sympathy'. This is most commonly done by fine professions that are cheap and easy. Like Pudd'nhead Wilson's maxims for 'luring youth to high moral altitudes', they need not be gathered from practice, but merely from observation. 'To be good', says he, 'is noble, but to show others how to be good is nobler, and is no trouble'. In his 'Psychologie de l'Anarchiste-Socialiste' ('Psychology of the Anarchist-Socialist', Paris, 1896) M. Hamon, for instance, tells us that 'love of liberty', 'tender-heartedness', 'a feeling of justice', 'a sense of logic', 'love of others', and 'a thirst for knowledge' are the guiding principles of the underground fanatics who explode picrine bombs in thronged streets and crowded theatres on Continental Europe. Thus, when it suits, ruthless massacre is invested with an aureole of patriotic pity—just as on Wall Street, the wholesale picking of the pockets of the poor by wheat-magnates or oil-kings is disguised by the euphemism of 'high finance'. The aggressively atheistic Freemasonry of Continental Europe can, on occasion, assume as sweet a political face as that of the Fair Damosel. Herein it resembles the hideous shape that Dante describes in the seventeenth chapter of his 'Inferno':—

'His face the semblance of a just man wore,
So kind and gracious was its outward cheer;
The rest was serpent all . . .
The fell monster with the deadly sting.'

*

The various Grand Orients may from time to time indulge in iridescent social or political catchwords or platitudes. Such bubble-blowing may amuse the initiated and impress or mystify those outside the portals of the well-tyled lodge. But their leaders have been at pains to make it clear that, in the matter of religion, their creed is the creed of their socialist brother, the revolutionary Blanqui: 'Ni Dieu ni Maitre!'—'Neither God nor Master!' And full many a time has the word gone forth, that (in substance) their final aim is, like that of Voltaire and the Great Revolution, the annihilation of Catholicism and of 'the Christian idea'. Our columns have from time to time borne witness to the prominent and directive part taken by the Masonic organisation during the past few years in the war a outrance against Christianity in France. Referring to the activity of the brethren in this regard, Mr. Algernon Sartoris (a non-Catholic writer) says in an article in the 'North American Review:' 'The disgraceful career of the Freemasons in France points to the danger of any secret society, however worthy its origin may be, degenerating into a political machine, with selfish purposes uppermost' Still, the world of men of God's open day is not to be ruled for long by rats holding council in a cellar. Evil has won, and will again win, its passing victories. But a victory, or even a series of victories, does not necessarily constitute a conquest. A stiff dose of persecution generally acts as a tonic to the faith and moral fibre of a people. It often teaches even those who are poltroons by nature to face death itself serenely,

'Or turn again to stand it out,
And those they fled, like lions rout'.

The Pope (as the 'Saturday Review' recently said) is fighting the battle of Christianity against aggressive atheism. And in the present war between the lodge and the Church, we have faith in the power that in more evil times stayed the invading hordes of Genseric and Attila, saved Italy from the Lombards and the Saracens and Europe from the conquering Turk, witnessed the downfall of Napoleon, and in our own day saw even the masterful Man of Blood and Iron knocking at the gates of Canossa.

The Meanest Controversy

In his 'Democracy and Liberty' (vol. ii, pp. 84-5) the rationalist historian Lecky says in reference to 'the religious war' in France: 'To cut down the income of an opponent is the meanest of all the forms of controversy; and the very moderate ecclesiastical budget, which was originally given in place of the ecclesiastical property that had been taken at the Revolution, has seemed too large to the modern Republican. Between 1883 and 1889,' adds Lecky, 'the stipends were reduced to the smallest limits. . . In everything relating to the Church the bias of the Government is displayed. The salaries of the bishops have been cut down to four hundred pounds a year—the sum at which they had stood in 1801—though the expenses of living have nearly doubled since then. The usual funds for the support of the chapters have been withheld. Many small grants, which had for generations been made for assisting the education of poor clergy and for various forms of clerical charity, have been ruthlessly suppressed.' And then the noted non-Catholic historian goes on to record various other forms of great and petty persecution that was carried on against the Catholic Faith in France when he penned these lines in 1899.

*

Matters have moved fast and far since then. 'The religious war' has entered upon a more crucial stage. 'The meanest of all the forms of controversy' has found a form still meaner. For not alone have the salaries — the one per cent. interest on stolen ecclesiastical property, guaranteed by a solemn Concordat—been reduced: they have been swept away by one great act of national repudiation. 'The very moderate ecclesiastical budget,' to which the country's honor was pledged by treaty, has been entirely stopped; every stick and stone and square metre of ecclesiastical property has been confiscated—the great pillage has not even spared so much as a paper of pins or an iron spoon; the clergy have been driven out of their homes, and the faithful out of the churches in which their fathers had worshipped for ages. The Second Reign of Terror has set sacrilegious hands on much that even the first had spared. The American 'Ecclesiastical Review' states that the number of priests deprived of their homes and incomes by the so-called Separation Law is (according to the official statistics of last year) 41,721. Seventeen of these are archbishops, whose allowance (on account of the Church property confiscated during the Revolution) was about £610; 67 were bishops, with allowances of less than £400 each; nearly all of the remainder were parish priests (whose 'traitement' varied from about £60—the highest—to about £40 a year), and assistants, who received from about £50 to £18 per annum. And what does the Radical-Socialist 'Bloc' or 'machine' offer to France as compensation for the wholesale proscription, plunder, and persecution of the past six years? The answer is supplied by Mr. Algernon Sartoris, a non-Catholic writer, in an article in the 'North American Review' on 'The War against Christianity in France': 'Simply to save the money which used to be spent by the State in upholding not only the Roman Catholic, but also the Protestant and Jewish creeds, by the suppression of the Budget of Public Worship, and thus to lessen the burdens of taxation! The legislators,' adds Mr. Sartoris, 'begin their economies with singular unanimity by voting an increase in their own salaries from $1750 (£350) per annum to $3000 (£600).' We wonder what Lecky, if he were still in the land of the living, would say to this refinement of 'the meanest of all the forms of controversy?' The economists of the 'Bloc' remind us of the red-hot republican in 'Lothair' who was also a landowner and duke. 'He was' (says Disraeli) 'opposed to all privilege, indeed to all orders of men—except dukes, who were a necessity. He was also in favor of the equal division of all property—except land.' Ah, well: political consistency's a Koh-i-noor. And Koh-i-noors are too precious for everyday wear—especially in a land where the Government itself is so busy with its new role of