

# THE AMERICAN TYLER-KEYSTONE

October 20, 1910

**A Remarkable Apron**

**Masonry Should Develop the  
Whole Man**  
Carl W. Mason

**The Roman Church and Masonry**  
J. D. Buck, M. D.

**An English Masonic Bard**

**Annual Ceremony of the Operatives**

**Scottish Rite Philosophy**  
N. F. de Clifford, M. D.

**Talks with the Worshipful Master**

**Extended Recognition of Foreign  
Masonic Bodies**  
Rev. John George Gibson

**The Religious Situation in France**  
Col. Ralph E. Prime, D. D. G. M.

**Our Public Schools and the Church  
of Rome**  
Thomas M. Steward, M. D.

**Our Duty to God, Our Neighbor,  
and Ourselves**  
Richard Goldsmith

Volume XXV

Number 8

JAS

## The Religious Situation in France

Colonel Ralph E. Prime, D. D. G. M., New York

Brethren: I have a message of greeting, of cheer, of congratulation to propose, to be sent by this Western Section of the Alliance to our brethren of the Reformed Churches in France, churches allied to us by a common faith, and also members with us of the Alliance of the Reformed Churches throughout the world holding the Presbyterian system. But before offering and reading to you the message I shall propose, I beg that you will indulge me while I state to you what all close readers of history must know, and what all of us ought to know. I fear that there are few of us in America, in the midst of our strenuous life, who know the actual and interesting facts of the history of the Church in France and the dealings of the State with the Church. I mean, of course, the Church known as the Roman Catholic Church. I have been astonished at the action of some American Roman Catholics in the city near which I live and elsewhere. Their meetings have been dominated by clerics; church organizations of all sorts have been turned out to parade the streets and conducted thence *en masse* into the meetings to swell numbers and produce effect. The crowds so obtained do not speak a voluntary gathering of much moral force. They are sending words of sympathy and of encouragement to the French citizens who are arrayed against the laws of their country, who are guilty of actions that can scarce be called by any other name than treason. In this connection I am more than surprised at the action of some of our Protestant Episcopal brethren, who have as individuals joined in this movement. In America, with all our boasted and valued liberty, we would not for a moment tolerate the same acts in our fellow citizens, and we would most loudly and effectively resent the acts of the citizens of any other country in encouraging such acts. We require of every foreign-born person, who becomes a naturalized citizen, that he under oath renounce and abandon all allegiance to any foreign sovereign or power, and the native-born, by his birth is in the same attitude. Yet, these words of sympathy and encouragement from some of our fellow citizens are to encourage French citizens to destroy the laws of France, and as against the Republic of France, to sustain an allegiance, not spiritual in any sense, to a foreign potentate in matters purely civil, and at the command of the Italian Pope, to defy and disobey the laws of their country. I am glad of personal knowledge to say that there are many of the most honored, prominent, respected and learned of our Roman Catholic fellow citizens who entertain no such feelings and take no part in any such demonstrations. I am compelled to believe that this abetting of treason is largely from those who lack knowledge of the facts, and I hesitate, but am compelled to say that such lack of knowledge almost justifies calling it gross ignorance.

And the condition in France is called persecution! Alas, that the habit of persecuting in the centuries past has become so ingrained and become such part and parcel of some natures, that the freedom, the legal liberty, to worship God, each according to the dictates of his own conscience, is called persecution, because forsooth, what is in fact real persecution is no more.

We ought to know something about what is the meaning of the term, the liberties of the Gallican Church, which term

we have heard for a long time and perhaps have little understood.

The relation of the Gallican Church, the Roman Catholic Church in France, to the Roman Pontiff, has always been peculiar. It has always claimed a freedom and independence of Rome quite unlike any other branch or part of the Roman Catholic Church. We may expect to find some things in history which will throw light on the reasons for the present situation.

The Church in France has often been called by Rome the eldest daughter of the Church. Many claims are made without the slightest grounds, and for this it seems to me there is no ground. Christianity was not planted in France by Rome. Gaul was missionary ground of the Eastern Church, not the Western Church. It was Polycarp, the chief pastor at Smyrna in Asia-Minor, who sent Pothenus, one of his pupils, from Smyrna to Gaul as an Evangelist. This was natural, for Smyrna knew more of Gaul or France than did Rome. Smyrna was a great seaport of the East, and Marseilles was a great seaport of France, and the commerce between the two was great, and brought the two distant regions together. Irenæus, the great heresy hunter, was also a pupil of Polycarp, who sent him to join Pothenus in the Mission at Lyons. Heresies in the Roman Church, patronized by the Pope Eleutherus, took Irenæus to Rome with a protest against the rise of Montanism, and he dared to face the Bishop of Rome and the Presbyter of Lyons checked the heresies of Rome itself! Here at least is none of the supremacy of Rome. Returning to Lyons, Irenæus found that the martyr Pothenus had gone to his reward in a pagan persecution, and he became his successor about A. D. 177, and organized the Christian Church in Gaul, the child, not of Rome, but of the Eastern Church. The Church organized by Irenæus was in fact free from Roman rule—independent of—though not indifferent to Rome.

The Gallican Church so remained for nearly six hundred years and until the middle of the eighth century, when in the time of Pepin and by the influence of Boniface, Bishop of Mainz, then in Eastern France, it came to recognize the Pope as head of the church. But this did not put the Gallican Church under the Pope, and later Pepin rewarded his favorites with ecclesiastical benefices.

Charlemagne in the ninth century moulded the Gallican Church into form and shape, and it took on a national character. Though crowned by the Pope as Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire, it is far from difficult to recognize that the Coronation Act was more political than ecclesiastical, and Charlemagne rather than the Pope became head of the Gallican Church, and very practically so, for bishops and abbots, like counts and dukes, all held feudal relation to him.

(To be continued.)



The building committee of the Masonic lodge of New Iberia, La., has accepted plans of Architect Crosely of New Orleans, and they will soon have a fine three story building, the lower story for commercial purposes and the two upper stories for lodge purposes.

# THE AMERICAN TYLER-KEYSTONE

November 5, 1910

---

**The Science of Correspondences**  
R. D. Book, M. D.

---

**Talks with the Worshipful Master**

---

**The Country and the Craft in  
Mourning**

---

**Pre-Grand Lodge Masonry and  
Present Opportunity**  
Wm. M. Shaver, P. G. M.

---

**An Honor to a Contributor**

---

**Elements of Symbology**  
Joseph White Norwood

---

**The Religious Situation in France**  
Colonel Ralph E. Prime, D. D. G. M., New York

---

**Scottish Rite Philosophy**  
N. F. de Clifford, M. D.

---

**Comment for the Craft at Large**

---

Volume XXV

Number 9

JAS

## The Religious Situation in France II.

Colonel Ralph E. Prime, D. D. G. M., New York

Constantine had been the head of the Church, and called councils and ruled them, and so Charlemagne made more firm the relation of Church and State and the supremacy of State. Bishops and abbots became as counts and dukes, a part of the feudalism of that time, and church benefices were held under the same conditions of feudal service, and under the Emperor the support by the State, of ministers of religion, was entrusted to the laws of the State.

To meet the mighty effort, the turning back of the Moors from Europe, Charles Martel seized the treasures of the Church and rewarded his warrior chiefs with the temporalities of the bishoprics and abbeys.

The claims of the Roman Pontiff to a jurisdiction humiliating to the king, were the cause of successive royal decrees in the years 1229, 1239 and 1270, defining for the Gallican Church its liberties and immunities, limiting the bishop's power of excommunication, putting the clergy under the laws of the State in civil and criminal affairs, and the first Pragmatic Sanction in 1268 was a guarantee of the authority of the bishops, and of the people against the rule of the Pope, and secured the election of bishops, not by the Pope, but by the chapters, and the right of the Gallican Church to convene for itself a council. In the controversy between Pope Boniface VIII and Philip IV, the king, the Parliament and the clergy clung to what were called the liberties of the Gallican Church as authorized by the Councils of Piza, of Constance, and of Basel. The Pragmatic Sanction is ascribed first to St. Louis (Louis IX, and it interdicts "the exactions and very heavy money charges which have been imposed or may hereafter be imposed on said Church by the Court of Rome, and by which our kingdom has been miserably impoverished; unless they take place for reasonable, pious and very urgent causes, through evident necessity, and with our spontaneous and express consent and that of the church of our kingdom." Surely such words tell the story of Papal assertion of temporal power and of the Gallican effectual and churchly denial of such power and the assertion of Church freedom.

The Second Pragmatic Sanction, that of Charles VII, in 1438, was another assertion of the liberties of the Gallican Church, and repudiates the claims of the Pope, and it was adopted by the Council of Ecclesiastics at Bouges. In an attempt to win favour with the Pope, Louis XI, in 1461, abrogated the Pragmatic Sanction of Charles, but failing to get what he desired, stood by and allowed his Parliament to maintain that charter of liberty of the Gallican Church.

The scope of the claims of these liberties and the courage to assert them, is illustrated by the fact that in 1455 the Bishop of Nantes, appealed to Rome from a royal decree, and he was at once accused to and condemned by Parliament for violation of the constitution and laws and principles of France.

In 1516 Francis I made his Concordat with Pope Leo X, abolishing the Pragmatic Sanction, but the people of France with the clergy repudiated the act of the king and continued to assert its principles, and the decrees of the Councils of Florence, Piza and Basel, which had approved the same principles and the Parliament refused to register the Concordat. Though it afterward yielded, it did so,

with not uncertain words that it was done under compulsion, and the University made order that it should not be published.

The Council of Trent made its decrees, but in France in 1545 they were only accepted so far as they agreed with the privileges of the king, the maxims of France and the laws of the Gallican Church.

In 1682 there was held in Paris an assembly or council of clergy and nobles, who formulated principles very like those of the Pragmatic Sanction, declaring that the Pope and the whole Church have power only in spiritual things; that however great the power of the Pope, he cannot overthrow the decrees of the Council of Constance, and that the laws, rules and customs of the Gallican Church all of which have been confirmed by that Council, cannot be overthrown and must remain intact; and the decisions of the Pope are not unchangeable unless the whole church agrees.

In 1735, after a war was ended by the treaty of Vienna, again the Pragmatic Sanction was guaranteed to France.

So that through all the history of France down to the very eve of the French Revolution there were acknowledged liberties of the Gallican Church which gave to it more than a quasi-independence of the Pope. It was all in harmony with the origin of the Church in France, a child of the East and not of the West, for the Eastern Church has in that respect stood unlike the West, and has been so separated by political and national lines that no ecclesiastic, however high, has had power outside the bounds of the nation within which he dwells.

But France was overwhelmingly Catholic. And the share of the State in the rule of the Church made that Church in a very large sense, a National Church. The edict of Nantes was a relief to the Huguenot population for political reasons, for they were a valuable and useful part of its citizenship. Its revocation, as also the massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day, were the natural results of the union of Church and State. The censures and discipline of the Church were enforced by the secular arm.

My views about the French Revolution have been largely changed and modified by a larger reading of the story of France. Savage as it was, we must take a moderate view of it, when we consider what its people had endured for centuries at the hands of the State, at the instigation of the Church. I am satisfied that the Church in France was primarily responsible for those awful years. The intolerant persecuting spirit of the organized Church hitched to the State, and the State using its power, at the instigation of the Church, was a horror, and naturally produced in the end of the 18th century a revulsion. One cannot read the details of the story without the whole nature being roused against it, and the sense of justice roused by its enormities. No wonder it came; it had to come.

France in the end of the ninth decade of the 18th century was surrounded with enemies, and had armies to sustain in every side. But it was poor. Some authorities say that one inch in every three of the soil of France had come to be held by the Church, the monastic orders and the ecclesiastics, and that an equal amount of the personal property of France was in their hands. The most conservative estimate of others is that the Church and that the

clergy held one-fifth of all the property in France. And upon none of this was a sou of taxes ever paid. It never contributed its share to the burdens of government of the nation. The higher clergy and the nobles rolled in wealth and lived luxuriously, while the people and the lower priests as a class were starving for bread. The Constitution was adopted by the states-general and was approved by the king. It secured nothing to anybody, but it organized a legislature with full and absolute legislative power.

Let us not forget that there is no spiritual element in property. No one has any guarantee of ownership of anything except as guaranteed by the law of State, and the State is the ultimate owner of all property. We enjoy it in life only as the State grants the ownership and protects us in the enjoyment. We will it to our children, or they inherit it from us, only by grace of the law. Even in America we only hold it safely by virtue of the Constitution, whose provisions no legislatures can violate. France has no such guarantee of security. Even in England, last year, vast property, adjudged by the courts to belong to the "Wee Frees," the old Free Church, was by a commission of Parliament distributed to another Church. This could not have been done anywhere in our country. It was done in England. Our Constitution would conclusively prevent such a diversion.

The national treasury of France was empty. The people had no money. The nation needed it for its defense, and the people needed it to buy what would sustain life. Was it wonder that it should be taken from those that had obtained it? France had done the same thing twice before. England when in no such need had for national safety stripped the Church of its wealth.

In the states-general, Talleyrand, Bishop of Autun, himself proposed that a part of the hoard of the Church should be taken for needs of the nation. The states-general, which had in the first instance of the nation's great need been summoned by the king, and which had framed the Constitution, now in September, 1789, decreed that all the property of the church and of the religious establishments was the property of the nation.

In view of what we have seen, the independence of the Church from Rome, the long recognized liberties of the Gallican Church, its national character, and how the king and the Parliament had always treated it as a part of the government, in fact a part of the administration, it is quite difficult to see how its property was not always in fact and after some manner already national property and hence that it was quite unnecessary to decree any change of title. Such decree hardly did any more than write in the words of the decree what was in fact the existing situation.

Certainly the history of the Gallican Church cannot be read without its facts surprising us, as to its national relation and as related to its property, and a very suggestive story it is. It had advantages for all French Catholics, and with the advantages to such, of its relation to the State, came corresponding necessary legal implications. We cannot have such relations without accepting with the implications.

The Church had for many centuries been so intimately connected with and related to the State, that it was in fact a department of government, rather than any separate entity. The government managed and directed the Church, just as it did the other departments of the government. Archbishops and bishops were appointed by the government.

Though related to Rome in theory, it was yet separate from Rome. The State forbade to Rome many things which belonged to the Church, and did them herself. It was very safely to a large degree a part of the government, and the Church decrees and discipline and punishments were executed by the government as acts of the government. Its accumulation of wealth and property was as by a branch of the government and belonged to the nation. It had sought for its own purposes that very relation to the State and its position as a part of the State, and it must take that with its implications, even to the extent of the relation of its accumulated property to the State. The means of the acquisition of its mass of wealth was through its relation to the State. This principle was not by any means altogether new. It had been invoked before in England, and also in other countries of Europe. John Huss in Bohemia about 1410 had denounced the wealth of the higher clergy, and preached against the wealth of the Church, and it is said that he advocated the transfer of all control of Church property to the State. In France, many times during more than a century from 1640 to 1750, the doctrine had been argued by the pamphleteers of that period. As already stated, France had twice before laid hands upon and used for national purposes the property of the Church and the ecclesiastics. In the French states-general the whole subject was debated. Talleyrand-Perigord, Mirabeau, La Coste, Garat, Thouret, Chassat, and even Goulet and Jullet representing the lower clergy, and a host of others argued for the actual ownership by the State, of the ecclesiastical property.

It is hard to say why the Church and ecclesiastical property did not belong to the nation without any decree of the states-general. The decree was the natural and necessary result of the position for centuries occupied by the Church, and of the then situation, and the decree of the states-general was not made without deliberation and logical claim of right, and it declared the logical result, that the Church and ecclesiastical property was the property of the nation.

But call it confiscation if you will. The legislative body had the power and the legal right to confiscate. It was supreme, and no constitutional guarantee prevented.

Some of us live today on land confiscated more than one hundred years ago, in the same way, by our forefathers after the Revolutionary struggle, and from those who were loyal to the British crown, and for that reason only. The whole region where I have for forty years had my home, is such land, and my own home is a part of the same. It were well we should examine the question of the right or wrong of our own titles before we condemn the French confiscation of Church property in 1789. Such condemnation would trouble many consciences in England today. But there is no such trouble in law or in morals. What the law gave the law can take away.

But the French confiscation did not bring money into the empty treasury. The Church property was sold to departments and communes, in each of which the treasury was also empty, but the issue of Assignats was authorized. They were in effect municipal bonds issued in payment to the nation for the property sold to the localities. That name Assignats has remained, and has ever since been and is used today. The sale of these bonds brought in their value, and the nation had money for its needs and for needs of its poor.

Many of us have seen cut in the stone above the doors

of churches in France the words which signify Liberty, Equality and Fraternity. They came with the Revolution only a little later, but do you suppose that the Roman Catholic Church, some time in the more than 100 years that have since passed, would not have chiselled out those words if they thought for a moment that it owned those churches, and hence had the right to do it? They have never removed one of those inscriptions in stone.

The Revolution quickly came. The reign of terror followed. Then the Republic and the Consulate, and with it the celebrated Concordat of Napoleon when he was first Consul. It was a pure political document, and was intended as such. The French Ambassador at Rome tried his hand first, and then the Pope sent his Secretary of State, Cardi-

nal Consalvi, to Paris to negotiate it. Napoleon treated him almost indifferently, and at least so talked to him and gave him to understand that he knew what he would have to do in the end, and it might as well be done at once. The wily Italian failed at every point. He begged for his master the acknowledgment of the Catholic Church as the National Church of France, but the first Consul told him there were valuable citizens of France who were Protestants. The only thing yielded in that line was put in a preamble which admits that the Roman Catholic religion is the religion of a great majority of the people of France. Far short of making the Roman Catholic Church the Church of France.

(To be continued.)

## Scottish Rite Philosophy

N. F. de Clifford, M.D.

(COPYRIGHTED.)

A. U. M. is the profound salutation of the Aryan Adept who always begins his devotional concentrations and ends them with an appeal to non-human presence with the trilateral word which represents the forever concealed primeval triune differentiation; not *from*, but *in* the One Absolute and is, therefore, symbolized by the Tetractys (or the 4, thus:—1 + 2 + 3 + 4 = 10), which was the symbol of the Kosmos, as containing within itself, the point, the line, the superficies, the solid; in other words, the essentials of all forms. Its mystical representation is the point within the triangle. The Decad or perfect number, is contained in the Four above stated.

"Om Mani," murmurs the Turanian Adept, and after pausing for a few seconds, he adds, "Padme-Hum." This famous invocation is very erroneously translated by the Orientalist, as meaning "O the Jewel in the Lotus." For although literally, OM is a syllable sacred to the Deity, Padme means "in the Lotus," and "Mani" is any precious stone. Still, neither the words themselves, nor their symbolical meaning are thus really correctly translated or rendered.

In this, the most sacred of Eastern formulas, not only has every syllable a secret potency, producing a definite result, but the whole invocation has seven different meanings, and can produce seven distinct results, each of which may differ from the other. The seven meanings and the seven results depend upon the intonation which is given to the whole formula, and to each of its syllables. Even the numerical value of the letters is added to or diminished, according as such or another rhythm is made use of. Let the student ever remember that number underlies form, and number guides sound, and that number lies at the root of the manifested universe.

The mystic sentence "*Om Mani Padme Hum*" when rightly understood, instead of being composed of the almost meaningless words, "O the Jewel in the Lotus" contains a reference to the indissoluble union between man and the universe, rendered in seven different ways, and having the capability of seven different applications to as many planes of thought and action.

From whatever aspect we examine the mystic sentence we shall most assuredly find that it means: *I am that I am*. "I am in thee, and thou art in me," or esoterically, "O, my God within me." For there is, most certainly, a God in each human being, for man was and will re-become God.

The sentence points to the indissoluble union between man and the universe. For the Lotus is the universal symbol of the Kosmos as the absolute totality, and the Jewel is spiritual man or God. If the Masonic student who would delve into the Vedas for the purpose of studying the esoteric sciences with double object:—*First*, Of proving man to be identical in spiritual and psychical essence with both the absolute principle and with God in Nature: *Second*, Of demonstrating the presence in him of the same potential powers as exist in the creative forces in Nature: Such an one who will give a careful study to the esoteric sciences will gain a perfect knowledge of the correspondences between colors, sounds, and numbers which is the first requisite. As already said the sacred formula of the Far East "Om Mani Padme Hum," is the best calculated to make these correspondential qualities and functions clear to the learned.

The Vedas seems to be utterly absurd and nonsensical to the great majority of people, because they do not understand the true meaning and consequently they cannot read and translate it aright. There is no question but it is the oldest record of human thought. It is the most ancient writings and contains the most venerable philosophy known to man. It contains all those profound philosophical and metaphysical ideas that have been reproduced and taught by our philosophers of this twentieth century. It is without exception the most interesting and instructive monument of human thought and human development.

We most assuredly owe to the Vedas and the Zend-Avesta, and not to the Hebrew books alone, all our philosophical ideas about God, the immortality of the soul, the Trinity, as well as the doctrines taught by St. John and St. Paul. Masonry owes to them her symbols and the doctrines of which these are the symbols, as I have hereinbefore explained. The sacred monosyllable is unquestionably concealed in certain symbolic words in Free Masonry and Aryan migrations and victories, no doubt, made it known to the Rishis and Sages all over the Orient. It is for this reason that I have gone into the subject, so that you may gain "More Light" on the so-called "Lost Word."

There is no question in my mind, but the real word belonged to the Aryan race, long centuries before it was separated into the Iran and Indu-Aryan branches, who originally formed the one great Aryan people. And the Irano-Aryan branches carried away with them the esoteric knowl-

# THE AMERICAN TYLER-KEYSTONE

November 20, 1910

---

**Masonic Views in France**  
Robert C. Wright

---

**Elements of Symbology**  
Joseph White Norwood

---

**Choosing Officers**  
Carl W. Mason

---

**The Acacia Fraternity at the  
University of Oregon**

---

**Our Duty to Our Neighbor**  
Richard Goldsmith

---

**The Science of Correspondences**  
R. D. Book, M. D.

---

**The Religious Situation in France**  
Colonel Ralph E. Prime, D. D. G. M., New York

---

**Some Letters of Interest**

---

**Here and There in the Craft**

---

**Volume XXV      Number 10**

JAS

## The Religious Situation in France III

Colonel Ralph E. Prime, D. D. G. M., New York

The first article of the Concordat concedes that the Roman Catholic religion shall be freely exercised in France; that its service shall be publicly performed conformably to regulations of police which the government shall judge necessary for the public tranquility. The fourth and fifth articles provide that the government shall nominate all bishops, and the Pope engages to give them canonical institution. The fifth article requires that all bishops shall take an oath of allegiance to the French government and shall carry on no correspondence, and be present at no conversation, and form no connection within or without France which shall in any degree disturb public tranquility, and shall immediately communicate to the government anything going forward to the prejudice of the State. Other articles provide also that all ecclesiastics shall take the same oath; that prayer for the State shall be said at every service; that the division of parishes must be approved by the government; that vicars-general approved by the government shall be appointed by the bishops; that unsold cathedrals and churches necessary to worship shall be placed at the disposal of the bishops; that the Pope for himself and his successors confirms the sale of all church property sold; that the government will pay the salaries of bishops and parish priests; and in article 16 the Pope recognizes the head of the republic to have the same rights and prerogatives in religious matters which the ancient government enjoyed.

How wonderfully Napoleon harnessed up the Church to the wheels of State. He certainly outdid all the Pragmatic Sanctions of former times.

The desire was that the Concordat should be proclaimed on the 14th of July, the anniversary of the destruction of the Bastille. But it was not signed until the 15th, and that was too late, and though it was signed July 15, 1801, and ratifications exchanged in Paris, September 10, 1801, yet it was not proclaimed until 18 Germinal Year X (8th of April, 1802), when with it was proclaimed the law of that date, which was then adopted by the corps legislative.

The law of 18th Germinal was certainly within the power of the corps legislative, and it remained the law of France for more than 100 years, and still is, except only so far as abrogated by the separation law of December, 1905. So far as it goes beyond necessary police regulation, it was within the terms of the Concordat, but it added additional bonds to the Church, and more securely fastened the Church to the State, and yet, it did for the Church nothing beyond the fixing of salaries for bishops and priests and agreeing to pay them.

Some of the details of this law I must tell you of. If I have translated it incorrectly out of the French, that may be laid to my fault. It forbids papal bulls, decrees or dispatches to be published in France without leave of the government; no individual can as nuncio, legate, or papal commissioner on French territory exercise any function with reference to the Gallican Church without like permission; the decree of foreign councils or synods shall not be published in France until the government has found that they conform to the laws of France; no council or meeting ecclesiastical can be held without permission of the government; appeal is granted to the Council of State for abuses by any ecclesiastic by

usurpation, excess of power, violation of laws of the Republic or of the canons received in France; or for infringement of liberties, franchises and customs of the Gallican Church, and all worship that compromises the conscience of the citizens; and all exemptions of ecclesiastics are abolished; cathedral chapters and seminaries may be established; all other establishments are suppressed; archbishops and bishops are to be called citizen or monsieur, and all their other titles abolished; all bishops must be thirty years of age, and no bishop except he be born in France; candidates for bishops to be examined by priests chosen by the government, who shall report to the government; priests to be appointed by the government, and must be instituted by the Pope, but not to officiate until the bull of institution is approved by the government; bishops must reside in their dioceses and not go out without permission of the government; seminary rules must be approved by the government; teachers in seminaries to subscribe to the declaration of 1682 and report to government names of all students; curates to take the oath of the Concordat; no stranger to be employed without leave of the government; priest not to quit his diocese without leave of government; government to be notified of every vacancy; only one liturgy and catechism to be used in all France; no fetes without leave of government; no special prayers; ecclesiastical dress to be French; no domestic chapels without leave of government; no religious ceremonies outside of a building in any place where there are churches of different religions; same church for only one religion; at all masses prayers for the government and for first consul; no attack on other religions; no marriage benediction but to those authorized by law to contract civil marriage; the calendar of the Revolution to be used; ancient edifices in hands of the nation, at rate of an edifice for a living to be at disposition of a bishop by decision of the prefect of a department, and to be reported to the civil officer charged with matters of religion and the ecclesiastic body in charge of churches and cathedrals to maintain and protect the buildings.

The other provisions of this remarkable law will not interest you at this time. What has been stated shows how completely Rome and the Pope were ignored, and how the liberties of the Gallican Church were guarded and the Catholic Church made a French institution. The monasteries had been suppressed, the religious orders abolished, the wealth of the clergy and of the orders confiscated by law, and lawfully, and restored to the nation, and no doubt it was by those who drew the Concordat and prepared the "articles organique," the law of 18th Germinal Year X (April 8, 1802), deemed that the third and last confiscation of the wealth of the Church and the regulations adopted secured the nation for the future against the encroachments of the Pope and the repetition of the awful enrichment of the Church and the impoverishment of the people. But man can never surely foresee. Let me quote prophetic words of Sloane in his book, "The French Revolution and Religious Reform," which was published in 1901. "What is today a menace to governmental authority in France, namely, the extraordinary power and wealth of uncontrolled and invading religious orders, was unforeseen by the makers of the



Concordat. The monasteries had been annihilated, their reorganization seemed impossible. No provision, therefore, was made against a contingency of which no one dreamed. But the unexpected came to pass, and the new orders which today conduct the education of the upper classes almost entirely, care for the sick very extensively, and print most widely circulated journals of the country, being unknown to France in 1801, defy all authority except that of Rome. The situation, therefore, seems utterly abnormal to both the government and its supporters, including the majority of those Catholics living under the Concordat. That such powers within the State will eventually be placed in some measure under State control, cannot be doubted. Should a new and more comprehensive Concordat be substituted for the old, or a supplement to the articles organique be enacted into a law controlling the new orders, the present ecclesiastical system may take a new lease of life. Otherwise France must move inward to complete disestablishment."

No one who has not read Zola's novel, "Truth," can fully appreciate the grip that those new religious orders had upon the upper classes in France, and how the schools maintained by them were made nurseries of treason and rebellion against the Republic. The Church, despite the oath of allegiance taken by every bishop and priest had become a machine of the monarchists, and the youths of France were being educated to be the enemies of Republican France.

The revelation of the facts by means, among others, of the Dreyfus case in its many chapters, opened the eyes of Republican France to the impending dangers. The new invading religious orders were driven out of France in 1902 and scattered over Europe, and even into French-speaking Canada. Then came the charges against the Bishop of Dijon of being a Free Mason and against the Bishop of Laval for immorality. The government, on principle, forbade them to go and thereby violate the Concordat, and the articles organique. It matters not if these men were obnoxious to the charges or not. They were sworn to obey the laws of France, which forbade them to go. The Pope insisted, and his insistence was a violation of the Concordat and a defiance of the laws of France. Another event occurred. The president of France paid a visit to the king of Italy in Rome. It was purely a political affair, such as we often hear of, the visit of the head of one government to the head of another friendly government. But it displeased the Court of the Vatican, and President Loubet was condemned by the Pope, and his anathema against the president of France was published all over Europe.

The last nail had been driven and the end came. The French Assembly commenced to debate the measure called the Separation Act. It was fought bitterly in the Corps Legislature for months, but at last it was adopted by the Chamber, and some months later by the Senate, and was promulgated in December, 1905, and became the law of France. I was privileged to be present in the French Assembly and heard part of the debate.

If this separation law was not the will of the great majority of the French people, they were given an opportunity to show it. An honored and learned respected American Roman Catholic, a speaker at one of the public meetings of his churchmen near New York, is reported to have said that the separation law "is an outrage on all humanity by a set of men temporarily in power through the vagaries of politics." Surely the ultramontane element in France in their

vastly read newspapers fully educated the people of France as to the issue. And what was their verdict? The separation law was adopted in the French Assembly by a very satisfactory majority, and the Assembly was dissolved and the government went to the people on that issue and the voters of France returned and elected a new Assembly, with a government majority fully one hundred greater than the majority by which the separation was adopted in the former Assembly. The present government majority, we are told, represents more than two-thirds of all the electors in France. Surely, this does not mean any "power through the vagaries of politics."

Now, what does the separation law do?

First, it assures, in France, the liberty of conscience and guarantees the free practice of religions, subject only to the restrictions in the interests of public order. It declares that the Republic neither recognizes nor subsidizes any religion, and will, after January 1, 1906, omit from the budget all expenses connected with the practice of religions, except for chaplains in public institutions, and it suppresses the public religious establishments, which, however, were to continue to exercise their functions until the assignment of property to the associations to be formed, but inventories were to be immediately taken of all church property, and that requirement was inserted in the law at the instance of the Catholics themselves, while the law was being considered in the Assembly, and yet when the inventories were being taken, for their benefit, and at their own instance, Catholics themselves resisted, and caused many riots and acts of violence. By the separation law the new associations, called Associations Cultuelles, were to be formed within one year, and to them the existing establishments were to turn over their property, and only for the practice of that same religion in the former districts of the same establishments. So that the Catholic establishment of a church or cathedral would turn it over only to an association formed for the practice of the same Roman Catholic religion. The law also provides for the gratuitous use of all the churches and cathedrals and other property by such associations, but to remain as before, the property of the State and the departments and the communes. But this law does require that religious worship shall be public.

These are a few of the not many provisions of the separation law. It cuts the knot, and definitely separates the Church completely from the State. It does require the formation of associations, but for practice of a religion only, and which shall be liable to the State and be subject to visitation by the State, as of other corporations, to see that it does not enter into unlawful work. It requires the practice of religion to be public, that the State may see to it, that the enemies of the Republic shall not, under the cover of a religious meeting, be able to organize or even teach treason.

With the past experience of France, why is not all this regulation reasonable and proper? It makes no distinction between churches or religions, and why should the State ever make such distinction? We in America resent any such union, and the constitutions of the different States guarantee just the same thing. In America every denomination must buy and pay in good gold for every inch of land or other property it owns or uses and be liable to pay taxes on the same, and many justly claim the Church with us ought to pay taxes just as others. But under this French law, a vast amount of church property, the value of which

must run up into hundreds of millions of dollars is given over to their use gratuitously without any of the burdens of taxation, and only burdened with the obligation to maintain it and keep it in repair. Let us not forget that all this property is legally the property of the nation, and was so acknowledged by the Pope, who also agrees in the Concordat of 1801 that it should remain so, and he also guaranteed in the Concordat the title in the purchaser of all property that had been sold. So it has ever since been, and for more than one hundred years has been used free and without expense by the Catholic Church. And let me repeat, if it were not so accepted as such, those words Liberty, Equality and Fraternity, would have been taken out from the portal front of every Roman Catholic Church years before any of us were born.

It will not do to say that the provisions of the separation law of 1905 were not accepted by the body of the Catholics of France. From what we can learn from the literature on the subject and the current news, they were accepted by a large body of Catholics. They were also so accepted by a large and very substantial majority of the French prelates, archbishops and bishops, who took measures immediately to conform to the law and who, we are told, were painfully disappointed when the Vatican interfered and forbade any submission to the law. We are also told that a very great body of the priests were pained to be placed in a position where they could not be good loyal Frenchmen and also good Catholics.

All this was clearly the work of ultramontanism. That element had also been secretly at work. Rome maintained an agent or Papal secretary in Paris. The government had reason to suspect what his work was, and arrested him and took him to the border and expelled him from France and set him over on foreign territory, and seized his papers we are told, and it is not yet contradicted, that about fifteen hundred documents were found among them, testifying to active treasonable interference since the year 1904 in the internal policies of France, also of Spain. The Concordat certainly had forbidden that. The law of 18th Germinal Year X (8 April, 1802), also forbade it. No nation could tolerate it.

French Catholics, as a body, have been wronged, not by the government of France, but by the Pope and the Vatican, and have against their will been placed in a position where they cannot be good Catholics from the standpoint of Rome, and at the same time loyal Frenchmen.

And these new provisions of the French law affect our own brethren of the Reformed Churches of France, just exactly as they do the Catholic Church. True, they never have had the use, "free gratis, for nothing," of any grand cathedrals and ancient churches, and like us have generally had to buy with good gold their properties, but the Concordat and the articles organique affected the Reformed Churches, and the pastors were salaried, though at less sums than the Catholic priests. But our Reformed brethren have been true and loyal Frenchmen, obedient to the law of France, and have loyally accepted the separation law and surrendered their salaries, formed associations under the Separation Act of 1906 and retained their buildings. The Reformed congregations are of the middle peasant class, and of limited means, and the burden of self-support will fall most heavily on them. Their buildings, the Temple de l'Oratoire, also the Temple Ste. Marie, in Paris, and others elsewhere, were national buildings, like the Roman Catholic buildings.

"Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's," certainly teaches loyalty and patriotism. Our brethren in France exemplify the precept. So also I believe of the mass of the people who are Catholic. The Hierarchy, the clergy and the ecclesiastics have forsaken all the traditions of the past of the Catholic Church in France, and have sold themselves and all the valued traditional liberties of the Gallican Church, and have become completely ultramontane.

(Concluded.)



## Craft Sonnets

Chas. F. Forshaw, M.D., LL.D., Bradford, England

### Masonic Candidates

If like the Lamb-skin he is Pure and White,  
 If like the Square, he's Upright, True and Straight,  
 Then let our would-be Brother see the Light,  
 And lead his footsteps with no faltering gait.  
 But see ye first that all his ways are Clean—  
 With nought to mar the Scutcheon of our Fame.  
 No deed to Sully, Tarnish or Demean,  
 Or cast upon our Craft the slightest blame.  
 We have a glorious record to uphold—  
 A treasured heirloom of Celestial Birth:  
 More ancient than the fabled fleece of gold—  
 Most priceless blessing throughout all the Earth.  
 See to it then, no thing of Shame and Sin  
 Shall to our Mysteries ever enter in!

### A Masonic Question

Do you, my Brother, strive each passing day  
 to glean some Knowledge from the fleeting hours?  
 Do you contrive some earth-born debt to pay  
 Which e'er enriches, elevates, endowers?  
 Do you devote some moments of your time  
 To soften grief and diresome woe assuage?  
 Nor rest contented till a joy Sublime  
 Rests on the fallen in life's pilgrimage?  
 If you do not, ne'er Grip me by the hand,  
 Nor hail me Brother as you onward pass;  
 Ne'er give the Sign that I should understand,  
 Nor breathe the Word unknown to human mass!  
 For knowing this, I scarce your hand could take  
 And give, sincerely, the Masonic Shake!

### Blackballed!

He bragged about his worldly wealth, and raved:—  
 "With riches such as mine I realms might buy,  
 Money can purchase all things, I have saved  
 Sufficient gold to half the world defy!  
 What is this Masonry I hear about?  
 I'll join a Lodge, be Master in a year,  
 The records of the past shall be wiped out  
 'Tis Cash that tells, you watch me, never fear."  
 But all his boasted Millions were in vain,  
 'Tis true a friend to nominate was found,  
 For what the ballot told us was quite plain,  
 (We knew it well before it started round).  
 An irreligious libertine was he  
 And all his gains will never make him Free!

WRITTEN FOR *The Tyler-Keystone*.