the circulation of the "oath" against him was libelous, and a use of means not to be recognized, etc.

A FALSE AND LIBELOUS OATH.

After reciting the "oath," which decency and respect for our order forbid reprinting, the committee in its report says:

"This committee can not condemn too strongly the publication of the false and libelous article referred to in the paper of Mr. Bonniwell, and which was the spurious Knights of Columbus oath, a copy of which is appended to the paper. It also condemns the publication of editorials to excite religious prejudice in a political campaign. No man should be persecuted for his religion, whether he be Catholic or Protestant."

PHILADELPHIA CASE.

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA AGAINST CHARLES MEGONEGAL AND CLARENCE H. STAGE.

Over a year ago (to be exact, February 20, 1913) two men were held in bail for appearance in court to answer charges made by local Knights of Columbus. Charles Megonegal, a printer, of 4201 Brown Street, was charged with printing and causing to be printed libelous matter (the bogus Knights of Columbus oath) willfully and maliciously exposing the Knights of Columbus as a body; Charles B. Dowds, upon whose affidavit the arrests were made; James A. Flaherty, the supreme knight; and Philip A. Hart, master of the fourth degree, to public hatred, contempt, and ridicule, to their great damage, disgrace, scandal, and infamy.

Megonegal and Clarence H. Stage, a barber, were charged jointly with conspiracy to defame and oppress the aforesaid members and others of the order by causing said matter to be circulated.

At the hearing it was elicited from Megonegal that he had bought copies of the bogus oath in bulk from the Menace before starting to print it on his own account.

A THREAT.

In its March 1, 1913, issue, the Menace, after reproducing a press dispatch reporting the result of the hearing before the magistrate, at which the accused were held for trial, said:

"Further than what is given here we do not know the particulars in this case, but we do know that these men are American citizens, and that they will be defended in their constitutional rights of free speech and free press. The press dispatch, as usual, lies when it says the Menace has printed the so-called Knights of Columbus oath, as the files of our paper will show. But if the Knights of Columbus want to start anything with the Menace for what it really has printed they have our permission to do their worst, as we are ready to defend every utterance we have ever made about the Knights. And if they don't want their complete ritual and secret work printed and distributed to a million men in this Republic they had better leave the Menace out of this controversy."

THE TRIAL.

On Friday, January 30, 1914, in the quarter sessions court, before Hon. Robert N. Willson, appeared Megonegal and Stage to answer the true bills of indictment found against them by the grand jury. Joseph Taulane, Esq., assistant district attorney, appeared for the Commonwealth; Owen J. Roberts, Esq., and Joseph P. Gaffney, for the private prosecutors; Peter F. MacLaren, Esq., for Megonegal; and Leroy N. King, Esq., for Stage.

The trial judge, the assistant district attorney, in charge of the prosecution, the senior counsel for the private prosecutors, and both attorneys for the defendants are non-Catholics.

James A. Flaherty, Esq., supreme knight of the Knights of Columbus, having been sworn, testified as follows:

"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 on account of the wide circulation given to this vile and scurrilous circular, the purpose of which 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. It was so persistently circulated that the Knights of Columbus were compelled to take some steps to refute it, and we thought criminal prosecution would be the best way to do it."

GUILT ADMITTED, SENTENCE SUSPENDED.

Megonegal having pleaded guilty and Stage nolo contendere, which means that the truth of the charge is not contradicted, the district attorney stated that the prosecution was willing that sentence be suspended.

Attorneys MacLaren and King, counsel for the defense, joined in this request to the court, pleading good faith on the part of their clients, who, they said, had received the "oath" from the Menace, of Aurora, Mo.

As evidence that their clients had been deceived, they presented to the court a copy of a letter sent to the Menace by Mr. King, asking the paper's aid in the defense of Megonegal and Stage, and the original of the reply received from the Menace.

The text of Mr. King's letter follows:

"PHILADELPHIA, February 27, 1913.

"MENACE PUBLISHING Co., Aurora, Mo.

"GENTLEMEN: Mr. Peter M. MacLaren and myself are associated in the case of libel and conspiracy brought by the Knights of Columbus against Clarence H. Stage and Charles Megonegal, of this city.

"We notice in your issue of March 1 that you are prepared to print and distribute the complete ritual and secret work of the Knights of Columbus, and we desire to obtain an authentic copy of said ritual and secret work for use in the trial of our clients, since the prosecution alleges that there is no oath taken by candidates for any of the Knights of Columbus degrees. Can you supply us with what we desire and need?

"Our clients have no knowledge of the authenticity of the Knights of Columbus oath, having received them in the first instance from your company, and they naturally rely upon you to aid them in their present difficulty.

"An early reply will be greatly appreciated.

"Yours, very truly,

"LEROY N. KING."

The answer of the Menace was as follows:

"AURORA, Mo., March 5, 1913.

"MR. LEROY N. KING, Philadelphia, Pa.

"DEAR SIR: Replying to your letter of February 27, we wish to state that we are not in possession of the ritual and secret work of the Knights of Columbus, but we believe we are in a fair way to get it; and 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 that it can be had. You will note

that we printed in our No. 99 the ritual and secret work of the Hibernians, and we are positive that it is authentic. The alleged oath which your clients in Philadelphia were arrested for distributing was circulated in practically every State during the late campaign and the demand upon us for this document was something great, and we had received copies of them from so many sources we simply printed and handled them as we would any other job of printing—to supply the demand—and while we have no apologies to make for so doing, we do not have any evidence that the oath is the one which is taken by members of the Knights of Columbus.

“We feel sure that it would be folly for you to undertake to base your defense on the authenticity of this document.

“We note that some of the officials are claiming that it is not an oath-bound order, which, of course, is a subterfuge and untrue. You can depend upon them resorting to any method which they can contrive to bluff away their critics, and if they are so bent on vindicating themselves, why not ask that they present in court the obligations which they do take. This would be the quickest way to clear the matter up in the minds of the people.

“We are filing your letter and will be on the lookout for anything which we think will aid in the defense of these men.

“Trusting that this will be satisfactory, we beg to remain, yours, sincerely,”

THE MENACE PUBLISHING Co.

STATEMENT FROM THE COURT.

Agreeing to the proposal that sentence be suspended, Judge Willson, who is one of the most prominent Presbyterian laymen in Philadelphia, said:

“I think that these cases have reached a very proper conclusion, and it is, in my judgment, quite suitable that, in accordance with the desire of all the parties concerned, sentence should be suspended in the cases.

“Great care ought to be taken that no injustice should be done by written or spoken words to either individuals or institutions. It is not at all strange that the prosecutors in these cases should not have been willing that the opprobrium which would naturally arise if the publications complained of had been founded in truth should be allowed to exist.

“I am personally glad to hear from the head of the order or society referred to what he has said in regard to the matter.

“Though not of the same faith, I realize fully and without reluctance that the church with which that society is affiliated accomplishes a vast deal of good. Its activities should be protected from misrepresentation.

“I may add that my personal acquaintance with Mr. Flaherty, the head of the order in question, leads me to accept his statement without hesitation.”

ANOTHER CASE.

STATE OF MINNESOTA AGAINST A. M. MORRISON AND GARFIELD E. MORRISON, EDITORS AND PUBLISHERS OF THE MANKATO (MINN.) MORNING JOURNAL.

A trial of the greatest interest to Knights of Columbus and to the Catholics of this country and of Canada, as well as to non-Catholics—and among them, to none more than to the small band of loud-mouthed bigots who rail against the church—was held in Waterville, Minn., Wednesday, July 29, 1914. This was an action of criminal libel brought by E. M. Lawless, editor of the Waterville Sentinel, against A. M. Morrison and G. E. Morrison, father and son, editors and publishers of the Mankato Morning Journal, of Mankato, Minn. The libel consisted in the charging of Lawless with having taken the bogus Knights of Columbus oath, which has been so largely circulated in this country and in Canada during the past year and a half. We will not attempt to reproduce this oath, but suffice it to say that it has been published as the Knights of Columbus oath and as the fourth-degree oath and is, in letter and insinuation, one of the foulest libels imaginable. It is in some respects a revamp of the old hoax which has for many years passed muster in the press of bigots as the Jesuit oath.

OBLIGATION PUT IN EVIDENCE.

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

Knights of Columbus and Catholics generally have been astounded at the conditions which make possible the publication and circulation by millions of copies of this foul libel. Well-meaning non-Catholics have been shocked by these accusations against Catholic men and Knights of Columbus whom they knew to be high-minded citizens

and ideal neighbors. The bigots working in the darkness, as of old, have pressed on the accusation and argued that if the "oath" was not true the Knights of Columbus would soon, by prosecution or otherwise, prevent its further circulation.

A SENSATIONAL TRIAL.

The fact is that the trial was a most sensational one from many points of view. It was presided over by Judge George J. Dressel. The district attorney who prosecuted the case was Francis J. Hanzel, of Montgomery, prosecuting attorney for Le Sueur County, who was assisted by Attorney Thomas Hessian, of Le Sueur. The defendants were represented by Owen Morris, of St. Paul. The small country court room was crowded to the very limits of its capacity, and the spectators filled every available inch of space, having come in from the surrounding country to hear the case tried. A jury was finally selected, and it is of more than passing importance and a matter of gratification to the order, as it is a compliment to him, that the Rev. Thomas Billing, the resident Methodist minister of the town, was chosen on the jury and was not challenged by the complainant, and, as the result showed, voted with the other 11 men to convict the two defendants.

The jury in this case were: William Callies, Emil Hehl, John W. Gish, Thomas McGovern, Vince Roessler, Rev. Thomas Billing, Joseph Miller, jr., H. J. Luther, V. R. Wood, Chris. Ruedy, Steve Hoban, Ed. Zinbrich.

The proceedings were taken down in shorthand by C. G. Bowdish, court reporter of the judicial district.

After each juror had been questioned in turn, the defendants waived any challenge.

The following witnesses were called by the State: P. J. Gutzler, Rev. H. E. Chapman, pastor of the Congregational Church; I. N. Griffith, deputy postmaster of Mankato; E. M. Lawless, Dr. E. W. Buckley, supreme physician of Knights of Columbus; William J. McGinley, supreme secretary of Knights of Columbus.

SUPREME OFFICERS PRESENT.

The surprise of the trial to the Knights of Columbus themselves, and to all those whose curiosity had whetted their appetite to learn some of the secrets of that great order, was the calling of two of the supreme officers as witnesses. The first was the supreme physician, Dr. E. W. Buckley, of St. Paul, who testified in effect that Mr. Lawless had received initiation in the fourth degree under his direction as master. Upon cross-examination Dr. Buckley was asked as to the nature of the "oath" administered in the fourth degree, and most emphatically denied then, as he did in answering subsequent questions of the defendants' counsel, that the order had any oath in any part of its ceremonial or degree work. He freely admitted that the order had a pledge or obligation which is administered to candidates. To the great surprise of all present, however, when interrogated as to the nature of this obligation, Dr. Buckley very fully answered the question and gave the substance of the obligation as administered to candidates on being initiated in the fourth degree of the Knights of Columbus.

William J. McGinley, of New Haven, Conn., supreme secretary of the Knights of Columbus, also testified as to the nature of the obligation, as the official custodian of the original manuscripts and of all matters pertaining to the ceremonial of the society. He placed a copy of the obligation in evidence, and it was made part of the records of the trial. He emphasized the fact that the Knights of Columbus was not an oath-bound society, and that no member was asked to take more than an obligation which any gentleman might take. Both Dr. Buckley and Mr. McGinley testified in no uncertain words that the bogus oath which was the subject matter of the prosecution was, neither in letter nor in spirit, a part of any of the ceremonial of the Knights of Columbus in any of its degrees.

The following is a portion of the direct and cross-examination of Dr. Buckley and Mr. McGinley:

Direct examination by County Attorney Hanzel.

Cross-examination by Attorney Morris.

Q. Your name is Edward W. Buckley?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You are a practicing physician and surgeon in St. Paul, are you not?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, you are also a Knight of Columbus?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Member of the Knights of Columbus, and a member of the fourth degree?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. On January 27, 1907, did you hold any position in the order?—A. I was master of the fourth degree for Minnesota and North Dakota.

Q. As such master, did you have charge of the giving of that degree?—A. I did.

Q. Did you have charge of the giving of that degree on January 29, 1907?—A. What date?

Q. January 27, 1907.—A. I did.

Q. That was the time that Mr. Lawless said he took that degree; do you remember of his taking it?—A. Well, he says he took it, and I think I remember his taking it, but I had 160 candidates in that class from Minnesota and North Dakota; I feel pretty certain Mr. Lawless took it at that time.

Q. Did you hear me read and have you heard that purported oath credited to the fourth degree of the Knights of Columbus read here in court.—A. I did.

Q. Did any of those candidates, including Mr. Lawless, take such an oath as that.—A. Not that I know of.

Q. Is there any such oath in the order.—A. There is not.

Q. Is there any oath in the order.—A. There is not.

Q. What do the members take in the order.—A. They take an obligation in the degrees—first, second, third, and fourth.

Q. Do you know the obligation of the fourth degree.—A. Well, I know what it is in a general way. Now, the master doesn't give any part of the degree; he has charge of it and the degree team under him, and he is supposed to give to each one of the members of the degree team the special charge belonging to their office; and one of the officers of the degree—it is the duty of one of the officers of the degree to give the obligation; and, in a general way, of course, I remember what it is. I am not master now, and haven't been for some years.

Q. You are the supreme physician of the order.—A. I am supreme physician, medical director, of the order.

Q. Well, give us your general idea of that fourth-degree obligation.—A. The fourth degree is a patriotic degree; it exemplifies patriotism, and the candidate affirms that he will support the Constitution of the United States and the constitution of his own State; that he will protect the purity of the ballot; and that he will remain a good member of the Catholic church. He also agrees to remain a good, law-abiding citizen of the United States.

Q. Is there any part of the degree work that resembles anything like that that appeared in that article that has been read here.

(By Mr. Morris.) Objected to as calling for the opinion or conclusion of the witness. The proper way to do is to tell what they have and then put this beside it, and let the jury say whether there is any resemblance.

Objected to as incompetent, irrelevant, and immaterial, calling for a conclusion.

Q. Is there any such oath taken in any of the degrees.—A. No, sir.

Cross-examination by Mr. Morris:

Q. Are there obligations taken in each of the degrees.—A. In each one; yes, sir.

Q. Are each of the four obligations different one from the other.—A. Yes, sir. There are only two principal obligations, the one following at the third degree and the other in the fourth.

Q. Is there anything in those oaths—A. Which oaths?

Q. Well, we are all wrong about calling them oaths; we all mean the same thing.—A. That is right, if you mean it, but I can't answer the question with the word oath in it.

Q. Well, I'll try to call it obligation.—A. All right.

Q. You stated that in some of those oaths there is a requirement—or in some of those obligations there is a requirement to remain members of the Catholic Church.—A. No; was that my wording?

Q. That's the way I took it down.—A. That's the intent, but that's not the wording. Well, yes, I'll take it back; they do really insist they must remain members of the Catholic Church in order to retain membership in the fourth degree.

Q. Yes; of the Knights of Columbus?—A. Yes.

Q. That's true as to each one of the obligations.—A. Well, it isn't so specifically stated; but the constitution and by-laws of the order provide that.

Q. Is there anything in those oaths—A. Again.

Q. Oh, those obligations—which has a denunciation of others of other denominations—which was—
A. Nothing.

Q. Will not spare age, sex, or condition; anything of that kind in any of the oaths—A. No, sir.

Q. Is the word "spare" in any of the oaths?—A. In what? Well, now, is that done purposely?

Q. It is not.—A. Well, I take it as an insult, because you are trying to trap me into saying "oath."

Q. Well, it isn't intentional; I inform the court and jury it isn't intentional at all. Is the word "spare" in any of the obligations?—A. In the sense that you mean, spare somebody from injury?

Q. Well, the word "spare"?—A. Well, it might be; I don't recall, but in the sense of sparing anybody or not sparing, no, sir.

Q. Which has the sense of not sparing?—A. There is no such word nor no such sense in it.

Q. Are the words "these infamous heretics" or words of that import, in any of the obligations?—A. No, sir.

Q. Doctor, you say one officer gives the obligation. You yourself, now, couldn't give verbatim any one of the four obligations, could you?—A. No, sir; I wouldn't attempt to.

Q. Is that oath written or unwritten?—A. I don't understand your question.

Q. Oh, is that obligation written or unwritten?—A. It is printed.

Q. And can you tell me where I may procure, where a copy of that obligation can be procured; give me the name and address of the person in whose custody one is?—A. Yes, sir. Now I understand; you ask two or three questions there together. I can tell the name of the person in whose custody the ritual of the order, the unwritten work and the written work of the order, is kept.

Q. Well, you may do so.

By Mr. HESSIAN. Well, I object to that as immaterial and incompetent. What has that got to do with this case?

By Mr. MORRIS. Well, if we find the oath as printed, we can compare it with this.

A. Compare with what?

Q. The obligation.—A. You mean, I think, to use that word purposely. It isn't my first time on the witness stand. I know when an attorney is asking a witness questions fairly and when he isn't. Now, I object to the word "oath," because it would charge us inadvertently with having taken such an obligation.

Q. We don't charge you with it.—A. You do by using the word "oath" and then comparing it with some other oath. We take no oath.

Direct examination of William J. McGinley:

Q. Your name is William J. McGinley?—A. Yes.

Q. Where do you reside, Mr. McGinley?—A. New York.

Q. In New York—in the State of New York?—A. City of New York.

Q. You are a member of the Knights of Columbus?—A. I am.

Q. Do you hold any position in the Knights of Columbus?—A. I do.

Q. What is that position?—A. Supreme secretary.

Q. Supreme secretary of the Knights of Columbus?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. As such secretary, are you custodian of the written and other work of the order?—A. I am.

Q. The ritual. You know of the obligations that are taken in the four degrees of that order?—A. I do.

Q. You have heard this purported oath read here in court, have you not?—A. I have.

Q. Do they take any oath?—A. They do not take any oath. Our society is not an oath-bound society; in fact, can't hardly be called a secret society. It is a society of Catholic laymen, recognizing the authority of the Catholic Church in matters spiritual.

By Mr. MORRIS. Objected to as not responsive to the question.

By the COURT. I will sustain the objection to that part of it.

A. I am leading up to it, your honor.

Q. What is the purpose of the Order of the Knights of Columbus?

Mr. MORRIS. Objected to as incompetent, irrelevant, and immaterial; the question here is whether Lawless took an oath as stated in that complaint. The purpose of the order will throw no light on whether he did or didn't.

By the COURT. He testified there is no oath taken; objection sustained.

Q. Have you a printed copy of that oath, of that obligation?—A. I have.

Q. Will you produce it?

(Marked "State's Exhibit D.")

Q. What is State's Exhibit D?—A. State's Exhibit D is an official copy duly attested under the seal of the Order of the Supreme Council of the obligation taken by all members initiated in the fourth degree of the order.

Q. And you are the custodian of this?—A. I am official custodian of the ritual and ceremonies of the order and the laws of the order under seal of the order.

Q. And let's see; have you stated that is the one taken by the fourth-degree members?

Mr. HESSIAN. Yes.

Mr. HANZEL. Now, we offer this in evidence.

Mr. MORRIS: One question. I notice "M., or F. N." at the head of this Exhibit D; what does that represent?—A. "Master, or faithful navigator," title of one of the officers of the degree.

Q. Is that the only obligation of the fourth degree?—A. The only obligation.

Q. Contains the only obligation in any way connected with the fourth degree of the Knights of Columbus?—A. Yes.

(State's Exhibit D read to the jury by Mr. Hanzel.)

State's Exhibit D is as follows:

"M., OR F. N.

"I swear to support the Constitution of the United States.

"I pledge myself, as a Catholic citizen and Knight of Columbus, to enlighten myself fully upon my duties as a citizen and to conscientiously perform such duties entirely in the interest of my country and regardless of all personal consequences. I pledge myself to do all in my power to preserve the integrity and purity of the ballot and to promote reverence and respect for law and order. I promise to practice my religion openly and consistently, but without ostentation, and to so conduct myself in public affairs and in the exercise of public virtue as to reflect nothing but credit upon our holy church, to the end that she may flourish and our country prosper to the greater honor and glory of God.

" [Supreme Council seal.]

" A true copy.

" Attest:

" (Signed) WM. J. M'GINLEY,
"Supreme Secretary."

Cross-examination by Mr. Morris:

Q. Mr. McGinley, references have been made here to the word "oath" and the word "obligation," and apparently exception has been taken to the use of the word "oath" as describing the thing we are thinking of. Will you tell us the difference between oath and obligation?—A. An oath, as I understand it, is a pledge or obligation or affirmation wherein or in connection with which God is called upon to witness, or the Deity; and an obligation is a pledge or undertaking of a kind in which the Deity is not called upon to witness. That is the distinction, I believe, between an oath and a pledge. I would suggest the word "pledge" rather than "obligation." It is easier to say.

Mr. HANZEL. Just a question. Ought there not to be inserted there also: Isn't an oath something that would be administered by proper legal authority? Ought not that to be a part of the explanation?

Q. I notice that you have these printed on little slips. What is the object of having them printed in that way, loose?—A. For the convenience of the ceremony in the fourth degree of the order, whereby annually, at the first meeting of the fourth degree, assembled in January of each year, all the members of the fourth degree renew that obligation. That is what is known as the annual meeting, and for the purpose of supplying the officers with their parts, for convenience sake, it is arranged in that form.

Q. Dr. Buckley, in his testimony, stated there was something in the obligation requiring members to remain members of the Catholic Church. Is that true?—A. That is a constitutional, fundamental law of the order. Well, toward the end there he promises to remain a member of the Catholic order, in there by implication, if not expressed.

Q. I will ask you is this all the obligation of the fourth degree?—A. That is our obligation in the fourth degree.

Q. Do any of the other obligations—first, second, or third degrees—have reference to non-Catholics in any way, directly or indirectly?—A. None whatever.

Q. You have heard this purported oath in the criminal warrant read, have you?—A. Yes; I have.

Q. Have you seen that elsewhere?—A. I have.

The defendants testified and also called Mr. Lawless, who had testified for the State. They were not cross-examined by the county attorney.

It is unnecessary to go into the recital of the other evidence in this case. Suffice it to say that the defendants made no attempt to establish the authenticity of the bogus oath, but threw themselves on the mercy of the court and tried to show that there was no intentional libel on Mr. Lawless.

DEFENDANTS FOUND GUILTY.

The jury returned a verdict of guilty, which was read by the foreman, Rev. Thomas Billing, and the court imposed a jail sentence of 30 days on each of the defendants, from which they took an appeal to the district court on the following day, each giving a bond of \$500, with H. B. Oblinger and W. Knaack as sureties.

Referring to the foregoing trial, we set forth below the correspondence between the Rev. Mr. Billing and Hon. Fred Bierman, of Decorah, Iowa, who, we believe, is the publisher of the Decorah Journal:

DECORAH, IOWA, August 14, 1914.

Rev. THOMAS BILLING, Pastor of Methodist Church, Waterville, Minn.

DEAR SIR: I have noted with interest that you were a juror in the prosecution of A. M. and G. E. Morrison, of Waterville, for criminal libel by E. M. Lawless, of the Waterville Sentinel.

"The reports are that the jury unanimously voted for the conviction of A. M. and G. E. Morrison. May I not ask you to write me a line or two, stating whether or not

this report is a fact? And also give me any bit of information that may be of interest in the case.

"This anti-Catholic agitation, in my judgment, is very discreditable to all the Protestant churches that do not seek in the spirit of Christian charity to quiet it. Furthermore, it is a menace to the best conduct of political affairs and breeds a very regrettable bitterness and suspicion among people who otherwise would be friends.

"If you have no objections, I should thank you very much for the privilege of publishing your reply in the Journal.

"Sincerely, yours,

"FRED BIERMAN."

"WATERVILLE, MINN., August 15, 1914.

"Mr. FRED BIERMAN, Decorah, Iowa.

"DEAR SIR: Yours of the 14th received. And while I do not care for publicity, must admit that either by the irony of fate or by the hand of Providence I found myself upon the jury empaneled to find a verdict in the E. M. Lawless criminal libel case against A. M. and G. E. Morrison, of the Mankota Journal. I did not know until I reached the courtroom of the case. Had I known what awaited me that day, I would probably have been absent when the sheriff came three-quarters of an hour before the trial to summons me. But when summoned did not inquire how or learn for what purpose. However, never having run away from anything that looked like duty, and not being challenged by either party, I stood my ground, and, notwithstanding much adverse local criticism, am glad to have had the privilege of helping to nail down so ugly and diabolical a lie as the pseudo oath so widely published and attributed to Ed. Lawless was proven to be.

"Furthermore, my district superintendent and other of my ministerial brethren (all of whom I have hitherto met) have expressed themselves as being perfectly at one with me.

"The case was very simple.

"1. The publication of the so-called oath in the defendants' paper was proven.

"2. Its diabolical character was proven.

"3. Its circulation in Waterville was proven by Rev. H. P. Chapman, pastor of the Congregational Church of that city.

"4. Its utter and complete falsity was proven by two witnesses of the highest standing in the order, viz, Dr. Buckley, of St. Paul, by whom or in whose presence the fourth degree was conferred on complainant Lawless; and also by William J. McGinley, of New York, supreme secretary of the order, and custodian of all the written and oral work.

"The first ballot stood 9 to 3 for conviction, the second ballot stood 10 to 2 for conviction, and the third was unanimous for conviction. The verdict was followed by a sentence of 30 days for each of the defendants in the county jail. The case, however, is appealed to the district court in September.

"The case was the result of an anti-Catholic spirit (which has had other deplorable results), stirred up by the advent of Annie Lowry, the pseudo nun, whose trail across the State is quite visible and certainly not enviable. Such things exhibit the strange anomaly of a religion of love producing the keenest haters and a gospel of peace engendering strife and animosities more bitter than the disputes and rivalries of the most profane.

"Yours, for the peace of Zion,

"(Rev.) THOMAS BILLINGS,
"Foreman of Jury."

THANKS FOR LETTER.

DECORAH, IOWA, August 17, 1914.

Rev. THOMAS BILLINGS, Waterville, Minn.

MY DEAR SIR: I thank you very much for your letter of August 15 and for the promptness of your reply. I want to compliment you on the position you take in the matter, and to say that, in my opinion, if the Protestant clergymen in general took this position they would be held in higher esteem by the general public.

If I can do you a favor at some future date, I hope that you will not hesitate to call upon me.

Sincerely, yours,

FRED BIERMAN.

ANOTHER PROSECUTION.

Another case was tried in St. Johns, Newfoundland, on February 18, 1913.

The defendant was Charles A. Swift.

This trial was held in the central district court, before Judge Knight.

The defendant was charged with criminal libel in publishing and circulating the same oath described in the foregoing pages.

The complainant was Charles O'Neill Conroy, for himself and the Knights of Columbus.

Mr. A. B. Morine, K. C., was counsel for the complainant and Mr. F. A. Mews for the defendant.

The witnesses for the Government were William Bowden, Kenneth Barnes, William F. Coaker, Charles O'Neill Conroy, John Fenelon.

The defendant testified, admitting the charge, and concluded his testimony as follows:

"I should now like to express my very deep regret to Mr. Conroy and Mr. Fenelon and the whole Council of Knights, in St. Johns and elsewhere, that I should have been led to believe through false representations that this was the oath of the Knights of Columbus, and I wish to make an apology to all concerned, saying, I sincerely regret having caused any pain or ill feeling to the members, and I wish this apology to be as complete as possible. I may add that in January last I did not know any of the members of the Knights of Columbus as such."

Mr. Morine then made the following statement to the court:

"This proceeding was taken for the purpose of showing the bogus nature of this alleged oath. If the accused had justified his conduct or attempted in any way to set up the truth of the alleged oath, the prosecution would be pushed to the greatest possible extent. There was no desire to persecute or even to punish where punishment was deserved. Mr. Swift having explained and given proper information, the complainant is satisfied that Mr. Swift was a victim; that he had no actual malice, and that he sincerely regrets his part in the circulation of the defamatory matter. This being so, the prosecutor's object has been achieved, and he desires that these proceedings go no further against this particular accused. He will, however, prosecute for any further circulation of this same or similar matter, and reserves his ordinary denial, their clear and deliberate assertions being made on oath in a properly constituted court. In exercising clemency the Knights will have won respect and admiration; but after this ample vindication it should be a solemn duty on the part of members of the order and their friends, whether Roman Catholic or Protestant, to take steps to assure the severest punishment the law provides to any who may make similar charges. It is an old story, this oath business, and the Knights of Columbus is not the only society that has suffered similarly in the past. What made the offense more atrocious was an evident desire on the part of some to revive those displays of sectarian hatred which were buried, it is hoped forever, a quarter of a century ago."

ACTION IN SEATTLE, WASH.

In Seattle, Wash., a public statement was made on September 1, 1912, in the course of which it was alleged that this same "oath" was the oath taken by fourth-degree members of the Knights of Columbus. As a result of this statement the Knights in Seattle voluntarily decided to submit to a committee of Protestant gentlemen the printed ceremonial containing the actual obligation taken by fourth-degree members of the order. The following newspaper extract gives the result of the investigation:

"The gentlemen to whom this obligation was submitted are H. C. Henry, railroad contractor and president of the Metropolitan Bank; J. D. Lowman, president of the Seattle Chamber of Commerce; J. E. Chilberg, vice president of the Scandinavian-American Bank of Seattle. The signed statement of these gentlemen follows:

" COMMITTEE FINDINGS.

" 'Honorable Catholic gentlemen of this city have placed for examination in the hands of the undersigned two papers—one the actual fourth-degree obligation taken by each person upon becoming a member of the Catholic organization known as the Knights of Columbus, the other a printed circular purporting to be the above-mentioned obligation. This latter is a blasphemous and horrible travesty upon the real oath, and as fair-minded citizens of this city we can not allow an atrocious libel upon the large body of our public-spirited Catholic fellow citizens to stand undisputed. We declare, further, that the obligation taken by the fourth-degree Knights of Columbus is one of loyalty and patriotism to our flag and Nation, and that the said obligation binds those who assume it to be the exercise of the highest type of American citizenship.

" 'Signed at Seattle, Wash., this 31st day of October, 1912.

" 'H. C. HENRY.

" 'J. D. LOWMAN.

" 'J. E. CHILBERG.'

"We beg to submit all of the above as evidence of the fact that we have been the objects of a malicious slander at the hands of a disturber of the public peace.

"T. J. GORMAN,

"*Past Vice Supreme Master of the Fourth Degree.*

"JOHN D. CARMODY,

"*State Deputy of Washington.*

"J. C. FORD,

"*Past Grand Knight, Seattle Council.*"

RESOLUTION PASSED.

“Mr. JOHN D. CARMODY, *Seattle, Wash.*

“DEAR SIR: The following resolution was passed by the Olympian Clericus, an organization composed of all Episcopal clergymen in the State of Washington west of the Cascades:

“Our attention has been called to a circular which has been rather widely distributed purporting to be a copy of the oath taken by the members of a certain religious order or society. We desire on behalf of ourselves to express our deep regret that such an attack should have been made on the members of a religious body. We disclaim any desire to judge others, but feel most deeply that the interests of true religion can never be served in such a way.’

“SIDNEY T. JAMES, *Secretary.*

“ALL SAINTS’ RECTORY, SEATTLE.”

LOS ANGELES INVESTIGATION.

The following letters need no explanation:

“Hon. PAUL G. McCORMICK,
“*Courthouse, Los Angeles.*

“MY DEAR JUDGE: I take pleasure in handing you herewith the findings of the committee of Freemasons to whom you exhibited the ceremonials and pledges of the Order of Knights of Columbus.

“I am very glad that I have been able in a measure to secure this refutation of a slanderous lie which has been widely circulated and which has been disseminated in many cases by well-meaning, credulous, and deluded persons.

“I shall see to it that this report has wide circulation among Masons, and you may use it in any way you deem best to bring about an understanding of the truth among men who, above all controversies and contentions, desire to know and to follow that which is right and true.

“Yours, cordially,

“W. R. HERVEY.”

OCTOBER 9, 1914.

“We hereby certify that by authority of the highest officer of the Knights of Columbus in the State of California, who acted under instructions from the supreme officer of the order in the United States, we were furnished a complete copy of all the work, ceremonies, and pledges used by the order, and that we carefully read, discussed, and examined the same. We found that while the order is in a sense a secret association, it is not an oath-bound organization, and that its ceremonies are comprised in four degrees, which are intended to teach and inculcate principles that lie at the foundation of every great religion and every free State. Our examination of these ceremonials and obligations was made primarily for the purpose of ascertaining whether or not a certain alleged oath of the Knights of Columbus which has been printed and widely circulated was in fact used by the order, and whether, if it was not used, any oath, obligation, or pledge was used which was or would be offensive to Protestants or Masons or those who are engaged in circulating a document of peculiar viciousness and wickedness. We find that neither the alleged oath nor any oath or pledge bearing the remotest resemblance thereto in matter, manner, spirit, or purpose is used or forms a part of the ceremonies of any degree of the Knights of Columbus. The alleged oath is scurrilous, wicked, and libelous, and must be the invention of an impious and venomous mind. We find that the Order of Knights of Columbus, as shown by its rituals, is dedicated to the Catholic religion, charity, and patriotism. There is no propaganda proposed or taught against Protestants or Masons or persons not of Catholic faith. Indeed, Protestants and Masons are not referred to, directly or indirectly, in the ceremonies and pledges. The ceremonial of the order teaches a high and noble patriotism, instills a love of country, inculcates a reverence for law and order, urges the conscientious and unselfish performance of civic duty, and hold up the Constitution of our country as the richest and most precious possession of knight of the order. We can find nothing in the entire ceremonials of the order that, to our minds, could be objected to by any person.

MOTLEY HEWES FLINT (33°),
Past Grand Master of Masons of California.
DANA REID WELLER (32°),
Past Grand Master of Masons of California.
WM. RHODES HERVEY (33°),
Past Master and Master of Scottish Rite Lodge.
SAMUEL E. BURKE (32°),
Past Master and Inspector of Masonic District.”

RECENT PROSECUTION IN SANTA CRUZ, CAL.

The Santa Cruz News, of Santa Cruz, Cal., published the following under date of October 28, 1914:

SOCIALIST EDITOR BOUND OVER; NO TESTIMONY PRESENTED BY DEFENSE.

H. S. Turner, editor of the World Issue and charged with libeling the fourth-degree members of the Knights of Columbus through the publication of a false oath attributed to the organization, was bound over to the superior court by Justice of the Peace Bias this morning under \$300 bonds, following a very interesting preliminary examination in which the most noticeable incident was the ingenuity of Attorney Ralph H. Smith in the defense of his client, the defendant.

The little court room above the fire house was completely filled when the case opened this morning. Assisting District Attorney Knight was John H. Leonard, the local attorney and a prominent Catholic.

The complainant was Charles Gillen, who testified with Joseph J. Rosborough, of Oakland, and Eugene F. Conlon, San Francisco. No evidence was offered by the defendant, and after argument by his attorney, Mr. Smith, Judge Bias held that there was sufficient evidence to hold the defendant for the higher court.

BUSINESS MEN OF INDIANAPOLIS PROTEST AGAINST THE CIRCULATION OF THE FAKE OATH.

The business men whose signatures appear below are all Protestant; they can not comprehend how any Christian can lend himself to the further circulation of the monstrous lie.

KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS "FAKE OATH."

We the undersigned citizens of Indianapolis, Ind., beg to make public the following statement of facts, the truth of which is established by thorough investigation, regarding the circulation in Indianapolis and Indiana of a "fake oath" as being the true fourth-degree oath of the Knights of Columbus.

It will be unnecessary to reproduce the fake oath here on account of its vile character. Ordinarily charges of such vile nature should go unnoticed, but good citizens of all creeds owe it to themselves to pillory before the public those circulating this literature as un-American.

The true oath of the fourth-degree members of the Knights of Columbus as hereinafter shown in the court proceedings is as follows:

"I swear to support the Constitution of the United States.

"I pledge myself, as a Catholic citizen and Knight of Columbus, to enlighten myself fully upon my duties as a citizen and to conscientiously perform such duties entirely in the interest of my country and regardless of all personal consequences. I pledge myself to do all in my power to preserve the integrity and purity of the ballot and to promote reverence and respect for law and order. I promise to practice my religion openly and consistently, but without ostentation, and to so conduct myself in public affairs and in the exercise of public virtue as to reflect nothing but credit upon our holy church, to the end that she may flourish and our country prosper to the greater honor and glory of God."

Appended to the "fake oath," which is being circulated anonymously, is this notation:

"Copied from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Washington, D. C., vol. 49, p. 4, Feb. 15, 1913, p. 3216."

By referring to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD quoted it will be found that this "fake oath" is filed as an exhibit by Eugene C. Bonniwell, of Pennsylvania, in his charge against THOMAS S. BUTLER, before the Committee on Elections No. 1, in Congress, growing out of an election contest. Mr. Bonniwell, the contestant, in his protest, printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, says:

"Messengers in the employ of supporters of THOMAS S. BUTLER traveled the district, having in their possession and circulating a blasphemous and infamous libel, a copy of which is hereto attached, pretended to be an oath of the Knights of Columbus, of which body the contestant is a member. So revolting are the terms of this document and so nauseating its pledges that the injury it did, not merely to the contestant but also to the Knights of Columbus and to Catholics in general, can hardly be measured in terms. [Copied from CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 49, pt. 4, p. 3216, Washington, D. C., Feb. 15, 1913.]

Mr. BUTLER, in his defense, as printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, says:

"I apprehend with alarm the use of such a document in a political campaign or at any other time. I did not believe in its truthfulness, and so stated my judgment concerning it on November 4, 1912, as soon as complaint was made to me of its general circulation. Inasmuch as I did not wish to give this document, which I judged to be spurious, any notoriety whatsoever, I refrained from its public condemnation until the time when a general complaint was made to me, and I thought it my duty to publicly condemn it." [Copied from CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 49, pt. 4, p. 3219, Washington, D. C., Feb. 15, 1913.]

The congressional committee to which the matter was referred reported in part as follows:

"The committee can not condemn too strongly the publication of the false and libelous article referred to in the paper of Mr. Bonniwell and which was the spurious Knights of Columbus oath, a copy of which is appended to the paper." [Copied from Congressional Record, vol. 49, pt. 4, p. 3221, Washington, D. C., Feb. 15, 1913.]

This shows that the "fake oath" is a fake, and it explains how it got into the Congressional Record.

In addition to the reference made in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD showing up this "fake oath," its false and malicious character was shown in two court proceedings, one in Waterville, Minn., tried on July 29, 1914, and one in Philadelphia, Pa., tried on January 30, 1914.

The Waterville case was a criminal libel brought by E. M. Lawless, the editor of the Waterville Sentinel, against A. M. Morrison and C. E. Morrison, father and son, editors and publishers of the Mankato Morning Journal, of Mankato, Minn.

The libel consisted in the charging of Lawless with having taken the "fake" Knights of Columbus "oath," which is the same "fake oath" so largely circulated in Marion County.

The trial was presided over by Judge George J. Dressel. The district attorney who prosecuted the case was Francis J. Hanzel, of Montgomery, prosecuting attorney for Le Sueur County, who was assisted by Attorney Thomas Hessian, of Le Sueur. The defendants were represented by Owen Morris, of St. Paul.

A jury was selected, and the Rev. Thomas Billing, the resident Methodist minister of Waterville, was chosen on the jury.

At the trial reputable citizens gave evidence that the "fake oath" was a vile fake, and that the obligation above set out is the true obligation of the Knights of Columbus.

The defendants at the trial made no attempt to establish the authenticity of the "fake oath," but threw themselves on the mercy of the court and tried to show that there was no intentional libel on Mr. Lawless.

The jury returned a verdict of guilty, which was read by the foreman, Rev. Thomas Billing, and the court imposed a jail sentence of 30 days.

In the Philadelphia case two men, Megonegal and Stage, were charged jointly with conspiracy to defame several members of the Knights of Columbus by causing the "fake oath" to be circulated.

At the hearing it appeared that the "fake oath" had been bought in bulk from the Menace in the beginning, but afterwards Megonegal had done the printing on his own account.

The Menace was called upon by counsel for these two men to give them some assistance, and it replied in a letter, dated March 5, 1913, and addressed to Leroy N. King, attorney for the defendants:

"We do not have any evidence that the oath is the one which is taken by the Knights of Columbus. We feel sure that it would be folly for you to base your defense on the authenticity of this document."

The case came on to trial at the quarter sessions court in Philadelphia on January 30, 1914, before Judge Robert W. Wilson. The district attorney was Joseph Taulane, who was assisted by Attorneys Owen J. Roberts and Joseph P. Gaffney. The defendants, in addition to Mr. King, had Peter F. MacLaren. Evidence was introduced that the "fake oath" was utterly false, and that no Knight of Columbus ever took it.

Megonegal pleaded guilty and Stage pleaded nolle. Whereupon, at the request of the plaintiffs, the sentence was suspended.

Knowing that the "fake oath" is false, we hold that all good citizens will join us in denouncing its circulation in Marion County and in Indiana, to the end that people of all creeds may dwell in peace and harmony as becomes the highest ideals of true and patriotic American citizenship.

Alex C. Ayres, attorney; H. C. Parker, physician; Aquilla Q. Jones, attorney; John G. Williams, attorney; Hugh McK. Landon, capitalist; Frederick M. Ayres, president L. S. Ayres & Co.; L. O. Hamilton, president Hamilton, Harris & Co.; Linneas C. Boyd, capitalist; Gustave A. Schnull; of Schnull & Co.; Albert P. Smith, attorney; J. M. McIntosh, president National City Bank, August M. Kuhn, treasurer Aetna Trust & Savings Co.; John Rauch, clerk Marion circuit court; G. A. Efroymsen, president H. P. Wasson Co.; Chester P. Wilson, president Interstate Public Service Co.; Frank S. C. Wicks, minister; Henry M. Downing, attorney; Henry H. Hornbrook, attorney; Frank E. Gavin, attorney; Dick Miller, broker; Hugh Dougherty, vice president Fletcher Savings & Trust Co.; J. W. Stickney, general manager Central Union Telephone Co.; Thomas A. Wynne, vice president and treasurer Indianapolis Light and Heat Co.; Louis Newberger, attorney; Henry Lawrence, manager Claypool Hotel; Otto N. Frenzel, president Merchants' National Bank; Frank Wheeler, of Wheeler & Schebler; John J. Appel, real estate agent; C. G. Sander, of Sander & Recker; John W. Minor, secretary and treasurer Sentinel Printing Co.; Evans Woolen, vice president American National Bank; William Fortune, president Indianapolis Telephone Co.; J. D. Forrest, general manager Citizens' Gas Co.; Chalmers Brown, president Reserve Loan Life Insurance Co.; F. F. Hutchins, physician; Wilson S. Doan, attorney; Edward E. Gates, attorney; Oscar Schmidt, president Old Town Co.; Elmer E. Stevenson, attorney; Samuel O. Pickens, attorney; Sol Meyer, president Meyer-Kiser Bank; Linton A. Cox, attorney; Frank T. Edenharter, attorney; John F. Robbins, attorney; Thos. J. Owens, secretary Meridian Life Insurance Co.; George J. Marott, shoe merchant.

The above appeared in the Indianapolis News October 17 and in the Star October 18. All signatures are those of prominent non-Catholic men of the city.