

# THE REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENT :

A DIAGNOSIS OF WORLD DISORDERS.

BY

J. FINDLATER.

EDINBURGH :

“ Brodiesord ”, Viewforth Terrace.

1933.

Printed by  
HAMMBTT & CO., HAMMET STREET,  
TAUNTON.

Behold

Not distant far with heavy pace the foe  
Approaching gross and huge, in hollow cube  
Training his dev'lish enginery, impal'd  
On every side with shadowing squadrons deep,  
To hide the fraud. At interview they stood  
A while; but suddenly at head appear'd  
SATAN, and thus was heard commanding loud—

VANGUARD, to right and left the front unfold;  
That all may see who hate us, how we seek  
Peace and composure, and with open breast  
Stand ready to receive them, if they like  
Our overture, and turn not back perverse;  
But that I doubt; however witness Heaven,  
Heav'n witness thou anon, while we discharge  
Freely our part; ye who appointed stand,  
Do as ye have in charge, and briefly touch  
What we propound, and loud that all may hear.

So scoffing in ambiguous words, he scarce  
Had ended; when to right and left the front  
Divided, and to either flank retir'd;  
Which to our eyes discover'd, new and strange,  
A triple mounted row of pillars laid  
On wheels, (for like to pillars most they seem'd,  
Or hollowed bodies made of oak or fir,  
With branches lopt, in wood or mountain fell'd),  
Brass, iron, stony mould, had not their mouths  
With hideous orifice gap'd on us wide,  
Portending hollow truce: at each behind  
A seraph stood, and in his hand a reed  
Stood waving, tipped with fire; while we suspense  
Collected stood within our thoughts amus'd,  
Not long, for sudden all at once their reeds  
Put forth, and to a narrow vent applied  
With nicest touch.

Immediate in a flame,  
But soon obscur'd with smoke, all heav'n appear'd  
From those deep-throated engines belch'd, whose roar  
Imbowell'd with outrageous noise the air,  
And all her entrails tore, disgorging foul  
Their dev'lish glut, chain'd thunderbolts and hail  
Of iron globes; which on the victor host  
Levell'd, with such impetuous fury smote,  
That whom they hit, none on their feet did stand.

*Paradise Lost, Book VI.*

## TO THE READER.

---

Many of the changes come in British Church life since a century ago, or now taking place throughout British civilisation in general, very markedly resemble the things aimed at and in part attained by the French Revolution of 1789. To you who have realised this fact such questions as the following must perforce present themselves and call for truthful answers :—

- I. Is there a deliberate plan to accomplish in Britain what was attempted to be done by means of the French Revolution ?
- II. Who caused the French Revolution, and why ?
- III. Is there any evidence that the Revolutionary Movement, now become worldwide, is but a continuation of the irruption of 1789 ?
- IV. Can the originators of that irruption have formed themselves into A CONTINUATION COMMITTEE to foster worldwide revolution ?
- V. Is that Continuation Committee responsible for much, perhaps most, of the fearful World-Disorder of our time ?
- VI. What is known of that Committee ? and how can its operations be discerned and counteracted ?

Till abler minds and pens get engaged on the solution of those problems, with the assistance of several experienced and closely observant friends I venture to present a considerable part of our discoveries as a contribution towards right answers to those important questions.

Increasing attention is being given to those matters. In the last few weeks the Paris Faculty of Letters, with a special invitation addressed to British students of History, instituted a Centre for the exploration and discussion of everything bearing on the origins, the course, and the sequelæ of the French Revolution of 1789, and on its connections with other movements down to our time, like the Russian Revolution. None are more interested in those things than British Christians and patriots. None have more at stake in the determination of the issues.

EDINBURGH,

January 27th, 1933.

## CONTENTS.

---

	<i>Page.</i>
Prologue	vii.
A New World-Order Arising	1
The French Revolution	7
The Illuminati	13
The French Revolution Romanticised	19
A World-Wide Menace	25
A World-Empire Projected	30
Who are the Conspirators ?	36
The Great Red Dragon	42
The Climacteric of Jesuitism	48
Jesuit Infallibility	53
The Vanguard of Rome	58
Sapping and Mining Operations	64
Jesuitism Essentially Antitheistic	69
Jesuit Communism	74
Retrospect and Conjecture	79
Further Facts and Forecasts	84
World Revolution Set Afoot	88
European Dictatorships	93
Cyclone, Blizzard, Typhoon, Tornado	97
A Grand Crisis Imminent	101
Heavenly Light	105
Epilogue	111
Appendix A. On the Theory of Development	122
B. On Brewsters "History of Freemasonry"	132

## Prologue.

---

In the sixteenth century, through the operation of forces that need not be specified here, the peoples of Western Europe divided into two widely separated rival groups, each of which carried with it as its peculiar possession certain elements of life and society which till then had mixed together but had never coalesced. Previous to that separation, throughout the area named a form of civilisation had existed in which the rival forces had been in some kind of counterpoise. Here those making for freedom had tilted the scales to one side; there those imposing restraint and coercion had swung them to the other: in general it had been a state of see-saw. In the nature of things a separation was bound to come sooner or later—though water and oil by churning be kept jumbled together in mixture, yet in milk by a similar churning the fats get separated from its heavier substances. The nations of Western Europe got thus separated in the sixteenth century; and out of that separation two new orders of civilisation were destined to arise. The nations of South-Western Europe, where the forces of compulsion had all along greatly predominated, were given over to follow a policy of forcible constraint, which soon bred within them the dissidence of dissent. The Northern nations, laying a broader stronger foundation for their corporate life, began to build up an order of civilisation which in our day confers its inestimable benefits on many who understand it all too little and sometimes even speak ill of it. The character of this British civilisation can be appreciated only by considering how it arose in the sixteenth century and afterwards grew to its present height.

**An Unjust Accusation.** Our popish accusers are wont to charge it upon us that the English Reformation, though not the Scottish, came about mainly, if not wholly, over the question of whether the marriage of Katharine of Arragon to Henry VIII was valid or not; and they aver that the severance of England from the Latin Church was essentially a political move and due to Henry's sinful desires. Are the facts susceptible of any such interpretation? Leaving aside for the moment the real case for the Reformation, that it was a natural and indeed a

necessary result of the workings of Divine grace in many English hearts and lives at that epoch; and on the other hand admitting quite freely that the marriage in question had, at least for the moment, a very important and in one view of the case a decisive bearing on the English Reformation, inasmuch as the settlement of that issue was an expression of the national will and carried with it certain far-reaching political consequences, yet it is quite untrue to say that the issue itself was primarily political. On the contrary, it was essentially religious. Indeed, nothing is more certain than that it turned on the acceptance, or rejection, of the cardinal religious principle on which the nations of Northern Europe one after another utterly repudiated the Roman Papacy—the principle that no decree of the Pope can ever over-ride or annul a law of God written in Holy Scripture, the very principle upon which all the Reformed Churches parted from the Latin Communion. And at the outset it is to be noted that the issue was sprung upon Henry, neither from Germany nor from Switzerland, but from Spain and France, where the first objections to the marriage of Henry and Katharine were raised, not on any political grounds, but as a religious question.

**The Real Issue.** Under a dispensation obtained from Pope Julius II, Henry in 1509 married Katharine, his brother Arthur's widow. Of this union the Princess Mary was born. In 1523 proposals of a marriage between the King of Spain and the Princess Mary became abortive owing to Spanish doubts as to Mary's being the legitimate child of Henry. In 1527 negotiations were nearly complete for Mary's marriage to the Dauphin of France, when this project also was wrecked on the selfsame shoal. In both cases the issue was as to whether, notwithstanding that the Pope had ruled Katharine's marriage to Henry lawful and valid, it had not been directly contrary to the law of God embodied in the Sacred Scriptures. Both the Spanish and the French objections to the Princess Mary implied that no papal ruling could override the Divine law on the subject.

**Henry's Dilemma.** Some small modicum of human fellow-feeling with Henry in the case may not be impossible even to partisans of the Latin Church. Obviously, he would have been

much more than human, as well as much more than a good and wise king, and at the same time far less in either capacity, had he taken the matter otherwise than he did. His feelings in the situation into which he had been thrust so awkwardly, not to say cruelly, he expressed in an address he delivered to the English Estates on the 8th November, 1529, when he touched the heart of his difficulties by quoting a sentence spoken by a leading French statesman touching the Princess Mary, "It must be ascertained whether she be the King of England's lawful daughter, or not. For it is well known that he begat her of his brother's wife; and that is directly against God's law and precepts". "If it be determined by judgment", said Henry, summarising his difficulties in the case, "that our marriage was against God's law and void, then shall I sorrow to depart from so good a lady—and that I have no true heir of my body to inherit this realm".

**The English Reformation Cleared.** So the case stated against us by our accusers breaks down completely on the very ground chosen by themselves for an attack on the English Reformation. Had it had no other source than in the issue here disposed of, there would still be no cause why any Briton need be in anywise ashamed of the Reformation. On the contrary, since England at that juncture determined to abide by the law of God and to repudiate all papal corruptions and perversions, Englishmen may justly and well be proud of that decision. Nor let us be beguiled into supposing the dispute was primarily of a political nature; it was essentially and thoroughly religious.

**Main Causes of the Reformation.** In reality, however, the marriage in question was one of the least of the causes of the English Reformation. Its primary source was opened in the giving of the Bible to men in their own tongue by John Wycliffe in 1380—2; for, English character being then what it still is, that event made the Reformation as certain as that Spring will follow Winter. Another main cause was the fierce and bloody persecution of those Christian believers in England who had opened their hearts to the truths of the Bible. A third factor that contributed powerfully to the spread of the Reformed Faith in England was the kindly spirit shown by the Protestants towards

their persecutors. Of them there were already hundreds of thousands in England by the middle of the sixteenth century, of whom several hundreds suffered death for the faith that was in them. The sayings of most of these latter are still on record. Almost without exception those martyrs continued, even with their dying breath, to call blessings down on the heads of their tormentors; hardly one of them was ever provoked into uttering an ill-disposed or railing word against their persecutors. And not less remarkable is it that the Protestants never retaliated the injuries done them and their fellows, not even when later they had come into power, when, as the saying goes, they could so easily have got their own back.\*

But probably the English Reformation received its greatest impulse from the dying testimonies of those martyrs to the truth of Christ's Gospel. When it was seen how men and women were ready to undergo the most abominable cruelties in order to preserve their fidelity to Christ, and when in dying for His cause in the world they testified their full and unshakable confidence in His promises recorded in the Bible, this could not fail to win multitudes of adherents to His cause. If "the blood of the martyrs is the seed of the Church", much more is the life-giving Word, relied

---

\* The only instance of retribution I have been able to discover had nothing of a retaliatory nature in it. It occurred in the year 1562, after Elizabeth was on the throne of England, and related to one of the most atrocious examples of persecution on record. In the Island of Guernsey in 1556 the popish clergy, headed by Dean Jacques Ami, the ecclesiastical Superior of the island, inveigled an aged widow and her two daughters into making a public profession of the Reformed Faith and then condemned all three to death. When tied to three stakes they were being slowly roasted as a burnt-sacrifice, the younger daughter gave birth to a well-formed healthy male child, which a bystander snatched from the flames and laid on the grass. But he in charge of the execution ordered the infant to be thrown into the flames. "So it was carried back again, and cast into the fire." Dean Ami also confiscated the dead widow's property, which he appropriated to his own uses.

Some six years later the widow's brother and nearly all the inhabitants of Guernsey petitioned Queen Elizabeth for the restoration of her property to her brother. The Queen sent commissioners to the island to ascertain the true state of the case and, having heard from them the facts above-stated, she not only ordered the property to be restored to the brother, but also sent Dean Ami to prison for the heinous crime of which he had been guilty. When Ami and others who had taken part in the diabolical deed had humbly confessed their faults and sued for the clemency of "the good Queen Bess," Elizabeth pardoned them and released Ami from prison, though there seems to be no record of his having had his ecclesiastical rank and offices restored.

on by them and openly sealed in their deaths, likely to prove the germ and power of a new and endless life in the hearts of hearers of those dying testimonies. By such means was the English Reformation planted and rooted in the heart of the English nation.

**The Scottish Reformation.** In its initiation the Scottish Reformation presents itself as a political much more than as a religious movement. Not that the religious element was wholly lacking there; for, from Patrick Hamilton to Walter Mill, Scotland also had had its martyrs for the Faith of Christ, though their numbers had been proportionally fewer than in England. Yet, through causes that are not far to seek, the Scottish Reformation came to pass as a popular movement in a degree to which the English Reformation never attained. In the Northern Kingdom the immoral living of the clergy and of the Religious Orders had greatly alienated the masses of the people from the Latin Church long before there was any strong reforming movement apparent. When towards the middle of the sixteenth century many of the Scottish nobility and gentry banded themselves together to secure some reform of the Church, they aimed much more at political than at religious reforms. But in the good providence of God some powerful religious reformers were soon brought on the scene, who appealed so strongly to the religious convictions and feelings of the masses throughout the Scottish Lowlands that soon the Reformation, as a definitely religious movement, took deeper root in Scotland than it had yet got in England; and in 1560 "the Estates of Scotland with the inhabitants of the same professing the Holy Evangel of Christ Jesus", adopted and published a National Confession of the Reformed Faith, commonly called The Scottish Confession of 1560".

**The Foundations of British Civilisation.** There is no question therefore that, both in England and in Scotland, the foundations of that new order of civilisation which has long characterised the British people, were laid in Bible religion. That form of civilisation the Pilgrim Fathers carried over the seas and planted in the wide spaces of the new world of the West—a civilisation whose most prominent features were, the regulation

of national and civic affairs according to the Christian principles of the New Testament; and the unfettered right of every citizen to believe and practise the Christian religion according to his own interpretation of Bible teaching.

**The Evangelical Revival.** In the consolidation and perfecting of the British (American also) order of civilisation, it would be difficult to over-estimate what it owes to the Evangelical Revival of the eighteenth century. The zealous preaching of the Gospel of Christ then translated the power of the Christian religion into multitudes of British and American hearts and lives. Historian after historian and public men almost innumerable have agreed that the Evangelical Revival infused a new life of devotion into the nation at large, kindled a spirit of fervent philanthropy, inaugurated prison reform, purified political life, gave a great impetus to popular education, started the campaign for better care of the sick and the suffering, abolished the slave trade, infused wisdom and clemency into the making and the administration of the penal laws, and awoke all the Churches to the prime importance of their mission and work for humanity. In the view of all competent observers the Revival changed and ennobled Britain almost unspeakably; and America nearly as much as Britain.

**The Missionary Movement.** A further direct result of the Evangelical Revival took shape when heralds of the Gospel of Christ went forth from the Churches of Britain and America into nearly every quarter of our globe, to proclaim the Good News to men of every tribe and nation, and to act also as pioneers of that noble order of civilisation set up in their homelands as one of the rich fruits of the Reformation and the Evangelical Revival. Every land brought within the scope of that Missionary Movement has thus participated more or less in the benefits attending our civilisation; and everywhere it has commended itself the more in that it has nowhere forced the thought and conduct of men into a cast-iron mould that would have made conduct as strained and artificial as thought would have been fettered, but has offered a freedom of life in which assimilation and growth were perfectly

unconstrained and natural, since it imposed on its subjects no external bonds, but, entering their hearts as the principle of a new and ampler life, expanded with the expansion, gradual but none the less sure and permanent, of their own special horizons.

**The Paralysis of Latin Christianity.** At the same time as Britain and America had been establishing their freer nobler order of civilisation, the nations of South Western Europe had been undergoing such changes in an opposite direction as must be felt to have been inherent in their choice to remain under the yoke of the Latin Church. Of these it is unnecessary to say more now than that the steady tightening of the bonds on those peoples induced either a paralysis of national life and a decrepitude of their powers, or a growing restlessness and uneasy reaching out for a form and degree of liberty which can be had and enjoyed only within the compass of Bible religion, which they had rejected. This was part of the nemesis they had invited by that rejection.

**The Revolt Within Latin Christianity.** In the eighteenth century events happened which resulted in the leading nation of that group making, as it believed, a bold bid for that larger liberty after which, like some others of the group, it had long been blindly and vainly groping. But that effort of France was at least as blind as its former groping had been. Instead of seeking the liberty for which it craved by taking the path that had led both Britain and America into the broad fields of freedom, instead of the leaders of French thought striving to make the Gallican race open their hearts to the Gospel of Christ and frame their lives according to the precepts of the New Testament, they incited the people to take yet a further step along the line they had been following and seek liberty in a submission yet more abject to the dictates of human reason, which soon proved to be but the acme of human folly.

**The New Civilisation.** The principle on which the system of the Latin Church had evolved till it culminated in the absolute supremacy of the Roman Papacy, if it can in some sense be called a religious principle, placed the essence of religion in

an obedience to the mind and will of men. It was therefore totally antitheistic in its fundamental conception of religion and in direct opposition to the teaching of Christ. Out of that perversion of the Christian religion had arisen that mechanised civilisation, if civilisation it can be called, against which France pined and fumed in the eighteenth century. But the leaders of that revolt, trained as they had been in the straitest schools of that mechanised civilisation, were incapable of turning the revolt in a right direction. Their sole thought and desire was to substitute for the old tyranny another, which was to prove still more tyrannical. Their only hope of abolishing the antitheistical tyranny of the Papacy being to use the ignorant mobs to destroy it, they cast the reins on the neck of the furious plebian beast, which soon turned positively atheistic in its rage for conquest and for blood. Thus the new civilisation set up in France was none less antitheistic than that of the Latin Church had been.

**Vain Remedies.** It is unnecessary here to consider whether those who had trained the makers of the French Revolution for their task had contemplated and purposed to give France so largely over to atheism as it became at the end of the eighteenth century. It is certain that some of the revolutionary leaders soon got to feel things had gone much too far; and they began striving to bring the nation back from the abyss to whose brink it had rushed in its mad fury. But there is no evidence that any leader whose voice could reach the French people generally, ever pointed out the true path to liberty.

**Mechanised and Tyrannical.** In the French Revolution arose this new order of civilisation which, as was to be anticipated from its antecedents, was little or none less mechanised and tyrannical than the order it had supplanted. To this day, as those who know the French Colonial possessions are aware, the French order of civilisation is wont to be imposed by the exercise of physical force, and obedience to the French Regime is exacted by such means as used to be common in the military training of even the British Forces of long ago. The system of ruling by force France inherited, even in that revolution

whose professed aim was to give all her citizens full and untrammelled liberty, equality and fraternity. To this day no outstanding leader has arisen in France to labour for the introduction of a truly Christian order of civilisation, though many have tried by other means to mitigate the rigours that were once repressive only. France has but alternated between repression and revolution. Such mitigations as have been tried are very partial and temporary; for no strong and all-compelling love of humanity can ever be other than very ephemeral which is not rooted in the love of God, and there is no means of begetting and sustaining the love of God save the Gospel of His Son Jesus Christ.

**Revolution**      What must strike the student of French history  
**Become**            during the last century and a half is that, if the  
**Endemic**          new order of civilisation introduced into the  
**In France.**        world by the Revolution of 1789 does not actually  
sustain itself by ever-recurrent revolutions, at least it lends itself to the revolutionary impulse, depending as it does, on the one hand on the support of the masses, and on the other on the exercise of physical force, for the execution of its purposes. The tyranny which maintained the papal supremacy occasionally evoked a revolutionary reaction. But the twin principles of the new civilisation, plebeian rule and ready resort to the argument of physical force, seem to account for the fact that revolution has been endemic in France for the last 140 years.

**Atheistic**        This new order of civilisation, where it is not  
**at Source.**        positively and nakedly atheistic, lingers ever on the borders of atheism, so that it rather seems as if its truest and most natural expression was shown in the years from 1792 to 1797. And, as will be seen in the following pages, since there is good and sufficient reason to regard the Russian Revolution as having come from the same source as the French, and since the Russian Revolution up to now has been and is thoroughly atheistical, there is real need to enquire whether the *fons et origo* of the whole revolutionary movement be not intensely and permanently atheistic; and consequently whether the new civilisation, of which

the revolutionary movement is the parent and mainstay, be not the greatest and most dangerous foe our British civilisation has ever had to encounter.

**British Civilisation Threatened.** Anyway, the fact is clear as day that the British and the Continental orders of civilisation are fundamentally opposed to one another and thoroughly incompatible. The tragedy of the case as it stands to-day seems to be that, while we are doing little or nothing to impart the secrets of our welfare and happiness to our Continental neighbours, or to share with them the inestimable benefits of our noble heritage, the directors of the revolutionary movement are obviously striving by hook or crook to thrust the Continental order of civilisation upon us. Bible religion is being attacked from every possible angle and with all manner of weapons. The foundations of family life and happiness are being undermined. Societies without number have been formed and are very active, whose objective is to substitute the Continental order of civilisation for the British. Agents of the conspiracy, whether pledged or merely unconsciously beguiled, are at work in all the Churches to undo the good things brought to our nation through the Reformation and the Evangelical Revival. Others have been insinuated into many of the most important administrative or executive posts of our civic life, or as teachers in our schools and seats of learning. A great part of our Public Press shows almost daily how largely the schools of journalism have been captured by the evil genius.

**An Appeal.** The time has more than come therefore to expect all men of right reason and goodwill to consider and weigh well the facts of the case; and, having taken account of the perils of our situation, to do all that in them lies to strengthen and settle the good things which still remain of our noble heritage, and to labour for the conversion of the misguided people now striving to undo and destroy our truly beneficial civilisation, that thus the menace which now imperils our welfare and the peace and prosperity of the world at large may be swept away entirely and for ever.

## A New World-Order Arising.

---

FROM one quarter and another we hear questionings concerning what seems a new order of human society, voices calling attention to rather startling resemblances to Jesuitism in the character of this or that lately revolutionised State. Here some lover of Italy, mindful of the great and memorable struggles of her people under the leadership of Cavour and Mazzini and Garibaldi, and of the great hopes then brought to birth, earnestly implores us not to put too much faith in the Fascist Regime, whose real head, if as yet undeclared, is known to exist by his shadow, Mussolini. There some writer who in bygone days had groaned with the masses of Russia under Czarist oppressions, on whom a bright hope had suddenly beamed a dozen odd years ago and then as suddenly vanished away under oppressive measures that were as scorpions in comparison with the knout of the Czars, sounds a clear note of warning that the Bolshevik Regime, albeit that it accords with the views of scarcely one in a hundred of Russia's many millions, is nevertheless strongly entrenched and "is borne up by an enthusiasm carrying with it a ruthlessness and resoluteness of self-denial and sacrifice which appear to bear an amazingly close affinity to the spirit of the Jesuits" and in various features to embody the lineaments of the Society of Jesus. In other lands too the new order of life and government established of recent years seems, save that members of the Roman Vanguard now hold the places of old occupied by "the professed", to copy closely the model of the Republic of Paraguay, so charmingly described by Mr. Cunninghame Graham in his book "A Vanished Arcadia"—the Republic which perished in 1767. Can such fresh shoots as Italian Fascism and Russian Bolshevism be but branches of the same stock, new stems sprung from a common root?

Certain phases of our national life seem to provide a clue to a correct understanding of the matter, if not directly and immediately indicating the right answer to the foregoing question. In the summer and autumn of 1925, when Communism was lifting high its head in our land, a widespread organisation of "British Fascists" appeared among us who, exercising in military formations as the

Italian Fascisti had done, proclaimed their determination to save Britain from the menace of Communism, if and when the General Strike should begin. But meantime they were themselves even more forward in the use of riotous force than were the Communists. When the Home Office had taken strong action against the latter, a few obscure persons, having an inkling of the ultimate designs of these "British Fascists", appealed to the Home Secretary, in view of their utterly unconstitutional ideas and irregular behaviour, to take similar measures against them to those being applied to the Communists; and at the same time they exposed the real state of affairs in the correspondence columns of the Press. The Home Secretary acted on the line of those suggestions, with the result that soon—somewhat prior to the General Strike—the leaders and most members of those Fascist Formations resolved to disband.\* Thus, at all events for the time being, that Punch and Judy game was called off the stage. When the General Strike took place, by means of those enrolled to serve under the authority and control of Parliament and the duly constituted Civil Magistracy, the end aimed at by its organisers—an end for which the British Fascists had striven at least as hard as the Communists—was wholly frustrated. The disbanded British Fascists have since reappeared under other names—in England as *British Loyalists*, and in Scotland as *Scottish Nationalists*. Has the chameleon changed its character with its colour?

For the key to what is happening around us and in many parts of the world to-day we must look to the work done by Voltaire and his collaborators in the eighteenth century, and to the career of Napoleon Buonaparte thereafter. The former aimed at the creation of *a new realm of ideas*; the latter strove might and main to embody those new ideas in *a Despotic State* erected on the ruins of

---

\* The British Fascist organisation still exists, though nowhere very much in evidence. The Editor of "British Fascism" recently denied the accuracy of the above statement. When questioned as to the number of those who in 1926 became dissociated, he confined himself to stating the number who joined one of the new bodies formed thereafter "was nothing so vast as the London Command, nor even as one postal area"—whatever that may mean!—and made no reply to queries as to actual numbers then either dissociated or remaining. There is clear evidence that, notwithstanding the severe setback it then underwent, this body still holds to the use of riotous force.

every country throughout the world. But for the disintegrating work done throughout France by Voltaire and his fellow-members of the Roman Vanguard, Napoleon must have found it impossible even to begin his attempt at World-Conquest by force of arms: his plan to establish universally an Absolute Despotism would have been but the fad of a weak visionary if the French people generally had not already been enkindled with the vision come through the sweeping successes of the Roman Vanguard in the French Revolution. They laid the foundation on which Napoleon attempted to build a great World-Empire.

Now, Voltaire was a pupil of the Jesuits. From them he derived his outlook on life. At several critical points in his career he sought and got their assistance. More than once he rendered signal service to their Order. And up to the end of his days he was in friendly, probably intimate, touch with them. Much the same can be said of Napoleon too, whose bearing towards and treatment of the Pope afford one of the first indications of the resolution taken by the Jesuits, because of the abolition of their Order by the Pope, to destroy the entire Papal Curia as soon as things should have been sufficiently prepared for such a revolutionary undertaking with consequences so stupendous.

When in the middle of the eighteenth century the doings of the Jesuits had caused a general coalition against them throughout Europe, the Ultramontane Romanists joining hands with the Constitutional Catholics to secure their overthrow in every country where the Pope was acknowledged as head of the Church, with the result that the Company of Jesus was expelled from one State after another and at length the Pope, mainly at the instigation of France, suppressed and abolished the Order in 1773, Voltaire rendered two very notable services to the outcasts—(1) from Frederick of Prussia and Catherine of Russia (each of whom soon came to be designated “the Great”, though Voltaire’s attempt to have the former designated also “Frederick the Immortal” seems to have evoked no such general response) he procured assylum for the Jesuits who, *pax* their vow of special obedience to the Pope, flatly refused to comply with his decree of July 21st, 1773, infallible and eternally binding though in the Roman sense he had made it to be; and (2)

he laid the train that exploded in the French Revolution of 1789, which with its attendant repercussions in all Europe had by 1814 brought the Papacy so very low that in that year Pope Pius VII. seems to have been glad to reverse, so far as he could, the decree of total annihilation made by Clement XIV. and to reincorporate the Company of Jesus as an integral part of the Roman Catholic Church.

The seeds of that French Revolution were sown broadcast by Voltaire, whose character has been thus summed up by Sir Archibald Alison:—

“He was all things to all men. With equal readiness he dealt out generosity for the generous, bravery for the brave, wisdom for the wise, selfishness for the selfish, voluptuousness for the voluptuous, profligacy for the profligate” (*History of Europe* vol. I., 81, 9th edit.)

Now look at this other picture, reluctantly drawn by the hand of Scotland's most distinguished foreign missionary, and note the family features:—

“Among the learned the Jesuits showed themselves lovers of learning; among the illiterate they upheld the maxim, Ignorance is the mother of devotion. Among the free they were advocates of liberty; among the bond apologists for slavery. Among the upright they feigned integrity; among the unscrupulous they encouraged fraud . . . Among atheists, deists, or Jews they could repudiate the God of the Bible and the Saviour of men. Among Protestants they could appear with an ultra zeal for Protestantism. Among Pagan idolators they could sanction the most degrading idolatry and superstition. Among self-tormenting ascetics they could submit to the most grievous self-inflicted severities” (Dr. Alexander Duff—*The Jesuits*, p. 41).

Both Alison and Duff produce detailed evidence for each of the charges made, which, for anyone conversant with the facts of Voltaire's career and with the history of the Company of Jesus, it would not be difficult to multiply.

Like Voltaire, Napoleon had been trained in the schools of the Jesuits. Alison's summary of his character occupies nearly two pages of his *History* (Vol. XII. 273-4). Some of the most outstanding features are—that Napoleon was pervaded with ambition and covetous of glory, careless of his pledged word, faithful to alliances only for so long as they were advantageous to himself, regardless of treaties when the keeping of them had become inexpedient, a thorough believer in the maxim that the end justifies the means, a

ruler utterly reckless of human slaughter, a leader who lured on his followers by a thirst for glory and a hope of gathering great spoils. A saying of Napoleon's, quoted by someone else, is to this effect—Man must have a religion. Were I in China, I should be a follower of Confucius. In Egypt I was a Mohammedan. For the selfsame reason, here I am a Catholic.

For almost as long as Voltaire had been the stormy petrel of European politics in the middle of the eighteenth century, at the end of that and the beginning of the nineteenth century Napoleon was the ranging leopard of European statecraft. On the wings of the mind the former flew over the face of the stormy waters; with ravening claws the latter spread death and desolation over the face of the earth. The two poles of the new World-Order projected, the former became the vendor of its ideas, the latter traded in its brass tacks. If in the net result Napoleon failed to achieve complete and enduring success, his failure was mainly due to the fact that the world at large had not, like the French, stocked its counters with the wares of Voltaire. More than a century's further work by the successors of Voltaire was needed ere the foundations could be laid for an integration of facts in that wider sphere where the new World-Order has lately been arising in so many fresh areas.

If the Russian Revolution has proved itself but a repetition, on rather a larger scale, of the French, its every outstanding feature proclaims but too surely its proper lineage. If Italian Fascism is another product from the same factory, it may well be that in Italy the Jesuits have succeeded in a way they liked better—by a comparatively bloodless revolution.

Temperamentally, the British are very different from both the French and the Russians, so that, even if in the General Strike of 1926 the Fascists and the Communists had succeeded in creating the general and bloody turmoil they were working for, at worst there would have been something far short of a French or a Russian Revolution. But in other directions there seem to be dangers for us almost as great. To mention one only—for years past in our University centres some teachers have been steadily impressing on susceptible youths at those seats of learning, that the British Constitution and our system of Representative Govern-

ment have become thoroughly effete, and that the clamant need of our time and the real hope for the future demand the setting up of a dictator, *a la* Mussolini, with *the elite* of our people holding every executive post under that dictator. The character of such a regime, could the conspirators succeed in setting it up among us, may be forecast with tolerable accuracy from such facts as these—that those most eager for dictatorship are as antagonistic to Bible religion as were Voltaire and Napoleon; that in public they pay such lip service to the Church as those were wont to render, while privately they stab her in the back as did they; and that in nearly every Christian congregation there exist an abundance of dry tinder and great heaps of gunpowder ready for the falling sparks when some conflagration gets lighted up. And that is but one of the dangers to be reckoned with at

THE SUDDEN BURSTING OF THE COMING TORNADO.

## The French Revolution.

**N**O epoch of secular history has received so much attention as the French Revolution. One recent writer has said that the bare titles of the books published upon it would fill a quarto volume of many hundred pages. For this continued interest many reasons will readily occur to most minds. But perhaps the weightiest of all is that most histories of the period so obviously fail to tell what most needs to be known of it. The sketches they give are as pictures of faces with no noses and no eyes. What people most want to know is—Who in fact caused the French Revolution?

Yet not all historians are thus strangely silent on this the most important of all matters relating to that tragedy. Lord Acton, for instance, touches it explicitly.\* And Justin McCarthy has devoted five chapters of his History of the epoch to a review of the underground forces working for revolution. In the opening chapter he quotes that lengthy passage of La Harpe's on which, doubtless, Dumas founded his weird prologue to "The Queen's Necklace". McCarthy calls it "that wonderful posthumous piece of fiction which La Harpe wrote under the guise of fact", adding, "Taine places it at the end of his study of the Old Order; it might more appropriately begin a record of the French Revolution". The scene, depicted by La Harpe as having taken place in his presence, differs in minor details only from the sketch given by Dumas in the prologue aforementioned.

In his second chapter McCarthy tells us a little concerning the origin and the operations of those underground forces afterwards so prominent in the French Revolution—"the mysterious Illuminati, with their strange cypher L. P. D., which, being interpreted, means *Lilia Pedibus Destrue*, and signifies the doom of kings . . . that strangest of Illuminati too, Balsamo Cagliostro, and all that was to come through him. We shall meet with Cagliostro in his season,

---

\* "The appalling thing in the French Revolution is not the tumult but the design. Through all the fire and smoke we perceive the evidence of calculating organisation. The managers remain studiously concealed and masked: but there is no doubt about their presence from the first. They had been active in the riots of Paris, and they were again active in the provincial rising" (*Lectures on the French Revolution*, p. 97).

and with the Illuminati and their terrible L. P. D." Here at any rate is Hamlet staged, with the ghost plainly in evidence at the forefront.

Those Illuminati McCarthy traces to an Order of Freemasonry founded on the Continent by certain Jacobite refugees in 1725. If at first not very unlike British Freemasonry,\* about the middle of the eighteenth century it so changed its character under the moulding hands of Adam Weishaupt and Count Cagliostro (his real name was Guiseppè Balsamo) that its first founders would not have known it. Readers of the D'Artagnan series of Dumas' romances may recall his sketches of a similar society, under the control of the Jesuits, in the days of Louis XIV, which in the Marie Antoinette series he presents again, but "on its own", functioning under Balsamo. McCarthy shows that from about 1774 it spread with amazing rapidity all over Europe, and that in France it appeared everywhere side by side with the "Philosophers" and their following—an association which he notes as a very strange feature of Revolution antecedents. These "Encyclopædists" and "Philosophers" we will notice presently. Meantime it may be noted that, if about 1770 Balsamo had been put in command of the French section of the Vanguard—the successors of those "initiated" auxiliaries of Jesuitism in the century preceding—and if then with the help of Weishaupt in 1773 to 1776 he had captured the Masonic Lodges founded in 1725 and had welded them into a single organ with the previously existing Vanguard, the spread of the Illuminati in those years must seem by no means so amazing, though quite as portentous, as McCarthy thought—no more surprising than the sudden appearance in 1922 of the Italian Fascisti under Mussolini, whose true prototype was Cagliostro and his Illuminati.

Later, McCarthy devotes three chapters (Vol. I. 222-271) to the affairs in which Cagliostro played a notable part. One passage reads (p. 244):—

"The Illuminati were to overturn the thrones of Europe. The first blow was to be struck in France. After the fall of the French monarchy it was proposed to attack Rome. The society was said to have countless followers. It was said to possess enormous funds, the proceeds of the annual subscriptions of its members, dispersed among the banks of Amsterdam, Rotterdam,

\* Professor Robinson's evidence, given in Appendix B, shows that Continental Freemasonry had undergone a great change before Weishaupt and Cagliostro appeared, who changed it still further in the same direction.

Basle, Lyons, London, Venice, and Genoa. It was said that a considerable sum of money was placed at Cagliostro's disposal, to enable him to propagate the doctrines of the sect in France. This was the origin of his first visit to Strasburg in the autumn of 1780, when he adopted for his device the letters L. P. D., signifying *Lilia Pedibus Destrue*—'trample the lilies under-foot'".

To turn now to that other wing of the Vanguard which McCarthy notices as having been a kind of counterfoil to the Illuminati in the years preceding the French Revolution—of "the Philosophers" and "the Encyclopædists" he says (p. 76), "D'Alembert was the only one of the great sceptics fostered by the sheltering wings of Jansenism. Most of the other Encyclopædists had been brought up under Jesuit influences". Then (p. 78) "the influence of the Encyclopædia upon the thought that tended to the Revolution was incalculable. It was only not so great as that of Voltaire"—whose connections with the Jesuits we reviewed in our first article. Of him S. G. Tallentyre says ("Life of Mirabeau", p. 1):—"Voltaire more than any other man undammed the torrent of Revolution"; and he shows how Mirabeau, "who had been at school with the Jesuits and had had as his schoolfellow Vaugenargues, hereafter the pure and pagan philosopher", afterwards did so much for the Revolution. McCarthy mentions (p. 200) that Turgot also, who became Controller-General at a most critical epoch in France, was trained in the Jesuit College Louis-le-Grand. Of one of the most important edicts issued by Turgot, McCarthy says: "When Turgot penned that edict (1774), he was unconsciously countersigning the death-warrant of the Old Order, and of the old monarchy of France".

Thus in the years preceding the Revolution we see two very powerful sets of forces operating for the overthrow of the Old Order, one openly and in the light of day, which undeniably had derived its impetus from the Jesuits, and which made its appeal to the intellectual classes; the other, which for the most part burrowed in the underground darkness, gathering into its train all the unthinking rowdy elements of unrest and disorder—which likewise, be its origins traced to certain Jacobite leaders or to the Jesuit auxiliaries of the seventeenth century or to both, owed its being to the Jesuit Camarilla and formed a striking weapon meet for its use. This month (November 1931) in Toronto, Canada, there has ended

the trial of certain leaders of a rather microscopical revolutionary faction which for years past had operated in just such a dual form—with an “A” section working on very similar lines to those favoured by the pre-Revolution “Philosophers” in France, and a “Z” section burrowing in underground darkness after the manner of Cagliostro and his gang. Sections “B” to “Y” of the movement in the meantime escape particular attention. But doubtless, as it was in France from the middle of the eighteenth century, and as it has been in every land where this upas tree has struck its roots into the soil, there are cohorts at work under nearly every letter of the revolutionary alphabet.

McCarthy has gathered together with assiduous care many of the facts concerning the revolutionary forces in France at that time whose work will be seen in true perspective against its proper background. In “the spacious days” of Louis XIV the Jesuit Camarilla had ruled the roost through the keepers of the King’s conscience, a succession of Jesuit Father Confessors, the last of whom, Le Tellier—not the Chancellor Le Tellier, who had signed and executed the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes—betook himself into voluntary exile on the King’s death in 1715, when the Duke of Orleans became Regent and a strong reaction against the Jesuits had set in. For some time indications had been multiplying that their hey-day in France was over, for a time at least; and that, unless they could regain power by other means and in some other way, their day was over and gone.

A few years later, when Louis XV had held the reins of government for some time, two inveterate enemies of the Jesuits obtained full ascendancy over the King, Madame de Pompadour, his brilliant mistress, and Choiseul, his Minister of State. They began to press for the total extermination of the Society of Jesus. At that point, to the eye that sees but part of the game, the day of Jesuit power in France must appear a thing of the past. But it was not so. The very Pompadour, working day and night for the destruction of Jesuitism, received into her high favour, countenanced and supported to the utmost of her power that new wing of the Jesuit Camarilla’s forces, the Encyclopædists and Philosophers. So the old fox, finding the front gate banged, bolted, and barred against him, slipped in again by a back way, to find himself welcomed and

caressed. Well knew he the temper of Kings' mistresses, that not one such could ever be a genuine supporter of that which he most feared, nor for long resist his charms, if not in this form then in that. Though she might thoroughly hate him in his character of "Mr. Hyde", she must soon love him well when he should appear in the finery of "Dr. Jekyll".

McCarthy, however, is almost silent on this particular phase of the game. If he realised how cleverly the Jesuit Camarilla had thus stolen a march on France, he has said as little as possible about it. Probably he was here in like case with many he mentions in this history, who were as unconscious of the bearings of their own actions as of the sources of the impulses moving them so to act. Such hypnotised agents are oftener than not the most adaptable to the moulding hands of their employers, free from all hypocrisy and guile. Any beam of better light, awakening in them some sense of hypocrisy, would set their feet on the lowermost rung of the ladder of salvation. But such rays of better light fall on such men but seldom.

The character of the 'civilisation' then introduced into France, if at first sight more approximate to Protestantism than to Romanism—it seems a curious fact that, when the Roman Catholic clergy had been completely ousted, in the early days of the revolutionary National Convention Protestants were welcomed and some of their pastors even sat as members, till they found themselves between the devil and the deep sea—is in reality Roman Catholic in its woof and its warp, and absolutely fatal to the religion of Jesus Christ.

But on the other hand this "civilisation" cannot be described as altogether germane to the older type of Roman Catholicism. Tridentine Catholicism in theory at least stood in part on the same basis as Protestantism, differing only in the fact that it unwarrantably extended "the Word of God" beyond the confines of the Old and New Testaments, and included in it the sum and substance of the ecclesiastical traditions, written and oral. The other brand, which first arrested general attention when the French revolutionaries proclaimed their purpose to introduce and establish their much-vaunted "civilisation" throughout the world, is properly germane to Jesuitism only—a shifty multifarious thing whose proper original is found in the cults of Babylon and Egypt, whose

twin-sister exists to-day in the Hinduism practised, not so much at the static shrines of India, but in full swing at her great periodical *melas*, a true description of which would have made Miss Mayo's "Mother India" even more startling.

To men like Justin McCarthy we owe much for exploring and mapping out many of the underground workings of this great conspiracy. It seems not a little curious that often such cryptic agencies have been brought to light mainly by those who were thoroughly conversant with the workings of the Roman Catholic mind. Naturally wholly unsuspecting, Englishmen may have such things under their very noses without detecting the odours which immediately set good Romanists to investigate where the deadly gasses are escaping. But for the patriotic action of a good Roman Catholic the story of the Gunpowder Plot would have been written in ink of a very different colour. To many another Roman Catholic we owe the truth concerning some of the ramifications of

OTHER VILE PLOTS OF JESUIT CAMARILLA.

## The Illuminati.

---

TO see things in true perspective, we must now glance back at the antecedents of those secret societies that played so important a part in preparing and shaping the French Revolution, which heralded the coming of the new "civilisation" that now threatens the destruction of the British Empire, the devastation of the entire world, and the annihilation of the Christian religion. The antecedents of the Illuminati go back two hundred years or more before their rise, and on their every appearance are seen in association as bodies under the direction of the Jesuit Camarilla. They were of two kinds—one semi-covert, semi-public; the other closely occult. The former consisted of those auxiliary agencies of the Society of Jesus which, though like itself keeping their proceedings strictly veiled from outsiders, were like it also in declaring their existence, places of meeting, &c., so that in these respects they may be said to have functioned openly. The others burrowed underground. Their existence and modes of operation became known only accidentally. In the strictest sense they were secret societies which discovered themselves only as burglars do, by the results of their work.

Of the semi-secret associations two only need be noticed here. One of these, the Sodality named *Prima Primaria*, was formed in Rome by the Jesuits in 1563, and in 1584 it was approved by Pope Gregory XIII. Nearly fifty years ago an account of this the leading auxiliary of the Society of Jesus was given by Father Gavin, S.J., from which it appears it was then (1885) at work in over ten thousand centres, and "probably three or four times that number (of centres) have been affiliated, though not registered". During the forty-six years since that was written, the Roman Catholic Church in Great Britain has more than tripled the number of its agencies. The membership of this Sodality must therefore be very great. It is strictly under the direction of Jesuit priests, to whom its members give regular accounts of all they learn and know. Well may the *Catholic Dictionary* say they render very great service to the Catholic cause!

The other semi-secret association is a Sisterhood started by Mary Ward. It was organised on very similar lines to the Society of Jesus, and by the Catholics of the seventeenth century its members were called *Jesuitresses*. In its early days it had a very stormy career. Mary Ward was accused before the Inquisition and for some time was shut up in strict confinement in a Convent. The Sisterhood was abolished by Pope Urban VIII. in 1632; but it was later re-formed on lines somewhat modified. To-day it has many branches throughout the world, working in close co-operation with the Jesuits.

Like the Company of Jesus itself, such associations were only semi-secret. Some of its ends therefore could obviously be served far better by agencies working wholly in the dark. But such guilds as the *Prima Primaria* offered a splendid recruiting-ground for the properly-occult associations, as did the Masonic Lodges afterwards for the Illuminati. Traces of those occult bodies keep cropping up throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. In his *Memoirs* the Duc de Saint Simon tells that in those two centuries the Jesuits had many such "hidden auxiliaries". And the Abbe de la Roche Arnauld, who from the position he had held within the Society of Jesus had seen those things as they were, so that he could speak with inner knowledge, writing in 1825 tells that in France alone there were then over six million such agents of Jesuitism. If in the middle of the eighteenth century then they had amounted but to a sixth of that number, that is, somewhat over a million, it can be seen how powerful was the force in France which was then working hard in the dark for the revolutionary cause.

In close alliance with these, and possibly included in the number stated by De la Roche Arnauld, was the other body noticed by Justin McCarthy, the Freemasonry established by the English Jacobite refugees. So much were the Jesuits the very heart and soul of Jacobitism that, when in 1715 the Pretender was about to embark on his ill-fated expedition, having asked Lord Douglas what would be most likely to gain the sympathy and support of the English, he was assured by Douglas that nothing would so much conduce to that end as to carry a dozen Jesuits with him and, as a pledge of his good faith, publicly to hang them all when he got to

Britain. When the expedition had miserably failed, the Jacobites set to work in 1716 founding Masonic Lodges in France and other parts of Europe; and the high favour shown by so many of the French to the Jacobite cause gave a great impetus to the spread of Freemasonry there, as an auxiliary to the Jesuit cause.

Then in 1774 we see Cagliostro there, hard at work introducing through the Masonic Lodges the new order of things promoted by the Illuminati. Can we doubt to whom he owed that open door into the Freemasonry of France? Whether he, or Adam Weishaupt, was the first leading exponent of Illuminism, may remain uncertain. But it is clear that Cagliostro devoted himself to the propagation of this cult in France at the very time Weishaupt headed its forces in Central Europe. Another notable fact about the two is that, while the doings of Weishaupt were brought into the light of day and the documents prepared by him and his collaborators laid before the public, the operations of Cagliostro in France became known only by their results, as those of burglars usually do. This difference is probably attributable to the diversities of character between the Germans and the French, the former being naturally open and ingenuous, the latter more secretive and stealthy. The two movements were so contemporaneous, and that discovered in Central Europe so certain to have produced, if unchecked, precisely similar results to those that followed in France, and they were moreover so alike in family features, that it were sheer folly to doubt their being directed from a common centre. The candour of some of the Germans admitted to the secrets of Weishaupt overcame their scruples concerning violation of the oaths they had inconsiderately taken, and led them to expose the conspiracy to the Elector of Bavaria and others, who took action to suppress Illuminism in Central Europe.

To the industry and fidelity of Professor John Robison more than to any other we owe our knowledge of the doings of the Illuminati at that period. In his "Proofs of a World Conspiracy", in 1797 he published the results of his prolonged and extensive enquiries, showing the doings and teachings of Adam Weishaupt and his followers in Bavaria and the adjacent States. Only a mere outline can be given here of the facts Robison put on record.

From among the members of the Masonic Lodge to which he belonged Weishaupt selected those he thought most adaptable to his purpose, and constituted them disciples of Illuminism, thus forming an association within the pale of but distinct from Freemasonry. Those neophytes he advanced from one "degree" of the new cult to another, according as they proved apt and pliant learners. Having thus formed a nucleus of the new society, he then proceeded to create similar "wheels within wheels" in other Masonic Lodges around. When a number of such had been set up, he then constituted a general council of the Association, made up of the chief men of the several local bodies, who thenceforth were called "The Areopagites"—a council which had advisory powers only, Weishaupt retaining in his own hands full and absolute powers of government.

Save that very few of the novices were withdrawn from their ordinary callings in life, the training undergone by the disciples of Illuminism resembled very closely that to which novices are subjected in the Society of Jesus, in which Weishaupt himself had been trained prior to the dissolution of the Order. A notable feature of the case of those budding Illuminati was, they were not at the outset informed of the tenets and the objects of the cult. But before being accepted for training they were required to bind themselves never to reveal any of the secrets of the Order, and on no pretext or occasion to make an extract from any papers that might be put in their hands or shown to them. On admission to the novitiate the postulant was called a *Minerval*. Every such novice, besides being under regular instruction by a Superior, was tested very frequently to see whether he were thoroughly and absolutely obedient to Superiors, whether he were undeviatingly careful to preserve any secrets of the Order entrusted to him at this stage, and whether he were consistently diligent in spying upon all around him and faithfully reporting to his Superiors his every observation and suspicion.

If within three years he had become entirely approved in those respects, he was then promoted to the first "degree" of the Order and became an *Illuminatus Minor*: otherwise he was set aside and remained thereafter a *Minerval* only, unless he forsook the Society.

The oath imposed—with a drawn sword pointed at the breast—on initiands to this lowest grade of the Illuminati is much too long to be quoted here. It repeats the terms of the oath taken by those entering the novitiate, and adds much to it—a promise of absolute loyalty to the Order, and “to serve it with my fortune, my honour, and my blood”; a promise to surrender wholly and absolutely the candidates’s own will and judgment, to account the good of the Order as his own, to hold its friends and enemies as his own personal friends and enemies, and in all things to do unquestioningly what the Superiors of the Order might direct. “All this I promise and vow, without secret reservation or qualification, according to the intention of the Society”.

To those who had taken this oath some of the more important secrets of the Order were confided, but “with delicacy and caution lest the timid become alarmed”. They were to be gradually and discreetly given to know that the Society was out to overturn all the governments of the world and to undermine and destroy the Christian religion on the plea that Illuminism is Christianity in its perfection. All who showed themselves zealous for such a revolution were then advanced to the “degree” of *Illuminatus Major*, under a further oath binding them, on pain of death, to work for revolution of State and Church throughout the world, and for the introduction of “that peculiar morality and popular religion the Order was about to give the world”.

By “the Areopagites” it was agreed that “the Order must possess itself of the power of life and death . . . The heads of every government in the world possess it; and our Order has come to take their places”. So they let it be known among the *elite* of the Society that “the power of the Order extends to putting individuals to death”.

The documents from which Professor Robison so largely quoted were seized when the Elector of Bavaria and certain neighbouring sovereigns raided the houses of some of the Illuminati. They were produced in Court as evidence against those of them who had been arrested and put on trial.

The fact that Weishaupt was very fond of declaiming against the Jesuits Robison seems here to accept at its face value. After

telling that, in the early days of Illuminism, a number of the disbanded Jesuits having joined his Society had with few exceptions withdrawn from it by and by, he adds, "After this disappointment Weishaupt became the implacable enemy of the Jesuits". The facts as a whole, however, admit of and very well agree with a very different interpretation of the case. And when seen from a distance with other known cases of the kind in view, they seem even to demand it. Besides, the whole constitution and *modus operandi* of the Illuminati show that this curious Society cannot be reasonably explained otherwise than as a "hidden auxiliary" of the Company of Jesus—the strong anti-Jesuit feeling so prevalent in Bavaria and other Catholic parts of Germany was in itself a sufficient reason for Weishaupt's ostensible antipathy to the Jesuits.

To those who have proposed that the Illuminati had *Jewish* connections it may be pointed out that Robison has given a list of the most prominent leaders of the Society, numbering over 70 in all. Nearly all of them were Roman Catholics, with a mere handful of Protestants; and there does not appear to have been a single Jew among those leading Illuminati. Thirteen of those named were noblemen, besides a prince; ten were Professors of Universities or Colleges; nine were Counsellors of State; seven were Roman Catholic priests; and three were Army Officers. Several of their connections with the Jesuit Camarilla are clear enough. But unless in some way at present unknown that Camarilla had connections with the Jews, it is difficult to see how the Illuminati could have had Jewish connections.

"The objects", says Professor Robison, "the undoubted objects of this Association are surely dangerous and detestable; namely, to overturn the present constitutions of the European States, in order to introduce a chimera which the history of the human family shows to be

CONTRARY TO THE NATURE OF MAN".

## The French Revolution Romanticised.

NO serious student of the French Revolution can have failed to perceive in it the key to the secrets of that new order of things which has been gaining ground in the world ever since, and for several decades past has made vast inroads on British modes of thinking and living, threatening even to extirpate Scriptural Christianity. But as usually viewed, in one respect at least, as to its immediate and decisive causes, that cataclysm remains mysterious. Most histories speak of no causes of the tragedy save those which confessedly were very remote—which nevertheless, instead of being put in the background of the picture, are set in the forefront. Not even Alison, whose treatment of the subject seems sanest because truest; not even Carlyle,\* whose sole explanation of the outbreak puts it down to the letting loose of passions long pent up over deep-seated and centuries-old ulcers of the body politic, essays to tackle the question, Why were those passions let loose at the end of the eighteenth century, not at its beginning nor at the end of the nineteenth? All such have much to tell of the accumulation of great quantities of explosives; none speak of the laying of a train; none picture the figure whose hand applied the match in 1789. With glimpses of the ordnance, veiled from our vision are the gunners taking aim and firing the shot. That, in many ways the most crucial thing of all, they leave shrouded in mystery.

In recent times a few historians, like Lord Acton and Justin McCarthy, have drawn sketches of the conspirators, though, probably for prudential reasons, without specifying the *fons et origo* of the conspiracy.

In the romances of Alexandre Dumas, however, that conspiracy is traced to its source. As anyone may see who reads the

\* Since the above was written Professor Robison's "Proofs of a Conspiracy against all the Religions and Governments of Europe" has come into my hands, necessitating a reestimate of the value of both Alison's and Carlyle's work. Both must have been acquainted with the evidence Robison has embodied in his book. Yet neither has taken it into account. In a word, in writing the story of the French Revolution neither of them spoke the plain truth in full. Both omitted the most important and altogether vital part of what they had set out to elucidate and interpret. If not actually a *suggestio falsi*, their putting of the case is most certainly a *suppressio veri*.

D'Artagnan and the Marie Antoinette series of those romances, Dumas has in them told how the French Revolution was prepared for by agents of the Society of Jesus and carried out by that very powerful body here called *the Vanguard*.

Romance of course is neither history, strictly speaking, nor fiction. It is founded on historical facts, into whose interstices the romancer weaves threads spun by his own imagination or sense of things. Commonly too he wanders into the byepaths of history, to gleam well-vouched but little-known facts that help to elucidate his tale and enliven his story. Let us hear then what Dumas has to say of the Jesuits and the French Revolution.

The D'Artagnan series of romances covers a great part of the seventeenth and earlier years of the eighteenth centuries. One of "The Three Musketeers" is Aramis, who in "The Vicomte de Bragelonne" (Chap. 17) appears as a Bishop in command of great wealth. In Chap. 71 of the same we see him again, but in close association with Jesuits, in a way that suggests much; and in Chap. 73 he comes into view as having control over a portion of the Vanguard.

In the next part of the series, "Louise de la Valliere", we meet Aramis at a gathering of the Jesuit Camarilla, summoned by the General in accordance with a decree of a former Grand Council. The purpose of this meeting is, that the General may at the end of his days seek out and appoint a successor, and hand over to him the government of the body and his seals of office. In addition to the candidates for the generalship, Dumas introduces a number of "the initiated" also (i.e., members of the Vanguard), one of whom is in medical attendance on the General, who is ill (chap. 34).

Then (Chap. 35) the "prospects" of those candidates are reviewed, and their interviews with the General narrated. Aramis, having unfolded a plan for a revolution in France which would reinstate the Jesuits in power there, is chosen. To him the General commits his ring and his papers, instructs him where and how to lay hands on a vast quantity of wealth and, being in great and ever-increasing pain, dies almost immediately. When all others had left the room, Aramis turns to "the physician", saying, "M. Grisart, empty and clean that glass. There is too much left in it of what the Grand Council desired you to put in it"—which may remind us of

the sudden and mysterious deaths of both the White Pope and the Black Pope on the 20th August, 1914.

In the last volume of that series, "The Man in the Iron Mask", we meet (Chap. 4) Aramis presenting M. Foquet, the Surintendant of France, with a handsome donation of 20 million gold pieces, to be spent in preparations for the carrying out of the plot disclosed to his predecessor. Then (in Chap. 18) we see Aramis visiting the Bastille, where he hails the Governor, Baisemeaux, as "an initiate of the Order", and instructs him to render certain services. When leaving the Bastille (Chap. 19), he hands Baisemeaux a very generous present, for services rendered and to be rendered.

Throughout this series we keep meeting some of "the initiated", preparing us for a change of *personnel* in the directorate of the Jesuit forces as they are seen in the Marie Antoinette series, which opens with the coming to France of Marie Antoinette early in 1770, when the Jesuits had already been expelled from France and other Catholic States of Europe.

In his introduction to the second volume of that series Dr. A. T. Baker says, strangely enough, that those romances "are mainly a series of scenes in which the central idea is not very prominent". Yet to each of the first and second parts of the series Dumas has affixed a prologue on the principal theme of the series—the existence in France and throughout Europe of a very powerful secret society whose "Chief" was Joseph Balsamo "the physician" or sorcerer, *alias* Count Cagliostro, *alias* Zanoni the Genoese banker, who at sundry times passed under many other *aliases* besides.

Only the main features of this far-flung and powerful body can be noticed. The oath taken by each of its initiands runs somewhat thus:—

"In the name of the crucified Son, I swear to break ths carnal bonds which unite me to father, mother, brothers, sisters, wife, kindred, friends, mistresses, kings, benefactors, or anyone else, or to any being to whom I have promised faith, obedience, gratitude, or service".

"I swear to reveal to my new Chief all I shall hear, learn, or guess, and even to seek and spy out what may not come under my eyes".

"I swear to honour and respect poison, steel, and fire, as prompt, pure and necessary means to purge the earth by the death of all who essay to defile truth and wrest it from our hands".

"I swear to avoid Naples, Rome, Spain, and every other accursed land. And I swear to shun temptation to reveal aught I may hear in our assemblies".

"Wilt thou drink to the death of every man who would betray our secrets?"

"I will".

"Bring the cup".

On this it might be said, either *Dumas* had access to the secrets of those *Illuminati* and was thus able to give the actual terms of their first oath, as administered in France under *Balsamo*; or he concocted a form of oath conveying his sense of the obligations borne by the *Illuminati* there.

The divisional heads of this gang, each of whom was directly under the orders of "the Chief", were drawn from all parts of the world and bound together by two main ties—they had taken a common oath, and they had promised prompt and unquestioning obedience to "the Chief's" every command. The object of the society was "to destroy the old order of things and create a new world" in which "not the monarchs only but monarchy will have perished, religious domination be despised, inferiority extinguished, aristocratic castes and unjust division of goods abolished".

In this cryptic confederation "the Chief" is the only living link between its three hundred divisional heads; his hands hold all the strings that set every part of the organisation in motion; and as far as possible he keeps each part in total ignorance of what the others are and do. "Scattered, you are quivering, unknown one to another, known to me only who can estimate your individual strength and tell its value. I alone unite you in one fraternal chain" for the accomplishment of the ends in view.

"How many are here present?" asked one at a meeting of these individuals. "Three hundred", came the reply. "Three hundred", repeated the president, "and each of you speaks for ten thousand more. Three hundred swords which carry with them three million poniards". What then is the programme of this secret service? Hear "the Chief";—

"France is the advance guard of the nations. Put a torch in her hand and with it kindle a widespread conflagration. An old king (*Louis XV.*, the date here being 1770) sits on the throne of France. He has but a few more years to live. Events must be prepared, to happen on his death. France is the keystone

of the arch: let but this stone be dislodged and the monarchical edifice will everywhere fall. Yea, the day when Europe's most haughty sovereigns hear there is no longer a king in France, amazed and bewildered, of themselves they will rush into the abyss cleft by the fall of the throne of Saint Louis".

The parts played in that revolution by Cagliostro and his gang would require more space than can here be given. Suffice it to say the pictures here drawn by Dumas are thoroughly consonant with the known facts of that time, when hell seemed to have come on earth; and that, seen in the light of the activities of a body so malign, that *inferno*, happening when it did and as it did, is duly and completely accounted for.

But what of Dumas himself? Did he write in order to create in the minds of his readers an intense and unalterable detestation to all he makes the name *Cagliostro* stand for? then how poor the performance! how unfortunate his habit of casting a romantic mantle over every evil thing he handles! how deadening to the moral sense, how repugnant to the Christian mind, his method of exposing villainies that make every Christian heart throb with pain and shame! Or wrote he with the connivance and perhaps at the instigation of agents of the Jesuit Camarilla? certainly, since one of the well-known aims of the Camarilla is to impress on people a sense of its own greatness and power, so that men should get to think it all but irresistible, the writings of Dumas may well be thought to comport admirably with that end.\*

Still, his pictures of French life—pictures in which hardly even a ray of Christianity's kindly light ever falls on any scene depicted—these pictures, apart from their romantic embellishments, must be acknowledged all too true to fact. To that, however, it must be added that no student of French history from the sixteenth century to the eighteenth can fail to perceive that more than any other factor, perhaps more than all other factors together, the forces set in motion by the Jesuits in those two-and-a-half centuries had

---

\* Another explanation suggests itself which seems perfectly reasonable, that Dumas cast the truth of things in the form he thought likely to command itself to the widest possible circle of readers.

introduced the rottenness which at the end infested French life from head to foot. Therein lies one of the world's greatest tragedies, and a plain reason why at the close of the Old Order in France the curtain falls on a scene of utter darkness and desolation. Suffocated in the deadly gases it had itself generated, perished the glory of Europe's once premier State. Lurid and shivering to extinction, sank the Sun of Western Christendom:

“Not, as his wont, with clear and golden fires;  
Bewilder'd, in a labyrinth of haze,  
His orb redoubled, with discoloured rays,  
Struggles and vanishes. Along the deep,  
With slow array, expanding vapours creep,  
Whose folds, in twilight's yellow glare uncurl'd,  
Present the dreams of an unreal world—  
Islands in air suspended, tragic ghosts  
Of armies, shapes of castles, winding coasts,  
Navies at anchor, mountains, woods, and streams—  
All, all is strange, and nothing what it seems.  
Till deep-involving gloom, without a spark  
Of star, moon, meteor—desolately dark—

THE DARK SEALS UP THE VISION”.

## A World-Wide Menace.

OVER thirty years ago the writer lit on a book\*, the reading of which raised a landmark in his way of thinking and largely influenced his subsequent course of life. The book deals with the Vatican Council of 1869-70—the preparations for its meeting, its proceedings and some of its sequents. It is one every serious Christian man and every lover of his native land should not only read but study. It focusses a plan of World-Conquest and World-Empire on a scale till then unparalleled and hardly even dreamt of. It analyses a programme all the more to be repudiated and opposed in that it deals with ideas only—ideas that fetter the mind, and warp and bind the soul.

To-day the book can be read with the advantage of seeing many of its parts already largely taking shape. Other things too have come into view that were unknown when it was written over fifty years ago. Seen in this newer light its facts, fully documented and well supported by evidence never questioned, lose none of their meaning but gain much in power as by degrees the plans are put in execution which Mr. Arthur has here set in proper perspective.

In the *Syllabus of Errors*, drawn up as a main part of the preparations for the Council and then made the basis of its *Schemata*, Mr. Arthur finds the key to the mass attack launched by the Church of Rome in 1871. It was largely a product of certain Jesuits, though in one respect officially opposed by the Society for reasons to be considered presently. In the pages of their leading organ the *Civiltà Cattolica*, it was expounded as announcing the advent of a new "civilisation", at the advance of which all incompatible forms of government will be overturned and their respective civilisations destroyed. What this new "civilisation" is will appear hereafter.

Mr. Arthur's book is as valid to-day and as necessary to be known as half-a-century ago. If not up-to-date, it is because much has happened in the interim to throw a flood of light on its pages.

---

\* *The Pope the Kings and the People*, by the Rev. William Arthur, M.A. A very excellent revision of this book, edited by Mr. W. Blair Neathy, M.A., has since been published by Messrs. Hodder and Stoughton.

For example, recent developments have revealed the enmity subsisting between the Society of Jesus and the Papal Curia, the cause of which is over a century-and-a-half old. Though in forms far more subtle than of late, even in Mr. Arthur's day it was already finding expression in some efforts of the Jesuits. But its fuller expression lately, so far from showing the turpitude of the conspirators less than Mr. Arthur represents it, only heightens and deepens it almost incalculably.

Mr. Arthur often shows himself keenly alive to the Jesuit habit of *double entendre*, and to their practice of looking one way while rowing the other. But in reading what some eminent diplomatists had written about the Jesuits in a style not wholly dissimilar, he seems sometimes to miss the real meaning. Thus, in his "Letters from Rome" *Quirinus* lays some stress (p. 80, 1 ed. 1870) on the fact that, whilst most Jesuits in their individual capacities and through the *Civiltà Cattolica* seemed to be moving heaven and earth to procure the Council's official approval of papal infallibility as a new article of the Roman Catholic Faith, the General of their Order and his official delegate were opposing it might and main. Mr. Arthur refers to this passage as showing that even the Jesuits seemed at loggerheads among themselves. But the passage is susceptible of quite a different meaning; and as *Quirinus* elsewhere says the Jesuit Order is a perfectly unified machine which *in reality* never works at cross purposes, the passage must be read accordingly.

In those "Letters" *Quirinus* declares that the Jesuits had ulterior ends to promote by such tactics, and even offers a hint as to what may underlie such apparent opposition of Jesuits to Jesuits. The former Mr. Arthur had quite grasped, for he says (p. 232), "One point stated by Lord Acton is that infallibility had been looked upon (by the Jesuits) as a means to an end". But it is doubtful if he ever guessed the objective they had in view.

What then was "the end" the Jesuits were aiming at in those dubious tactics? If in the preparations for and the proceedings at the Council they were no more working against one another than the steersman of a boat opposes the rowers—if indeed they were acting in concert according to a plan carefully pre-arranged—then evidently they were helping to dig the pit of papal infallibility wide

enough to encircle both wings of Tridentine Catholicism, and deep enough to engulf first the Constitutional Catholics, and after them the Ultramontane Romanists also, and by and by even the great and hoary Papal Curia itself. For, since the official policy of the Order was in opposition to the declaration that *the Bishop of Rome* is infallible, the way was thereby left open for the Society's producing and establishing its own version of infallibility, when a suitable moment should have arrived.

Between those two points there is an obvious hiatus, and apart from other aspects of the case it is not so obvious what the factor needed to bridge the span is. But it is easy to see that, unless the Society of Jesus had changed its mind since 1773, the annihilation of the Papal Court must have been a main objective of the Order from the day when the *Bishop of Rome*, acting in his capacity of infallible head of the Church, irreformably decreed the total and everlasting extinction of the Society—a decree which, with the support of all the Catholic States of Europe, he had sternly enforced as to externals. Only the will of that Company he could not change—in all its history there is no record of its having ever changed any of its really important purposes; and all the known facts bear witness that in this it yielded its will to the Pope not in the slightest degree. Outwardly perforce it had to give way; but to break and renew the will of the Company the Pope found he had no power at all. When pressed to extremity by the forces set in motion by the Society, Pope Pius VII. capitulated, and bowed abjectly to its will.

When then the Jesuits returned from the Exile, it was to divulge a doctrine that was destined to transmute the essential character of Roman Catholicism—the Theory of Development.\* Without discussing here the nature and the bearings of that new basic principle of Catholicism, let us note that the new dogma of Papal Infallibility, as ratified by the Vatican Council, was based on that theory. And it requires no keen penetration to see that, once the theory had been admitted as warranting the acceptance of papal infallibility, its warranty for a further change must seem even far stronger—for a change of dynasty at the head of the Roman Church, when a suitable season shall have arrived. For very obviously a transference of the headship of the Church from one dynasty to another will be but a very minor change in comparison with the

\* See Appendix A.

act that made her earthly head infallible in his every *ex cathedra* utterance; and one of the least surprising things of our time may be, that the Pope himself should be made to decree that contemplated change, delivering it with notes of infallibility and irreformability as many and as emphatic as those given to the decree of July 21st, 1773, by Pope Clement XIV.

Sure, the changes made in 1870 were greater far than any of those can be. The passing of the infallibility decree effaced Constitutional Catholicism utterly and within an hour. Having flourished widely, it existed up to noon of July 18th, 1870; at 1 p.m. of that summer day it had passed away for ever. Next to the craven surrender made by Pope Pius VII. on August 16th, 1814, this was the most spectacular triumph of the Jesuits. And the placing of the infallibility decree on the basis of the Theory of Development effectually undermined Ultramontane Romanism in so far as it had remained loyal to Tridentine Catholicism. Since then it has fast decayed and withered up as a result of the spread in Catholic circles of the theory of development, till now, if it still exist, it is but as a spent force. Thus were both Constitutional Catholicism and Ultramontane Romanism irretrievably engulfed in the abyss of perdition. "Future historians," says *Quirinus* (p. 815), "will begin a new period of Church history with July 18th, 1870, as with October 31st, 1517".

About midway between the time Mr. Arthur wrote, and our own, a book was published in Russia which forms an important link with the present—the "Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion". Said to have been circulated there as early as 1902, the only edition now available, a copy of which is lodged in the British Museum, is dated 1905. In Britain no attention seems to have been paid it till the horrors of the Russian Revolution awoke some to realise that in the Protocols even the worst features of that tragedy are clearly predicted. Writing in the *Spectator* of August 27th, 1921, Lord Sydenham said, "The *Protocols* explain in almost laborious detail the objects of Bolshevism and the methods of carrying it into effect"—the main object being the creation of an absolute despotism by the use of brute force; and the methods revolution by means of mob attacks, and terrorism. And, says Lord Sydenham, "the

deadly accuracy of the forecasts in the *Protocols*” is shown in that “most of them have been fulfilled to the letter”. The Society whose programme is sketched in them has thus demonstrated its power to execute in full its threats against “the Russian Autocracy”. The book is manifestly a forgery, and it may well be that the woman who was said to have stolen the manuscript from the archives of a Secret Society in Paris was used by the conspirators whose plan of action is contained in the *Protocols* to palm the forgery off on the public, so as to lay the blame at another door than its own.

Anyway, that the *Protocols* genuinely divulge the devilish plot of an existing society is beyond doubt or question. And the many and most remarkable correspondences of the *Protocols* with the *Syllabus of Errors* leave little or no place for doubt that they emanate from one and the selfsame source. The only real difference is that, whereas the latter presents the Ideology of the Society of Jesus, the former unfold a plan of work-a-day operations, following identically the same lines. Both documents lay claim to what they regard as an incontestable right to establish an absolute despotism over the whole world. The *Syllabus* outlines the scheme ideally, with here and there a tentacle extended to touch some practical phase, as that the Church has an inherent right to command and direct the use of physical force for the suppression or extermination of resisters. So too do the *Protocols*, which in the plainest terms tell also that the Society has a vast network of secret agencies at work throughout the earth, all striving incessantly for the realisation of its objects—which is exactly what is known concerning the cryptic forces of

THE SOCIETY OF JESUS.

## A World-Empire Projected.

---

**I**N collaboration with several experienced men of different nationalities a distinguished American divine has circulated a statement on the above subject, in which he says, "Governments are struggling. Christians are distressed by apostasy from the faith and corruption of morals. The clue to the whole matter lies in a book entitled *Protocols of the Wise Men of Zion* . . . . It embodies the basic plan of a world apostasy and defiance of God . . . The facts stare at us from every newspaper. Suppose a man holding in his hand plans and specifications which in every detail correspond with a huge building before him—could anyone deny that the building had been put up by the man who made the plans? The history of the world, especially for the last thirty years, has followed exactly the lines laid down in this book".

What then is the book? what are its contents? and to what author, or authors, is it attributable? The last of those three questions must await discussion in a following article.

The book *purports* to give the plans of a *Jewish Society* working for the establishment of a World-Empire ruled by an absolutely despotic dictator. It is said to contain skeleton lectures delivered in camera at Paris to members or students of the Secret Society whose operations it deals with. One thing certain about it is that the Russian book from which this was translated was published in 1905 by a Russian Government official, called Sergei Nilus—a fact to be kept in mind when reading this and the article following. Probably, if we knew all the personal history of this Nilus, we should get a reliable clue to the authorship of this strange book and to the part it played in the recent Russian Revolution. But another important, if not decisive, clue thereto, lies in the fact that the *Protocols* is the third and latest in succession of three such books. The first of these is Machiavelli's book, *The Prince*, which was written so long ago as 1510, but not published till 1532 A.D. About that, it is a noteworthy fact that the worst of Machiavelli's teachings were almost immediately adopted and put in practice by a Society which, founded at that very time, from the beginning aspired to world-power and universal dominion.

The second of the three was written by a Paris lawyer and publicist, Maurice Joli by name, and was published at Brussels in 1865. It aimed at undermining and overturning the throne and government of Napoleon III., then the most outstanding supporter of the temporal power of the Bishop of Rome—a man utterly detested by the Society which practised the teachings of Machiavelli. The bearings of those facts fall naturally to be discussed when we come to consider the authorship of the *Protocols*.

In presenting some of the main features of this book, page references will be given (1) to the English translation published by Eyre and Spottiswoode in 1920,\* and (2), but within brackets ( ), to Mr. Victor E. Marsden's translation, issued by the Britons Publishing Society in 1925.\* This double reference will enable readers who possess either of those translations to turn at once to see the connections in which the passages occur.

1.—On p. 5 (p. 14) and elsewhere it is contended that in Autocracy or Absolute Despotism is the only solid basis of stable government. Consequently, the Society responsible for the *Protocols* is out to establish irresponsible dictatorships in every nation. The number of such dictatorships set up since that book appeared, some of them in countries among the greatest in the world, forms rather a startling commentary on the prediction here.

2.—On p. 13 (pp. 20-1) we are told that the revolutions necessary to the establishment of the Society's World-Empire would be effected by *making use of the mob* to overthrow the existing governments. In almost every land where such dictatorships have lately been introduced has not this been the method used to carry the change through?

---

\* Both these translations can now be got from "The Britons", 40 Great Ormond Street, London, W.C.1. But it should be mentioned that, contrary to the whole facts of the case here presented, "The Britons" charge the Jews as being the authors of the conspiracy. Not only does this seem very unfair to the Jews, but also it tends to obscure and hide God's most gracious purposes of mercy and goodness concerning the Jews. Even more, if it does not close our eyes to many of the conspirators' operations in our midst, both past and present, it greatly helps to turn attention away from them, breaks up our front line, and serves to confuse our forces.

3.—On p. 32 (p. 36) it is said, "In this way (by the Society's control of ready money) we will create a blind mighty force which will never be in a position to move in any direction without the guidance of our agents set at its head as leaders of the mob". In recent applications of this policy how tactfully have those leaders camouflaged the situation by harmless demonstrations outside the institutions belonging to their Paymasters!

4.—On pp. 29-30 (p. 34) it is said the changes desired by the Society are being prepared for and brought about by *a secret undermining of existing Institutions*. Seen in retrospect under this light, how very significant seem many changes lately come to pass!

5.—On pp. 41-5 (pp. 42-6) those very changes are outlined that have been made in Italy under the Fascist Regime so dramatically set up in 1922, showing that the Society's aims are being realised in that sunny land.

6.—On p. 51 (p. 50) "the Russian Autocracy" was singled out as being, next to the Papacy, "our only dangerous enemy". The counterpart of that came in a shower of blood at Ekateringburg.

7.—On p. 65 (p. 59) the total destruction of "the Papal Court" is foretold as being about to come by means of a mob attack upon the Vatican. *Pace* some recent feints in that direction, this attack on the Vatican will probably be held in abeyance till, perhaps in the next World-War, the Bishop of Rome's supporters are otherwise too heavily engaged to be able to lend any effective help to the present Roman Curia. Then God help the Pope!

8.—On pp. 65-6 (pp. 59-60) the Society claims to have a vast network of agencies in every land, part of whose duties is to ascertain and report to Headquarters all that can be discovered about everybody and everything, and to do the utmost possible to mould men and things in conformity with the purposes of the Society—a very efficient spy system.

9.—These agencies, which on p. 65 (p. 59) are said to include large numbers of "administrators, editors, printers, publishers, clerks, salesmen, coachmen, footmen", and so on, are employed also to disseminate injurious reports against any and every

*personam non gratam* in the eyes of the Society. And on p. 34 (pp. 37-8) instances are given of people who had been broken by such means. Reference in this connection will later be made to Earl Balfour. Not only are all those agents well paid, but on p. 32 (p. 36) it is said, "The mob is used to listen to us who pay it for its attention and obedience". Is this how foreign subventions are being used in this country?

10.—The Society claims—p. 82 (p. 71) and elsewhere—to have possession and control of *nearly all the gold* of the world, and to be able "in two days" to produce any quantity it pleases for any purpose. And on p. 74 (p. 65) it is said that, "as money acts as a lubricant of the machinery of State", the Society is thereby in a position to control the issues of paper currency, the floating of State loans, and the interest charged upon them, so that at any time it can cripple any country opposing the execution of its purposes.

11.—On p. 71 (pp. 65-6) they say, "Taxation is best arranged by a graduated tax on property", with "progressive taxes according to the wealth of the individual", so as to bring all power as rapidly as possible into the hands of the Society by squeezing out the rich and ensuring the support of "the ignorant masses of mankind".

12.—On p. 14 (p. 21) it is declared, "By all possible subterfuges, and with the help of gold, we will create *a universal economic crisis*, whereby we will throw crowds of unemployed workers simultaneously on the streets in every country in Europe. Those masses will then be glad to rush upon and shed the blood of those whom in the simplicity of ignorance they have envied from childhood". It is by such means the Society looks for the extermination of "the aristocracy" of every country still free from the yoke, just as in France "the populace exterminated the aristocracy" at its bidding, p. 12 (20).

13.—On p. 1 (p. 11) we read, "the best results in government are obtained by violence and terrorisation, not by academic discussions"; on p. 54 (52), that "people who impede our cause . . . all die, when it is necessary, apparantly by a natural death", and that, "in order to a really great object, we need not count the number of victims to be sacrificed".

14.—One part of the Society's plan, we are told on p. 25 (p. 30), is "to meet opposition on the part of any country with a declaration of war by a neighbouring State", and if need be "by creating a Universal War"; while on pp. 19-21 (pp. 25-7) we learn that in case of war, by supplying both sides with the sinews of war and by having their agents in the Councils on both sides, they seek to gain ascendancy over all parties and then, if possible, to throw the victory to the side that promises most to the Society.

15.—But whereas war and assassinations are occasional resorts only, *the Public Press* like Gold, is relied upon as one of the most constant means of promoting the objects of the Society. They speak of the need to include and to leaven with their yeast all varieties of press opinion, and on p. 25 (pp. 30-1) they claim that "the Press, with a few inconsiderable exceptions, is already in our hands". The Universities too and the Schools are specially singled out for capture, so that they may present the Ideology and promote the cause of the Society, pp. 60-3 (pp. 56-8).

16. Against religion, however, is the chief attack of all directed, and in particular against the Christian Churches. On p. 17 (p. 23) we read that they out to *undermine all faith and to tear the very idea of God out of the minds of Christians*; while on p. 64 (p. 58) we learn that they have long *laboured to discredit the Christian Clergy and ruin their mission*, and that *their influence is diminishing daily*. Note then, as stated on p. 65 (p. 59), that the warfare is carried on, *not by an open attack upon the Churches, but by Sceptical Criticism promoted from within*, calculated to promote dissensions and deadness, and by fostering debauchery among the young people.

In the *Times* of August 16, 17 and 18, 1921, several reasons are given to show that the *Protocols* are not a product of any *Jewish Society*. To clear the ground somewhat for the enquiry to be made in our next article, let two other reasons to the same effect close this article:—

(a) The *Protocols* claims that the Society for which it speaks created, inspired, and directed the course of the French Revolution of 1789. One of the remarkable features of that revolution was the

fury with which it raged against the Jews, fiercer even than the storm against the Catholics of France. Such Jews as could fled to the mountains to take refuge among the Protestants who had found safety and settled in those inaccessible parts over a century before the outbreak of the Revolution. Among them the Jews found rest.

(b) The late Lord Balfour was both a lover and beloved of the Jews. When Chief Secretary for Ireland he did much to play into the hands of the Roman body; and soon honours fell to him thick and fast. Later, as Prime Minister of Great Britain, he took measures with a view to safeguarding our Protestant heritage; and presently an outcry against him was raised all over the land, and all the influence of the Jews on his behalf proved wholly insufficient to save him from being shelved in disgrace. The Society which broke Balfour proved up to the hilt that it has such power in that respect as in the Protocols is claimed for it. One thing is very certain—

IT WAS NOT A JEWISH SOCIETY.

## Who are the Conspirators?

A key that operates the bar of a highly complicated lock must be a product either of the lock's maker or of someone who had access to his secrets. If then the events under review in our former articles on this subject seem just such a lock, the *Protocols* is a key which smoothly passes every intricate ward, lifts easily every tumbler, and shoots the bolt to perfection. But the implications of that fact will scarcely be realised save by keeping in mind that this book deals not only with events of the past but also with others come to pass since its publication and precisely in accordance with its predictions, as well as some still in process of fulfilment in our time.

Doubtless it is a startling revelation whose disclosures are so repulsive as to be believable only amid the blackest of darkness. Yet, since the book itself purports to give the programme of an existing Society with resources in men and money and influence said to be almost unlimited, and since so many of the things predicted in it are already come to pass and others now being done under our eyes exactly as that book foretold, it were sheer folly to ignore or despise the power of the Society it speaks for; and the inhuman ruthlessness and diabolical cruelty that ooze from many of its pages should not only not induce us to cry "Tosh! Impossible!", but ought even to lead us to reflect that already in our very day we have seen just such things done, evidently quite in cold blood. The reason for our so doing will appear yet all the stronger if it can be shown that the Society responsible for the issue of the *Protocols* is one with a long history deeply and indelibly stained with just such crimes against humanity and against God.

Who then are the conspirators? Readers of the article "A New World-Order Arising" may recall that some of the events spoken of in it pointed very definitely to the Society of Jesus. But if so, it follows that it is the Company of Jesus, and not some Jewish Society, whose programme of vast civil and religious changes is outlined in the *Protocols*. That such is verily the case, there is a whole mass of evidence, of which, within the space limits here imposed, only a few parts can be given, lying along four several lines as follows:—

I. There is the evidence *about* the "Protocols" referred to in our last article. Briefly put, it is this—A considerable part of the *Protocols* is a word-for-word repetition of parts of Maurice Joli's *Dialogue*, published in 1865: and many of the ideas of both are drawn from Machiavelli's *Prince*.

Now, for well over a century from the inauguration of their Company the Jesuits practised and applied the worst sentiments of Machiavelli to such an extent that at length the Catholic States of Europe found their presence and doings intolerable, and drove them out every one as pernicious pests of society and inveterate enemies to God and men. Yea, and even the Pope, for whom the Jesuits *professed* special love and to whom they had *vowed special obedience*, concurred in the findings of the Civil States and decreed accordingly that the Company be for ever extinguished. Those things resulted from the Company's having followed Machiavelli's directions.

As to Joli's *Dialogue*, as previously stated, it was directed against the administration and the crown of Napoleon III at the very time when the Jesuits were attacking him right and left and with that relentless tenacity so characteristic of their Company that it abated not till in 1870 he had been deposed and driven into exile.

In view of those things, who could doubt that Joli's book was inspired by the Jesuits? And seen in that light, what is the *Protocols* but an up-to-date restatement of the purposes and plans of the Society of Jesus!

II. The internal evidences of the *Protocols* show equally clearly that the plan it contains is just the present civil programme of that Company. Some of these internal evidences are as follows:—

1. The use of the term "civilisation". Derivatively, that term has two meanings very different from one another: (1) that form of society which has taken shape from the social intercourse of free men and women of enlightened minds and kindly hearts—a condition in which normal associations are entirely free, where the primary and main emphasis falls on *unity* and not on *union*—which to British people is the only meaning of the term *civilisation*. (2) In the other sense it is employed to denote a very specialised form of civil government imposed, forcibly if necessary, by a superior

authority—which is the sense in which it is used in all Jesuit writings. In a well-disciplined army we have this “civilisation” approaching perfection: in the old prison economy we had something yet nearer it: in Russia to-day, as also in Italy—to mention no other lands—we see it enforced. Well, in the *Protocols* the term is uniformly used in this sense. Thus, on p. 5 (p. 14) we read, “Without Absolute Despotism civilisation cannot exist”—a sentiment often repeated in that book.

2. On p. 10 (p. 18) it is said that *the plan of the Society is certain to succeed because of its adaptability to the varying temperaments of the nations*. “Everywhere, chameleon-like”, says Dr. Alexander Duff, “Jesuitism assumed the hue and colour of national, local, and social peculiarities. Everywhere with elastic spring did it accommodate itself to established habits manners and customs”.

3. On p. 29 (p. 34) it is affirmed that in every country influences are being brought to bear on the Legislatures to pass laws which would be found so conflicting with one another that they could be administered only by men *judging by the rule of conscience and not adhering to the letter of the law*. Now, this doctrine of conscience is the very root idea of Jesuitism, and will be examined in the articles following this.

4. On pp. 59-60 (pp. 55-6) it is laid down as a fundamental necessity of the case that all men should be wholly obedient and absolutely submissive in everything to the will of Rulers appointed by the Society—which is the be-all and end-all of the system excogitated by Ignatius Loyola.

5. On p. 4 (p. 13) it is said that, since the end justifies the means, attention must be paid, not so much to what is morally good, but to what is necessary for success. This corresponds exactly with the history of the Society of Jesus given by Pope Clement XIV. in the decree by which he abolished that Order. His summing up of their deplorable teachings and criminal practices was—“scandalous and manifestly contrary to good morals”.

6. On pp. 64-5 (p. 59) we are told that, when the great attack upon the Vatican comes off, the Society will intervene to have the Papal Curia annihilated with as little bloodshed as possible. But

who save the Italians could carry out such a mob attack? and who but the Jesuits could thus intervene? Curiously enough, Father Tarquini, S.J., speaking of the revolutions in Europe engineered by the Jesuits from 1789 to 1850, says that when in those revolutions the Rulers and great men of the various States had been brought down in the dust, the Society had then rushed in to calm the storm, and the storm had usually calmed down.

7. On p. 64 (p. 59), and in many another passage of the *Protocols*, it is shown how the Society overturns governments and dynasties by making use of the mobs. Mr. Isaac Taylor was a man intimately acquainted with the secrets of the Company of Jesus; and in his *Loyola and Jesuitism* (p. 23 and elsewhere) he speaks to this effect—Jesuitism of old ruled the world by its control over Sovereigns and Statesmen. But in future it will exercise its power by inciting mobs to overthrow every ruler who dares to oppose the Society. *He knew whereof he spake.*

8. It is repeatedly claimed that the Society spoken of in the *Protocols* had made and controlled the French Revolution of 1789. But the evidence that that revolution was prepared for, started, and directed, by the Society of Jesus is ample and clear.

III. The third line of evidence lies in the correspondence of the teachings of the *Protocols* with the propositions of the *Syllabus of Errors*, issued in 1864 to prepare the way for the meeting of the Vatican Council.

- a. Both aim at a Universal World-Empire.
- b. Both lay it down as a *sine qua non* that the projected World-Empire must be founded on an absolute despotism.
- c. Both maintain that for the creation and continuance of that World-Empire *the use of physical force* is both allowable and in itself right.
- d. Both hold that the Society for which they speak has the right, if in possession of sufficient power, to compel all men to obey the Society's will.
- e. Both teach that the Rulers and Governments of every nation owe unquestioning obedience to the Head of the Society; and while the *Syllabus* only infers, the *Protocols* proclaim, that the disobedient should be destroyed.

- f. Both insist on having all educational institutions **absolutely** under the Society's control.
- g. Both demand complete command of the Press.

The validity of this line of evidence lies in this, that the *Syllabus* was mainly a product of the Jesuits, which is still far more enhanced by the fact that the expositions of the *Syllabus* made by the *Civiltà Cattolica*, the chief official organ of the Jesuits, are in perfect accord with the teachings of the *Protocols*.

IV. The last line of evidence is drawn from the prophecies of the New Testament respecting *the great apostasy* from the Christian Faith. The case cannot be elaborated here. But if readers can refer to Dr. Horatius Bonar's *Prophetical Landmarks* (pp. 174-189), they will find it clearly and cogently stated there. The heart of the case is this: Those New Testament prophecies show very definitely that the waters of that apostasy, both the earlier apostasy and the later, would flow in a channel which is organically a continuation of the channel formed by the holy waters poured down on earth at the Day of Pentecost and onwards; that the apostasy has two well-defined stages, in the first of which, though already antichristian in spirit, the Church remained outwardly still Christian in form, but in the second it becomes antichristian in profession as well as in spirit; and that the second stage is but a natural development of the first. The earlier form of the apostasy Dr. Bonar identifies as the Papal Church, out of which comes forth the later form, much as the pupa emerges from the larva.

Now, besides the Company of Jesus, what Society aspiring to Universal Dominion in such a World-Empire as both the *Syllabus* and the *Protocols* lay claim to, was born and reared within the apostate "Catholic" Church? But Jesuitism answers perfectly to the description?

In fine then, while it is quite possible the Jesuits have power and control over individuals and over even associated bodies among the Jews, just as they have power and control over some associated bodies as well as over various individuals among the Protestants, there seems to be nothing to show there is now in the world any Society other than the Company of Jesus which answers to the

picture so repulsively drawn in the *Protocols*. Only, if here it be permissible to borrow from Robert Louis Stevenson, in the *Syllabus* the Company moves easily in the daytime with the dignified bearing of the great "Dr. Jekyll", whilst in "Mr. Hyde", as seen in the *Protocols*, it slouches along in the shadow of walls and hedges even amid the gloom of night. But behind the *personae* of both the former and the latter is one and the same entity, there suave and bland,

**HERE DEEPLY DEPRAVED AND DECIDEDLY DEVILISH.**

## The Great Red Dragon.

---

THOUGHTFUL people desirous of a glimpse into the real heart of Jesuitism could not do better than read the "Letters from Rome on the Council", written by *Quirinus*.\* The author was a devout Roman Catholic, of a type which became all but impossible by reason of the events he deals with. The value of his book lies partly in the fact that he seeks to clarify every position by casting powerful side-lights upon it; partly in the telling illustrations he gives, drawn from the writings of the Jesuits or from his own personal observations of their activities; and partly in that his sketches are distinguished by the fineness of their lines and the lightness of their touches. Yet, with a difference in execution premised, it may safely be predicted that the reader of those *Letters* as he closes the book will rise with a firm persuasion that there is hardly a feature of the plan disclosed in the "Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion" whose counterpart is not exposed in the *Letters*.

A scheme of world conquest tallying even minutely with that of the *Protocols*; the subversion, or destruction, of every incompatible civil government, to make way for one great Super-State; the erection of this sole and universal empire under a single irresponsible despot; the setting of States at war one with another as one ready means of conquest; the fomenting of civil disturbances and revolutions as another effective means to the same end; the penetration of every country by a highly organised spy system; the appeal to mob law wheresoever it could be made to serve the purpose; the amassing of wealth by fair means or foul; the subsidising of revolutionary elements in Civil States; the promotion to high place of men with dark blots upon their escutcheons, which could be used as guarantees for their pliability and subserviency; the use of deceit and treachery, of forgeries and fictions, both to promote and to conceal the real objectives of the conspirators; the fostering in some areas of superstition and in others of atheistic disposition as counteragents to religion and piety; the

---

\* Generally admitted to have been Lord Acton.

play on the superstitious desires and hopes and fears of women ; the production of concussive effects by the spread of atheism among men ; the undermining of constituted authorities by the stirring up of sedition ; the engineering of schemes making for their ultimate ends ; the inculcation of pleas that members of the Council had in reality no rights, but duties only ; the dragooning of these in order to supplement tutoring efforts ; the browbeating of sturdy opponents when the grinding down and splitting up of parties in opposition had reached their limits ; the employment of grim and stark duress upon hardy objectors—every one of those elements *Quirinus* had had occasion to note in the proceedings of the Jesuits ; and in the *Letters* he analyses what had been thus laid to his hand, exposing the results. For this he was well equipped by being thoroughly acquainted with the Constitutions of the Society of Jesus and with the outlines of its history, some features of which will enable us also to appreciate his findings.

In the first charter of the Company of Jesus, granted by Pope Paul III. on the 27th September, 1540, it is said :—

“ Be it known unto all men that it must be engraved, not only on the doors of their Profess-houses, but also on the hearts of its members in large and life-enduring letters, that the whole Company, both each and all of those who become its members, are bound to render whole-hearted obedience to our holy lord the Pope, as well as to all his successors, and to fight for God in this the only way of obedience. . . All and each must vow to render implicit obedience to the decisions of the General on every matter relating to the affairs of the Order ”.

Loyola's conception of the nature of that obedience which every Jesuit vows and promises to give without demur or questioning may be gathered from his “ Letter on Obedience ”, sent in 1553 to “ the brethren of the Society of Jesus ” in Portugal, some parts of which are as follows :—

“ It is my wish to see all within our Society devote themselves to the service of God so as to distinguish themselves by a true and perfect obedience, and an abdication of their own will and judgment. . . Obedience is to be rendered to a Superior, not on account of his wisdom or goodness or any other such qualities wherewith he may be endowed, but solely because to them he stands in God's stead and exercises His authority. . . In conforming yourselves absolutely to the Divine will as interpreted to you by him who stands in God's stead toward you, be assured that all your volitions are thus in harmony with the surest

rules of right living and action. Take heed therefore never to attempt to bend and mould to your own will the determinations of your Superior, which you must ever take as the will of God. . . Whosoever would fully immolate himself to God must yield to Him, not his will alone, but his intellect also—which is the third and higher grade of obedience—so that he not only wills what the Superior wills, but even thinks as he thinks, subordinating to him his own ideas as fully as a devoted will can mould and control the thoughts”.

To Protestants who have had no personal acquaintance with the things involved in such requirements, the above may seem a very theoretical and remote, if not unreal, affair. But those will feel far differently who have had opportunity to examine the results of such self-immolations, howsoever they may be attained, whether by such a course of training as every Jesuit must perforce submit to, or under the control exercised by some powerful personality through spiritualistic or hypnotic means. As to the latter of these, but with broad hints that the Jesuit training produces similar results, Alexandre Dumas has drawn some graphic pictures in his romance of the days of Marie Antoinette, which begins with his “Memoirs of a Physician”. That series of his covers roughly the last thirty years of the eighteenth century, a period during the whole of which the Jesuits were rigidly excluded from France. But their interests there were then in the hands of *the Vanguard*, numbering many thousands; and it is largely from their doings, both in France and in other parts of Europe, that Dumas has in this romance drawn many of his most arresting scenes, some of them truly appalling in their interest, with its centre in occultism and the play of mesmeric forces destroying the foundations of personality.

To all practical intents and purposes the results of the Jesuit course of training are identical with those achieved by Joseph Balsamo over Lorenza Feliciani (*a la Dumas*) through the use of occult means. Of that intensified course of training Mr. W. C. Cartwright, M.P., speaks thus:—

“Every conceivable guarantee is provided”, in the Statutes of the Society of Jesus and in the methods of training used, “for crushing out any germ of independent impulse that could possibly allow momentary play in an individual member to some movement of dissent however suppressed and strictly mental, from an order emanating from his Superior. . . Faculties are lodged with the Supreme Authority of the Order which have no

parallel in their range; while the whole plan of the extraordinarily protracted training to which every member is subjected has been carefully thought out with a view to the particular end of making him a thoroughly supple instrument ready at any instant to the hand of the Superior for any purpose. . . A mechanism has thus been contrived which, while exceptionally complicated, has yet worked with noiseless smoothness, setting in action a body of forces elaborately disciplined for the attainment of distinctly specified results, under the guidance of motive powers at once steeled into inflexible rigidity as regards ultimate aims, and yet capable of Protean suppleness in the adoption of forms of procedure at the dictate of policy" (*The Jesuits*, pp. 14-15).

But this intensified surveillance persists, not during the period of training only. In one aspect at least it invades the life of the Jesuit till his eyes close in death. For "every Jesuit", says Isaac Taylor (*Loyola and Jesuitism*, p. 296), "is encouraged, nay bound, to report to his Superior whatever he may know and whatever he may suspect relative to the conduct, to the private habits, or to the secret dispositions of every other. Every Jesuit is a spy upon every other Jesuit". He is required, however, to spy on others too besides his fellow-Jesuits. Referring to the system of regular reports each Jesuit must forward to his immediate superior, or in certain cases to the General directly, Mr. Cartwright says (pp. 24-5):—

"Whatever matters have to be written about 'which relate to anyone outside the Society', care must be taken so to word the report that in the event of its falling into the hands of the person in question, it should not startle him. . . Three things are indispensably implied in the injunctions concerning these reports: first a system of the closest inspection, and of the most detailed reporting and denouncing is inculcated; secondly, that system is explicitly extended to matters appertaining to individuals who are not members of the Society; and thirdly, in the intention of the framers of these regulations the system is to be of that spying character which renders the employment of conventional terms and cyphers expedient, solely for the purpose of furnishing the General with knowledge which is to be left to his discretion to turn to account in promotion of the interests of the Society".

This spying system is simply a corollary of another factor of Jesuitism dwelt upon by Bishop Palafox in a letter, written in 1649, to Pope Innocent X., in which he says—

"The Jesuits alone shroud themselves intentionally in a darkness which the laity are completely debarred from penetrating;

and the veil is not uplifted to many of their own members even. . . Their procedure is not regulated according to the rules of the Catholic Church; but it is determined by certain secret principles known to the chiefs only”.

Add then to this what G. B. Nicolini says regarding that wider organisation, the great Vanguard of Rome (*History of the Jesuits*, pp. 45-46) :—

“ There is also a secret class known only to the General and a few faithful Jesuits, which perhaps more than any other contributes to the dreaded and mysterious power of the Order. It is composed of laymen of all ranks from the Minister of State to the humble shoe-boy. Among those composing this body are many women who, unknown and unsuspected, are more dangerous in themselves and more accurate spies to the Company. They are affiliated to the Society, but are not bound by any vows. . . Some are paid for their services in hard cash, according to a rule of the Society which empowers the General to disburse money to *persons who will make themselves useful*. In return for this and other favours they act as spies of the Order, reporting what goes on in those classes of society in which the Jesuits themselves cannot mix; and they serve, often unwittingly, as the tools and accomplices in dark and mysterious crimes”.

Nicolini says further that many of the women so used are simply religious devotees. Such, it appears, was the Empress Eugenie, through whom, we may suppose, the Jesuits induced her husband to give the cold shoulder to his thoroughly loyal and staunch friends, and thereby brought ruin on him and the Empress, and subjected France to renewed devastations.

Some idea of the extent and the malevolence of this ubiquitous body may be got from the series of romances, written by Dumas, above referred to.

Along more than one line those things may be traced back to the earliest days of the Society. The character of the training undergone by the Jesuits, the secrecy in which the Company has shrouded its most important affairs, the system of spying and reporting, none of these have altered materially since the days of Loyola. But in another line he left a deep mark on the affairs of the Order. He not only became Father Confessor to many ladies of high rank, but also founded in Rome what here in Victorian days would have been called a *Magdalen Refuge*, dedicated “ To the holy

Martha", a cloister into which women could retire for periods of penitence, where the only task imposed on them was the practice of Confession and Manifestation of Conscience. Hereby the Father Confessors obtained access to the secrets of many, some even in high position at Rome, which gave the Jesuits a hold over them, often a stranglehold. After a period in the Refuge, usually short, those "beautiful sinners" re-embarked on the stream of common life in Rome, mostly "enthusiastic for the new order of things", as one historian puts it, who adds that, owing to the great success of that first venture along this line, the members of the Order seem ever since to have taken special care to win over as many as possible of the fair sex, whether married or single.

"With consummate coolness and self-possession", says Dr. Alexander Duff (*The Jesuits*, pp. 34-5), "aye, and with an imperturbably calm and self-satisfied peace of mind, they sit down; and by their specious machinery of sophistries and subtleties and hair-splitting distinctions and straining at gnats while swallowing camels they contrive to transmute every virtue of God's tree of life, every doctrine and precept of the blessed Gospel—which, if well used, had been the pledge of immortality—into a deadly poison, not for the healing of, but to minister spiritual and eternal death to, the nations. Who then will presume to reply in the negative when I ask whether all this, in its intention progress and consummation, be not literally and most truly the very masterpiece of hell,

THE VERY PERFECTION OF DEVILISM?"

## The Climacteric of Jesuitism.

**T**O understand the Society of Jesus at and since its climacteric year is to be provided with a master-key to the secrets of world-affairs in our time. For such an understanding one must keep in view certain outstanding characteristics of Jesuitism during the first two centuries of its existence and the factors that gave form and colour to the changes it underwent in its climacteric period. Most fundamental and most prominent among these was its determination to establish and settle a universal empire under the rule of the Roman Pontiff—an empire in comparison with which that of the Cæsars would pale away to the merest shadow of a shade—an empire in which not only the lives and possessions of its every subject would be at the disposal of the Supreme Ruler, but their minds and wills and consciences also in utter subjection—an empire so universal, so absolute, and so all-comprehensive as never before to have been claimed by any man, but only by God Himself, the Creator and Sustainer of all.

A second factor had been that, notwithstanding an express provision of the Constitution of the Society of Jesus, and notwithstanding the solemn vow taken by its every member, "to render wholehearted obedience to our holy lord the Pope", time and again over various matters both the Society as a whole and certain groups of its members in particular had not only failed to comply with the Pope's directions, but had also treated with ignominy and contempt those who had insisted on obedience to papal commands, had even put some of them under duress, and in one instance at least had murdered a papal legate in cold blood. By such deliberate procedure, never once disclaimed nor regretted nor apologised for, but flagrantly repeated whensoever any new occasion had arisen, the Company of Jesus had shown very unmistakably in what sense it interpreted the above-mentioned provision of its Constitution and the solemn vow taken by its every member from the General down to the last who had "made profession"—making it clear as day to every observant beholder that the Company held itself and its every several member subject to no law but that proceeding from itself alone, that in point of religion it was in fact a thoroughly lawless association.

A third factor was the doctrine of Papal Infallibility which for nearly two centuries the Jesuits were the chief and practically the only advocates of, so that it might be said to have been then a peculiarity of the Society. But it is to be noted that up to the climacteric period of the Society the Jesuits had been sufficiently influential and wily enough to ensure that the Pope should never speak *ex cathedra* save to give utterance and form to matters predetermined by the Society. In that further sense then papal infallibility may be said to have been specifically a peculiarity of theirs.

A fourth of these arose out of the place held by the Jesuits in the European Cabinets and Councils during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, when they were in a position to dictate the policies of the several Catholic Countries. But in the early years of the eighteenth century this influence of theirs began to be broken, and in the middle of that century they were expelled from every State where before they had ruled the roost. Had they been animated by a Christian spirit, they would have laid the lesson to heart. But the only effect of their expulsion was, to make them more than ever determined to be masters in every land, by hook and crook.

The operation of those four main factors was preparing the way for the changes that were to result from the falling of the sorest stroke ever sustained by Jesuitism, which concerned their doctrine of infallibility so as to wound the Society in its tenderest part. In that doctrine the four notes of every infallible utterance were—(1) that it was made under that plenary Divine authority and power (supposed to have been) conferred first of all on Peter, and through him on the Bishops of Rome his (supposed) successors, an authority extending to all matters within the universal jurisdiction of the Pontiff—doctrinal, disciplinary and governmental; (2) that in the particular matter of every infallible decree the Pontiff speaks under the special and immediate inspiration of the Holy Spirit requisite to the occasion; (3) that the decree so made is irreformable and everlasting; and (4) that it became an article of faith, binding the conscience of the Pontiff's every subject so as to be believed by each of them and inviolably observed by all.

Well, the fateful decree of July 21, 1773, sounded each and all of those notes of infallibility, as is evident from such passages as

the following :—

“Aided by the presence and inspiration of the Holy Spirit, compelled also by the necessity of our ministry, . . . upon mature deliberation and out of our certain knowledge and in the fulness of our apostolical power,

**WE SUPPRESS AND ABOLISH THE SAID SOCIETY (OF JESUS) . . .**

We declare its entire and every kind of authority to be now **FOR EVER ANNULLED AND EXTINGUISHED**, . . . so that the name of the Society shall be and hereby is exterminated and done away . . . These our mandates (or rescripts) shall be for ever and to all eternity valid, permanent and efficacious ; and shall be inviolably observed by all and each of those they concern, or may concern, now and hereafter in any manner whatsoever”.

Thus from the height of the highest heaven known in Roman Catholicism fell the entire weight of papal infallibility on the very body that had created and up to then manipulated it. Should it surprise us at all if, in falling on the Jesuit Order to crush but (as the event proved) not to annihilate it, this infernal machine shattered its own essential integrity, lost the strength and resiliency the Jesuits had imparted to it, and became to them thenceforth but a dead stone of stumbling and rock of offence? If then the Company had been disposed for at least one single occasion to acknowledge itself at fault on a major issue, or even if it had been slightly less tenacious of what *it* deemed the most fundamental thing in its constitution, must it not still have been more than difficult for the Company to attempt to reintegrate papal infallibility with its own? nay, the two could nevermore be homologated further than in appearance. From this point then Jesuit aims and aspirations became wholly incompatible with a Roman Catholic Church ruled by an infallible Bishop of Rome. So, recovering from the shattering lightning-stroke, the Society began preparing for the day when, in a final trial of strength, it would be once and for all determined which of the two infallibilities should rule the roost and hold the field.

The plan of attack was just what the circumstances seemed to demand. Led by France, the Catholic States of Europe had driven the Jesuits out as constant disturbers of the public peace: the Catholic States must therefore be revolutionised, and their monarchical institutions swept away, beginning with France. The

Western Catholic Church, comprising the ecclesiastical establishments of those Catholic States, had declared eternal war against the Society of Jesus, the Church of France being foremost in the fray: those ecclesiastical institutions must also be revolutionised or destroyed, so that all might be brought into abject submission to the rulers of the Society. The Bishop of Rome, in concert with the Papal Curia and under pressure of the civil and ecclesiastical authorities abovementioned, had used his infallibility to crush the Jesuit Order, with the intention of destroying it utterly: Papal infallibility and the entire Roman Curia must therefore be rooted out of the earth. For these ends, what readier method could have been devised that by establishing universally such a new order of "civilisation" as we have had under review in the preceding pages? and what fitter agency could have been chosen for this purpose than the Vanguard?

In the pre-climacteric period of the Order, the Vanguard had served as but a useful adjunct to the Society, as a body placed in a strictly subordinate capacity, and used only for purposes of peaceful penetration, to facilitate the smooth working and ensure the success of the primary machine. When then that primary machine ceased to function ordinarily, the other and far larger one was pushed forward and set to work at double speed. When the leading battle-line failed on being broken, the supports and reserves were rushed to the front. The Jesuit Order, as represented in its "professed" members, having passed into comparative obscurity, the great Vanguard came into the fullest prominence and its doings became the cynosure of all eyes by reason both of their horrible character and of their astounding success.

The Vanguard's initial attack was concentrated on France, on her Church first of all and then on her Monarchy. From the middle of the eighteenth century that attack persisted with ever-intensifying cholera and violence, showing an unrelenting determination on the part of the assailants both to bring utter and endless ruin on the authorities civil and ecclesiastical, and in the eyes of the world to justify itself in so doing by exciting odium against them on account of those very faults and vices which in former times the Jesuits themselves had ever been so ready to condone, who had in fact been often foremost in fostering them among those in the high

places both of Church and State. In the latter years of that century the floodgates of disorder and destruction were thrown wide open, and a torrent of evil poured forth in such a diabolical orgy of crime and debauchery, of blasphemy against God and of "man's inhumanity to man", as the world till then had hardly ever witnessed.

No human mind can contemplate the scenes enacted in the French Revolution without being plunged in an abyss of horror and despair. No Christian heart can come in contact with the personalities taking part in that tragedy, whether as its victims or as their persecutors, save to register a vow yet more earnest, to spend and be spent in bringing men to a knowledge of God in Christ—which is the only but all-sufficient bulwark against such Satanic forces when they threaten—and with the weapons of the Spirit to fight to the death that confederation of evil powers which brought that revolution to pass and made it the prototype of others in every land where rulers and people strongly oppose the conspiracy.

Even if all the indescribable excesses of that fearful time had not been foreseen by the leaders of the Vanguard, the promoters of that revolution; and if we may suppose the Jesuits themselves had no very direct hand upon it to guide its course, nevertheless its general plan had been prepared by the latter, and its execution entrusted to the former. None but agents of the Jesuit Camarilla kindled the conflagration in the middle of the eighteenth century, and it was its representatives, the members of the Vanguard, who afterwards fanned it into fury. If disorder and destruction went beyond the bounds which on second thoughts they, or at any rate some of their agents, wished to set, that fact might very easily have been foreseen. Was it not? seeing that in our day the whole orgy has been very deliberately repeated in Russia, seems it not more than doubtful that the horrors in France went a bit farther than the Jesuits had calculated for? May it not be that they were clearly foreseen and the risks deliberately taken, and that the assassination of relay after relay of the Society's leading agents in the earlier stages of the revolution there, as again in Russia recently, was indeed but part of

THE SOCIETY'S PLAN OF EXTERMINATION ?

## Jesuit Infallibility.

**J**S a rooted conviction of its own infallibility the real mainspring of the Jesuit Camarilla's bold bid for world empire? In the accessible records of the Society of Jesus there is but one solitary instance of anything approaching a confession of fault. It occurs in a decree of the Fifth General Congregation of the Order, held in 1606. From the fact that this minute of the Congregation's Proceedings was countersigned by Pope Paul V. it may be reasonably inferred the decree was passed in compliance with his injunctions. But it had been so framed as to make it appear that, while grave faults were admitted by the Society, the blame for them lay really at other doors, as Adam, with perhaps better justification, had shelved the blame for his sin from off himself. If the wording of the decree can be taken as an attenuated confession of fault, it certainly shows nothing of that *manifestation of conscience* which Jesuitism has made one of its strongholds. On the contrary, since the decree is thus brought to a point, "therefore our congregation has resolved we should abstain from all *appearance* of evil, and as far as in us lies should remedy the evils produced by *false suspicions*", it is fairly clear that even here the implications of jesuit infallibility and irreformability had by no means been lost sight of.

The whole idea of human infallibility has been, rather wittily, traced and ascribed to the natural self-conceit of man, when devoid of all wifely counterbalance. But on the other hand, it has in fact quite a lengthy history, enabling us to trace its several stages from its rise in this particularised form on to its denouement. At its first appearance in the world it was dressed in the garb of *ecclesiastical infallibility*. In other words, it made its debut in the idea that the Church of Christ cannot wholly fail or perish—the notion that it cannot err or go wrong followed considerably later. By and by, when sacerdotalism began to be officially superimposed on Scriptural Christianity, the illusion was fostered that only "the priests" of the church were infallible, which became stereotyped in the delusion of *clerical infallibility*. That again became further narrowed down by the caption that infallibility inhered in the episcopate only, which naturally took shape in the theory of *conciliar infallibility*, namely, that infallibility was practicable and became

operative only when the bishops of the whole church were assembled in solemn session. Thus we might say the poison was becoming localised in the system; and the applications of such poultices as were compounded from the eighth to the thirteenth centuries served to draw the virus to a head in the pretence of absolute papal supremacy, which in the sixteenth century opened in the running sore of *papal infallibility*, once the Pope had got the Council of Trent off his hands without a revival of the quarrel between him and the united episcopate, for which the Council of Constance is famous. The discharges from that ulcer the Jesuits took possession of as a vaccinal medicament suited to their peculiar and almost exclusive use.

From then on, and for two hundred years or more, we see the Jesuit Camarilla in charge, practically complete charge, of that department of the Pope's conscience in which infallible decisions were excogitated. Then in the middle of the eighteenth century the Catholic kings of Europe were given the keys of that department, whence they soon extracted the infallible irreformable and eternally binding decree of July 21st, 1773—a decree which, if not owing to its premature birth, died very soon as a result of violence.

From the time the Jesuits euded infallibility from the pretended absolute supremacy of the Pope till Clement XIV. broke away and suppressed the Order in 1773, papal infallibility had really amounted to this, that the Jesuit Camarilla used the Pope as the mouthpiece and organ of its own infallibility. But as the whole facts of the case make clear, his breaking away as he did in 1773 begot a resolution to make *jesuit infallibility*—which is the fifth and apparently the last stage in the evolution of the delusion concerning human infallibility—as formal and secure as previously for two centuries or more it had been real though undeclared.

The true nature of jesuit infallibility is revealed in a sentence of the thirteenth cardinal rule (or "Spiritual Exercise") of the Order. It reads, *Denique, ut ipsi Ecclesiæ Catholicæ omnino unanimes conformesque simus, si quid, quod oculis nostris apparet album, nigrum illa esse definierit, debemus itidem, quod nigrum sit, pronuntiare*—i.e., "Lastly, in order that we may be wholly of the same mind and conforming with the Catholic Church, we are in

that respect bound, if she shall have defined that to be black which to our eyes appears white, to pronounce it is black". If ecclesiastical infallibility is the foundation principle of Roman Catholicism, in this thirteenth rule of the Jesuit Order we have the natural, and logically the necessary, application of that its first and governing principle.

In former articles it was noted that the Jesuit theory of development is perfectly adaptable and adapted to the special teachings and to many of the doings of the Order which are positively anti-christian and very outrageous. In the passage quoted from the thirteenth "Spiritual Exercise" we have both the essence and the defence of this fearful delusion. Here is the machinery by which the organ of infallibility functions in accordance with the theory of development. All who accept that cardinal rule bind themselves to concur in every pronouncement made by that church's supreme authority, even should it be such an obvious lie as is the affirmation that white is black.

In the old papal church, ere the Jesuits gained full control over it, perhaps no feature was more emphasised than her unchangeability. The boast of papists was that she was *semper eadem*, in the sense that in her every essential characteristic—in doctrine, in organisation, in discipline, and in practice—she was changeless and unchangeable. Once anything had been determined by her constituted authorities and formally embodied concerning her teaching or constitution or procedure, it was held to be unalterable for ever, on the principle that the church's infallibility in which those decisions had originated and which became inherent in them, made them irreformable. It was a principle which, so to speak, laid hold on certain things of time and space, stripped them of every temporal and spatial accident, and invested them with the qualities proper only to eternity and infinity. For good or evil it exalted the things of earth to become the things of heaven. If the infallibility which thus transmuted the things it touched did not give them any real permanence, at least it gave them an appearance of constancy and endless duration. Further than that we need not pursue it, in the sense above indicated.

In each of the stages prior to the last—as ecclesiastical infallibility, as clerical infallibility, as conciliar infallibility, and as papal infallibility—the illusion was begotten of an erroneous notion that certain men have a power to invest human affairs with qualities proper to God alone. But in its final stage, as jesuit infallibility, the delusion began by accepting what was supposed to have been obtained and established in the previous stages, and making that a point of departure in precisely an opposite direction, so as just to reverse the former process. By the former process it was attempted to exalt certain human beings to a level with God and to impart to the things they touched the character of the things of heaven. By the latter it is attempted to bring God down to the level of men and to recast the things of heaven in conformity with those of this world. Perhaps the nexus of the two exists in the final scene of the fourth act, the definition of papal infallibility.

Anyway, this new departure, unchaining infallibility from the eternal and changeless, harnesses it to the present moment alone and to the ever-changing things of earth. It is indeed a noteworthy fact of our time that, wheresoever this gangrene has spread in Christendom, there has commenced a loud and constant outcry to have things regulated in accordance with the views and the supposed needs of *the living church*, as if all truth and reality were every moment concentrated and all the time being enlarged in the body that pretends to supreme authority in the world. Yet was this to be expected in view of the promulgation of the theory of development a century or so ago, and of the great eagerness of every jesuitised propagandist to carry that theory into every sphere and have it applied to every moral and religious issue. Just how widely this new kind of infallibility differs from the old may be seen on considering that, in harmony with the theory of development, a thing which by the organ of this infallibility was yesterday pronounced black may to-day be infallibly defined as purple, to-morrow be infallibly declared brown, the next day be infallibly given out as grey, and the following day be infallibly pronounced white. Or even, in cases that may seem to admit of no such delay, the conjuring trick may be performed *per saltum*, and by a single flash of Loyolian illumination the black made infallibly to appear white.

The idea of papal infallibility, viewed from one of its historical angles, came into vogue as a sequent of papal supremacy. Going further back, papal supremacy had been established by manipulation of that temporal sovereignty which the Bishops of Rome had laid hold of. In reality therefore papal infallibility had been set up on a basis of temporal power; though, when so erected, a new foundation was sought out for it, that of divine right, and it was accordingly decked out in divine colours. But, since on the Jesuit theory of development every divine element must be reduced to mere human terms, so that the jesuit theology subsists but as an ever-shifting panoramic display like the mirage of some sand-swept desert, it needs no great arguing that Jesuitism could by no means maintain *its* brand of infallibility on the high ground on which papal infallibility was last set; and that its only hope of maintaining it at all must be by replacing infallibility on the mundane basis of temporal power. In a word, jesuit infallibility would remain to the world but a mere empty name, unless the Camarilla could seize and hold full and universal temporal sovereignty—which naturally and adequately explains

ITS BOLD BID FOR WORLD EMPIRE.

## The Vanguard of Rome.

---

THE character of this seemingly ubiquitous body, as also the modes and the extent of its operations, can be ill understood apart from an acquaintance with the salient features of the constitution and the great landmarks in the history of the Society of Jesus, its creators.

By the fifth decade of the sixteenth century the affairs of the Papacy had come into a parlous condition. As in an earthquake, the foundations of Papal power and supremacy had been so shaken and dislocated that the whole edifice seemed ready to fall into ruin perpetual. Many forces had been at work to bring it down. But by far the greatest of its losses had come through the spiritual work of the Reformation. Consequent thereon, there had been a growing alienation and separation from the Pope on the part of the Civil States of Northern Europe, while at the self-same time those of Southern Europe had become more and more hostile to the Religious Orders, for centuries the mainstay of Papal supremacy. Save for the brief day of Napoleonic power, from the rise of the Papacy down to the present time, when its existence seems to hang on a mere thread, probably the Papal Court and dynasty were never in danger so great and pressing as in the middle of the sixteenth century.

At that very critical epoch arose Loyola and his associates, who banded themselves together to defend and promote the Catholic religion and, as a chief part of their work, to re-establish and maintain the absolute supremacy of the Bishop of Rome in a thoroughly Hildebrandian sense. Calling themselves "the Company of Jesus", they became commonly known as "Jesuits". In many ways very diverse from the older Religious Orders, now fallen into disrepute in all Europe, the Jesuits from the beginning took an additional vow, the fourth, promising special obedience to the Roman Pontiff and aiming to make him paramount ruler of a universal empire. Since in the Society's early days most Jesuits were men of noble birth, and in view of their exceptional devotion to his Person and Cause, very naturally the Pope regarded the new Order

most favourably; and in its second Constitution (1549) Paul III bestowed on its head and members honours and privileges altogether unique.

Little wonder then that, with such a nucleus and such a send-off, the new Society soon attracted to itself so many promising youths as made it impossible to admit more than a few to "the profession" for which it was training the many. But, the Order having undertaken to educate and train likely boys and youths as a ready means of establishing the universal empire it aimed at, congenial employment could be found in that line and in other germane occupations for those partially or fully trained for the priesthood when places could not be got for them in the ranks of "the professed". Ere long indeed the Company was in a position to choose, of every hundred or more so trained, but one only for admission to its full membership. Of the other ninety-and-nine, all who were willing and zealous to do the Society's work in other callings got an open way into important and often lucrative positions, with the Company's backing and all the many benefits that involved. Thus then originated *the Vanguard*—a body which includes all ranks and classes of Jesuit agents who have not "made profession". Its members were not (nor are they now) *Jesuits*, but just zealous agents of Jesuitism, mostly undeclared.

A society in a position to select for its full membership but one only of the many trained for its profession very naturally became, as to its inner circle, a body of very able and distinguished men who, held in the highest favour at Rome, were soon courted in every Roman country of Europe. Kings and statesmen chose Jesuits as their Father Confessors in preference to all others; and as the Order had taken great care to instruct such Confessors in the arts of statecraft, ere long the policies of most Roman Catholic States were being directed in accordance with the purposes and wishes of the Society.

Now, in statecraft the Society drew its main ideas from Machiavelli—ideas making for self-aggrandisement and not for quietness and peace. Ere long, then, Jesuit uses of Machiavelli's maxims brought rulers and peoples of the Romanist countries to see they were being used as tools to promote the Society's ends.

Men everywhere began to say aloud that its motto, *Ad Majorem Dei Gloriam*, ought rather to run, "For the Greater Glory of the Society". Jesuit cupidity and greed caused general resentment against them. But far more their practice of embroiling the nations in warfare, resulting in sombre devastation, created in the Roman Catholic peoples an implacable hatred to Jesuitism, and stirred in them a raging fury against the Jesuits.

The upshot of it all was that in the sixth decade of the eighteenth century the Jesuits were expelled from the leading Romanist States of Europe; and in 1773 Pope Clement XIV. decreed the total abolition and eternal extinction of the Company, ordering its members to disband, lay aside the Jesuit dress and customs, and nevermore associate as Jesuits nor even name the name of the Society. The way of *ordinary obedience* in such a case was perfectly plain. But the Jesuits had taken a vow of *special obedience* to the Pope. When, then, matters were thus put to an acid test, *Jesuit obedience* proved itself to be an *extra special brand*. With few exceptions they refused to obey the Pope's decree, but fled instead into retreats already prepared for them in Prussia and in Russia by some members of the Vanguard.

A thing that far more concerns our case, however, because in it lies the key to their subsequent proceedings and to what they have been at and are about to do in Italy, is that up to 1773 the Jesuits had been foremost and loudest in proclaiming the infallibility of the Pope. In the Roman sense of infallibility, Clement had made the decree of July 21st, 1773, infallible and irreformable. We may therefore safely conclude \* that, however deeply the Jesuits might help to dig the pit of Papal Infallibility with a view to engulfing the whole

---

\* There seems a possible alternative to the total destruction of the papacy—one that would harmonise well with the Jesuit theory of development—namely, to take the election of future Popes out of the hands of the Roman Cardinals and give it to the Jesuit Camarilla, if that would ensure that no Pope should hereafter speak *ex cathedra* except at the Camarilla's dictation. By the decree of July 18th, 1870, the Pope is empowered to make such a change of procedure in the election of his successors, and probably of the two evils he would choose the lesser, if given any option. But would the Camarilla regard it as practicable? at any rate, it would seem to accord with the theory of development to terminate the dispute in that way.

Papal Curia, the idea that the Bishop of Rome alone is infallible would stink in their nostrils as eternally as the decree above-mentioned.

Some idea of the great power of the Society at that time may be got from the fact that at the date of its abolition its "professed" members numbered *almost three-and-twenty thousand*. If then half only of the others trained under its auspices had become members of the Vanguard—not to speak of those brought into its ranks in other ways—readers can estimate what a power in the earth Jesuitism had even then become. Powerful enough it proved itself to be—to mention but one phase of its work—to be able to throw France and most of Europe into bloody turmoil for over a quarter of a century.

Till the troubles arose which came to a climax in the French Revolution little had been heard or known of the Vanguard. But some of its members then came into great prominence as the stormy petrels of European politics, and later others as the ranging leopards of European State affairs, till things began to settle down in 1815. Threatened with destruction as the Papacy had been by Napoleon, in 1814 Pope Pius VII re-incorporated the Company of Jesus as an integral part of the Roman Church. The work of the Vanguard had ensured that the Society should win out and triumph over all its foes.

From the day the Jesuits returned from the Exile great and far-reaching changes were set afoot, mainly through the agency of the Vanguard, though in the Romanist body itself, as was natural, doubtless "the professed" played the leading part. Yet even there, if not so largely as in Eastern Catholicism and in Protestantism, the more numerous body has done its share.

The things already effected in all three areas show unmistakably that the design of the Society has been either to change essentially the character of all the Churches—Roman, Eastern, and Protestant alike—by giving each of them a new basis of doctrine and a new form, so as thereby to prepare for their being hammered into a single great machine; or, if the changes contemplated could not be

effected by measures of peaceful penetration, then to wipe them off the face of the earth in showers of blood—a policy, however, that would be meaningless unless the Society were aiming at the creation of a single World-Empire under Jesuit dictatorship, a polymorphic Super-State.

For such a task then need we wonder at the creation of such a force as the Vanguard, composed of many hundreds of thousands of keen and highly trained men, some of them among the astutest and ablest on earth? Is it surprising that many of them occupy key positions in Church and State? that others are the great financiers of the world? that some are leaders in educational affairs? that others, as journalists and writers, are forming and directing and controlling the minds of men in nearly every nation?

See then what has been accomplished in the several ecclesiastical spheres! In the Romanist body directly after the return from the Exile the Jesuits propounded and spread abroad their *Theory of Development*, a formative principle that tears up Tridentine Catholicism by the roots at the same time as it gathers together and gives expression to certain elements long floating loose in it. So astounding was their success in this venture that, by the help of some side winds, in 1870 the Vatican Council was brought to set the Church's official approval on that new doctrinal basis, making the Theory of Development the supreme rule for determining every dogma of the Roman Faith. Thus was the whole body of Roman Catholic doctrine transubstantiated. Thus by a single stroke perished the old Roman Catholicism of Trent and the former Councils.

In the Russian and Eastern Churches what all the efforts of the Vanguard had failed to do by measures of peaceful penetration seems pretty thoroughly to have been accomplished under the Reign of Terror begun a dozen odd years ago. In such tragedies as the French and the Russian Revolutions we see, in part at least, both what Jesuitism is aiming at in the ultimate, and the lengths to which it is prepared to go in order to compass its ends.

In our next article the work of the Vanguard among the Protestant Churches will be touched upon. Its members are known

to operate, some from without all the Churches—people who seem to take the position and attitude of Voltaire; and others from within one or another of the Protestant bodies, where they pass as very devoted and loyal members of the Churches they have severally entered—people who are usually full of the praises of the special virtues of the body in which they have nested. Closely associated with these cuckoos are those, born and reared in Protestantism and still retaining their original connections, who can best be described as *the Vanguard's camp-followers*—folk who in one way or another have imbibed Jesuit ideas or have become enamoured of the Jesuit programme, though probably without in the least knowing whence those new ideas came or for whom they fag. Largely through the co-operation of those camp-followers many of the changes desired by the Society are being put in execution in nearly every Protestant Church. Thus are things being silently and stealthily prepared for THE DAY when, under economic distresses and amid turmoil of war and stupefaction resulting from overmuch sorrow of heart,

THE GRAND COUP WILL IF POSSIBLE  
— BE PUT IN EXECUTION. —

## Sapping and Mining Operations.

---

**J**F on returning to the bosom of its mother the Society of Jesus had still its old ambition, not as of yore to maintain the supremacy of the Bishop of Rome, yet to bring all men into the Roman obedience now differently interpreted, doubtless for the attack upon the Protestant Churches the work entrusted to the Vanguard would be much as follows:—

1. To substitute Jesuit for Christian ideas, partly by changing the sense and meaning of accepted Protestant terms, and partly by representing Protestant theology as deficient in respect of some so-called essentials of Christianity.
2. To allay suspicion as to these and other changes, partly by a campaign of invective against popery—hereby two birds might be killed with one throw of the stone, now that the Society was out for the destruction of the Papacy—and partly by a pretence that the cardinal tenets of Protestantism, though differently accentuated, are substantially the same as those of the New Catholicism for which the Order stood sponsor.
3. To cut the ground of Protestantism clean away, here by discrediting the Bible so that people should distrust it and lay it aside, and there by warping the moral sense of Protestants by means of the persuasion that the Scriptural Way of Salvation can be rightly understood only when the Gospel Message is expounded and applied by an authorised interpreter.
4. To cool the zeal and quench the love of earnest Christians, partly by inducing them to put secondary things first, partly by decoying them into the pleasures of this life, and partly by defamation and ostracism.
5. In the sphere of ecclesiastical affairs, to get nominees of theirs planted in all the key positions of the Protestant Churches, and to secure that these their nominees should have control as unrestricted as possible of the finances of their respective bodies.

Now, in point of fact, these are the main features of the programme set afoot in the British Protestant Churches within a decade from the day the Jesuits returned from the Exile, as is now perfectly clear in retrospect. As an entirely fair specimen of such work, let us here examine that done in this way by Isaac Taylor, of Stanford Rivers, whose writings began to appear in 1823, and for over forty years were then steadily added to.

Mr. Taylor first came into wide public notice as a writer of books of an extreme anti-Papal type, profusely and loudly denouncing the abominations and cruelties of Romanism. Was it but a mere coincidence that about the same time this was the line taken also by John Henry Newman and others in the earlier *Tractarian* publications? Be that as it may, it is certain that this method of operations gained both for Mr. Taylor and for them a wide hearing in the then British Protestant world. But it is evident that, as Mr. Taylor's books became more and more popular—can it now be believed they were then almost as widely read and as eagerly sought for as Sir Walter Scott's?—their tone easily changed; save for occasional blasts of the trumpet against the Papacy, "the abominations of Rome" became things to be understood rather than named; and Mr. Taylor began to commend to the public a form of Catholicism which, contra-distinguished from the Tridentine form, was swallowed by many without its properties or its implications being understood.

This jesuitised Catholicism Mr. Taylor expounded as being essentially one and the same with Protestantism. Thus in his *Loyola and Jesuitism*, p. 5, he calls Martin Luther and Ignatius Loyola "binary stars revolving round a common centre"; and on p. 109, comparing the preaching of Loyola and his band with that of the Wesleys, he says "the story is substantially the same". If we demur that assuredly Loyola did not learn from the Bible "the gospel" he preached, Mr. Taylor goes one better and retorts (p. 48) that it was "as well what he had learned directly from Heaven as what his experience had taught him". If still we argue that Christians learn of Christ neither "directly from Heaven" nor from their own "experience", Mr. Taylor would end discussion by saying (p. 183), "But our Protestant notions would lead us into a very perilous kind of uncharitableness if they forbade our thinking of Ignatius Loyola as an eminently good and Christian man". He even (pp. 226-7) palliates and excuses, but not so as to advocate, the part of Loyola's teaching that, were the earthly head of the Church to pronounce something black which is obviously white, all men are positively required to affirm it is black.

Consider then his teaching on the following main points in dispute:—

I. The most fundamental issue Catholicism and Protestantism disagree over concerns the Bible. Tridentine Catholicism took the Bible as the standard of its doctrine, but under the proviso that the Scriptures can rightly be understood only when interpreted by "the Church" according to Catholic Traditions—thus making Catholic Traditions an authority really superior to the Bible, and the Catholic Priesthood in some sense superior to Tradition. But Protestantism says the Bible only—the Bible interpreted to each individual soul by the Holy Spirit alone—reveals to all men the true religion.

Now, in his *Wesley and Methodism* (pp. 317-9) Mr. Taylor boldly asserted the time was near when the Protestant Churches, fallen into chaos, would escape by being brought to adopt "the fearless THEOLOGY OF INTERPRETATION" (the capitals are his): that this change would be analogous to the revolution effected in physical science by the Baconian philosophy; and that this revolution would be carried through only "by strong arms in some season of anguish and anxiety". And in the meantime he urged (*Ibid.* p. 241) all Protestant ministers to procure and study the writings of the Higher Critics, "German especially", which at that time (1850) had begun to pour into Britain; and he added a threat that those who disregarded his advice would ere long be taught "a serious lesson". In similar vein he affirms (p. 33) that John Wesley had learnt the doctrine of Justification by Faith from certain German teachers, men who are now known to have been instructed and inspired by the Jesuits—teachers whom Wesley himself had repudiated utterly, calling them "a kind of Protestant Jesuits" (*Works*, vol. ii. p. 39).

II. Another chief point where Catholicism diverges from Christianity is in this very doctrine of Justification. Here, though they differ essentially as to both the means and the mode of justification, both Tridentine Catholicism and the new Catholicism promoted by the Jesuits make it to result from human action. But, as taught by the Scriptures, Protestants ascribe the whole salvation of the soul to God alone. God only justifies and saves the sinner.

In treating of the Jesuit tenet of Justification through Faith Mr. Taylor presents it (*Loyola and Jesuitism* p. 43) as being identical with the Protestant view. But what he says of it, so far from

proving his contention, shows instead that the Jesuit doctrine says in effect, Only believe you are justified, and thereby your justification takes effect. This, though essentially diverse from the Tridentine teaching, as much as that makes justification depend on a human act. It is totally at variance with the Protestant view, howsoever common it may have become amongst us in our day.

III. Closely connected with the truth of Justification is the doctrine of *Christian Individualism*. The Bible view of the latter Bishop Lightfoot has put thus: "Each individual member (of the body of Christ) holds personal communion with the Divine Head. To Him immediately he is responsible, and from Him directly he obtains pardon and draws strength" (*The Christian Ministry*, p. 131). But Catholicism places "many mediators" between the soul and God. In his *Ultimate Civilisation*, pp. 72-9, this is just what Mr. Taylor does.

IV. Then as to *the Church*—in the Catholic view the *esse* of the Church consists of "the Priests" only, an idea utterly repugnant to the New Testament.

Having in his *Wesley and Methodism*, pp. 157-8, told the world that Methodism has no place for "the Church idea", Mr. Taylor proceeds:—

"THE CHURCH IDEA (capitals are his) lays hold of all born within its circle and seals them the property of the Church and treats them as its passive subjects (not individually indeed but *seriatim* rather) in its own appointed manner as they arrive at every epoch of their mortal journey from the cradle to the grave. It duly engages for their safety and welfare, certain conditions being complied with; and it sends them on authoritatively countersigned or endorsed, not merely into the unseen world, but beyond its entrance".

V. At the first, the third, and the fourth of those sets of points where Catholicism diverges from the straight line of Christianity Mr. Taylor set the points so as to switch Protestants on to the downward track of Catholicism, either Tridentine or Jesuitic. But at the second they were set for the latter only. And now at the fifth he has set and locked the points as securely against Tridentine Catholicism as against Protestantism. Dealing with "the lately-divulged doctrine of 'Development'" (*Loyola and Jesuitism*, pp. 324-6), commonly known as *the Theory of Development*, Mr.

Taylor prognosticates that by its coming into vogue the character of Catholicism would be transmuted; and he opines this task would be accomplished by the Jesuits. His suggestion, however, that the theory harmonises with Protestantism is altogether misleading. The doctrine is even much more alien from Protestantism than from Tridentine Catholicism; and it is as fatal to the one as to the other.

In *Fanaticism*, published in 1833, casting an eye over many of the changes even then in progress in all the Churches, he predicted (pp. 334-6) that "an unobtrusive power now at work beneath the ground of our sectarian edifices", would *within fifty years*, that is, by 1883 at latest, "bring them down to the abyss". Whether by this "unobtrusive power" operating underground he meant *the Theory of Development*, or perhaps *the Vanguard itself*, or maybe both the one and the other, who shall say? Anyway, in view of the fact that in 1870 the character of the Roman Church was transubstantiated even as Mr. Taylor had prophesied, it must be admitted that on affairs relating to that body at least he was exceptionally well-informed. But about the Russian and Eastern Churches he miscalculated by quite a whole generation. As to the Protestant Churches, almost at the end of two periods of fifty years each they yet stand, somewhat shaken perhaps, in some cases even roughly shaken, in the earthquake Mr. Taylor foretold as certain to come and hurl them "down to the abyss"—but at least still standing. Standing too upon their walls is his hand-writing, as if to prove, assuredly not the certainty of their doom, but that the prophet had no true and authentic warrant to speak upon things in the Protestant world.

Nevertheless, seeing that the great and mysterious "unobtrusive power" is, if the above guesses have hit the mark, still working as of yore in the subterranean darkness, mere madness were it not, dire treachery even, to rest on our arms reversed as if we had come to the interment of much we have dearly loved, much our fathers made great sacrifices for, sometimes even their blood? Nay, nay! but let us trust in God and keep our powder dry. The battle is the Lord's, and ours assuredly must the victory eventually be if only in His strength we go forward with courage good, mind alert, and vision clear. Thanks then be unto God who always leadeth us forward in Triumph!

"THE BEST OF ALL IS, GOD IS WITH US".

## Jesuitism Essentially Antitheistic.

THE man who denies the existence of God is an atheist. The man who opposes the only true God is an antitheist. Though antitheism leads naturally to atheism and under certain conditions seems always to issue therein, yet the former is but a halfway house to the latter. Antitheism expresses itself either by setting up other gods in opposition to the One and Only God, or in claims to represent God and to speak with full authority in His name by men who teach and act in flat opposition to His Word—men like the Scribes and Pharisees of our Lord's day, whom He denounced as false teachers and blind leaders of the blind, saying they were not of God but of the Devil their father, and that the proof of their antitheism would become manifest when by the hands of wicked men they should have put Him to death.

Closely allied to antichristianism as it is, antitheism relates to something more ultimate. This relates to the God, or gods, to whom men render worship and obedience and service—a fact that explains the different varieties of antitheists; that concerns *the way*, the right way and wrong ways, of coming to God. Both this and that imply a profession and observe the forms of religion—but false professions and bastard forms. And one of the noteworthy facts of religious history is that, whereas when professing Christians abandon their form of religion almost invariably they take refuge in the halfway house of agnosticism, those lapse into atheism who turn away from an antichristian or antitheistic form of religion—which is but to say they leave their halfway house to go home.

The antitheism of the Society of Jesus, like original sin, is as old as its host, as may be seen from (I) countless acts of Jesuits, performed with the approval of their Company; (II) the teaching and “discipline” of the Order down to the time of its abolition in 1773; and (III) their Doctrine of Development, promoted since the Exile. Much of the evidence that proves the Society truly antitheistical seems to exclude all doubt that, were its aims once realised in the creation of a World-Empire under its rule, the Company will in all probability cast off and throw away its forms of religion and become frankly and nakedly atheistic in the day of its power. Examine the case:—

I. In the decree of Pope Clement XIV. by which he abolished the Company of Jesus there is a mass of evidence, fully documented, to show how antitheistic that Society had been up to then. Instance after instance of transactions most ungodly he lays his finger upon, running "almost from the very moment of the institution of this Society". But perhaps the most sinister parts of this evidence occur as it were incidentally in Clement's manner of narrating the fate of former Pontiffs who, having taken proceedings to curb somewhat the lawlessness of the Jesuits, had died suddenly and unexpectedly—"But this Pontiff having been carried off by a premature death", says he of Pope Sixtus V, and continues his story down to Clement XIII, his immediate predecessor, of whom he states, "But the unexpected death of this Pontiff also rendered that project abortive". So much does Clement seem to have felt the force of these facts that, as he laid down the pen with which he had signed the decree of July, 21st, 1773, he exclaimed to those standing around "There then! I have signed my own death warrant!". Near the close of that year, when the Abolition Decree had already been executed, one morning there appeared on the gates of the Vatican the letters "I.S.S.V.", painted there during the darkness of night. People of Rome, far better versed in such matters than Britons have become, interpreted those symbols as conveying the message *In Settembre Sacra Sede Vacante*—"In September next the Holy See will be vacant". Pope Clement died suddenly September 22nd, 1774.

Turning to other histories—the reward offered for the assassination of Elizabeth; the attempts on the life of the liberator of the Netherlands, ending in his murder on the 10th July, 1584; after various former attempts on his life which had led to the Jesuits being expelled from France in 1594, the assassination on the 14th May, 1610, of King Henry IV. by the Jesuit Ravailac, who told the Court which condemned him to death that prior to the murder he had confessed his purpose to Father Aubigny, S. J., and had received absolution retrospective and anticipatory; and to name but one more affair of the kind, recorded in Macaulay's *History of England*, Vol V. xvi. 292, the prayer scattered throughout Britain and even on the Continent, for the speedy and bloody extermination of our own William and Mary together with all their supporters—

each one of them an act as antitheistical as that of the Scribes and Pharisees who by wicked hands killed the Son of Man, the Redeemer of the world.

Of similar interpretation are such things as their sanction of idolatrous and grossly impious rites and practices, as in India and in China; the attempt of Geronimo Xavier, S.J., a cousin of Francis Xavier, to hoodwink the Emperor Akbar and catch him by guile in palming off on him a collection of Persian legends as verily parts of the Four Gospels of the New Testament; the ritual "service of consecration" by which in pre-dissolution times, if not since, would-be assassins of proscribed enemies of the Jesuit Order were set apart and sent forth to do their devilish deeds; their habitual practice of the device set forth in the motto of Loyola, *To subdue our enemies by setting them at war with one another*; and so on, almost endlessly.

II. Not less so are the "discipline" and the doctrines of the Jesuits:—

1. The fourth vow contains a promise of such absolute obedience to be rendered by every Jesuit to certain of his fellow men as must of necessity cause him sometimes to break the moral law of God. Loyola's interpretation of cases of that kind is that such (what he calls *apparent*) breaches of the Divine law are not sinful; and that, even were there any sin in them, it would lie at the door of the Superior who gave the order, not against him who readily and unquestioningly obeyed it. It is by this fourth vow every Jesuit "makes profession"; and in it there is a clause categorically expressing the antitheism of the Society—the clause which says "I promise obedience to the General of the Society of Jesus, standing in the place of God".

2. The Jesuit practice of *the manifestation of conscience*, a thing which goes far beyond the requirements of the Roman Catholic confessional and obliges the penitent not only to disclose to the Father Confessor the very innermost thoughts of his heart and all he knows of everyone and everything the Father Confessor chooses to question him about, but also to receive submissively every proposition that Father Confessor makes to him, and to cherish every such idea as part of his own thoughts. This is surely an enthroning of the Jesuit superior in another human heart, "in the place of God".

3. The Jesuit Doctrine of *the supremacy of conscience* makes a human mind the supreme authority on all moral and religious matters. In effect it says that no law on those matters is binding on a man, unless it have the sanction of conscience, thereby abrogating the moral and religious laws of God. As administered by the Jesuits in accordance with their practice of *manifestation*, this doctrine of conscience-authority compels all men to obey the behests of their General and functionaries. Were the General himself true to the fourth vow—which he is very far from being—all men would hereby be brought into absolute subjection to the will of the Pope. The antitheism of the position thus created is undeniably that of the great apostasy predicted and outlined in II Thess 2<sup>3-12</sup>, and certain other passages of the New Testament.

4. The Jesuit Doctrines of *Probability*, *Mental Reservation*, and *Expediency* are as decidedly antitheistical as they are thoroughly consonant with the Jesuit exaltation of their General's conscience and the enslavement of all others.

5. Quite recently on behalf of the Jesuits the public were challenged to show where in any writing bearing the imprimatur of the Order the doctrine is taught that *the end justifies the means*. It was admitted that the Jesuits are generally believed to hold that idea. What then, it may be asked, gave that belief such wide currency? what but the fact that the doctrine is deeply engraved on *age-long practices of the Jesuits never repudiated by their Society?*

III. But nowhere will the antitheism of that body become more evident than in its *Doctrine of Development*, widely advocated from the day the Jesuits returned from the Exile, by the Vatican Council officially approved in 1870 as the formative principle of all Roman Catholic dogma, and already become not uncommon in circles bearing still the name "Protestant". The doctrine cuts away by the roots, not only the absolute authority of the eternal truths divinely revealed in Holy Scripture—which makes its acceptance absolutely fatal to Protestantism; but also the validity and quasi-authority of well-certified traditions—making its reception fatal to Tridentine Catholicism.

A little clear earnest thinking must beget a conviction that this Theory of Development, which frees men from all obligation to obey the religious and moral laws given by God in the Bible—which frees

them as effectually and as fully as it releases them from all obligatory regard to bygone things by its insistence that the only voice of authority is that of *the living Church*—this doctrine crystallises as by some stroke of genius both all antitheistic factors of Jesuitism and also the antitheistical elements formerly floating loose in the atmosphere of Tridentine Catholicism. As giving ordered expression to those inchoate elements of the older Catholicism, this master-solvent of Jesuitism made great headway and brought the Jesuits their signal success of 1870. And by means of the *Rationalistic Criticism of the Bible*, carried on by *secret agents of Jesuitism who posed as good Protestants*, an opening was made for the entrance of the Theory of Development into the Protestant world, where already it has made great headway. With such a triumph in the Catholic body, and with progress so considerable in the Protestant Churches, who can wonder that the Jesuits hope soon to attain their ultimate goal?

But how would things be, if and when that goal were reached? A notable fact of religious history is that, whereas Catholics lapsing from their form of faith become atheists, Protestants leaving theirs seem mostly to enter the halfway house of agnosticism. Scarcely less striking is it that, taking the world as it has been for the last century and a half, the number of Catholics lapsing has been proportionally far higher than that of Protestants—a state of things the Catholics may think themselves somewhat compensated for by the fact that so many who still remain Protestants in name have in the last hundred years or so become Catholics in reality. But what is this save to say that, under whatsoever influences, such “Protestants” have only taken another route toward atheism than that leading through agnosticism? Perhaps the number of people thus gained over to Catholicism is larger far than we care to think; yet it must really matter but little by which half-way house men go over to atheism. The great question is, If the Society of Jesus, being antitheistical in doctrine and practice, should succeed in its efforts to catholicise the Protestant Churches now that it has gained full control of the Catholic body, what kind of “civilisation” will it then, in the ultimate, impose and erect on the ruins of our bemused and desolated world save

AN ATHEISTICAL EMPIRE?

## Jesuit Communism.

---

**A**ROUND us to-day a special type of political communism has become so common as almost to have ceased to excite surprise or repugnance; and in several lands it is already in supreme power. In general it seems most active and clamorous, and to succeed best, wheresoever the agencies of the Latin Church, open or clandestine, are strongest. Though this type first engaged worldwide attention when it burst forth most furiously in the French Revolution, its true prototype had previously existed in the long-extinct Jesuit Republic of Paraguay. The chief features of that Regime call therefore for review in such an enquiry as ours; but the better to focus the picture, let us first trace some of the remoter antecedents of that Jesuit experiment.

Telling of his invasion of Gaul, Cæsar (*Commentaries*, Bk. VI., Ch. 13—20) gives an account of the manners and customs of the inhabitants of Gaul and of Britain, as he found them. Each tribe was composed of two distinct orders—the rulers, who were overlords; and the common folk, who were just slaves. The rulers again were sharply classified in two ranks—the Druids; and the knights, or secular noblemen. The Druids were not only teachers of religion, they also administered all the civil affairs of the tribes. All were under the rule of an Arch-Druid, “who possesses absolute power among them”. In all matters of religion they kept their tenets and observances so closely veiled and obscure that no Druid was ever allowed to commit them to writing. Besides the administration of all civil affairs, the Druids decided as to war or peace, but did not themselves go to battle, being exempt from military service. They took toll of all the rest of the tribe, but themselves paid no tribute on any account or occasion. They had the power of life and death throughout the tribe, and—what may be thought more than the power of death—the power of boycott. The knights, being executive officers to the Druids, were the leaders in warfare. In saying the common herd were slaves, all is told of them that need be said. In dealing with graver offences, the Druids either imposed the death penalty or excommunicated the convict, excommunication being followed by boycott, even the man’s own family being obliged strictly to shun him, or be themselves laid under the like penalties

as being guilty of mortal sin. As to whether these excommunications were revocable, there seems to be no clear evidence.

In tracing the most prominent anti-christian features of the Latin Church to their first sources, and in particular when unravelling the much-tangled web of Papal Supremacy, Mosheim (*History*, Cent. 8, Chaps. 4—12) finds the druidical elements decidedly predominant. Hallam too (*Middle Ages*, Chap. 8) gives a similar account. Striking indeed and impressive is the analogy of the Latin Cult with the Druidical. The Druids, while frequently hurling their peoples into warfare, were themselves exempt from military service: during the Mediæval period the Latin clergy did likewise under similar exemption. The Druids paid no taxes, but exacted heavy dues from all others: as do the Roman priests to this day. The Druids practised a strict *disciplina arcani* and to the utmost kept their peoples under gross ignorance: this too has the Latin priesthood done since the seventh century or earlier. The Druids held their folk in bondage by the terrors of death and damnation, and by threats of excommunication followed by boycotting and ostracism: the priests of Rome have ever wielded the selfsame weapons, supplemented by the horrors and fears of a purgatory whose keys they claim to be possessed of. No man could judge a Druid save the Arch-Druid or another appointed by him: from mediæval times the Roman clergy claim a like privilege as theirs by divine right. The Arch-Druid, being regarded as the *fons et origo* of all law, held himself and was taken to be above all law—in other words, a *lawless one*: which is exactly what is claimed by and for the Roman Pontiff.

The summit of Papal supremacy and power came into view in the days of Hildebrand, and its climacteric period extended thence into the thirteenth century, in the time of Innocent III. The spirit of free enquiry, which had spread wide into many parts of Europe in the twelfth century, was not quenched in the blood of the martyrs so ruthlessly and so lavishly shed by Papal hosts. Rather, it gathered momentum in proportion as it got confined within narrower limits. If men generally were not as yet altogether ready to feel the just force of that truth for which those martyrs had so nobly shed their blood, they nevertheless inwardly revolted against

the monstrousness of that tyranny which had caused the blood-letting; and the world of that day was thus gradually prepared for the Reformation of the sixteenth century, in which the foundations of Papal usurpation and boastfulness were thoroughly shattered.

The unique privileges and unheard-of favours heaped on the Company of Jesus, inaugurated at that epoch for the purpose of rebuilding and consolidating the Papal Empire, give some indication of both how difficult and precarious the situation of the Papacy was then felt to be and what high hopes were entertained as to the programme of these "Companions of Jesus". History tells how far those hopes were at times in process and how far they fell short of actual realisation. Our subject, however, is concerned with the fact that from the outset the Jesuits constituted themselves, and by the Pope were accepted as, the special custodians of his political engrossments—taken over from the Druids. As such, and for the greatest and speediest success of their undertakings, they adopted the most deplorable of Machiavelli's suggestions, as to the surest and promptest ways and means of recovering and maintaining universal empire.

It seemed quite in the nature of things then that the Jesuits should desire a country of their own, where everything would be under their undivided and absolute control. In 1586 they found such a sphere, and set to work in Paraguay, then a part—but many times larger than the present tiny Republic—of the Spanish possessions in South America, inhabited by the Guarani tribe of Indians. Within a score of years the Jesuits had established twenty strong Mission centres, called *Reductions*, with many thousands of the Guaranis enrolled as their members. Then they applied to the King of Spain for permission to constitute Paraguay "a Christian Republic in which no secular governor be allowed any control; . . . so that a truly paradisiacal state of innocency be established", under the King's suzerainty, to whom the Jesuits offered to pay an annual tribute of a dollar for each adult member of the community. In 1608 the King (Philip III.) acceded to this petition, and the Jesuit Republic was set up.

The general features of this State, which lasted till 1767, need not be elaborated here, save to say that each Reduction was

administered by two priests, a senior and a junior, with a rigid uniformity throughout everything, even the cities being so exactly alike that those sent to dispossess the Jesuits in 1767, arriving at one city after another, at first thought they had made a circuit and got back to the town they had just left—a fact showing that during the 158 years of their rule there the Jesuits had thoroughly imposed the stamp of their Order on the Guaranis. Certain other features of the case call for more particular notice:—

1. The Jesuits aimed to set up there a completely communistic system, in the sense that no individual rights were recognised and there was no private property. Everything belonged to the State, and was supposed to be shared in common. But in reality much the greater part of the proceeds of goods sold was always remitted to the Camarilla in Europe; and the Guaranis got only the bare necessities of life in return for their toil and sweat.

2. The money thus derived was “truly enormous”, says Bishop Palafox, even many hundreds of thousands of dollars annually. Writing of their revenues in the whole of South America about 1650, he declared their wealth had become so great “that the secular clergy of the Church will soon have to beg their bread from the Jesuits”, who had seized all the sources of wealth.

3. By the charter empowering them to rule Paraquay and by their antecedent pledges, the Jesuits should have paid annual tribute to the King amounting to a dollar per adult citizen. The highest sum ever paid was 40,000 dollars, though the adult population was probably never under 300,000.

4. There was one single point of connection between the Republic and the Spanish Empire, in the person of the King; just as the Jesuit Order connects with the Latin Church only in the person of the Roman Pontiff. The frailty of that connection stands disclosed in the matter of the tribute money. Indeed, so devoid of loyalty to Spain were the Jesuits that neither would they allow any Guarani to learn Spanish, nor would they tolerate any intercourse between the Guaranis and the peoples of the surrounding Spanish Colonies—a prohibition maintained at the sword's point.

5. Within Paraguay the Jesuits kept themselves as a caste completely apart from the Guaranis, even more so than the Druids from their people. In the whole 180 years of their stay there no Guarani was ever prepared for and admitted to the priesthood; none ever promoted to be a teacher even.

6. Religious services were held mostly on *Saints' Days*, with sports and dances, which, as the Jesuits said, were accounted the best modes of condescending to the mental calibre of the Indians and of meeting their religious needs.

7. There is no evidence that any effort was ever made by the Jesuits to impart the truths, properly so called, of the Christian religion. Considering that so many of the Guaranis became so highly expert in the various handicrafts that the Jesuits could and did justly boast of their preeminent skill, it must be felt that these Indians had mental capacities of no mean order which were never developed, nay more, which were even steadily repressed.

8. When then the Jesuits were expelled, the Guaranis, having had no moral or religious training to fit them to continue in the Christian Faith, in a few years laid aside the rags and tatters of their religious observances and became as if no religious teachers had ever lived and worked among them—"A Vanished Arcadia"—an irony or a satire according to our point of view.

9. Having throughout their tenure of Paraguay treated all their neighbours as scoundrels and pariahs, in 1767 the Jesuits had nowhere a friend to lift his voice or move a hand to succour them; but men everywhere rejoiced to see the day of their humiliation and discomfiture.

The communism of the Paraguay experiment is indeed the true prototype of the many political ventures which, since the French Revolution but much more especially since the Great War of 1914-18, have been taking shape in so many parts of the world wheresoever the Vanguard of Rome has been strong enough and long enough at work under the surface of things to give body and life to

## THE PROGRAMME OF THE JESUIT CAMARILLA.

## Retrospect and Conjecture.

---

**A**T this stage of our enquiry we cannot do better than take a long and wide view of our subject from that commanding altitude on which the inspired writers of Holy Scripture looked forth upon it, and thus visualise it in the unerring light of their prophecies concerning it.

The New Testament forecasts of the fearful apostasy from the Faith of Christ "in the last days" fall naturally into four groups: (1) those made by Christ Himself prior to His death at Jerusalem. That He supplemented them during the forty days after the Resurrection seems clear: and, though little is narrated of what He then told His disciples, from the Epistles of Peter and Jude, neither of whom claims to have had any special revelation hereon from Christ in heaven, we may reasonably infer certain things; (2) those made by Paul, given him by special revelation and therefore carrying peculiar weight and importance; (3) those made by Peter, Jude, Matthew, Mark, and Luke—all of them obviously based on oral statements by our Lord to the disciples collectively; and (4) those of John, in the Book of the Revelation mainly, shown him when all the other apostles had passed away—the parts of the Revelation that relate to the great apostasy being as plain and emphatic as those of Paul, and presenting the same general view identically.

The factors that gave rise to the apostasy were present in the churches of Christ even in apostolic times. But the apostles foresaw that many ages must elapse ere it had reached that stage in which the churches would be ranged, apparently in pretty solid phalanx, against Christ and His Gospel. To confine ourselves to the predictions made by Paul, and those in the Book of the Revelation whose meaning is certain and obvious, we learn from the statements made in them that the apostasy would be marked by such broad and general features as these:—

- 1.—That God had set in the earth a Power—namely, the Civil Rulers of the world, at that time particularly those of the Roman Empire—exercising a strong restraining effect on the development of the apostasy.

- 2.—That within the Christian churches would the lawless apostasy arise, waxing ever stronger in proportion as the authority of the earth's Civil Rulers waned and their independence and vigilance declined.
- 3.—That as the apostasy developed the tendency would prevail which aims at transferring to ecclesiastical rulers those powers and prerogatives that by the Divine appointment belong to Civil Magistrates alone.
- 4.—That, having matured, the apostasy would be headed by a dynastic succession, called "the man of sin, the son of perdition", *occupying the place of God*, and usurping authority over the princes and peoples of the world.
- 5.—That in the day of his power this *man of sin* would openly display himself as "the lawless one", contemning the laws of God written in His Word.
- 6.—That at the zenith of the apostasy in its first stage the power of the *man of sin* would be largely broken; whereupon a "second beast" would arise and, having obtained all the power of the first, would compel the whole world to worship "the image of the first beast".
- 7.—That the inception of the apostasy in apostolic times was the work of Satan, and in its final form would be a manifestation of devilism, pure and simple.

This summary of the content of the New Testament predictions lays emphasis on two things in particular: that the progressive apostasy from Christianity was coeval with the process by which *the man of sin* should arrogate to himself the powers and prerogatives of the world's Civil Rulers; and that it will be near its destined end when *that lawless one* shall have got to think himself sure of attaining the goal of his ambitions.

That such an apostasy has developed in the nominally Christian world, and that it has been centred in the Latin Church, will be evident to all who consider the salient facts of history, some of which are as follows:—

1. Soon in "the church that was at Rome" there came a tendency to assimilate its constitution and procedure to that of the civil power by having, instead of its original collegiate eldership, a single officer to administer its affairs and represent it in dealings with the outside world. About the middle of the second century we begin to hear of "the bishop of Rome"—the operation of this

tendency having resulted in one of the elders of that church being elevated above the rest and styled "*the bishop*".

2. Rome being the metropolis of the Empire and most accessible to those in distant parts, it seemed natural and became customary for such to seek advice from the church in Rome on matters of difficulty in the outlying churches.

3. On the removal of the seat of Empire to New Rome (Constantinople), the Bishop of Rome, Christianity being now the established religion of the empire, began exercising far greater authority, ecclesiastically and politically as well as in matters of religion.

4. The Emperor Justinian, probably in order to curb the political aspirations of the bishop of Rome, in his new Code of Laws (534) recognised him as the chief spokesman of the whole Christian Church, but under certain well-defined and strictly limited powers.

5. In 606 Phocas, who in 602 usurped the Imperial throne and was acclaimed Emperor by Gregory I, bishop of Rome, designated Gregory's successor (Boniface III) "*the universal father*" (Pope), and at the same time abolished some of Justinian's limitations. The Papacy dates from that year.

6. In the year 663 Pope Vitalianus decreed that throughout "*the Catholic Church*" *the Latin language* should be used in all public services. The Papal Communion thus became the Latin Church from that year.

7. In 734 Luitprand, king of the Lombards, gave part of Lombardy to the Pope as a temporal principality. Then in 754 Pepin, king of France, having seized the Exarchate of Ravenna, gave that also to the Pope. His son Charlemagne in 774 added the principality of Rome, and in 800 some adjacent territory. Thus arose "*the Temporal Power*", sometimes called "*the Temporal Sovereignty*", of the Pope, in respect of which he donned *the triple crown*.

8. In return for his second gift (800), Pope Leo III revived the Western Empire and crowned Charlemagne *Roman Emperor*—an act out of which arose the Papal claim to suzerainty over even the Roman Emperors.

9. On the appearance of the famous "Forged Decretals" in 837, it began to be maintained that the Pope had supreme authority and power over all the kings of the earth, in virtue of his being "Christ's vicar" on earth.

10. In 1073 Gregory VII (Hildebrand) solemnly claimed absolute sovereignty over all the Civil Rulers of the world; and in 1076 he excommunicated and deposed the Emperor, Henry IV, who had withstood his pretensions.

11. Similarly, in 1207 Innocent III deposed King John of England—the weakest, surely, of all British Sovereigns—and laid England under an interdict till John submitted and did homage to the Papal Legate in 1213.

In those events we see a steady progression of the great apostasy from Christianity, till in the days of Innocent III it reached and passed its zenith. It is noteworthy that, a generation or so before Innocent's day, a great revival of Scriptural Christianity occurred in Italy, resulting in the conversion of many thousands of people who became known as *Waldenses*. In 1160 some thirty of those pious folk landed in England to preach the Gospel, where soon they were arrested and accused of heresy, and all were put to death. But the work done by the Waldenses laid the foundations of that revolt from the Papacy which, renewed in the fourteenth century, and spread far and wide by the noble efforts of Wycliffe and the Lollards, in the Reformation of the sixteenth century shattered the power, and soon liberated the northern half of Europe from the domination, of the Papacy.

12. At that memorable epoch, in 1540, the Company of Jesus was founded for the purpose of re-establishing the Papal power and dominion throughout the world. For 150 years or so thereafter the Jesuits scored many great successes and, having preserved most of Southern Europe in allegiance to the Pope, obtained the direction of civil and ecclesiastical affairs in many states.

13. But by the middle of the eighteenth century they had, by their cunning and cupidity, everywhere overreached themselves and were expelled from all the States where lately they had ruled the

roost. In 1773 this was followed by the Pope issuing a decree, infallible and irreformable, suppressing the Jesuit Order and enacting the total extermination of the Society of Jesus.

14. This Papal mandate, however, the Jesuits stubbornly refused to obey, and set to work, as the sequel shows, for three main objects—(a) to revolutionise all the States of the world and bring them under the absolute rule of the Camarilla; (b) to permeate and transmute all the religions so as to make them ring out the notes of Jesuit ideology only, and hammer all the ecclesiastical institutions into one great machine, ready to be smashed to pieces when it had fulfilled its purpose; and (c) to abolish and entirely destroy the Papacy when (a) and (b) should appear certain of accomplishment.

How natural seem now the stages by which the Latin Church drifted from the Christianity of Jesus Christ and His Apostles, to become the Great Apostasy foretold in the New Testament! How consecutive, too, the steps by which its first stage passed into the second! All present indications point to the near approach of a grand climax to the derangement.

In view of some New Testament predictions, it would be somewhat hazardous to contend that the Jesuit conspiracy against the world, and against the Christ and the people of God, cannot succeed, if only for a brief and inglorious day. The vast changes brought about since the outbreak of the French Revolution, and more especially the stupendous progress made by the conspirators in our lifetime, warn us against being over-confident. But at the very least, this we can affirm and maintain in face of all circumstances and of the world at large:—Should the Jesuit Camarilla succeed in setting up its hoped-for Utopia, or new Arcadia, when erected it will be nought but

THE REALISATION OF DEVILISM.

## Further Facts and Forecasts.

**N**APOLEON, risen to power with the goodwill and by the support of those who created and managed the French Revolution, in 1809 put Pope Pius VII under forcible restraint as a prisoner till he should accede to his demands. Some of these are stated in the histories of that time, with intimations of others unspecified. Was the reincorporation of the Jesuit Order as an integral part of the Latin Church one of the unspecified demands of the Emperor? The subsequent course of events seems to say so. On the 23rd January 1814 the Pope was released from captivity and, having returned to Rome, promulgated the decree of August 15, 1814, re-establishing the Society of Jesus. Two remarkable passages in that decree read as follows:—

We should deem Ourselves under a great offence against God if amid the present dangers to the Christian republic We neglected the aids the special providence of God has put at Our disposal; and if, placed in the barque of Peter, now tossed and battered by continual storms, We refused to employ the hardy and storm-seasoned oarsmen who now offer to master the sea-billows that every moment threaten shipwreck and death. . .

“ In virtue of Our full apostolic power We therefore enact that the Society of Jesus be received back in every country pertaining to the Christian Church; that it be confirmed in its former fabric, rules, legislative powers, liberties, in its offices of teaching, preaching, confession, and in its colleges, houses and provinces, under the immediate patronage and protection in the obedience of the Holy See; and that it be freed and delivered from all consequences of the Abolition Decree set forth in the Brief of Clement XIV. Whosoever therefore shall dare to thwart or impede in any way this Our enactment touching the sturdy navigator of the craft of Holy Peter, let the wrath of God Almighty and the curse of the apostles Peter and Paul fall upon him to destroy him utterly and infallibly.

Thus to the Jesuit Camarilla was restored the supremacy in and practically the control of the Latin Church throughout the world. Purbblind indeed should we be if we failed to see in that decree of Pius VII a craven capitulation—a surrender of the ship he commanded to attackers who had all but succeeded in sending her to the bottom of the ocean. Thus did the Pope and his Curia sell themselves, body and soul, into bondage from which they have not yet been delivered.

Is it here asked as an aside, What more could the Jesuit Camarilla desire or seek? A little reflection will show that the

poisoned wound could not be healed by such a salve, even though Pius VII had guaranteed its infallible efficacy. Was it not this very papal infallibility that had incurably poisoned the wound inflicted in 1773? Had not Clement XIV, before striking his would-be death-blow to Jesuitism, first dipped his sword in the infallibility bowl, which till then had been reserved for the sole and exclusive use of the Jesuit Camarilla? Put yourself in its place then, and consider the case. Could this papal infallibility be any more relied upon which, having twice over served as the guarantee of the inviolability, eternal validity, and irrevocability of the pledges under which the Jesuit Order had obtained its constitution and secured its unique privileges, had then become the seal of that Society's total extinction and of the absolute recall of its every privilege "for ever and to all eternity"? Whatsoever the vagaries of Jesuit infallibility may have been and are, on this point at least it had been and is consistent. So, to substitute in very reality Jesuit for papal infallibility must from that time have seemed a clear and sheer necessity of the case.

In the upheaval that ensued, the fact that the Church of France was overthrown by the Camarilla's agents; the fact that the force used to accomplish this was composed, not of the "professed" members of the Company of Jesus, but of the far more numerous members of the Vanguard—the one wing of which was composed of "the Philosophers" and "Encyclopaedists" and their numerous followers, and the other of the host of the Illuminati under Cagliostro; the fact that, after vanquishing that Church, that force had then destroyed the French Monarchy which had ever supported the Church; the fact that, having exterminated the Church and the Monarchy, this force was then set to work for the humiliation and overthrow of the Papacy and to weaken and batter the Latin Church in other lands; and the fact, plainly admitted in the first part above quoted of the papal decree, that the Papacy and the Latin Church at large were "every moment threatened with shipwreck and death"—from those facts may we not only safely conjecture, but even be forced to conclude, that the forces let loose by the Camarilla in the eighteenth century must soon have annihilated the papal church, had not Napoleon enforced his will on the Pope in 1814?

Those facts and their bearings make it perfectly plain that the realities of the situation became heavily obscured by the restoration

of the Jesuit Order in 1814. That restoration had in itself nothing likely to change the fixed purposes, but only to alter the tactics, of the Camarilla. Had there then been nothing happening in the world around us to-day to justify it, we must still have felt assured the events of the period from 1750 to 1814 amply warrant such conjectural thoughts as these—that it was now a settled part of the Camarilla's policy utterly to destroy the Papacy on the first favourable opportunity; that it would rely mainly on the Vanguard for the success of its schemes; that it would seek to revolutionise the Civil States of the world as France had been revolutionised, by resort to mob law; that by jesuitising the Latin Church, and as far as possible all the ecclesiastical institutions of the world, it would foster and second the effort to usurp and maintain universal and absolute dominion over the Civil States; and that, with absolute universal power obtained, it would then abolish every ecclesiastical institution and exterminate all religion as being but mere superstition.

Those conjectures are seen to have been in course of rapid realisation since the present century began. The tornado that swept over the world from 1914 to 1918 brought revolution in its train to every country in Central, Southern, and Eastern Europe; and in many of those lands a form of government has been set up which shows that in them the Jesuit Camarilla already has the ball at its feet.

As in Russia, one feature of the case in Italy deserves some notice. The Italian Dictator, who began as a Cagliostro and now reigns as a Napoleon in everything but name, in 1919 was still a Socialist of the extreme type. Yet in 1922, at the head of a great gang of Fascisti whom in three years or so *he* could not possibly have organised and trained, he marched on Rome and overthrew the Constitutional Government. It is credibly stated that this Mussolini in 1910 attended at Copenhagen a secret meeting of socialist leaders of the extreme wing; and that at that meeting revolutionary measures were deliberated which have been kept as secret as possible. Others who are reported to have attended that gathering—to mention those only who have since risen into power in their respective countries—were Lenin, Ebert, Clemenceau, Trotsky, Ramsay Macdonald, Vanderveldt, Branting; and Briand is said to have homologated the resolutions passed there. If those resolutions were not drawn up to give practical effect to the programme set forth in the

“Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion,” some of those who attended that meeting would be rendering a real service to all thoughtful people, and would be doing their own cause and name no injury, by publishing those resolutions for the information of mankind. But if the proceedings there gave body and life to the programme of the *Protocols*, the subsequent course of events in Russia, in Turkey, in Hungary, in Germany, in France and Belgium, in Italy, in Spain, and—to mention no others—to some extent in Britain itself, seems to warrant a conjecture that Britain and the world at large have not yet seen the end of grievous troubles, and that the stranglehold obtained upon them through the Great War will be broken only with great difficulty, if broken it ever be without universal revolution and tribulation wholly unprecedented.

Naturally, in such case we should ask ourselves how things stand in our own and certain other lands which, in name at least, are still predominantly Protestant. Perhaps the fact which would first strike an attentive observer of Britain is that, be the general mind of the British people what it may, the British Government has long since ceased to be actively Protestant, and that at every turn of affairs it has favoured the Latin cult more and more. Conformably with this, he would find that in the Departments of State a proportion of the higher appointments is unblushingly given to Catholics far above their numerical ratio in the land—a proportion that becomes absurdly high when related to the average educational levels of Protestants and Catholics respectively. But what might most astonish him as he kept enquiring more closely and exactly into our case would probably be the fact that so many—so very many—of the official positions in most of the British Protestant Churches are held by men of decided Catholic tastes and sympathies, perhaps Catholics even by solemn, if as yet unavowed, pledges; and above all, that these latinised interlopers are Catholic, not according to the standards of that older Catholicism which was effectually strangled in the summer of 1870, but of that shifty, multifarious type which first took shape in the statutes and constitution of the Company of Jesus in the earlier half of the sixteenth century. Guided by those and other like facts, such an one would inevitably conjecture that we are more than likely to see some rather

STARTLING THINGS IN THE VERY NEAR FUTURE.

## World Revolution Set Afoot.

OF all the literature bearing on the Revolutionary Movement perhaps no essay is more important or valuable than Professor John Robison's "Proofs of a Conspiracy against all the Religions and Governments of Europe". Not only does it deal with the origins of the movement; its author had had most exceptional opportunities to examine at close quarters and to estimate both the strength and the weakness of the revolutionary cause. To some extent and by force of circumstances he had been drawn almost into the centre of the swelling current at the very time when it had burst its banks and swept aside into a revolutionary channel. For years on end he had watched the most prominent figures directing the altered course of that sullen stream, till at length he turned away in weariness and disgust. Yet, so far from his book being a petulant whine or an outraged scream, it calmly and strikingly sets all the features of the conspiracy against a background of Christian living such as our worthiest forebears had striven to embody in the texture of our British civilisation. To a student of the revolutionary movement, intent on seeing its sources as they existed and lay open immediately above and below the point where the pent-up waters first overflowed in great volume into revolutionary channels, no book is more commendable than this.

John Robison was one of Scotland's great and noble souls who have thought first of all of the interests of Christ's Kingdom on earth, then of the welfare and prosperity of their fellows, and minded least of all their private concerns and pleasures. Born at Bog Hall in the County of Stirling in 1739, he became, says Sir James Mackintosh, one of "the greatest mathematical philosophers of his age". A graduate of the University of Glasgow, he served with considerable distinction in many parts of the world, till in 1773, while engaged on important work in Russia for Catherine (the Great), he was appointed Professor of Natural Philosophy in the University of Edinburgh; and in 1783 he was elected Secretary to the Royal Society of Edinburgh. He died in 1805. One of his most intimate friends, James Watt the inventor of the steam engine, said of him, "He was a man of the clearest head and the most science of anybody I have ever known". In days to come, as the

great revolutionary movement now sweeping over the world gets better understood, probably no work of Robison's will stand quite so high as that above-named. As temperate as it is incisive, as well balanced as genuinely documented, it will carry overwhelming conviction to all seriously-minded people more or less alarmed at the progress of world revolution in our time.

Here we can quote but a couple of its more outstanding statements, which go near the heart of the conspiracy, as Professor Robison saw it. On pages 11 and 12, of the 1st edition, he says:—

I have been able to trace attempts made through a course of fifty years under the specious pretext of enlightening the world by the torch of philosophy, and of dispelling the clouds of civil and religious superstition which keep the nations of Europe in darkness and slavery. I have observed those doctrines gradually diffusing . . . . . till at last AN ASSOCIATION HAS BEEN FORMED for the express purpose of ROOTING OUT ALL RELIGIOUS ESTABLISHMENTS, AND OVERTURNING ALL THE EXISTING GOVERNMENTS OF EUROPE (the caps. are Robison's). I have seen this Association exerting itself zealously and systematically, till it has become almost irresistible. And I have seen the most active leaders in the French Revolution were members of this Association and conducted their movements according to its principles and by means of its instructions and assistance, *formally requested and obtained*. And lastly, I have seen that this Association still exists, and still works in secret.

In France the Illuminati had no other object (than to overturn the constitution completely and plant a democracy or oligarchy on its ruins). They accounted all Princes usurpers and tyrants, and all privileged orders as their abettors. They intended to establish a government of 'Morality' as they called it—universal 'liberty' and 'equality', 'the imprescriptible rights of Man'. At least, they pretended all this to those who were neither *Magi* nor *Regentes*. And as necessary preparations for all this they intended to root out all religion and ordinary morality, to break even the bonds of domestic life by destroying all veneration for marriage vows, and by taking the education of children out of their parents' hands. *This was all the Illuminati could teach: and this precisely France has done* (p. 375).

The President of an Academy at Caen in Normandy, a Mr. Lefranc, found among the papers of a deceased friend many documents belonging to the Order of the Illuminati, expounding its tenets and unfolding its purposes and plans. He was so alarmed that he communicated his discovery to the Archbishop of Paris, hoping he would take steps to break up the conspiracy; but in vain.

In about two years more the French Revolution began. Then, to let Professor Robison continue the story :—

On the 19th November, 1793, the Archbishop of Paris came to the Bar of the Assembly, accompanied by his Vicar and eleven other Clergymen, who there renounced their Christianity and their clerical vows : acknowledging they had played the villain for many years against their consciences, teaching what they knew to be a lie, and were now resolved to be honest men (p. 383).

Practically every main feature of the plan for world-conquest revealed in the "Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion", is contained in the papers of the conspirators whose character and doings Robison has here unmasked—to set up an absolute despotism under a cloak of "Liberty Equality and Fraternity"; to overthrow existing governments by mob attacks; the use of violence and terrorisation; a secret undermining of existing institutions; a wide-spread and very active spy system; ostensibly rival forces organised under the control of a common head, and used to create disorder in times of social unrest; persistent efforts to beget and foster discontent and envy among the poor of the community; the introduction of disputes between Christian agencies; subversion of the Christian Faith by rationalising processes; the use of fair means and foul to disqualify and discredit opponents of the Order directing the conspiracy; the control of the Press, of the Schools, and of the Postal System. One marked difference there is; while the Society of the Protocols claims—perhaps with great reason, as the result of the operations of such agencies as those lately directed by Ivar Kreuger and his gang—to have control of nearly all the gold of the world, in the seized documents written by some of the leading Illuminati there are pathetic appeals made and pitiable shifts sanctioned for the getting of money needed to carry on—the fact being that the sources, mainly in South and Central America, from which the organisers of the Illuminati had formerly drawn some tens of million pounds a year, had been closed to them in the middle of the eighteenth century.

Who were the real conspirators charged by Professor Robison? the Jesuits alone. On pages 22 to 27 he tells of their underground work in Britain during the reigns of Charles II, James II, and on

into the time of William and Mary—efforts directed to the overthrow of Protestantism and the re-establishment of Roman Catholicism as the national religion. On the Continent of Europe, when the Roman Catholic authorities had moved for the suppression of the Jesuit Order, the work of the Philosophers and Encyclopædists owed its inspiration to the Sons of Loyola (the Jesuits). He stresses (p. 6) the importance of the fact that it was “about the time the Order of Loyola was suppressed” that the Order of the Illuminati first began to operate for the objects above stated. Under ample proof he has uncovered the *fons et origo* of the whole conspiracy.

Lately in some quarters Robison has been represented as having pilloried the Jews for having taken a great part in the conspiracy. It is untrue. The only passage in the book which makes what might be thought an unkindly reference to them is p. 226, where he says the Illuminati were everywhere “fostering a narrow Jewish corporation (? clannish) spirit”. But had he written “Scottish” for “Jewish”, who would have dreamt he was thus accusing his fellow-countrymen of conspiring?

Two facts *about* the book deserve notice. When the political situation of Europe had largely settled to rest after the Battle of Waterloo, people very naturally got to think the dangers Robison and others had given warning of were quite over and gone. So perhaps it is hardly surprising that from about 1820 his biographers began to put this work of his into the shade; and soon others took to speaking disparagingly of it, as if Robison had deserved pity rather than praise for that part of his labours. Then came the time when monographs of his work took no notice of this book.

The second fact may be thought not altogether unrelated to the first. Not to speak of transatlantic issues, the first edition of the book bears a date in September 1797, and before that year ended a second had appeared. In the following year three more editions were added here. The number of copies put in circulation must therefore have been fairly large. But for long the book is hardly ever seen: even old and experienced booksellers state they had never seen a copy. Probably the number of copies left is but very

small. On the other hand, periodical advertisements have for long kept appearing for copies of the book; and in the opinion of qualified persons some of these may have come from collectors who want to destroy all available copies.

The evidence is abundant and clear that the revolutionary movement has been continuous from the eighteenth century down to our own time, mainly as a great underground current, usually showing the course it was taking by its effects upon the institutions it aimed at bringing down, and sometimes breaking out in disastrous revolutions. Of recent years tricklets from that sullen vicious stream have been finding their way, by seepage and through fissures and long-disused shafts, to the molten fiery masses underneath, causing many very terrible and alarming explosions and upheavals. Worse things, however, may yet lie ahead, when the main current shall happen to strike and sweep into

SOME GREAT VOLCANIC CRATER.

## European Dictatorships.

---

**U**NDER the above title a very trenchant book has recently appeared, written by Count Carlo Sforza, who for a number of years held diplomatic posts in several European countries till he became Foreign Secretary in the Government of Italy. Later, he was Italian Ambassador to France when Mussolini executed his Fascist coup in 1922, who then offered him a position in the Fascist Regime, endeavouring to rope him in as a supporter. But the Count, being persuaded that the real aims of Fascism agreed far less with his own views and feelings than its declared intentions—even these being in many respects a negation of what Sforza had worked for throughout his life, an annulment of all Cavour and Mazzini and Garibaldi had toiled and suffered for on Italy's behalf—and having no intention to play the traitor to himself or to his proposed new masters, went out into the wilderness till the wheels of time should have taken another turn.

“ I resigned ” says he (p. 9), “ the very day the dictator came to power in my country, and maintained my resignation despite his written requests to resume office. I may well add that it was clear to all impartial observers that under a dictatorship capable agents stand no chance, unless they debased themselves by a simulated servility and never ventured frankly to disapprove policies they considered baneful, . . . Dictatorship is organised mob-rule, and often it involves organised lynch-laws ”.

A man of wide experience and sterling integrity, the writer shows himself also a man of sound judgment. When then in his preface (p. viii) he speaks of “ the links which unite the dictatorial landscape from Rome to Moscow, from Warsaw to Budapest ”, there is a suggestion that he proposes to reveal some of the ramifications of that same conspiracy Professor John Robison so ably exposed at the end of the eighteenth century. Indirectly, and to some extent quite effectively, he does so, but without even touching on whether the dictatorships he discusses are but phases of a great conspiracy. Generally, he confines himself to an examination of dictatorship, as seen in various European lands since the close of the War. He scrutinises and exposes the effects, or symptoms, of the disease, leaving it to others to trace out and demonstrate its cause.

His survey takes in Italy, Hungary, Jugoslavia, Poland, Russia, Turkey, and Spain ; and he has a chapter on the trend of events in Germany, where already, under a cloaked but virtual dictatorship, things seem shaping towards a more open and more rigorous despotism, with an anti-Jewish policy inspired by an intense hatred of the Jews—a phase of things which the Count notes as a feature of Fascist policy wheresoever Fascism has taken root. He has no difficulty in showing that, while the conditions facilitating the introduction of dictatorships in those lands were of the most diverse kind, the dictators, once in power, display a marked similarity both of aims and of means to attain them. If by “the links which unite the dictatorial landscape” he meant merely this similarity of aims and methods, he would hardly have thrown out the hints which here and there occur. Thus, in speaking of the origins of the Fascist movement, with particular reference to D’Annunzio’s contribution to Fascism, he pours scorn on “the empty conjuring up of Rome’s old glories, as it had been during the two centuries of Jesuit domination”—a broad suggestion that in his mind Fascism is very definitely linked up with that former Jesuit domination.

It is as needless as here it would be impossible to summarise the Count’s opinions of any but the Italian dictatorship. Of that, however, he speaks with most authority. His estimate of the character of Mussolini he conveys by recalling occurrences, in some of which the Duce is seen in braggadocio, and in others as the rather feckless tool of those he pretends to command. “Mussolini declared for violence in order to remain head of a party of violents” (p. 23). “Many even of those who had recently suffered from Fascist violence hoped the man would prove better than his followers, and would bring them to heel. But this general atmosphere of benevolent expectancy presupposed one condition—that Mussolini was an independent man, not the mere tool of a faction” (p. 25). Early in 1925 he “filled Rome and all the chief towns of Italy with ianatic gangs drawn from the Fascist underworld”, a reminiscence of “what Paris must have been in the days of the Terror”, in which Fascism “had the whole criminal element of the country on its side” (p. 36). By the autumn of 1926 the Fascisti had imposed “such an oppression as Czarist Russia never witnessed” (p. 38). Having on p. 5 noted that the writers who

acclaimed Fascism as heaven-sent were the very men who in pre-war days had been wont to identify GOD with the State (or nation). Sforza quotes (p. 39), from another anti-Fascist writer, a forecast of what seems almost certain to befall the Italian Monarchy and the Papacy once Fascism has sufficiently secured itself to be able to wipe them out of existence.

The Count's views as to the bearings of present things on the future of Fascism and of the Papacy in Italy may be gathered from such passages as these :—

“ The Fascist Revolution is a gigantic house of cards which may remain standing for any length of time, but may equally fall at any moment ; and its builders live inside it with buoyant phrases on their lips, but with quaking hearts ” (p. 41).

“ The Fascist Dictatorship, by the suppression of every political and personal liberty, has created a revolutionary peril where none existed before the triumph of Fascism ” (p. 63).

“ The destruction of all the free and representative institutions has already made it possible to lay down the elements of another form of struggle, which would have seemed inconceivable in the free tolerant Italy of yesterday ; I mean, the awakening of a strong anti-Vatican feeling as the result of the Lateran Treaties of February, 1929 (p. 66).

“ Verily, no enemies of the Catholic Church ever laid the foundations of future violence in the religious world so successfully as did the negotiators of the Lateran Treaties of 1929 ” (p. 69).

By a masterly stroke Sforza pricks the Fascist balloon by giving in full Mussolini's demands embodied in a “ Manifesto ” issued in 1919. It reads :—

1. A National Constituent Assembly, as the Italian section of an International Constituent Assembly of peoples, to proceed to a radical transformation of the political and economic bases of community life.
2. Proclamation of the Italian Republic. Decentralisation of the Executive power ; autonomous administration of regions and communes by means of their own legislative organs. Sovereignty of the people, exercised through a universal, equal, and direct franchise of citizens of both sexes, the people to reserve to themselves the initiative of referendum and veto.
3. Abolition of the Senate. Abolition of the political police. Magistrates to be elected independently of the Executive power.
4. Abolition of all titles of nobility and of all orders of knighthood.
5. Abolition of compulsory service.
6. Liberty of opinion, of conscience, of religion, associations, the press.

7. An education system of schools, general and professional, open to all.
8. The maximum of attention to social hygiene.
9. Dissolution of industrial and financial limited companies. Suppression of every kind of speculation, of Banks, and Stock Exchanges.
10. Census and taxation of private wealth. Confiscation of unproductive revenue.
11. Prohibition of labour by children under 16 years of age. Eight-hour day.
12. Reorganisation of production on a co-operative basis and direct sharing in the profits by all the workers.
13. Abolition of secret diplomacy.
14. International policy opened to and inspired by the solidarity of peoples, and their independence in a Confederation of States.

Persons conversant with the writings of the Illuminati will very readily recognise the source of this pretentious document. And readers of the "Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion" need not be told why the actions of the Italian Fascists have belied these Mussolini touches as badly as the course of the French Revolution belied the lip-service paid by the French philosophers and the Illuminati to "Liberty Equality and Fraternity".

What then are the prospects of the Fascist Regime, as Count Sforza sees them? A new revolutionary peril where none had existed in Italy before the triumph of Fascism, a great insurgence of the people generally, perhaps after Fascism shall have exterminated the Italian Monarchy and the Church of Rome in "an anti-clerical reaction such as in Italy has never been seen"—an insurgence which will sweep Fascism completely out of existence.

Far apart as Russian Bolshevism and Italian Fascism may seem to the unwary and the thoughtless, none who read this book with any measure of attention can fail to perceive their close kinship. Both are ruthless despotisms. Aiming at a common objective, they strive to attain it by the use of very much the same means. To those who have given very close attention to the wider aspects of the case, the book presents a valuable and impressive view of a present-day phase of

## Cyclone, Blizzard, Typhoon, Tornado.

USUALLY about the middle of June on the Western Ghats of India may be witnessed some phenomena of Nature in her wilder moods. A startling crash of thunder calls the eye to the highest peak of the range. There already a cloud is seen capping the peak, and out of that thick cloud streams of lightning are almost incessantly flashing forth in every direction amid continuous thunderings. Rapidly the cloud falls lower and lower, till like a blanket it hides the mountain from view. Wider and wider grows the area of that flashing bellowing cloud. Nearer and nearer it comes, sweeping over the intervening valleys with a majesty defying all description. At length it is over and about us. All is darkness save for the blinding light of its flashes. The windows of heaven open in that stygian-like darkness.

The portent is so well known that on the first alarming peal the natives everywhere take to their heels and for dear life instantly flee to some accessible shelter till the worst of the hurricane has passed, thence to escape home in the first temporary abatement. Such is the *Andhi* (or Cyclone) which year by year announces the breaking of the Monsoon in India; and woe betide the laggard who neglects the first token that Nature has once again taken the bit in her teeth! Let it serve as a parable which may be aptly applied to our own situation to-day.

With so many striking successes obtained in the aftermath of the War, it must have seemed very natural to the Jesuit Camarilla to think the time already ripe to strike for the conquest and subjection of the British Empire. England being, as a spokesman of theirs said long ago, "the head of Protestantism, the centre of its movements and the stronghold of its power, weakened in England it is paralysed everywhere; conquered in England it is conquered throughout the world". To those who so wished and planned what could seem more fitting or timely at such a juncture than that an assault should next be made on Britain, beginning forthwith.

In 1925 it became perfectly plain that the skirmishing had commenced. Everywhere the conspirators were busy stirring up the Labour Unions to join in a General Strike, so as to throw the

wheels of British life out of gear and paralyse her Government's powers of action. Everywhere groups of rowdy Fascists and Communists were let loose to fly at each others' throats in preparation for THE DAY when, in the General Strike, they would combine and fall on the loyal citizens. That autumn things looked dark indeed for Britain's peace and prosperity; and if her enemy felt assured of being on the eve of his first great success, he had much reason on his side.

But in certain particulars he had seriously miscalculated, as the Amalekite enemy of the Jews had done in the days of King Ahasuerus. When, on the gibbet he had erected for the execution of Mordecai, Haman the son of Hammedatha had met death and been vanquished, all men got to see he had miscalculated. And by midsummer 1926 we too became aware that the organisers of the General Strike of May that year had similarly miscalculated, and that their elaborate preparations had badly miscarried. The first assault made failed ignominiously.

Forthwith a second was launched at a point where the enemy forces had been so concentrated, and ours so greatly weakened by treachery, that his success seemed almost inevitable, just as the French Revolution became inescapable when the flower of the French Army, formed and maintained as the foundation of the Throne, ratted and went over to the revolutionaries. Since the Reformation the Church of England had formed the Brigade of Guards surrounding the Throne of Protestantism. But for nearly a century the loyalty of this brigade had been undergoing a steady process of attrition, till many of its officers had become so unfaithful to their vows (in virtue of which they held their commissions), and so adverse to the Protestantism they were enrolled to maintain, that twice they importuned the High Court of Parliament to sanction their dire treachery and approve that false form of Christianity against which Britain had revolted and from which the British Churches had cut clean away in the sixteenth century. In this culminating act of treachery those conspirators had the support of all the forces the Vanguard could command in every department of the State and in all the Churches of our land—a host more influential than numerous, great indeed as its numbers were.

But a second time it proved the enemy had miscalculated. Twice over Parliament decisively rejected the proposals of the conspirators, and our Nation generally became stirred to its depths over the treacherous attack on what it counted dearest and most sacred in our great heritage.

Within three years came a third mass attack at a point the enemy (judging by his own measure) probably deemed the citadel of our strength—our monetary and economic systems. The authors of the *Protocols* say that, when they attack a nation, they would cripple it financially by withdrawing its supplies of gold, and thus paralyse it economically, so as to bring about a revolution. Such economic crises, we are told, would be created by making a run on the ready money of the country attacked, so as to throw crowds of unemployed workers on the streets who, led by secret revolutionary agents, would soon commence to slaughter the Rulers and plunder the wealthy.

In the middle of July, 1931, Britain was rudely startled by the opening stage of such an attack. In the space of ten days or so some thirty millions of the gold held by the Bank of England were whisked off to foreign countries, and a worldwide impression was created that British finance was in parlous condition and British credit falling fast to zero. Within two months some two hundred millions of English gold went overseas, till on September 18/19 nearly twenty-eight millions in gold or in credits taken on a gold basis were transported away.

But within a few weeks there were distinct signs that this third attack had reached its climax and nearly spent its force; and in the months that have intervened since then there have been many evidences that the attack had not got near the foundations of British credit. And as for gold, one happy effect of the attack has been seen in our having learnt that some dross, scooped out of the bowels of the earth, is not a thing of highest value, but in a true scale of values is but mere tinsel trash. Perhaps the world too has been learning that in this third attack our enemy, far from having been able to touch the citadel of British credit and power, has nearly laid in ruins the citadel of his own power and pride, as is evident from such repercussions as the Ivar Kreuger affair. But, indeed, is

it not written that the time is coming when, "as for gold, men will no more delight in it"?

Though these three successive assaults have failed, there are unmistakable evidences that the enemy has not given up all thought of renewed attacks at the same points, and it would be foolhardy to slacken vigilance at any one of them. Besides, on his own showing, he still has at least four or five other lines of attack. The troubles in our Navy at the end of last year—to name, first, one of the most important—should remind us that both the French and the Russian Revolutions became inevitable when their respective Armies had been corrupted by the revolutionaries; the German, when their Navy ratted.

Another has come into view in the late rioting at Glasgow, Dundee, Liverpool, and now in London also—the rioters in every case being largely drawn from Southern Ireland, elements as hostile to Britain as they are pliant in the hands of the enemy whose campaign is here exposed.

A third is the "removal"—by poison, by steel, by fire—of outstanding champions of the Cause the conspirators are attacking.

A fourth is War against any country which proves itself otherwise impervious to the measures of "peaceful penetration" taken by the conspirators.

And a fifth threatened is "a Universal War"—still no impossibility.

Meantime it stands that the attacks already made, in some ways perhaps the most dangerous, have failed miserably and utterly; and in the last of the three the enemy had to fall back with his right arm broken and useless. The whole campaign, be it said, has been none of our choosing. But is it altogether either to our credit or to our advantage that hitherto we have been on the defensive only? The secret of successful warfare is ever to take and hold the initiative in attack. When, then, some of Britain's Christian leaders undertake to attack in downright earnest, humbly trusting in our Almighty Lord and Saviour, as did a Paul, a Wycliffe, a Knox, a Wesley, then may we find that

GOD EVER FAVOURS THE BRAVE.

## A Grand Crisis Imminent.

---

**I**N the world at large the progress of the revolutionary movement since the beginning of the present century, and its ever-accelerating pace, seem more than enough to convince all thoughtful observers that we are very near a tremendous climax in world-affairs. The disturbances that keep multiplying nearly everywhere and the growing unrest from which none seem exempt suggest the likelihood of far greater upheavals than we have yet seen. We live in an atmosphere heavily charged with vague but impressively mysterious voices telling we know not what, nor how—such an atmosphere as those are familiar with who have lived through great catastrophes, moral, political, or seismological. Only now the portents and the atmosphere have ceased to be confined to some particular locality; they are world-wide.

This prevalent unrest is by some ascribed mainly to an awakening of the peoples generally to aspire to better social conditions and higher political ideals. Others blame the economic and financial dislocations which have affected so injuriously the world's capacity for trade. And many are firmly persuaded that nothing has contributed to the general unsettlement nearly so much as the alarming decay of Christian faith and hope and love, whereby genuine Christianity has largely ceased to be "the salt of the earth". There is, doubtless, much truth in each of those assertions, as there is also in what is said about various other causes of the unrest; and certainly the third cause above-mentioned goes very close to the tap-root of all the world troubles. But the view advanced in these pages is that there is a specific primary cause behind all these subordinate causes; and many evidences have been produced as to the identity and the character of that Primary Cause, showing when and how it had brought those subordinate causes into play—which leads to the natural inference that they will be overcome and done away only when it shall have been put out of action. There is also a further direct inference from the facts proved, namely, that the conspiracy here laid bare is likely to be crushed and broken up only when those directing it shall have brought things to a head in a general engagement of forces. There is every reason to believe that engagement, when it takes place, will prove to be the grand climax of affairs, and will eventuate as Christians wish and hope.

For it is here that Christian people possess an overwhelming advantage. For though, according to all merely human methods of calculation, the approaching crisis may seem certain to issue in the realisation of the conspirators' hopes and plans, the prophecies of the Bible, which long ago foretold the coming of such a world-crisis in "the last days" of this age and that it would take place within the life-time of the generation which should see the various clearly-specified signs that have sprung into being within the last score of years or so—those prophecies also predict that the great struggle at the end of this age will eventuate in a complete and permanent overthrow of that confederation of evil powers which has propagated the mystery of iniquity.

The conflict for which the irreligious forces of the world seem steadily to be preparing will be, as all the great prophecies show, the prelude to the coming again of Christ with power and great glory; and it will end in the total destruction of the agencies of lawlessness—an "everlasting destruction". Fearful indeed are some of the New Testament forecasts of this, and none more so than those which fell from the lips of Him who came to earth, not to judge the world, but that the world through Him might be saved. Especially terrifying must these be to those who have seen the destruction and carnage of the battlefield. Yet, horrifying as is the tenor of those predictions, however they may be fulfilled—that they will be effected in the spirit and to the letter, what Christian believer can in the least doubt?—we must be cautious and circumspect both to collate them with other prophecies far different in tenor and to read them in the light of all God has revealed as to His ways of exercising mercy even in the execution of the strictest justice.

Some parts of Scripture, for example, connect the future coming of our Lord with an antecedent general revival of pure and undefiled religion. Thus Peter, addressing his own nation soon after the Day of Pentecost, exhorted them one and all to repent and turn unto the Lord, "that so there may come the seasons of refreshing from the presence of the Lord; and that He may send the Christ, even Jesus: whom the heaven must receive until the times of restoration of all things". Predictions like this must be taken side by side with those that foretell the destruction of the wicked when our Lord appears again.

How illuminating in this connection and how highly encouraging to Christian love and pity and hope is the Book of Jonah! That prophet of the Lord had been sent to the great and very wicked city of Nineveh to deliver this fearful message, "Yet forty days, and Nineveh shall be overthrown". But on hearing the terrible doom pronounced upon them, the rulers and people of Nineveh repented and put their wickedness far from them. In their ceasing to be evil any more, the destruction of the wicked city Nineveh was accomplished, just as when Paul says (Rom. 6<sup>6</sup>) that the body of sin may be destroyed in Christian believers still living on earth, he means that the body is then delivered from the dominion of sin. So, when Nineveh ceased to be a wicked city, God repented of the evil He said He would do unto it; and He did it not. If then a result so merciful was obtained under the Old Covenant by the preaching of a prophet who seems to have had but scant sympathy with God's purpose of kindness and mercy in sending him to deliver His message, what encouragement is given the followers of Him who came not to destroy men's lives, but to save them! For, according to the Christian view, even the sternest message of doom applies primarily, not to the sinner, be he ever so sinful, but to his sin. If only he can be separated from his sin, the sentence of of destruction flashed upon him will thereby have been executed in full, and in the way God likes best.

Well therefore may we reflect for a brief moment on what will certainly be another phase of the great crisis fast approaching—the aspect presented in such predictions as these: "It shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will pour out my Spirit on all flesh" (Acts 2<sup>17</sup>). "And so all Israel shall be saved; as it is written, There shall come out of Zion the Deliverer, who shall turn ungodliness away from Jacob: for this is my covenant unto them when I shall take away their sins" (Rom. 11<sup>26-7</sup>). "Now, if the fall of them (the Israelites) be the riches of the world, and the diminishing of them the riches of the Gentiles; how much more their fulness? . . . For if the casting away of them be the reconciling of the world, what shall the receiving back of them be but life from the dead?" (Rom. 11<sup>12-15</sup>).

There then stand two sides, apparently parallel, of what will occur at or near our Lord's return to earth. How they will both

be made to fit into the same building, perhaps the event alone can show. Enough for us that both are predicted, one as clearly as the other; and that it is ours to interpret God's warnings concerning vengeance in the above sense. Ours too it is to arm ourselves and to alarm others against the trials sure to come in the dark days preceding our Lord's appearing, the calamities and distresses which portend the nearness of His coming again with power and great glory.

Although the world is soon to be given to Christ, says an old writer, yet *there shall come a dark day first*. Our great enemy still holds the dominion of this world. Though overcome, he is not yet dispossessed. The strong man armed is still able to spoil its goods. At times made to feel the might of a stronger arm than his own, like a chafed lion he then rises up in wrath. . . . As the time approaches when Christianity shall fill the whole earth, and all men shall be brought into subjection to Christ, the rage of our great enemy will surely become more rampant. Then will he make the last grand rally of his forces, and never yield while there is yet a forlorn hope. For a moment Zion will be covered with clouds in that terrible encounter. But Christ shall then break through them to bring forth His bride, fair as the moon, clear as the sun, and terrible as an army with banners.

In preparation for THAT DAY, let the watchword be "Victory and Conquest". If in many Christian hearts the Spirit of God beget a yearning love and tender solicitude for the salvation of those now ranked in battle array to smite us, God will grant the desires of their hearts and show His way to

### VICTORY AND CONQUEST.

## Heavenly Light.

---

THE remark of a friend that, liking greatly to converse with Christians who often read the Book of the Revelation, he yet tried to give as wide a berth as possible to any who claimed to be able to expound it, was not so paradoxical as might at first sight appear. For in that Book, as in the realm of Nature around us, there are elements of two vastly different kinds, some perfectly intelligible to every reasonable being, others whose constitution and meaning are wrapped up in the deepest mystery. We speak of those earthly things as the plain facts and the mysteries of life. But in the things of the Book of the Revelation there is a third class also, belonging in part to each of those two categories though it cannot fairly be said to lie between them. It is composed of the mysteries whose unfolding is the main purpose of the Book—the mysteries it does in fact reveal to every sincere Christian believer. This third class is made up of *the facts of faith*.

If then in closing these articles we can link up some of the facts of faith as they appear in the Book of the Revelation with some of the plain facts of life, our brief study may be to our great advantage.

The divisions of the Book into chapters and verses is comparatively modern, made for convenience' sake. It does not belong to the original. Yet in it these divisions seem to correspond wonderfully well with its subject matter.

Its habitual readers must have noticed there are broader divisions also. At the beginning there are three chapters which constitute the prologue of the Book. And the three chapters at the end form its epilogue. The former deals with things existing at the time the Apostle John wrote the Book. The latter relates events to take place subsequent to the coming again of Christ with power and great glory. The intervening sixteen chapters contain a prophetic survey of the course of the Christian Church between those two termini.

Attentive readers of the Book can scarcely have failed to observe that these sixteen chapters are themselves divided up, at

the end of the eleventh, into two fairly equal portions. For in the eleventh chapter, as again in the nineteenth, the future coming of our Lord to take possession of the kingdoms of this world is expressly foretold. If then we now assume hypothetically this division of this the main part of the Book, it is to be observed that, whereas in the first half (chaps. IV. to XI.) we read of the opening of the seven seals and under the seventh seal the sounding of the seven trumpets, in the second half (Chaps. XII. to XIX.) we hear seven mighty angels uttering their great voices and under the seventh great voice the pouring out of the seven bowls of God's wrath on the earth, which in the expending complement the fury of the Divine vengeance on disobedient and evil men.

A close comparison of the two halves with one another will leave little or no doubt that, from different angles, they give two views of the same subject. But the full force and meaning of this can be felt only when each pair of symbols—a seal and a great voice; a trumpet and a bowl—is set side by side. It will then be seen that every pair relates to one and the selfsame subject, usually presenting two different chronological parts, and in one case two antithetical parts. Let them be briefly stated here:—

*The First Seal*—Rev. 6<sup>1-2</sup>.

Christ rides forth on a white horse, conquering and to conquer.

*Second Seal*—Rev. 6<sup>3-4</sup>.

Judgment being executed, by War, on the wicked of the earth.

*Third Seal*—Rev. 6<sup>5-6</sup>.

Privation to the wicked, protection to the good.

*Fourth Seal*—Rev. 6<sup>7-8</sup>.

Fearful afflictions fall on the wicked within the Church.

*Fifth Seal*—Rev. 6<sup>9-11</sup>.

The souls of those slain for the Word of God appear praying under the altar.

*The First Voice*—Rev. 14<sup>2-5</sup>.

The hundred and forty-four thousand follow Christ, arrayed in white.

*Second Voice*—Rev. 14<sup>6-8</sup>.

Judgment being executed on the wicked Babylonians.

*Third Voice*—Rev. 14<sup>9-12</sup>.

Torment for the Babylonians, comfort and blessing to God's people.

*Fourth Voice*—Rev. 14<sup>13</sup>.

Rest and blessedness made to abound to faithful followers of Christ.

*Fifth Voice*—Rev. 14<sup>14-16</sup>.

The harvest of the earth reaped—a great ingathering of God's folk at the mowing-down time.

*Sixth Seal*—Rev. 6<sup>12-17</sup>.  
One of the Great Days of God's wrath begins on earth.

Here an *interlude* (Chap. VII.), in which the faithful servants of God are sealed in the forehead.

*Seventh Seal*—Rev. 8<sup>1-6</sup>.  
The seven angels with the seven trumpets sent forth to sound.

*The First Trumpet*—Rev. 8<sup>7</sup>.  
Plagues sent "upon the earth".

*Second Trumpet*—Rev. 8<sup>8-9</sup>.  
Plagues sent "into the sea".

*Third Trumpet*—Rev. 8<sup>10-11</sup>.  
Plagues fall "on the rivers and fountains of water".

*Fourth Trumpet*—Rev. 8<sup>12-13</sup>.  
Sun, moon, and stars smitten.

*Fifth Trumpet*—Rev. 9<sup>1-12</sup>.  
Apollyon, fallen from heaven, establishes his throne on earth.

*Sixth Trumpet*—Rev. 9<sup>13-21</sup>.  
Loosing the Powers surrounding "the great river Euphrates."

*Interlude* here (Rev. 10<sup>1-11</sup>), containing loud warning of grand crisis to ensue immediately.

*Seventh Trumpet*—Rev. 11<sup>15-19</sup>.  
The kingdoms of this world become the kingdom of our Lord.

*Sixth Voice*—Rev. 14<sup>17-20</sup>.  
The winepress of the great wrath of God is trodden on the earth.

Here an *interlude* (Chap. XV.), in which God's faithful witnesses appear in a most joyful triumph.

*Seventh Voice*—Rev. 16<sup>1</sup>.  
The seven angels with the seven bowls commanded to go and pour out their bowls.

*The First Bowl*—Rev. 16<sup>2</sup>.  
Poured out "upon the earth".

*Second Bowl*—Rev. 16<sup>3</sup>.  
Poured out "upon the sea".

*Third Bowl*—Rev. 16<sup>4-7</sup>.  
Poured out "upon the rivers and fountains of water".

*Fourth Bowl*—Rev. 16<sup>8-9</sup>.  
Poured out "upon the sun".

*Fifth Bowl*—Rev. 16<sup>10-11</sup>.  
Poured out "upon the throne of the beast".

*Sixth Bowl*—Rev. 16<sup>12-14</sup>.  
Poured out "upon the great river Euphrates".

*Interlude* here (Rev. 16<sup>15-16</sup>), in which the midnight cry goes forth.

**BEHOLD THE BRIDEGROOM.**

*Seventh Bowl*—Rev. 16<sup>17-21</sup>.  
Consummation of all things announced by the Proclamation "IT IS DONE".

Such is the skeleton framework of the building whose plans are given in the main portion of the Book of the Revelation. It is but a skeleton, consisting of two rows of pillars, one on what may fitly be called the eastern side of the building and the other on its western. Or it might be termed a twofold sketch of the Church of Christ, from two quite different points of view outlining the things which would befall it from the end of the first century till

the still future return of our Lord. The first portrait presents the Church as being primarily Israelite in character, and only secondarily Gentile. The innumerable multitude of Gentile martyrs follow, both in the divine order of precedence and in point of time, the hundred and forty-four thousand of the twelve tribes of Israel. But in the New Testament is not this the view of the Church uniformly presented, as consisting of a Hebrew nucleus with a Gentile body surrounding that nucleus? A close study of the Apostolic Writings cannot fail to create what further study will but help to deepen—an impression that this is the truly divine order of the Church's constitution. The seals and trumpets appear to foretell the lot of the Church so constituted up to the time when Christ will come again to take possession of the kingdom.

In Chapters XII. to XIX. we see the Church from a very different point of view. The narrative opens with *the birth of the man child*. As to the meaning of that Bishop Newton has noted a most significant fact, perhaps decisive even. The Emperor Constantine was converted to Christianity in 313 A.D., just 280 years from the time when the Church received the Holy Spirit on the Day of Pentecost. Now, "as the time of gestation from the conception to the birth of a child is known to be 40 weeks or 280 days", says Bishop Newton, "so, according to the prophetic reckoning of a day for a year, from the first rise of our Saviour's kingdom in 33 A.D. to the year 313 was exactly 280 years". If this is the true interpretation of Rev. XII., it suggests several things—that the Emperor Constantine, in his capacity of protector of the Christians, was Heaven-sent; that his term in that office was but short; that his successors in office adopted a different policy—Chapter XIII. tells of the rising of the first beast from "out of the sea", followed by the rising of the second beast, also called "the false prophet", from "out of the earth", indicating that the early promise of Constantine's time had been nipped in the bud; that under his successors the nominal church became officially perverted, while the real Church was driven out "into the wilderness"; and that the view of the official church given in this second half of the prophecies concerning it shows how it sank to the status of one of the kingdoms of this world.

To put those two views of the Church side by side again—we have the history of its eastern face presented in Chapters IV. to XI., showing the vicissitudes through which it must pass in its original and diviner character; and in Chapters XII. to XIX. we trace the course it was to follow and did follow on the western front, where it adopted a policy of earthly sensual devilish wisdom, and became just the reverse of all our Saviour intended it to be.

Our space limits do not permit any detailed survey of the facts of faith embodied in this main portion of the Book. But there is a historical interpretation of the meaning of “the seven bowls of the wrath of God” which will greatly interest most readers and ought not to be omitted. In the year 1701 the Rev. Robert Fleming, then a minister of the Church of Scotland in London, published a little book entitled “Rise and Fall of the Papacy”, giving an exposition of the meaning and application of the Seven Vials or Bowls. In it Mr. Fleming, having explained the previous stages of the execution of God’s wrath upon the Latin Church up to that time (1701), from Rev. 16<sup>8-9</sup> (the pouring out of the Fourth Bowl upon the sun) drew “a conjecture” that *the French Monarchy*, the mainstay of the papacy for about a thousand years, *would be extinguished not later than the year 1794*—that is, 1260 years from 534 A.D., when the Emperor Justinian had appointed the Bishop of Rome chief spokesman of the whole Christian Church. Many years after Mr. Fleming had gone to rest from his labours that “conjecture” was verified to the letter.

The outpouring of the Fifth Bowl “upon the throne of the beast” was due, he thought, to culminate in 1848—in retrospect seen as one of the most memorable years in European history, when the Pope, dreading the revolutionary forces threatening him on all sides, fled from Rome disguised as a lackey. That period, covered by the Fifth Bowl, appears to terminate in 1870, the very year in which the Pope’s Temporal Sovereignty was extinguished.

In the next period (Sixth Bowl) God’s judgment’s on the Moslem Power are executed. As to *when* the Turkish Kaliphate would be abolished, Mr. Fleming has no conjecture. But he has stated his full conviction that immediately after its destruction the agents of “mystical Babylon” would succeed in creating a great League of

Nations germane with "their idolatrous and spurious Christianity"—a League aiming at complete dominion over the whole world. Then, says Mr. Fleming, "when the forces of this apostate confederacy shall have been brought to that place of battle which is called *Armageddon*—that is, the place where there will be a most diabolically cunning and powerful conspiracy against Christ's followers—then immediately will the seventh angel pour out his vial, to their utter ruin and destruction".

Heaven's multitudes then lift up their voices (Rev. 19<sup>6-9</sup>), "saying, Hallelujah: for the Lord our God, the Almighty, reigneth. Let us rejoice and be exceeding glad, and let us give the glory unto Him: for the marriage of the Lamb is come, and His wife hath made herself ready.

"And it was given unto her that she should array herself in fine linen, bright and pure: for the fine linen is the righteous acts of the saints.

"And he saith unto me, Write, Blessed are they which are bidden to

THE MARRIAGE SUPPER OF THE LAMB".

## Epilogue.

---

Face to face in the world to-day stand two wholly incompatible and mutually destructive orders of civilisation, each aiming at sole supremacy, so that, when one shall have gained its objective, the other must perforce go down and perish. Both may be said to have sprung from the Latin form of civilisation which covered Western and Central Europe up to the sixteenth century, though neither is properly of the same stock with it. Were hybrids fertile, and had a pair of these propagated offspring of the two distinct species from which it had itself sprung, the result would be nearly analogous to the rise of the two orders of civilisation now under review. Only, in this case there had never been any true hybridisation; it would be nearer the mark to say that two distinct and widely different races had sprung from a common mother, but of two fathers who had little or nothing in common.

**Our British Civilisation.** The older of those two types of civilisation, which in the sixteenth century took shape in the Northern half of Western Europe, was created and moulded by a revival of Bible religion, such as had prevailed in the Christian churches in apostolic and sub-apostolic times. Its ruling principle was that both governors and governed should freely order their lives and their relations with one another by Bible precepts, especially by the teachings of the New Testament. Here in Britain the principle took expression in the idea, which by degrees got embodied in a settled order, that the Legislature of the land should be constituted by the free choice of its responsible citizens, with the Executive absolutely subject to the duly-elected Legislature; and that the Sovereign, advised by a Privy Council, should be the fountainhead of justice for all and each, to be administered according to the New Testament—his own person and office being held inviolably sacred and free from interference, so long as he acted and ruled on those Christian principles. To some extent those features of British civilisation had existed in pre-Reformation times; but they had been overlaid by other elements which by and by took shape in that newer Continental order of civilisation which arose in the eighteenth century.

On the Continent the predominant feature of the pre-Reformation civilisation had been *Autocracy*—not a single and harmonious autocracy, but two-headed, with Popes and Emperors clashing and striving with one another almost perpetually from the time the Papacy had become powerful enough to vie with the Empire for supremacy. Britain being outside the Empire, though for obvious reasons English (and to a less extent Scottish) sympathies had been with the Emperors, she had but seldom taken any very active part in the quarrels between the Papacy and the Empire—neither in England nor in Scotland had there been any great love for autocratic rule, papal or imperial. From the sixteenth century our Island held the Pope as much an alien as the Emperor.

**Rise of the New Continental Civilisation.** Three consequences of the separation made in the sixteenth century had far-reaching, and in combination decisive, effects on the older Continental civilisation. The withdrawal of the forces making for a freer order of life removed the most effective check on Autocracy. It also greatly weakened the Emperor's position, and correspondingly strengthened that of the Pope. And chiefly, it led to the formation of the Company of Jesus, the most autocratic body ever seen on earth, whose Chiefs were soon at the head of the Latin world, directing all affairs, civil and ecclesiastical. For a century and a half, under Jesuit rule autocracy on the one hand became more than ever domineering and tyrannical, and on the other gave itself over to loose living—a combination far from uncommon. Thereby the nations of Latin Christendom steadily deteriorated till the early eighteenth century, when they essayed to lay the axe to the roots of Jesuitism.

The blows by which that upas-tree was then hewn down soon proved all but fatal to the hewers. The thunderous crash of its fall had not ceased resounding ere the rumblings were heard of the earthquake which, started by the electric currents released by the falling tree, shook the earth and the heavens of that hoary Latin world. Out of a crater pierced from within the Latin Church and opened in the premier State of Latin Christendom, the French Revolution erupted its fire and smoke and fumes upon

Europe, scattering its dust and ashes over the whole earth; and under that smoke screen the new order of Continental civilisation gradually emerged. That volcanic activity, as the subsequent history of France shows, has characterised that newer civilisation to this day. Strife and hatreds, turmoil and wars, intrigue and revolutions are become endemic there and wheresoever the Latin Church has been rooted. It seems to exist and perpetuate itself but by revolutions engineered by secret societies and underhand methods. It extends by insinuating its disguised agents into every society and community. Its spy system seems ubiquitous. In each area its agents speak its language even when using the terms of speech current among those whose institutions it attacks and means to destroy.

**The Revival Of Jesuitism.** One of the most disastrous effects of the earthquakes that devastated Europe at the close of the eighteenth and beginning of the nineteenth centuries was the Pope's decision to revive the Society of Jesus. This he did in 1814, and put the Jesuits in command of the positions which gave them complete control of the Latin Church. One very momentous outcome of this change was soon seen in the widespread diffusion of their Theory of Development—a doctrine which, crystallising certain elements which for centuries had been floating loose in the atmosphere of Latin Christendom, polluted it more and more, like the gathering soot of a London fog—this doctrine destroyed completely what little hold the Latin Church till then had retained on the Christian Faith revealed in the Bible. Till the theory of development came into vogue, Roman Catholicism may be said to have pendulated, as to the seat of authority in religion, between the mind of God revealed in Holy Scripture and the mind of the Church expressed in the decrees of Councils, but ever endeavouring to maintain that the latter were infallibly true and in perfect harmony with the former. The doctrine of development now "cut the painter," first by placing the seat of authority in the mind of the Church, and not in Holy Scripture; and then by narrowing the term "the mind of the Church," to mean the mind of the Roman Pontiff alone, as head of the Church. In the course of little more than a single generation this doctrine had become

so generally accepted throughout Latin Christendom that the Vatican Council in 1870 decreed that the Roman Pontiff alone is infallible, supposing it to have been proved true by the theory of development. No better proof is needed of how thoroughly the Latin Church had then been jesuitised. But this jesuitising of that great body had yet another result not less important and far-reaching. It brought the agencies of the Latin Church into close alliance with the Revolutionary Movement. Here and there individual Roman Catholics still took the field as active opponents of every form of revolutionary activity. But they were now become amphibious creatures truly at home in neither element. As a whole, the Latin Church had surrendered itself to promote the revolutionary cause, as if she expected thereby to regain her sway in Protestant lands and to establish herself in absolute dominion over every nation on earth. To a dispassionate onlooker this may seem but mere midsummer madness. The physician sees in it such a derangement as, starting in some mesmeric trance, pursues the *ignus fatuus* on beyond the verge of the precipice, on to total destruction.

**Our British Civilisation Endangered.** For British Christians all this has a two-fold importance. The Revolutionary Movement is specially directed at the cardinal truths of Christianity, brought to light and life again in the Reformation; and against the British Empire also, which, despite delinquencies, has been God's own provision for having the glorious gospel of Jesus Christ carried far and wide, so that it should be freely published throughout the earth. That the case is essentially pathological, needs chiefly to be realised. The whole movement here surveyed presents itself as a disease—in some parts as a cancer caused by conditions that have conduced to many cells of the body politic detaching themselves from their natural allegiance and place, so that, having lost the power to function normally, they play the rebel and congregate in moribund colonies; and there is also a derangement of the brain, an unbalancing which has upset all the faculties of the body. A cure must therefore depend on a correct diagnosis of the disease.

**Several Lines Of Diagnosis.** First, we may trace the course of the disease in its earliest appearance in the French Revolution of 1789, and note how true a prototype that is of every subsequent outbreak. All the facts of that first outbreak leave little or no room to doubt it would then have overrun the earth, if in the preceding century Britain had not been inoculated with a serum derived from milder germs of the same group, and by the prophylactic course of medicine administered in the Evangelical Revival was then being pulled together at the very time the French Revolution was making its incursion. These things point very definitely to certain counter-agents.

Another line of diagnosis presents a study of the further course of the disease in France, where it became endemic. Revolution followed upon revolution, with much the same features in each, on the one hand a form of botulism depriving the Heads of State of true perception and sanity of action, and on the other a persistence of cancer colonies—the underground secret societies at work in the body politic. France in 1848 was still the world's storm-centre; but the fury of the tempest had already begun to expend itself elsewhere.

A glimpse of Paris in that year shows how uneasily the fires of revolution had been slumbering on there. Lamartine, one of the more moderate revolutionary leaders in 1848, divides the insurrectionary forces into three main lots, *the Liberals*, of whom he was one; *the Socialists*, who strove for the abolition of private property; and *the Terrorists*, men of "a fierce and turbulent spirit," "whose ideal was terror." When the Terrorist gangs had started the Revolution in February, 1848, Lamartine and other moderate leaders manœuvred (as he narrates) and manipulated the forces so as to get a provisional government established on moderate republican lines, taking such rapid decisions as the exigencies of the moment seemed to demand, then at once sending out bands of trusty henchmen to mingle with the surging mobs and raise on all sides the slogans of their self-appointed provisional government—efforts at first remarkably successful, till in June the Terrorists had rallied their forces for renewed attack. Let Lamartine continue the account:—

“The agents of the (Terrorist) Party had consulted during the night, and ere daybreak spread themselves through the various places of meeting of the conspirators, the resorts of vice, and the quarter of the indigent and ignorant, to raise and recruit the elements of a second revolutionary deluge which should devastate what the first national convulsion had spared, and demolish what the moderation of the people had established. They succeeded but too well. The universal fermentation served their designs; for all elements of the population, both sound and corrupt, had been so disturbed and confused amid the general excitement of events that it was easy to give them a new impulse and direct them at will to an insurrection that, guided by skilful and daring leaders, was accomplished by blind and involuntary agents. To impel this mass on to the destruction of the republic under the pretence of the Terrorists.”

(*History of the French Revolution of 1848*, p. 199).

The chief value of such accounts of revolutionary activities and stratagems lies in the fact that they show how entirely devoid of Christian principle and Christian conduct every branch of the revolutionary movement has been.

**The Russian Revolution.** An examination of the hundreds of books published in English dealing with the Russian Revolution is equally enlightening to the same effect. Scarcely half a score of these were written by persons outside the revolutionary movement. And it is significant that of the multitude written by people who approved of the revolution, nearly all of them having been active workers for it in the earlier stages, more than nineteen of every score condemn unsparingly the Bolshevik Regime. Each of these narratives must create a feeling in every Christian mind, which *in cumulo* the rest cannot fail to establish, that behind all the agencies openly or covertly working for revolution things have been so managed and controlled that the Russian people are being prepared, and Russian life is being remoulded, for a further enterprise to be set afoot when once the Bolshevik Regime shall in its turn have served the purpose underlying all the successive upheavals. What the ultimate goal of that purpose is, is probably adumbrated in a book, “Russia in Resurrection,” describing what it calls “the European Movement.” The writer relates (pp. 185—190):—

**NOTE.** A line near the end of the quotation at the top of this page has dropped out. The final sentence should read—

To impel this mass on to the destruction of the republic under the pretence of effecting its accomplishment was the hope of the Terrorists".

“Secret societies of practical men have been formed in many places in Russia—men without much positive theory of any kind, but united in their detestation of the Bolshevik tyranny and resolute to take advantage of the first opportunity for its overthrow. Such men did not indeed become actual members of the (Bolshevist) Dictatorship—that privilege was reserved for the Old Guard; but they became, to use a military metaphor, its seconds-in-command—they did not shape the policy of the country, but were responsible for carrying it into effect; they stood near the helm of State, though they could not as yet lay their hands on it. Across the guarded frontiers they respond, eagerly though secretly, to the overtures of their comrades. To-day Russia is looking forward, not back, to the men, not of the past, but of the future. And, as has been shown, the Leaders are there.”

The writer tells that in civil affairs the aim of this European Movement is directed to the setting up of a *properly-communistic State*; and in matters of religion it aims at introducing a modified Buddhism, embodying the essence of the cult practised in Tibet. But the real objective of the movement peeps out at almost countless crannies—to seize and hold unlimited power in Russia; and its character is shown by its readiness to employ as much craft and force as any of the parties that have striven for paramount power there.

**The German Situation.** Did space permit, a study of South and Central American affairs would help considerably towards a right diagnosis. Up to the mid-eighteenth century education in all those countries had been in the hands of the Jesuits; and thither they swarmed back over a hundred years ago. Should it seem strange then that ere the middle of last century the fires of revolution had been kindled in every Central and South American State? or that in practically every one of them revolution has been endemic ever since?

But for us the case of Germany has a much closer and more living interest, where a tremendous immediate danger seems ready to spring on Europe and sweep over the world at large any day, just as did the monetary crisis of 1931. Perhaps the acme of that danger lies in this—that one half of Germany is Roman Catholic and the other half nominally Protestant; and that, while the Roman Catholic half has been very largely jesuitised by the

means described above, Bible religion has become for several decades almost non-existent in German Protestantism through the efforts of more subtle jesuitisers, so that the effective checks upon the revolutionary forces there have been almost wholly abolished, and Facists and Communists are evidently preparing for a decisive struggle.

After outlining the stages by which Bolshevism came into power in Russia, a close observer of German affairs wrote recently that the late Chancellor, Herr Bruening, the head of the Centre (Roman Catholic) Party, had evidently played the same part for Germany that Kerensky took in the Russian Revolution, and that the Fascists, who are out for the destruction of every vestige of constitutional government, appear to be well within sight of their goal, which they may soon reach by the assistance of the Communists.

**A Startling Sidelight.** The revelations that have followed the suicide of Mr. Ivar Kreuger, the Swedish "match king," point to possibilities not a little disconcerting. The Auditors examining his affairs, besides discovering that several million pounds of the money Kreuger had command of had disappeared without a trace of anything to show where it had gone, found among his papers receipts showing how, at the time he was paying huge sums amounting to many millions of pounds to various European Governments in return for monopolies in his favour in their respective States, he had also been largely subsidising both the Fascist and the Communist parties, not in Germany only, but also in several other Continental States—conspirators who from a common centre are working for the overthrow and destruction of the governments of these States. A paragraph in the *Scotsman's* report (April 12th, 1932) of the German General Election shows the same face from a different angle. It reads:—

"All the papers discuss the strange fact that yesterday thousands of Communists voted for their arch-enemy Hitler, whose professed aim is to extirpate Communism. None gives a clear reason for the slump in the Communist vote."

Those acquainted with the facts set forth by General Ludendorff in his book, "The Coming War," published here in

June, 1931, will see nothing "strange" in the fact thus commented on concerning the recent German election.

**A Menacing Conspiracy.** At hundreds of points and almost daily we keep coming in contact with tentacles of the revolutionary octopus, so that it were more than silly to refrain from acquainting ourselves with its history and its habits, so as to ascertain its real character as accurately as possible. That we have tried to do in the foregoing articles, beginning with its first outbreak, the French Revolution. The evidence given on that in Professor Robison's great book is so clear and strong, and it bears out so completely the conclusions stated in the articles written before his evidence had been obtained, that it may be well to summarise it here.

1. He traces the French Revolution to its source, and lays it at the door of the *Gesu* in Rome.
2. He tells that the agents used to bring it about belonged to that great body here called *the Vanguard*.
3. He suggests that its main cause lay in the action taken against the Jesuits by the nations of Latin Christendom, France in particular.
4. He notes that the French Philosophers and Encyclopædists, who got their impulse from the Jesuits, prepared the ground for the Revolution.
5. He shows that the Revolution was carried through by the Illuminati, an Order created by Jesuits when their own Order had been abolished.
6. He states that the *modus operandi* in the Revolution was by secret undermining of existing institutions and then by mob attacks.
7. He found that the ultimate objective of the Revolutionary Movement was to recover universal empire and establish a despotic State by using the deluded mobs to destroy existing institutions, civil and ecclesiastical.
8. He proves that the organisers of the movement were out to pervert the Christian Faith in order to abolish everything properly religious.

The only conclusion of real importance reached by us on which Robison is silent is, that the Jesuit Camarilla has planned the utter destruction of the Papacy on the first favourable opportunity. But the evidence of that came to light only of recent times, many years after Robison had passed away.

**Are Jesuits All Involved?** Is every Jesuit to be taken as being hand-in-glove with the conspiracy? some of the evidence points rather the other way. Certain facts seem even to indicate, if less convincingly than those pointing to the intention to annihilate the Papacy, that the Camarilla may mean to abolish the Society of Jesus if and when its main objective, to seize all the Civil Administrations of the world, shall have been gained. It is far from inconceivable in such a case that the Order of Jesuit priests might then become a rankling thorn in the Camarilla's flesh. History shows that, whensoever the Jesuit Chiefs thought their projects could be better served by sacrificing than by promoting the interests of their ordinary members, the General and his coterie did not hesitate to throw them over. In one instance they even set their heavy ordnance firing on a band of banished Jesuits, already reduced to the last extremity of wretchedness—a fact whose full import can be gauged only in view of the complete absence of any record acknowledging the evil of deeds that stand to the Camarilla's eternal discredit. It would, therefore, be far from surprising if to this day numbers of Jesuits were individually retarding rather than promoting the conspiracy here exposed.

**Call to Action.** It is needless to detail the ramifications of the cancer eating into the vital organs political and ecclesiastic. Carcinomatous colonies have been established in every area of our land. Yet far worse, in the brains of our nation the *bacillus botulinus* is doing a deal of deranging work. Great therefore is the danger. But it will abate in measure as the character of the disease and its natural results become understood; and all the more rapidly when all men of good-will unite to fight it might and main.

As fuller information on the aims and methods of the groups and parties working for revolution is more widely spread, stronger and ever stronger must grow the British opposition to the whole movement and its every branch, open or underground. On the civil side Britons have a great heritage of accumulated wealth to conserve and hand on enriched and enlarged—a heritage bought by our fathers at the expense of much sweat and many sorrows,

sometimes by the free shedding of their blood. On the religious side we are the children of the Reformation and the Evangelical Revival, on whose rich fruits our land has lived and thriven till now, despite the chicanery and treachery of some who owed their all to those great works of God's grace, despite the indifference too and supineness of others of whom better things were to be expected. If ever the revolutionary movement should succeed in Britain, at their door will lie the greater guilt and shame.

**Irreconcilable Antagonisms.** Between such revolutionary partisans and leal-hearted British Christians a great gulf is fixed. The latter hold our patriotic forebears in well-deserved esteem and most reverent regard, and in matters of religion they place their faith and stake their lives on the Word of God alone; but the former belaud the makers of the French Revolution, and its principles they set before themselves and others as the model of civil and religious "Freedom, Equality and Fraternity." To hold, actively or passively, the principles of the French Revolution is but to make oneself an enemy of Jesus Christ and the gospel of His grace, and to become a dangerous foe to British patriots and patriotism. Such undermine our institutions. They despise and degrade our inherited lineage. They shut the rays of the sun off our fields and gardens and habitations. They poison our wells; they infect our food supplies with very deadly germs. They charge our sewerages with lethal fumes which discharge themselves into our streets and houses. With their noxious gases they foul our atmosphere. In a word, they are at war with us: they act as if they were our implacable enemies.

Yet need our one and only fear be lest we should compromise on the vital issues they have sprung upon us; lest we should complacently let them work their will; or lest, in attacking their positions, we should forget it is quite as much to our interest as to theirs that we should win them over to unite with us—to attach them by appeals to right reason and by genuine and unflinching regard to their persons. No victory will be half so good and lasting as one that unites victors and vanquished in real friendship and amity. If in spite of our endeavours thus to win them we largely fail, such failure will do us none the less honour and will bring us the fewer regrets.

## APPENDIX.

---

### A—On the Theory of Development.

---

**A**S a doctrine that was soon to be made a directive principle of Latin Christianity, the Theory of Development made its debut in Britain in the form of "An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine," written by John H. Newman in 1845, on the eve of his secession from the English to the Latin Church.

**A New Theory.** Not only had the theory had no place in any Christian Confession till then, but it is totally opposed to the normative and formative principles of all the Churches, Orthodox and Eastern, Latin and Reformed. Its real *fons et origo* must therefore be sought outside all the Churches.

**Its Main Clauses.** The essential parts of the doctrine seem to be these—

- (1) that to the Christian Church at the beginning (the theory assumes that from the first the Christian communities were not Churches, but a Church) was committed a depositum of doctrine, some parts of which were quite explicit and were universally professed by the Christians, but others were as yet implicit only, existing as it were in the sub-conscious mind of the Church:
- (2) that the former were embodied in the earliest Conciliar Statements of the Church, as interpretations of the Apostolic Doctrines:
- (3) that the Doctrine of Development had to do with the implicit parts only, according to the supposed fact that, as the Church grew and extended its bounds so that it had to face new conditions, one after another of the implicit parts of the depositum got brought to the conscious surface of the Church's mind:
- (4) that those inchoate elements of the Church's beliefs were precipitated on being authoritatively "defined" and officially incorporated as parts of the Church's professed Faith:
- (5) that each part so incorporated was defined in harmony with the Church's Faith as a whole:
- and (6) that each several "definition" of a belief was *divinely inspired*, so that the doctrine thus defined was held to have been given by immediate revelation, and as such became part of the revealed Faith of the Church.

**Evolution of Mariolatry.** As one of the illustrations showing how perfectly (as Dr. Newman thought) the theory fitted the facts of ecclesiastical history he cited the progress of the idea that the Virgin Mary had been immaculately conceived and born without sin, entitling her to worship of a secondary order. First, said he, the Arian heretics invented and offered such worship to Jesus Christ, holding him the possessor of quasi-divinity only—as being in fact but a demi-god, a creature and not the Co-eternal Son of the Everlasting Father. Then, when the Council of Nicea had condemned the Arian heresy, and declared it is part of the Christian Faith to hold that the Son of God, in His Divine nature, is co-equal and co-eternal with the Father, there arose in many of the Christian communities a new belief and practice, that as Christ was both God and man he was not one person but two; and that on the one hand, as the Son of God, He was entitled to the same worship as was given the Father, but on the other, as the son of man, he should be given but a secondary worship only. This error, of ascribing a double personality to Christ, became known as the Nestorian heresy, and was condemned by the Council of Chalcedon in 451.

**A Niche Vacant.** Now, says Dr. Newman in effect, when the Council of Nicea abolished the Arian heresy, it left a niche in the thought and practice of the Church for the figure of a demi-god to be worshipped, only according to a secondary order; and into that niche the Nestorians thrust a miniature figure of Jesus Christ. But when the Council of Chalcedon had re-affirmed the primitive Christian belief that the Son of God is a single person, and not two persons, and had commanded that He should be worshipped only with the same worship as the Father, then the niche carved out by the Arians for the figure of a demi-god was left empty. Soon the thought of the Church, searching around for a proper occupant of that vacant niche, lit on the Virgin Mary, whose figure it installed in the empty place, thenceforth hailing the Blessed Virgin as “a wonder in heaven,” and assigning to her “a throne far above all created powers, mediatorial, intercessory, a title archetypal, a crown bright as the morning star, a glory issuing from the throne eternal, robes pure as the heavens, and

a sceptre over all" (pp. 143—4).

**Unlawful Idolatry.** Accepting Dr. Newman's putting of the case as a perfectly fair and true and good illustration of the developments whereby he builds his castle, it overthrows absolutely and for ever his argument that those developments were truly Christian. For his very first premise in the case—that is, his suggestion that the Council of Nicea tolerated and even sanctioned the offering of a secondary order of worship to any being who was "a little less than God"—this premise is precisely the opposite of the fact and is absolutely false. For in the Council of Nicea the opponents of Arianism, besides proving from the Holy Scriptures the true and proper Deity of our Lord, contended strongly that, if He had not been "very God of very God," it would be most sinful to worship Him at all, since such worship would be mere idolatry. Thus Dr. Newman's first foundation-stone, like all the rest of his foundation-stones, crumbles to pieces when touched by the rod of truth. The developments by which he builds up his castle to its apex are not, as he holds, new revelations of truth formerly hidden, but plain perversions of the truth God had revealed in its fulness and once for all.

**Chief End and Aim.** The apex of Dr. Newman's structure related to papal infallibility. Some have thought his whole Essay was written to support and commend that doctrine. His argument about it, keeping in mind his reasonings about these developments of doctrine, may be gathered from a couple of sentences: "If the Christian doctrine, as originally taught, admits of true and important developments, as was argued in the foregoing section, this is a strong antecedent argument in favour of a provision in the dispensation for putting a seal of authority upon those developments" (p. 79). "Christianity must, humanly speaking, have an infallible expounder" (p. 90). He thinks it impossible "that an Infinite Wisdom, which sees the end from the beginning, in decreeing the rise of an universal empire, should not have decreed the development of a sovereign ruler" (p. 155). Here his

---

[All page numbers are of the fifth edition, except where otherwise specified.]

argument becomes two-edged. He first uses his doctrine of development to convey, if not to prove, the reasonableness of the gradual evolution of papal infallibility; in other words, he seeks a warrant for papal infallibility in his theory of development. Then, reversing the action, he pleads that an infallible interpreter, and none but an infallible interpreter, can guarantee the rightness, or avoid the wrongness, of each new development thrust upon the church. But if, as has been shown, the developments are crooked and false, the interpreter who takes his stand upon them must fall with them; and no guarantee he gives of them is worth the paper it is written on. The most decisive argument against both the theory of development and papal infallibility, however, is that the New Testament, so far from sanctioning them, teaches precisely their opposites.

**Conscience Authority.** In his discussion of questions affecting *the human conscience* and its functions (pp. 361—8), Dr. Newman unconsciously fumbles around the root of all the fallacies that are characteristic of, if not peculiar to, the self-styled "Catholic Church." The origin of Catholicism lay in men's having begun to regard the human conscience as the final authority in religion, thus supplanting God's revelation of His will in the Bible. As a result, a man-made religion was substituted for the true religion God had given to men. When, at the rise of Catholicism in the church, a beginning was made to teach that the human conscience takes precedence to the truth of God revealed in Holy Scripture, that was the starting-point of all those perverted developments which Dr. Newman here treats of, and by means of which he endeavours to prove the necessity for and the lawfulness of such doctrines as the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff. But, if we trace the development of this idea of conscience-authority through its successive stages—the inchoate "conscience" of the whole mass of church members; then, sacerdotalism having begun to prevail, the "conscience" of the "priesthood"; afterwards, under the narrowing process, the "conscience" of the episcopate; and lastly, completely away from the conscience of the individual by coming back to the "conscience" of one, the Roman Pontiff—in those successive stages we see, both how freedom of conscience was wrested away from the many

till it became reserved to one alone, and how the mystery of iniquity grew to a height enabling it to threaten the whole world with dire disaster and to assail the throne of God and His Christ. Of all this Dr. Newman in his unconscious fumbings seems to see nothing whatsoever. Yet any poor sinner, who in penitence had fled to Christ and found in Him peace and salvation through faith, could have guided the great man's hand to the latch of that door which admits every believing soul to the Father's house, where love and rest and joy abide and abound more and more for ever.

**Evolutionary Topsy-Turveydom.** A striking illustration of the unsoundness of the theory of development was given at the promulgation of papal infallibility. In the final vote on that issue two members of the Vatican Council, Bishop Riccio of Naples and Bishop Fitzgerald of Little Rock, U.S.A., declared against the doctrine, which was rejected by Dr. Dollinger also and many more who were not voting members of the Council. At 11 a.m. of the 18th July, 1870, therefore, the conscience of those three persons held the doctrine of papal infallibility to be unchristian and false, yet in the Catholic view of things, all three were presumably on the way to eternal happiness. At noon that day the Pope, speaking *ex cathedra*, pronounced his own infallibility to be an article of the Catholic Faith, which every Catholic must believe, or be damned eternally. As his final anathema on the subject, spoken in the candle-light which in that vast building called attention to the darkened heavens but did nothing to shut out the flashing of their wrath or to stifle the roaring of their angry elements—as that final anathema was drowned in the sound of a more potent one whose sanctions none could doubt or question, Bishop Riccio fell on his knees murmuring, "*Credo*"; while Bishop Fitzgerald, pressing his episcopal cross to his heart, exclaimed, "Now I believe. Now do I also truly believe."

So at 12.30 p.m. of that summer day which had lost its every summery aspect those two bishops had executed a complete *volte face*; but, though now heading in an opposite direction, they were, as Catholics think, still on the safe and sure road to heaven. But poor Dr. Dollinger, continuing to believe as he had always

believed and as all Christian people for centuries had believed, had ceased to be a Catholic—he had become, as they hold, a mere damned soul, on the way to everlasting misery. In Catholic estimation, he wrecked his soul by not believing one of the corollaries of the doctrine of development.

**Theory Breaks Down.** Did Dr. Newman himself really believe that doctrine? In his subsequent history there is much that seems to say he did not. But here let us confine ourselves to his Essay on the subject. As he works his way through the arguments by which he seeks to justify (say) purgatory and papal infallibility, forgetting for the moment some of the postulates of his theory, he stumbles badly. "The theology of the Church is no random combination of various opinions," says he (p. 353, 1st edit., 1845), "but a diligent, patient working out of one doctrine from many materials. The conduct of Popes, Councils, Fathers, betokens the slow, painful, anxious taking up of new elements into an existing body of belief." That at anyrate was a frank admission that *new elements* had been taken up and embodied in the Catholic Faith; but, however little he was aware of it at the moment, that admission knocked the bottom completely out of his tub. That he soon realised he had stumbled here is evident from the fact that in subsequent editions—see his fifth edition (1887), p. 366—he changed the two words italicised to read "new truths." But even that change does not in reality at all overcome the difficulty. For, according to the first postulate of the theory, all religious truths were present in the original depositum, either explicitly or implicitly; and there could be no new factors properly and validly "taken up." If any such were taken up, it matters not in the least whether they were called "elements" or "truths." Either there never were any new doctrines taken into the beliefs of the Latin Church, or, if there were, the theory of development affords no support whatsoever to the plea that Roman Catholicism is the true heir of the Apostolic Church. As Dr. Newman has admitted there were new elements, which later he called "new truths," taken into the Roman Catholic Faith, his evidence really supports the Protestant view, that the Latin Church has corrupted and perverted the Christian Faith taught by the apostles.

**Origin of the Theory.** There are various indications that the theory of development originated in Jesuit circles during the years of the Captivity—1773 to 1814. Clearly, it is not only perfectly compatible with, but it is also a key that fits, their maxims of Expediency, Probability, and Mental Reservation, as well as that ruling idea that a good end sanctifies any and every means used to attain that end. And besides being fully accordant with the tenets of their Order, the theory paved the way for much they had set their hearts upon, which has come to pass within the last hundred years, and for other things still to follow.

**How it Spread.** Dr. Newman seceded to Rome in 1845, openly declaring that his way to do so had been cleared by accepting the doctrine of development. In the eyes of most Roman Catholics this therefore was a high commendation for the theory. Many others too who had been inclining to Rome, in the English Church especially, eagerly swallowed the bait thrown out by Dr. Newman in his Essay, and went over to Rome by scores and hundreds—which in the estimation of Roman Catholics raised the doctrine of development far higher still. It is also to be remembered that immediately after the restoration of their Order in 1814 Jesuits had been re-appointed teachers in all Roman Catholic seminaries, where every facility and opportunity would be theirs to instruct the youths under them in the knowledge and bearings of the theory of development. This last must have prepared for the great spurt given the doctrine by Newman's secession in 1845.

**Cunning Tactics.** Nine years later, on the 8th December, 1854, the Pope, influenced no doubt by the great reception given to Newman's brochure, and particularly by what he had said in it about the Immaculate Conception and about Papal Infallibility, issued what purported to be an infallible decree proclaiming the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary. In view of the intention soon to convoke a General Council of the Latin Church to deal with the question of the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff, never was there an astuter move made than by that decree of December 8th, 1854.

**Becomes a Directive Principle.** Such an officially-approved account of Latin Christianity as "The Story of the Catholic Church," by the Rev. George Stebbing, C.Ss.R., shows how much Romanists of to-day depend on the doctrine of development as their strongest apologetic and main line of defence. Similarly, in the Vatican Council nearly all the speeches on the infallibility question put the development argument into the central place. Quite recently a doughty champion of Latin Christianity, the Rev. Giles Black, O.P., of the Dominican Mission to the students of Edinburgh University, wrote thus of the theory in the *Scotsman* of the 16th June, 1932:—

"Catholics believe and always have believed the whole Deposit of Faith, i.e., articles already defined and everything else the Church shall ever declare to be contained in the said Deposit of Faith. There is no question of adding to or subtracting from that Deposit, but only of declaring what is contained in that Deposit, and its meaning.

"Let us take an example. Up to 1854 Catholics might think or not think that our Blessed Lady was conceived immaculately; nevertheless their Faith was the same before 1854 and after. Before 1854 they believed the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception implicitly, because they believed everything the Church should ever declare to be contained in the Deposit of Faith. After 1854 they believed the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception explicitly as something declared and defined."

In the pages of the same journal another eminent Roman apologist, the Right Reverend Monseigneur P. M'Gettigan, had previously expounded the same views, in a series of lengthy letters, in terms suggesting that he had Newman's book open before him as he was writing. Parts of one of these (*Scotsman*, December 22nd, 1930) ran as follows:—

Faith of the Christian belief may be twofold—Explicit and Implicit Faith. Explicit Faith is assent to a revealed truth presented definitely to the understanding, and assented to on account of the Divine Authority revealing it. Implicit Faith is assent to truths, not because they are specifically presented to the understanding, but because they are implied in another revealed truth to which the understanding already assents. For example, a Catholic believes in the divine authority of the Church. Some of the articles of that Church may be present to his understanding, some not. Those that are present he believes with explicit faith, those that are not he believes with implicit faith

—that is, he believes them because they are implied in his belief in the divine authority of the Church. Their adoption is a necessary conclusion from a truth he holds as of faith . . . New definitions were not bolts from the blue, but crystallisations of the floating and indefinite beliefs of the Church. Clearly, the crystallisation could not have taken place if the implicit faith had not provided the raw material . . .

All this has a direct bearing on the matter under discussion, papal infallibility. I asserted that 'it had been implicitly believed and acted upon from the beginning.' By this I did not mean that it was always and everywhere an article of faith, but was a truth which flowed from an article of faith, that article of faith being the supremacy of the Pope. No one can deny that supremacy without repudiating the first eight Ecumenical Councils, the unanimous teaching of the Fathers of the Church, and the attitude of Christendom for 1600 years. I admit that Mr. Cotter, one of your correspondents, will find occasional sentences from the Fathers which, taken out of their context, may seem to argue the other way. But '*Securus judicat orbis terrarum*,' and whatever may seem to militate against the Pope's supremacy is to be explained by the prevailing consent of the world at the time. If then the world believed that the Pope was the head of the Church and her teacher by Divine command, then he is bound to be believed by those whom he is empowered to teach. But no one could be bound to believe a teacher in matters where salvation was at stake, if such a teacher was liable to error. The conclusion, therefore, is that the Pope, in matters of faith and morals, is safeguarded from error, and is in that sense infallible. The Church, before the Vatican Council, had always (sic.) acted on that conclusion. The conclusion may not have been formally before the mind and explicitly acknowledged. But Catholics ever regarded the Pope as the final Court of Appeal, and when Rome had spoken the case was definitely closed. Union with the Holy See was the test of orthodoxy, and his pronouncements the Rule of Faith. He was the ultimate bond of unity of faith and hierarchial obedience.

Such was always the implicit belief of Catholics. It is no rejoinder to say that there were distinguished Catholics who believed not so, any more than to say there were distinguished Catholics who in every age opposed the implicit faith of the Church before it was defined. Surely catholicity of belief is not tested by a numerical consensus, but by a moral consensus, and in spite of the fact that there were Bossuets in France, and Dollingers in Bavaria, and Keenans in Scotland, and Actons in England, and Kenricks in America, &c., they were mere passing episodes in the 1900 years of the Church's existence, and do not argue against the general consensus of the Church. . .

Let me say in conclusion that at the root of your correspondents' mistaken notions generally is the fact that they failed to take account of the explicit and implicit faith of the Church, as well as of its correlative, the development of Christian doctrine.

**Not Really Religious.** For serious people of a religious cast of mind the theory of development *seems* to provide a religious basis of thought and feeling by claiming as it does to deal with ever-recurring further "revelations" of truth declared to be necessary to the spiritual well-being of men. But on the other hand it is at least equally capable of a non-religious meaning and application—it can be as reasonably and as readily applied (say) by an atheistic world-dictator as by a quasi-religious Roman Pontiff; and, with the historical aspects of the case set over against the philosophical, the balance would seem to be very decidedly in favour of reserving it for the atheistic dictator.

**Essentially Unchristian.** To Christian folk of all classes the crux of the matter lies in the fact that the theory of development is a direct and sustained attack on Bible religion. It begins with and builds upon the assumption that in the Bible there is not a full, adequate and final revelation of all religious truth necessary for right living here and for eternal happiness hereafter. Its complete contradiction of the Christianity of the New Testament is seen in Dr. Newman's exposition of the cultus of the Virgin Mary, with its express sanction of that idolatry which is as severely reprobated and condemned in the New Testament as in the Old.

**Characteristically Anti-British.** As to the wider relations and bearings of the theory, thoughtful men of all classes, and British patriots in particular, will be struck by the fact that it is so utterly compatible with the man-made principles commonly accepted in that new order of civilisation which has been taking shape in so many parts of the world since the time of the French Revolution. For, just as our British civilisation could never have come into being apart from Bible religion and the sacrifices so many of our forebears made on its behalf, nor could long continue to stand or even to exist except by the force of Bible religion swaying the hearts and lives of multitudes of our people, so does that Continental order of civilisation depend for its support and extension on purely human principles of thought and action—principles which naturally and almost necessarily group themselves around the theory of development.

## B—On Brewster's "History of Freemasonry."

---

When, to discredit a book written by another, a writer attacks many of its trivial points which in the argument count for nothing one way or the other, and on major issues says really the same as the one he opposes had done, the inference is fairly clear. In his "Proofs of a Conspiracy" Professor John Robison, who in youth had served in the higher ranks of Freemasonry, tells how by and by he lost appetite for the Masonic craft on finding he had less spare time, so that for this and other specified reasons he ceased to while away comparatively leisure hours in the harmless diversions of the lodges. Though he exculpates British Masonry from his strictures on its illegitimate progeny on the Continent of Europe, this avowal seems to have aroused considerable resentment against Robison among Freemasons here, and elicited Brewster's (commonly spoken of as *Lawrie's*) "History of Freemasonry."

**Brewster's History of Freemasonry.** The dubiety as to the authorship of this book is solved by a manuscript note inserted in certain copies. Written by Dr. David Irving, Librarian of the Advocates' (now the Scottish National) Library, this note states that the facts of the case, known perhaps to only two persons then living, were these—When Alexander Lawrie was "Grand Stationer" of Scottish Masonry, he asked Dr. Irving to write such a history. But Dr. Irving declined the task, for reasons unspecified, which therefore can only be guessed at. When similarly approached, David Brewster very readily accepted Lawrie's offer, and completed the work, says Irving, "to the entire satisfaction of his employer." In 1804 the book appeared without the author's name on the title-page, but with a dedication, signed by Alexander Lawrie, to the Earl of Dalhousie, Grand Master-Elect of Scottish Masonry. It thus became commonly known as *Lawrie's History of Freemasonry*.

**Purport of the History.** As the preface tells, the book had been written in order to clear Freemasonry (perhaps British Freemasonry) from charges made against it, and to protest that Free-

masons had had no part in nor any sympathy with the outbreak and course of the French Revolution of 1789. It censures most the writings of an ex-Jesuit, named Barruel. Unfortunately, it misses the true line of attack on his carefully-concealed positions. If, instead of aiming at points where assault could yield no real advantage, Brewster had shown that the Jacobite influence on Continental Masonry had been inspired and directed by the Heads of Jesuitism, that would have put an end to Barruel's shams. Brewster would not then have needed to labour, as he does none too successfully, to prove that Freemasonry had existed in France long before James II vacated the Throne of Britain. But, striving thus to belittle the influence of Jacobitism on French Masonry, as if it had been negligible, and elsewhere admitting, quite as explicitly as Robison had shown, that in the eighteenth century Masonry in France was vastly unlike that of Britain, Brewster's line of argument is none too convincing to impartial readers; and it is very far from destructive of either Barruel's perversions of the facts or Robison's quite straightforward putting of the case. His contest with Robison concerning Continental Freemasonry will be noticed hereafter.

**Things in** Save on three other points of some importance,  
**Dispute.** Brewster's gibes and thrusts at Robison, which are frequent, concern matters so very trifling as to seem unworthy of recount. As to the three exceptions—if, as Brewster holds, Freemasonry was imported from Scotland into France in the days of Mary, Queen of Scots, that would be a thing of real interest; though it affects not in the least the fact that in the eighteenth century French Freemasonry, by whatsoever means, had become vastly and radically different from that of Great Britain. Brewster, however, produces no direct evidence of the existence of Masonic lodges in France prior to 1689, but leaves the matter conjectural. On this point, therefore, we may well think Robison the wiser of the two, who confined himself to positively known facts.

Again, Brewster says Robison had depicted Weishaupt a Freemason prior to the year 1775, when he founded the German branch of the Order of Illuminati; and on the authority of Barruel

he holds he was enrolled in 1777 only. But, apart from a possibility that Barruel had reasons to misrepresent the true state of the case, it must be noted that Robison nowhere says Weishaupt was a Freemason (in the sense here meant by Brewster) before 1775. What he does state ("*Proofs*," p. 101) is, that Weishaupt in 1775 belonged to a remarkable lodge of Eclectic Masonry, of the type styled *Stricten Observanz*. Of that selfsame sect of German Masonry Brewster himself relates (p. 136):—

"In the year 1773 a compact was entered into between the Grand Lodge of England and the Grand Lodge in Berlin, . . . to counteract all innovations in Freemasonry, particularly the proceedings of a set of Masons in Berlin, who, under the denomination *Stricte Observantz*, had annihilated their former constitutions, erected themselves into a Grand Lodge, and sanctioned very improper innovations upon the principles and ceremonies of the Fraternity."

It seems just possible that Weishaupt got himself enrolled in 1777 as a member of a Masonic lodge connected with the Grand Lodges of Berlin and of England. But even if he did so, that does not at all affect the fact that in 1775 he was a member of a lodge belonging to the other sect abovenamed—a fact for which Robison vouches on the strength of the documentary evidence in his hands. Readers, by the way, will note the important bearings of the fact that the pact here referred to was entered into *in the year 1773*.

The third thing of secondary importance whereon Brewster attacks Robison was as to whether there had ever been any "emissaries of corrupted Freemasonry and Illuminism lurking in the British Empire and plotting its destruction." Brewster denied that there had been. But in the recent Scott Centenary celebrations several speakers, referring to his (Sir Walter's) and his family's connections with Masonry, which they all had kept closely and constantly *sub rosa*, have clarified the case by restoring the historical background of that time, "when," to quote the words of one of those Masonic speakers, "several officers of Masonic lodges, convicted of having used the Order as secret societies concerned in political treason, had been hanged as Jacobite rebels." Here also then, Brewster's high-pitched denials quite out-soar the bounds of lawful polemics, and Robison's sober statements stand unshaken, firm as the boulders of Bog Hall.

**Brewster confirms Robison.** That he would, if he could, have rebutted Robison's presentation at every point, seems fairly clear from Brewster's many quibblings and disputings over trifles, and from his every mention of the "Proofs of a Conspiracy." How significant then are his confirmations, by admission, of the matters on which Robison had laid the chief emphasis! On p. 118 Brewster tells of the dangerous innovations in French and German Masonry near the middle of the eighteenth century—most unwarrantable alterations of the principles and the ceremonies of the Order; changes devoid of the slightest connection with the aims and objects of Masonry—unnatural excrescences foisted on it by designing men to cloak hypocrisy and licentiousness—doctrines which it is the duty of every government to discover and extirpate. He exults that British lodges had retained their primitive simplicity, furthering no sinister cause, and harbouring no traitors, atheists, or French philosophers. With pleasure he records (p. 134) that as late as 1765 a Masonic lodge at Marseilles, and probably others in France, were still withstanding the encroachments of "the votaries of scepticism and disloyalty." But the gravamen of Robison's case he admits in the following words (p. 142):—

"Speculative opinions which were certainly inconsistent with the principles of sound religion and social order were not merely circulated by Weishaupt in a few of the Lodges and taught in the assemblies of the Illuminati. They were published to the world in the most fascinating form by the French Encyclopædists, and inculcated in all the eloquence with which some of the most celebrated philosophers on the Continent could adorn them. It can be said of Weishaupt therefore that he was not just such a determined infidel as Voltaire and his associates."

**Extent of Agreement.** It may be said then that Robison and Brewster speak to the same effect on all major issues but one, namely, the connections of Freemasonry with the French Revolution; and even there the real difference is not very great. Brewster contends that the French Revolution was due to other causes, and was not brought about by the Freemasons. Robison on the other hand, though specifying many of the remoter contributory causes of the Revolution, traced the outbreak to its

main source and produced many direct and clear proofs (all of which Brewster left unnoticed) that the conspirators who kindled that conflagration and fed its flames had well ascertained connections with French and German Masonry, one of the arch-conspirators being the Duke of Orleans, Grand Master of the sect designated the Grand Orient of France. Admissions made by Brewster like those abovecited show how little he really differed from Robison on this head. Other main features of the case stated by him he casually supports. Where he leaves unnoticed any chief part of the plot exposed in the "Proofs of a Conspiracy," his silence may be taken as tacit consent to what is there stated.

**Brewster** As between these two then the case stands thus—  
*versus* Robison had shown that both the French  
**Robison.** philosophers and the Illuminati, for their attacks on the Catholic Church and on the Governments of certain Catholic States, had taken cover in the lodges of Continental Masonry, using these lodges as ready and convenient centres for the spread of their anti-christian and seditious teachings. With no attempt to controvert a single part of the evidence produced by Robison (save for one rather trivial and very doubtful point), or even to place it in another light, if he thought it bore a different meaning from that given it by Robison, Brewster arranged his matter so as to create an impression that no Freemasons had worked for or taken part in the French Revolution, which he too held in detestation. If he really believed it so, at least Brewster should have tackled the mass of Robison's evidence. His complete evasion of it, save for the question as to the year in which Weishaupt was first enrolled as a Freemason—even that he seems but to have camouflaged—must be left to speak for itself.

Robison also, while expressly exonerating British Masonry as a whole from complicity in the revolutionary movement he had so honourably and so ably laid before the public, had mentioned that there were some British lodges being used for the propagation of doctrines derived from the Illuminati and the French philosophers. Brewster, suppressing the fact that a number of prominent British Freemasons had by then been convicted of treason, and either executed or banished from the realm, pours

a stream of loose contempt on Robison's statements in terms that suggest, either that he had accused British Masonry as a whole, or that he had had no good grounds to charge any members of the craft as he had done. It looks like an appeal to Masonic prejudices; and Dr. Irving's manuscript note on the performance seems to show the shame felt by one good Scottish Mason for that phase of Brewster's work.

**Robison's** In his "Proofs of a Conspiracy" Robison has a **Main Heads.** mass of evidence on the following chief points—that the French Revolution was a deliberately planned affair; that the leading actors in it were of the Order of the Illuminati; that this Masonic sect made its first appearance at the time the Society of Jesus was abolished; that, as their readiest and safest way to propagate their pernicious doctrines, the Illuminati sought, often all too successfully, to worm their way into the Masonic lodges; that commonly they found it easy to capture and dominate those lodges by reason of the work done by the French philosophers, almost all of whom were members of the Masonic fraternities; that the changes effected in those fraternities by the philosophers and Encyclopædists had been largely facilitated by the form in which Continental Masonry had been moulded by the hands of the jesuitised Jacobites at the end of the seventeenth and in the early eighteenth century.

The preparations for the French Revolution, in which the Catholic Church and the Monarchy in France were submerged and perished, may therefore be said to have advanced by four successive stages, each of which tallied broadly with the changing fortunes of the Jesuit Order and bore marks of having proceeded under the direction of its Heads. First, a remoulding of Continental Masonry, to make it serve as a handmaid to Jesuitism. Next, toward the middle of the eighteenth century, many Masonic lodges converted into revolutionary foci by the French sceptics. Then, about 1773, the formation of the Order of the Illuminati, to destroy the Christian Religion and to overturn every government which counteracted the plans of the Heads of Jesuitism. Lastly, when other States had secured their peoples against attack, in France the open revolt of the revolutionaries, who mutinied and scuttled the ship.

**Encyclopædists and Illuminati.** From their own writings and from the published accounts of their lives Robison has shed a revealing light on the moral character of the French sceptics and the leading Illuminati, showing that, while their writings contained many expressions of high moral sentiment which suggested that the writers were men of intense moral earnestness, their conduct frequently betrayed, not merely a lack of Christian virtue, but even a sheer disregard of the most elementary forms of rectitude. Voltaire had no scruples whatsoever over cheating the publishers of his books when any fit opportunity seemed to have presented itself for the fraud and he saw he could get away with the spoils. Robison might have added how Voltaire did not on occasion shun even perjury, but swore in Court that a book of his had been written by another man, then recently deceased. Mirabeau deemed it a virtue to hoodwink and mislead the authorities and the public by lying accounts of affairs he was personally implicated in, painting things just the opposite of what they actually were. To his seniors in the Royal Family of France the Duke of Orleans, as Grand Master of French Freemasonry, pretended to be standing right loyally by them, doing all he could to support their cause and promote their interests, when in fact he was busy distributing large sums of money to the riff-raff of Paris as inducements to rebellion, bloodshed and regicide. Condorcet, who owed his all to the gratuitous patronage of the old Duc de Rochefoucault, when thereby raised to fame and high estate, repaid his patron's great kindness and generosity by circulating highly injurious tales against him, and even hired desperadoes to assassinate his benefactor. The philosophy of the Encyclopædists seldom, if ever, placed any weight on the interests of others, if and when they appeared to conflict with their own self-interests.

Though the leading Illuminati too professed, not only to be themselves the most enlightened members of our race, but also to have taken up the work of enlightening mankind by the torch of philosophy, the facts embodied in their confidential writings to one another leave no room for doubt that their glib professions were, as Brewster remarked, only a cloak for licentiousness and hypocrisy. How indeed could it have been otherwise with men

who in their most private communications one to another enjoined such maxims as these:—

"Every means is consecrated by the end for which it is used."

"We must boggle at nothing which promotes the interests of our Order."

"He is the best man who best conceals his faults!"

**Cunning Tactics.** Robison has given one instance, relating to Germany, and Brewster another, relating to France, illustrative of the tactics used by these revolutionaries, showing a depth of cunning unsurpassed by anything in the "Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion." In the former case, certain of the Illuminati travelled all over Germany, ostensibly hunting out "concealed Jesuits," whom they pretended to discover and "unmask" in every place. But the men "unmasked" were neither Jesuits nor ever in any way connected with Jesuitism. On the contrary, they were sincere evangelical Christians and staunch supporters of the Rulers of their respective States. By this line of action the performers of those monkey tricks were able for a time to do much harm to the cause of Bible Christianity and to the active patriots, while at the same time assisting to screen the real agents of Jesuitism, their allies. Brewster tells of the astute division in France of the revolutionary forces into two wings, ostensibly waging a life-and-death warfare with one another, drawing the bulk of the people into one camp or the other. One wing consisted of "professed" Jesuits and their quasi-religious followers. The other was formed of French sceptics and other members of the revolutionary secret societies—true prototypes of the Fascists and the Communists of our time.

The *modus operandi* used in Germany may have been suggested by the fact that conditions there differed greatly from those of France. In the German States there were both a strong body of active Protestants and many Catholics also who had escaped the corruptions then so prevalent in the Gallican Church, among its higher clergy especially, so that in Germany a great number, both Protestants and Catholics, were powerfully impeding the progress of the revolutionary movement. But in France it was easy to rope in great sections of the people as members of one or the other wing of the revolutionary forces, just as to-day the revolutionary

leaders find it far easier than of old to enlist our people, which they do, either as Fascists or as Communists, indifferently.

**Revolutionary Sisterhoods.** Another part of the plan made by the German Illuminati was to establish Sisterhoods corresponding with the male lodges, but with this difference, they were to be of two separate classes, kept in total ignorance of one another's existence—one set of lodges for those of virtuous character, the other for "the freer-hearted" women and girls. As arranged, each female lodge was directed by a man, who exercised his functions through an "illuminated" woman, nominally the head of the lodge, so that its members should have no suspicion it was run by a man. The scheme, however, was early nipped in the bud. When several German Rulers took action against the Illuminati, as a result of the publication of the confidential papers found in the houses of some of their chief leaders the German women of all classes seem to have turned away from Illuminism in disgust, or in shame. The scheme for revolutionary sisterhoods in Germany thus died a speedy death.

**Masonic Types.** Both Robison and Brewster regarded British Masonry as the mother of the Masonic craft in all parts of the world; and they agree in holding it the standard type, from which Continental Lodges—as Robison speaks, who knew Continental Masonry by long personal contact with it, practically all the lodges; but as Brewster would persuade us, who knew it but by hearsay, only a few of the lodges—had departed, both as to aims and objects, and as to ceremonies and the number of "degrees." In the main they concur in saying that British Masonry, despite determined attempts to pervert it, had remained true to its salt in loyalty to all duly-constituted authorities and in benevolence toward the children of men; and also that the perversions of Continental Masonry had loaded the lodges with a mountain of ceremonial mummery, and had diverted Masonic activities to very hurtful ends.

Robison lays stress on the fact that, while British Masonry conferred only three "degrees" and acknowledged no more, its Continental progeny had greatly multiplied their number. As on admission to each "degree" there was a set fee payable, the craft, as seen on the Continent, had become a money-making business.

In this lay a severe temptation to some British lodges, if not to all; and there is much evidence that some have succumbed to it. To-day we often hear, both in Britain and in other parts of the Empire, of "Masons of the Eighteenth Degree," and so forth. As this was being written an obituary notice appeared in the public press, which told of the many high Masonic offices the deceased had held and of the lodges he had founded of the type he belonged to; and it adds that he was a "member of the Royal Order of Scotland, of the Rose Croix Sovereign Chapter, 18 degrees No. 1, and member of Consistory, 30 degrees, and of the 31st degree."

Whether Robison, like Brewster, continued to regard even British Masonry as being quite consistent with genuine Christianity, is very doubtful. Rather, he got to feel it accorded better with the principles of natural religion than with the Christian Revelation. As to whether it is at all compatible with a life of full devotion to Christ, Christians will probably agree that its initial demand—that the postulant for admission to its ranks should take vows and obligations without previous knowledge of their actual content, or in other words, that he should consent to enter the Order mentally blind-folded—this is as radically and wholly incongruous with the primary requirements of sound reason as it is contradictory to the basic principles of Christianity—a leap in the dark, with far too much taken on trust, and far more surrendered than is ours lawfully to part with.

**Illuminism** One feature of the case presented by Robison but  
**Tragically** left unnoticed by Brewster deserves special attention  
**Disloyal.** from every lover of his native land—the total eradication of every patriotic feeling and every sentiment of personal honour from the minds of all who gave ear to the apostles of Illuminism. When the French Revolution was at its height, and the armies of France were over-running the most accessible foreign States, some of the fairest territories in Germany were laid waste by the French as a result of treacherous connivance with the enemy by associates and disciples of Weishaupt. Inviting the French to invade their areas, these German traitors feloniously opened to them the gates of their fortified cities. In one case a French General, Custine, gave a point-blank refusal to the offers

and solicitations of the German Illuminati, and afterwards in the National Convention stoutly defended his refusal of the despicable proposal. But he was condemned and executed. "His death," says Theirs, "was a terrible example to all generals, and operated as a signal for their absolute obedience to the orders of the revolutionary government."

In point of disloyalty, the revolutionary movement seems not to have changed its character at all since then; and a thing of high importance to us is the presence in Britain of swarms of Southern Irish people, nearly all of whom seem to support the revolutionaries, who aim at devastating Britain and laying her in the dust. There is probably no revolutionary organisation or clique which does not draw largely on those Southern Irish people. As antagonistic to British ideals and modes of life as they are envious at the sources and the extent of our prosperity, they seem as unwilling to learn as they are unable to forget. Should events by and by compel their being expelled from our coasts, the revolutionary forces left would probably be but an impotent handful. Replanted in their own land, they might then begin to feel they had unconsciously learnt enough among us to make them rally to the support of law and order. What a gain that to Southern Ireland! How well too would the loss of such intractable elements work out to our manifold advantage!

**Robison's**      Having told how so many leaders of the revolution-  
**Masterly**      ary movement were adepts in "ghost raising,"  
**Exposure.**      "fortune telling," "magic," "alchemy," "trans-  
mutation of metals," "universal medicine," and so forth, Professor Robison has a passage (pp. 483—4) which to some extent indicates the measure of his abilities to treat such an intricate and much-befogged subject as Illuminism. It occurs in his account of the doings of Tom Paine and Dr. Priestley, two of the leading revolutionaries then courting England, but all in vain. The passage reads:—

"Were it possible for the departed soul of Newton to feel pain, he would surely recollect with regret that unhappy hour when, provoked by Dr. Hooke's charge of plagiarism, he first threw out his whim of a vibrating ether, to show what might be made of *an hypothesis*. For Sir Isaac Newton must be allowed to have paved the way for much of *the atomic philosophy*

of the moderns. Newton's ether is assumed as a *fac totum* by every precipitate sciolist, who in despite of logic and in contradiction to every principle of mechanics gives us theories of muscular motion, of animal magnetism, and even of intelligence and volition, by the undulations of ethereal fluids. Not one in a hundred of these theorists could go through the fundamental theorem of all this doctrine—the Forty-seventh Proposition of the Second Book of the *Principia*; and not one in a thousand knows that Newton's investigation is inconclusive. Yet they talk of the effects and modifications of these undulations as familiarly and confidently as if they could demonstrate their propositions by Euclid Elements. "Such is the reasoning that satisfies Dr. Priestley. But I do not suppose he has yet attained the acme of his Illumination."

**Sir David Brewster.** The author of the "History of Freemasonry" later became known as Sir David Brewster. He was but 23 years of age when he completed the work given him by Alexander Lawrie. There seems little or nothing fanciful in the idea that, while in the "Proofs of a Conspiracy" we have the considered and impartial judgment of a man chastened in spirit, strong of intellect, and with wide experience of the things he treats of—a man, moreover, who is aware that already he has one foot planted on the eternal shore while his other stands still on the sands of time—in the "History of Freemasonry" we see the fires of youth flaring up, over-ardent in a cause espoused ere yet its champion had had time and opportunity to see all its settings and bearings. What but this could have induced the youthful David to raise his arm, as here he does, against the honoured University teacher of his still earlier years? And perhaps with that also a feeling that there still remained to him a long time for repentance!

Did Brewster live to regret this part of the "History"? this at least can be told—seventeen years or more after it appeared, and the same period of time after Robison had passed to his eternal reward, in 1822 Dr. David Brewster brought out, with highly commendatory notes of his own, a four-volume edition of Dr. Robison's scientific papers. That act and work certainly did no discredit to Dr. Brewster. And nearly as certain it seems that the kindly scowl the good Dr. David Irving had cast on some parts of the "History of Freemasonry" had not been altogether without good effect.