

PATRIOTISM.

Unfold the Flag in all Our Public Schools.

It is undoubtedly a truthful assertion that out of every evil some good is realized. Not always directly, to be sure, but indirectly and remotely good is a resultant effect.

President Simmonds of the board of education in New York, not long ago suggested the idea that the American flag should be placed in all of our school rooms.

In connection with this introduction of the stars and stripes, many superintendents of schools propose to introduce patriotic talks and songs, which shall help to make the children familiar with the institutions and principles that are symbolized by our flag.

Says Inspector D. W. C. Ward, of the Seventh school district of New York:

"You have no idea of the enthusiasm which has been aroused in our district by the introduction of Americanism in our schools. What man thoroughly imbued with a love of American institutions, and a knowledge of America's history and mission could have any sympathy with growths of despotism and anarchy?"

As to the origin of language, or speech, the following is the 1st and 2nd verses of the 1st chapter of Jasher. (See verses 26 and 27, 1st chapter of Gen. in our Bible.)

1st. "And God said, let us make man in our own images, after our likeness, and God created man in his own image."

quicken with a throb of pride at the mention of such names as Lincoln and Grant, and who realize nothing of the principles involved in the national struggle against treason.

But let the flag be placed in all of our public schools; let the children be taught to feel a personal pride in our national history; let them understand that we are great because we are free, and that freedom means not license, but liberty under law, and the old flag will mean more to them than the flags of all the kings and emperors of the earth.

WHO WROTE THE BIBLE?

Conclusive Evidence That Erroneous Ideas Exist.

FOR THE AMERICAN:

The present Bible is probably the work of Solomon, down to his time. The Book of the Upright or Jasher, was the Book from which he collated his facts of history.

An abstract of the philology of the words used in the first twenty-five verses of the 1st chapter of Genesis, of our present Bible, given in our dictionaries, is as follows:

Table with 3 columns: No., LANGUAGES, No. WORDS. Lists various languages and their word counts.

We can go further in this investigation. Our dictionaries give, or quote, several languages as indicating the derivation of words.

Table with 3 columns: No., PEOPLE OR LANGUAGE, Times Quoted. Lists various languages and how many times they are quoted.

As to the origin of language, or speech, the following is the 1st and 2nd verses of the 1st chapter of Jasher.

1st. "And God said, let us make man in our own images, after our likeness, and God created man in his own image."

2nd. "And God formed man from the ground, and he blew into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul, endowed with speech."

Noah Webster's dictionary, August, 1847, says: "It is, therefore, probable that language, as well as the faculty of speech, was the immediate gift of God. We are not, however, to suppose the language of our first parents in paradise to have been copious, like most modern languages, or the identical language they used, to be now in existence."

tional alterations from other causes incident to men in society."

Those remarks are quite in keeping with our experience, in Technology, take steam, or electricity, now words have grown up with their use; so with all other modern arts, even if the art was known before, we in our rediscovery and practical application, have coined new words to express the new idea or use.

We can then say, When a new idea is invented, a new word is coined to express it, and thence the philologists of the word are the inventors of the idea.

If we apply this method of reasoning to our Bible, then we must accord to the people who coined the word to express the idea, the origin of the invention or discovery. Then, to the people from whom the Anglo-Saxon people have descended, are the authors of our Bible.

The first knowledge we have of writing is recorded in the Book of Jasher, chapter 2, verse 13: "And in those days (365 Am., 3639 B. C.) Cainan wrote upon tablets of stone what was to take place in time to come, and he put them in his treasures."

The Book of Jasher is equally authentic with the Bible. This book should be, and justly, entitled the "Father of History."

The Book of Jasher extensively quotes from the Book of Enoch. The last date in the Book of Enoch is 2560 B. C., the last date in the Book of Jasher, 1479 B. C. N. A. LIST.

CHURCH RULES INTERPRETED.

Societies that are Not Recognized by the Catholic Church.

Archbishop Katzer's circular letter to the clergy of the archdiocese regarding secret societies was made public Thursday. The letter is the result of the bishop's refusal to confirm Joseph Klochner, of Oshkosh, as the treasurer of a Catholic congregation, because Mr. Klochner was a turner.

- 1. Masons and Carbonari are ex-communicated by name and expressly.
2. There can be no doubt that the Odd Fellows and Sons of Temperance are at least by name and expressly forbidden.
3. Although not explicitly and by name, nevertheless implicitly, are excommunicated all societies which, under whatever name, plot either against the church and the Catholic religion or against legitimate governments, whether they exact from their members an oath of secrecy or not.

The Provincial council of Milwaukee, approved by the Holy See, has declared communists, socialists, anarchists, and turners who are allied to the society known under the general title of "turnerbund" to be this class.

4. Moreover, all societies are implicitly ex-communicated, which claim for themselves "a priest" or chaplain, or minister of worship, on their own authority with their own special ritual and ceremonies, not of any or every kind, nor as sometimes happens among our people when certain prayers are recited in meetings of citizens, but of such a manner that the society itself, proposing to itself and evil end, becomes schismatical or heretical.

5. Societies, which bind their members either by oath or by mere word of honor to observe the secret, so strictly that it cannot be revealed with impunity even to the ecclesiastical authority (i. e., the bishop) lawfully demanding it are forbidden under the pain of excommunication, and on this account are to be shunned.

6. Likewise under the pain of excommunication are forbidden societies which bind their members to unreserved and blind obedience.

In practice therefore:

- 1. Masons and Carbonari cannot be absolved unless they have "de facto" left the society. The case is always excepted in which a dying man can only before witnesses (or) in the extreme necessity to the confessor alone promise that he will leave the society.
2. Odd Fellows and Sons of Temperance cannot be absolved, until they in fact leave the society or at least seriously promise that they will at once withdraw.
3. When a priest is aware, with a knowledge entirely certain, obtained outside of confession, that a society on account of reasons enumerated above, is either implicitly ex-communicated or forbidden under the pain of excommunication, he cannot absolve a member of such a society, unless the condition laid down in No. 2 be fulfilled.

Especially must rectors take care that Catholic unions do not (if they desire to be recognized as such by ecclesiastical authority, and admitted into the church with their badges) admit as members to their society the members of even doubtful societies.

As to fanatics of members of such societies we make the following decrees:

- 1. Masons, Carbonari, Odd Fellows, Sons of Temperance, unless they have in fact left the secret society, are to be deprived of ecclesiastical burial, except in the case in which a dying man could only promise before witnesses that he would leave it.
2. Since other societies have not been declared as forbidden by name, their members, unless something else prevents it, can be buried; but we forbid their fellow members "in a body" or with badges and regalia to be present at, or to march or to perform any rites or ceremonies at the funeral, with the exception, perhaps, of the union known as "The Grand Army of the Republic," because this society is considered rather as a military and a patriotic society. In this case even all rights and ceremonies must be excluded that are not strictly military.

The Sentinel, in commenting on the above, says: "Archbishop Katzer has made an interesting list of the classes of persons who are ex-communicated by reason of membership in secret societies. It would have added to the interest if he had suggested a reason

for some of them are condemned by a church. The Masons and the charcoal burners (the old Carbonari) who took the first steps for the rescue of Italy from the control of foreigners) appear to be the particular spilt-head and forked tail victims of the church's wrath. The Odd Fellows and Sons of Temperance are also expressly denied absolution. The general provision which excludes members of secret societies from the privileges of the church would exclude these, but it has been thought to be necessary to mention Masons, Odd Fellows and Sons of Temperance by name, indicating that they are especially wicked in the eyes of the church.

It was the Milwaukee Catholic council that first classed the Turners with anarchists, socialists and communists. This council pronounced a decree against the Turners and it has been ratified by the Holy See. There is something unnecessarily insulting in this rash classification of the Turners, who are among the most law-abiding and patriotic citizens. It is true that "free thinking" is popularly believed to be prevalent among Turners, and there may be reason why the Catholic church considers Turners influences unfavorable to the church, but this does not warrant the coupling of the Turners with anarchists.

All the secret societies in this country that have had a long existence and are not formed entirely of persons having a single idea and belonging to a single class, are not only harmless but useful. Benevolence is the leading purpose in every case. The secrecy is a sort of mild humbug that does not harm anybody, any more than the gaudy trappings, the dull-edged swords that get tangled in the legs of the processionists, the high titles and the grips and pass-words. Men of all kinds and classes belong to these secret societies, and it is certain that if any other motive than to promote good-fellowship and mutual aid—if any of them had a purpose to overthrow the Catholic church, most of one's neighbors would not stay in them.

Perhaps there is an influence, unintentional, however, in most societies, that is not favorable to the authority of the church. For just as sure as a strong churchman mingles freely with men of different religions he becomes liberal. Doubtless it is an element of strength to a church that undertakes the close control of its member's lives, when it can prevent its members from forming close and familiar relations with outsiders, and this may be the reason why the Masons, Odd Fellows and Turners are classed among those having horns and split-hoofs.

IS IT A CHICKEN BONE?

What the Rev. Mr. O'Connor Says of an Alleged Holy Relic.

While hundreds of the faithful were crowding into the little Canadian church of St. Jean Baptiste on East Seventy-sixth street last evening to kiss the glass case in which an alleged fragment of one of St. Ann's arms is incased the Rev. James A. O'Connor of Christ's Mission, 142 West Twenty-first street, was preaching to an attentive audience as to the fallacy of the relic.

The Times on Friday last noticed the credulous interest that many Catholics were manifesting in the anxiety to get a glimpse of what they were assured was nothing less than two inches of the bone of the arm of St. Ann, the mother of Mary, the mother of Christ. Thousands of persons have crowded into the little church to see the relic.

As to its genuineness the Rev. Mr. O'Connor, who for eight years was a Roman Catholic priest, gave his opinion last evening. The text of his sermon was "Relics," with special reference to the fragmentary arm bone which Father Tetreau is exhibiting to his flock and the public by the courtesy of Mgr. Marquis of Quebec, who is on his way home from Rome, where he got the sacred relic.

Mr. O'Connor told his listeners that he had paid two visits to the church to see and examine the relic. "I examined it," said he "as closely as I could through the glass case. I do not hesitate to say that this 'relic' resembles more a chicken bone and the down on it incipient feathers than it does a human bone or human hair."

"I asked the priest who was exhibiting the relic what his idea was as to the personality of St. Ann, and he said she was the grandmother of God. Now, all trace of St. Ann's remains was lost sight of for 700 years, when it is claimed, they were discovered in Jerusalem and sent to Rome."

"This relic, now on exhibition in St. Jean Baptiste church, is an imposition upon the people. There are no fragments of the remains of St. Ann extant. This bone is a bogus one, a rank imposition, placed on exhibition for

revenue only, and if the revenues were not forthcoming the exhibitor would cease."

"I stood there beside the priest and watched the people as they came in to kiss the 'holy relic.' About six inches from where the priest sat is a small box on which is the plain sign: 'Put 10 cents in the box and then light a candle.' The poor deluded people not only put the dime in, but many much more. I dare say that the exhibition has netted upward of \$1,000."

"There is supposed to be a sacred relic in every Catholic altar stone, but this is the first time in the United States that one has ever been exhibited for money. It is a disgraceful, shameful traffic in what is supposed to be a sacred relic. It may safely be predicted that as this exhibition has paid so well, it will not be the last, and other priests will begin to exhibit their relics or get some imported, whereby to increase the devotion of the faithful—and the revenues of the church. Such a thing is worse than profanation."—New York Times.

ULYSSESS S. GRANT.

Strong Words From a Contemporary in His Behalf.

The San Francisco Argonaut, of May 9, 1892, in commenting on the dilatory action of the Metropolis in honoring the dead hero, says:

In 1885, when the great soldier lay in his last sleep, the voice of the nation favored Washington as the place of sepulture, the people instinctively recognizing the appropriateness of the national capitol as the place of rest for him who did so much to save the Union, and whose name is linked forever with the grand story of its preservation. But New York rushed forward with indecent village clamor, and demanded the honor of giving Grant a grave. Its press and men of mark and wealth were generous with promises. A million dollars was to be raised at once by popular subscription in the city for a tomb that would be worthy of him who slept, and the metropolis whose grateful free-will offerings should rear it. New York prevailed. Grant's dust was pushed into the little temporary concrete cell at Riverside, and that was practically the end of the city's liberality. Year dragged after year, the New York press appealed vainly to the citizens, the country from one ocean's shore to the other uttered its scorn, and congress, in response to outraged public feeling, considered a joint resolution calling for the removal of the warrior's ashes to the capital. New York roused herself again, in strictly New York fashion. Promises flowed once more like water. But the danger of being deprived of a park attraction having passed, the metropolitan pocket was rebuked. At the end of seven years, the total contributions, wrung from those who felt in some faint degree the humiliation of the situation, amounted to just \$155,000.

Congress now being again in session, and the country's demand for the removal of the body to Washington having been revived, New York reawakened. She thrifly resolved that instead of a million-dollar monument she would erect one at half that cost. Two months ago, General Horace Porter was commissioned by the committee to show the world what New York could do when she set out to be munificent. He divided the city into districts, with branch subscription bureaus, and issued moving, patriotic appeals to the two million inhabitants. At the laying of the corner stone the other day, he stated the result—which was received with self-applauding enthusiasm by the multitude present. The two months of fervid effort, backed by the whole begging power of the metropolitan press, had brought up the grand total to \$202,800. That is, the two months of strenuous endeavor had drawn \$47,800 from the clutches of one of the largest and richest cities in the world, which numbers among its population hundreds of millionaires, and some citizens who count their wealth by the fifty and hundred millions.

Congress should hesitate no longer. The ashes of the leader of the Union armies ought to be rescued from the possession of a city which has so flagrantly proved its unworthiness to be their custodian. The people of the United States, in whom, outside of New York, the name of Grant awakens pride, gratitude and reverence, have a right to insist upon this, and they will do so, if got at once, then assuredly when the rains and snows of successive summers and winters have beaten upon the unengaged corner-stone; for that, doubtless, is as far as New York's grudging heart will permit the monument to grow.

The behavior of the metropolis in this instance is not exceptional, but typical. Three years ago it was resolved to commemorate the centenary of the adoption of the federal constitu-

tion and Washington's inauguration as president in New York by the erection of a magnificent arch at Washington Square. It is unnecessary to say that the arch is not paid for yet. The shameful indifference of the city to the noble gift of the French artist, Bartholdi, will never be forgotten so long as the colossal figure of Liberty Enlightening the World sheds the rays of its uplifted lamp over the waters of the bay. But for the prayers of a newspaper, which appealed successfully to the country for dimes and nickels wherewith to construct a pedestal, the statue would still be lying dismembered in a warehouse.

The truth is that New York is not an American city. During a century she has been the catch-basin for the offal of the world. She is more Irish than Dublin, more priest-ridden and priest-ridden than Rome, more Jewish than Jerusalem, nearly as Hungarian as Hungary, and as Italian and Sicilian as Italy and Sicily. The host of all the foreigners who enter her port depart for the west, and the dregs remain. There is no city on earth that is cursed with such a festering mass of ignorance, penury, viciousness and crime. She is a political and social sore on the body of the republic. The American residents are corrupted by their surroundings. The plutocracy are so near Europe that they ape the manners, customs, and modes of thought of its aristocracy. The middle classes, environed by hordes of debased Europeans living in loathsome squalor, feel like members of an American colony in a foreign land, and they are naturally devoid of sympathy with or understanding of these repulsive fellow-creatures. So it comes that there is no community of sentiment to bind the population together. The struggle for existence is fierce, and begets a selfishness that is brutal and savage. It is impossible that there should be public spirit in such a city, or that it should be American in its instincts. Chicago is American to the core. Yet her foreign population is probably as great proportionately as that of New York. But Chicago is environed by American territory and people, not open on one side to the influence of England and the torrent of barbarous immigration direct from the bogs of Ireland. Moreover, her foreigners are of a better grade than those who, on being dumped on the Atlantic seaboard, have neither the energy nor ambition to get away from the tenements into which they have been chuted from the steerage. Chicago Americanizes her foreigners; New York's immigrants have foreignized New York. Chicago has patriotism, local pride, self-respect, and capacity to act with unity. Witness her capture of the World's Fair from between the eager and underserving paws of New York, and the splendid subscription of \$5,000,000 made by her citizens. Chicago has the vitality of youth; the fire of the west is in her blood. New York is old and rotten, petty and jealous. Her contribution to the World's Fair—a splendid national enterprise—has consisted chiefly of sneers. Governor Flower, when he said "Rats!" to a delegation who waited on him with a request that he recommend a legislative appropriation of half a million, accurately expressed the feeling with which New York regards the superior brains and patriotism of Chicago. When, a few weeks ago, Mayor Grant went down on his knees at a mass-meeting and kissed the hand of Archbishop Corrigan, when that tremendous Brooklyn Irishman stalked majestically into the hall, New York was not shocked. The majority of her citizens gave their first duty to the pope, holding their loyalty to the United States government secondary to their allegiance to a foreign potentate.

ONCE ON A TIME—Senator Blackburn says—a typical American city convention was held to parcel out the offices. It was agreed in advance that all potent elements should be recognized, so for mayor an Irishman was nominated, for auditor a German, for treasurer an Irishman, for clerk a Swede, for street commissioner an Irishman, and so on. After these valuable adjuncts to American government had been duly and properly recognized, there yet remained one small, inconsequential office to fill. A little man arose timidly and said mildly that if the foreign element had no objection, and if the delegation from Europe had been properly provided for, perhaps it would be advisable to give this office to an American. In the midst of the general uproar an Irishman, very red and very angry, jumped to his feet and cried out: "Mr. President, if this is to be a damned know-nothing convention, I withdraw!" "The force of this here observation lies in the application of it."—Exchange.