

DEATHS

O'MALLEY.—On April 26, at her residence, Ikam-atua, Grey Valley, Mrs. O'Malley, beloved wife of James O'Malley.—R.I.P.

GREELISH.—On June 7, at his residence, Fairview, Hook, Patrick, beloved husband of Honoria Greelish; aged 75 years. Deeply regretted.—R.I.P.

HILL.—On June 13, at her son's residence, Church street, Roslyn, Annie Hill, relict of the late Charles Hill, beloved mother of James and Thomas Hill and sister of Thomas and Edmund Carroll, Mornington.—R.I.P.



*To promote the cause of Religion and Justice by the ways of Truth and Peace.*

LEO XIII. to the N.Z. TABLET

THURSDAY, JUNE 15, 1905.

A MOSS-GROWN CALUMNY



THE Declaration of St. Petersburg and the Geneva Convention did much to mitigate the atrocities of war. There is still a crying need for an analogous code to stamp out well-poisoning and the free use of controversial vitriol in the inevitable theological word-wars that must separate creed and creed until the happy day when there shall be one Fold and one Shepherd, and a spiri-

tual peace greater than that of Nirvana shall wrap the earth as with an atmosphere of heaven. We are still sniffing—although in a much attenuated form—the air which blows from the hot and sulphureous controversy that stormed around the great religious revolution of the sixteenth century. Catholic writers generally are to this hour scrupulously careful—as was Bellarmine in his more difficult day—to avoid misrepresentation of the doctrines and religious practices of their separated brethren. But alas! for the rarity of Christian charity under the sun, their good example in this respect has not met with the flattery of extended imitation. On the contrary, more or less serious misrepresentations of our teachings constitute the stock-in-trade of the great bulk of non-Catholic controversialists. In their case, a serviceable calumny seems to be as difficult of surrender as a valuable vested interest in lands or buildings. And few anti-Catholic falsehoods have seen harder service in the cause of religious enmity than the old phosphor-bronze calumny that the Jesuits teach that a good end or purpose justifies the use of wicked means for its attainment. It has been refuted a thousand thousand times. At least three learned Protestant writers have exposed its utter and reckless falsehood—to wit, Starbuck, Brieger, and Staatsrath Fisher. The last-mentioned writer says of it.—

“This much is certain. that it is not merely not true that the doctrine of a good end justifying bad means is a principle of the (Jesuit) Society; but it is not even a plausible story, and has not once been alleged by the most thoroughly competent of the Society's opponents. It springs simply from the shallowest sources of sensation-mongering and unsound logic, and rests upon a fixed prejudice.”

Some years ago we courteously directed attention to a peculiarly flagrant calumny that was flung at the Catholic body on the ‘Glorious Twelfth’ by a clergy-

man whose religious and political tint was a deep saffron. After some delay, the reverend author of the calumny replied by publishing (it was in the ‘Riponshire Advocate’) a written ‘opinion’ of the solicitor of the Victorian Grand Lodge to this effect. that we had no right whatever to expect proof of statements reflecting on the Romish Church, when ‘made on so important an occasion as a Twelfth of July celebration’! The anger—and sometimes the wrathful and explosive violence—with which many of our opponents meet the most inoffensively worded requests for evidence in support of ‘tall’ tales against the Old Faith go to prove that they regard No-Popery calumnies, as did the Victorian clergyman, in the light of privileged statements. The anti-Jesuit slander appears to be, at best, no conspicuous exception to this seeming rule of controversial morality that guides the conduct of so many credulous and unscholarly enthusiasts in our day. It is Thucydides who makes one party in a discussion say to the other: ‘While we bless your simplicity, we do not envy your lack of good sense.’ In a similar way we can excuse the hearts of the great bulk of the utterers of anti-Catholic fiction; for they are not manufacturers, but mere retailers. But the amazing belief in the privileged character of such injurious tales is nowhere more curiously evidenced than in the fact that even the stimulus of repeated challenges has time and again signally failed to secure even the semblance of an attempt at proof. Conspicuous among the innumerable challenges publicly issued in connection with the alleged Jesuit doctrine mentioned above were the following. (1) In 1852 the learned Jesuit, Father Roch, offered, in Frankfort, a thousand Rhenish guilders to any person who would prove that the members of his Society ever advocated the principle that a good end or object justifies evil means. He named as the judges in the case the Law Faculty of the University of Bonn or of that of Heidelberg—neither of which could be suspected of any undue leaning towards the Catholic Church or the Society of Jesus. The challenge was left open. After sixteen years (in 1868) the Protestant Pastor of Pfalz (Rev. Karl Maurer) came forward, submitted his ‘evidence,’ and claimed the thousand guilders. The Law Faculty of Heidelberg looked at his ‘proofs,’ and (we may, perhaps, presume) ‘smiled a low, wise smile.’ At anyrate, they advised him to let the matter drop and go back to Pfalz, as otherwise he would be simply courting public defeat and humiliation. And Pastor Maurer went back. Father Roch's challenge is still open to the world, and the Rhenish guilders have never yet been awarded.

(2) Among the other challenges in point, of which we have made a note, was that which was issued in 1901 by Father Thurston, S.J., in the columns of the ‘Referee.’ There again there was a hopeless failure to advance even the decent semblance of ‘proof.’ (3) In November, 1903, the Right Rev. Dr. Ludden, Catholic Bishop of Syracuse (United States), met a statement of a professor of the local University by a challenge which runs in part as follows:—

‘I hereby solemnly assert that no Jesuit ever held such a principle, and would not be tolerated to hold, much less to teach, such a principle. And to emphasise the more my assertion, I hereby state that I shall pay to any student of the University the expenses of his board and tuition during the remaining years of his studies there, if he can find in any of the writings or teachings of the Jesuits, or from any authentic source whatsoever, that they ever taught the doctrine that the end justifies the means.’

To this day, Bishop Ludden's challenge has not been taken up.

(1) Some two years ago, in Germany, the controversy on this moth-eaten old fable reached another stage. The Rev. G. Dasbach publicly offered a reward of two thousand florins to any person who should prove that the Jesuits taught this outrageous doctrine: ‘A good end (or object) justifies the use of bad means.’ The