

# New Zealand Gazette

VOL. XIV.—No. 43.

DUNEDIN: FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 1887

PRICE 6D.

## Current Topics

AT HOME AND ABROAD.

OURSELVES. IN reply to certain suggestions that have of late been made to us as to alterations in the character of the TABLET, we desire to lay before our readers the following statement of our position.—The object for which the TABLET was originally established, and with which it has so far been carried on, was that of defending Catholic interests and the Catholic name, which in many instances were wantonly and cruelly attacked, and for whose defence the secular Press afforded no opportunity. It was also to support and advocate the claims of Catholics as such in any case in which the necessity might arise, as, for example, in that connected with the godless schools. It devoted upon us as well to explain and vindicate the Irish cause and to protect the Irish people against defamation and calumny, or to refute and expose such charges when advanced to their prejudice. If, besides doing this, we could present our readers with interesting and instructive matter for their perusal we felt that our duty would be fully accomplished. As to Colonial affairs, taken in their secular bearing only, we have always believed that they concerned us in a very secondary way.—As a Catholic newspaper our office was to take such a course as might fall in harmoniously with the views of all Catholics who, however united they must necessarily be on subjects purely Catholic, must be expected where secular matters were concerned to differ as other people do.—It would not therefore suit our place, on many questions, to take any decided part.—We could not, for example, hope for the support of the Catholic who was a free-trader if we devoted ourselves to the advocacy of protection—nor on the other hand could we look to the Catholic protectionist to sustain us in advocating the interests of freetrade.—So far as Colonial politics, therefore, in their secular bearings were concerned, it has been our endeavour to steer a perfectly independent course and, whenever the occasion arose for our alluding to them, to do so without an attempt to influence the opinions of any one—merely stating our own, so that they might be taken for what they were worth.—In matters relating to Colonial secular news again we have not considered it necessary to be very copious in our publication.—We are aware that in every place the local newspapers contain all that is of interest in this connection, and as a matter of course, they also are seen by our readers almost without an exception.—To fill our columns, therefore, to the exclusion of the Catholic and Irish intelligence it forms one of our chief ends to provide would serve no useful purpose—while it would hinder one of our principal objects.—But it has been suggested to us that we should furnish our readers with what those who make the suggestion call “light reading”—and this is a suggestion that, we confess, we are completely unable to understand.—We do not suppose that it is thought possible that we should open our columns, for example, to the reports of the police and law courts.—That is done by no respectable Catholic paper that we know of. Such reading has always fallen under the heaviest condemnation of the ecclesiastical authorities who have from the first seen what it must result in.—And of its result, we have a vivid illustration in the revolting details of a late divorce case in London, which have been met with remonstrance even by people known as of anything rather than a squeamish mind. No such details, however, would have been published had not the public taste been vitiated and formed for their reception by the long course of debasing reports that had preceded them.—Nor can we consistently publish sensational tales.—These also are of an immoral tendency, and do much, even in their best form, to injure the mind that gives itself up to their study.—There is another class of light reading “which, indeed, we have from time to time rejected. It consists of what are known as “skits” on local people or events, and sometimes we have received it in the shape of an attempt at the reproduction of the Irish brogue.—Verily this kind of “light-reading” struck us as of excelling heaviness, and we never had the slightest hesitation about consigning it to the waste paper basket. It is not open to us to insult the intelligence of our readers. Perhaps it is from such wits as the producers of stuff like this that the suggestion to which we allude really emanates.—Meantime, we claim that the Catholic and Irish reading which we principally give to our readers is as light as such reading can be.—Religious matters can hardly be lightly treated of consistently with the respect due to

them, but who can truly accuse the Irish national papers of heaviness? Our extracts are very largely taken from the *Nation*, *United Ireland* and the *Dublin Freeman*, and these are the papers that principally circulate among the Irish people at home, and are most enjoyed by them. Have the Irish people abroad become of a more frivolous disposition? It is not pleasing to us by any means to blow our own trumpet, but relying on high encouragement given to us not once or twice but many times, and on approbation expressed of our paper by authorities whose judgment no one could despise, we may assert that we have so far done the work laid out for us, and fairly accomplished what was demanded of us. So far as it could be done by a newspaper, we have maintained the respect due to the Catholic body in New Zealand, and no one has been able to point to our columns in derision as an illustration of what “Irish Papists” could do when they attempted to deal with literary matters. If Irish Catholics are branded, as they sometimes are, with the accusation of intellectual inferiority, we may defy anyone to say, with truth that any article or publication that has ever appeared in our paper has done anything to give even plausibility to such an accusation. Sometimes, perhaps, we have been betrayed into the use of stronger language than it might be advisable for us to employ. But on such occasions, had the circumstances been known, it would be found that we were not without some excuse.—Some long course of provocation had been persisted in, or it was necessary for us to reach some hardened mind or some dull understanding, or to smite a hidden enemy behind his screen. Shall we then depart from the position in which relying on high authority we know that we have acquitted ourselves well. Shall we lower our tone and come down to the level of what many people would be glad to point out as the proper level of the Irish Catholic? Shall we become a mere gossiping organ, attempting by a forced wit to provoke a laugh, or by a little stale chaff to gain a popularity as dishonouring to ourselves as to those by whom it would be bestowed upon us? No, we have men, and sensible men to deal with. We have a people who in many ways demand our support and assistance to consult for, and even in the lighter matter that we provide for their perusal they will expect us to keep our graver and more important objects in view. We cannot lower our tone without betraying our cause, and deserting the noble task that has been committed to us.

SOME lies there are that die hard, and some that AN IMMORTAL never die at all. Still we must admit that the LIE. principle of their vitality need not, as a matter of absolute necessity, exist in any intentional malice or well considered design on the part of those who sustain them. Folly and ignorance are equally an excuse for many things—and, above all, we are willing to admit that they excuse many things that happen in the camp of our Evangelical friends. Lies that are repeated and repeated again, therefore, may stand on no more malicious base than the poor silly meagrim of some moldered brain. Nay, those who repeat them may mean very well all the time, and if their intentions, according to St. Bernard's famous saying, go to pave a lower region, that is the fault of their intellect and opportunities, and may be counted to them as a misfortune only. What, then, are we to say, for example, concerning this “Secret Oath of the Jesuits,” that, like Sir Boyle Roche's rat, is floating in our atmosphere, and producing such strange results as did the angel produce on Balaam's ass. A bray of horror and remonstrance, sweet music of the Land of Beulah, fills all our ears, and doubtless troubles many people who have little else to trouble them. But as to this “Secret Oath of the Jesuits,” it was exploded almost as soon as it was born. It saw the light in London in the year of grace 1848, and received a public and conclusive contradiction in Dublin in 1865. The manner of the exposure was as follows:—The firm of Seeley and Co., Fleet street, London, published in the year 1848 an English translation of the forged document known as the *Monita Secreta* of the Society of Jesus—a document no longer claimed as genuine even by the most pronounced enemies of the Jesuits, which, for example, Nicolini openly rejects, and of which Cartwright makes no mention. Which document, moreover, was printed for the first time at Cracow in 1612 by some calumniator of the Society, and immediately condemned as false and scandalous—although Messrs. Seeley apparently unaware of this, attribute its discovery to the year 1622, when, say they, it was found by Duke Christian of Brunswick in sacking the college of Paderborn in Westphalia. In this English edition published in 1848, the oath