

Rome vs. America

[SEVENTH THOUSAND]
Price 20 cents, 3 for 50 cents

A NOTE OF WARNING TO ALL LOYAL AMERICAN CITIZENS
RESPECTING THE DANGER WHICH THREATENS OUR FREE
INSTITUTIONS FROM THE ANTI-AMERICAN PRINCIPLES OF THE
ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH.

"Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence, I conjure you to believe me, fellow citizens, the jealousy of a -free people ought to be constantly awake, since history and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of a Republican government."— *George Washington*.

"If ever the liberty of the American Republic is destroyed, it will be the work, of the Roman Catholic priests,"—*General Lafayette*

BY D.A. SOMMER

Published by the
OCTOGRAPHIC REVIEW
Indianapolis, Indiana

COPYRIGHTED 1910

BY

THE OCTOGRAPHIC REVIEW
INDIANAPOLIS, INDIANA

COMMENDATIONS

This tract was formerly published under the title, "Letters to Roosevelt on Romanism," but has been changed somewhat so as to be more permanent in form. It has been doubled in size, with the same kind of facts which characterized the other booklet. G.V. Fradryssa, a Spanish ex-priest and a man who was prominent in the Roman Church, and who is the author of the famous book. "Roman Catholicism Capitulating Before Protestantism." says concerning the Letters to Roosevelt: "I have received and read with delight and profit your tract. You are accurate and your testimonies are of the best kind in the matter. If Protestants like to be successful in their rights, they must follow your example; never looking for sensational more than serious and trustworthy testimonies."

Alfred Seddon, an editor of the Christian Standard, and a missionary in Paris, France, says in that journal that "Roosevelt and Romanism" is a tract "which every American citizen should read."

Open letters to Cardinal Gibbons on Roman Catholicism and American Liberty

Dear Mr." Gibbons:—In your book, "The Faith of Our Fathers," you give us a chapter on the subject of "Civil and Religious Liberty." In the North American Review for March, 1909, you give the American people a long essay on "The Church and the Republic." In these essays, and many other of your writings, you try to allay the fears of the American people, who have hitherto believed that Roman Catholicism is incompatible with their government. I wish to show in this open letter to you that the charge of Protestants is true, and that they have a right to refuse to put a Roman Catholic into public office. I take as my subject in this letter, the bold proposition that, **THE PRINCIPLES OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH ARE REPUGNANT TO THE PRINCIPLES OF THE AMERICAN REPUBLIC, AND NO MAN CAN BE AN ACTIVE, LOYAL ROMAN CATHOLIC AND A LOYAL AMERICAN CITIZEN AT THE SAME TIME.** No doubt many Catholic people, and even many Protestants, will think that our proposition is absurd; yet I ask them all to consider kindly the testimony I produce. Many of the best people who have ever lived have been Roman Catholics; and some of these people have been as true to our government as it is possible for a man to be. But this is because they have been brought under the influence of American liberties and because they have not been active in carrying out the principles of their church. The great mass of these people, however, are under the complete power of their ecclesiastics, and these ecclesiastics are continually trying to overthrow the free institutions of *OUR* land.

I shall now proceed to prove my proposition from Catholic authorities. The general line of my argument shall be to show

that popes and prelates are opposed to the freedom of speech and of the press, and freedom of conscience and worship, our non-sectarian school system, the separation of State and church, and they are teaching these things to their people, and that every Roman Catholic is taught to obey these superiors.

Rome Is Opposed to the Freedom of Speech and of the Press.

Pope Leo XIII was one of the most remarkable men who ever sat on the papal chair. The Catholic people believe that his words *ex cathedra* are the words of God and must be obeyed in order to salvation. In his Encyclical entitled, "The Christian Constitution of States," dated November 1, 1885, he uses this language against equality, freedom of thought, sovereignty of "the people, freedom of conscience, freedom of speech, and freedom of the press.

Sad it is to call to mind how harmful and lamentable rage for innovation which rose to a climax in the 16th Century, threw first of all into confusion the Christian religion, and next, by natural sequence, invaded the precincts of philosophy, whence it spread amongst all classes of society. From this source, as from a fountain head, burst forth all those later tenets of unbridled license, which, in the midst of the terrible upheavals of the last century, were wildly conceived and boldly proclaimed as the principles and foundation of that new jurisprudence which was not merely previously unknown, but was at variance on many points with not only the Christian, but even with the natural law.

Amongst these principles the main one lays down that as all men are alike by race and nature, so in like manner all are equal in the control of their life; that each one is so far his own master as to be in no sense under the rule of any other individual; that each is free to think on every subject just as he may choose, and to do whatever he may like to do; that no man has any right to rule over other men. In a society grounded upon such maxims, all government is nothing more nor less than the will of the people, and the people, being under the power of itself alone, is alone its own ruler. It does choose nevertheless some to whose charge it may commit itself, but in such wise that it makes over to them not the right so much as the business of governing, to be exercised, however, in its name.

The authority of God is passed over in silence, * * * as if there could be a government of which the whole origin and power and authority did not reside in God himself. Thus, as is evident, a State becomes nothing but a multitude, which is its own master and ruler. And since the populace is declared to contain within itself the spring-head of all rights and all power, it follows that the State does not consider itself bound by any idea of duty

toward God. Moreover, it believes that it is not obliged to make public profession of any religion; or to inquire which of the very many religions is the only true one; or to prefer one religion to all the rest; or to show to any form of religion special favor; but on the contrary is bound to grant equal rights to every creed, so that public order may not be disturbed by any particular form of religious belief.

And it is a part of this theory that all questions that concern religion are to be referred to private judgment; and that every one is to be free to follow whatever religion he prefers, or none at all if he disprove of all. From this the following consequences logically flow: that the judgment of each one's conscience is independent of all law; that the most unrestrained opinion may be openly expressed as to the practice or omission of divine worship; and that every one has unbounded license to think whatever he chooses and to publish abroad whatever he thinks.—The Great Encyclical Letters of Leo XIII, pp. 120-1.

The sovereignty of the people, however, and this without any reference to God, is held to reside in the multitude; which is doubtless a doctrine exceedingly well calculated to flatter and inflame many passions, but which lacks all reasonable proof and all power of insuring public safety and preserving order. * * * The liberty of thinking, and of publishing, whatsoever each one likes, without any hindrance, is not in itself an advantage over which society can wisely rejoice.—The Great Encyclical Letters of Leo XIII, p. 123.

Listen now to the "inspired" words of another "infallible" pope, this time Gregory XVI, in 1832:

From this polluted fountain of indifference flows that absurd and erroneous doctrine, or rather raving, in favor and defense of "liberty of conscience," for which most pestilential error, the course is opened for that entire and wild liberty of opinion, which is everywhere attempting the overthrow of religious and civil institutions; and which the unblushing impudence of some has held forth as an advantage to religion. Hence that pest, of all others the most to be dreaded in a state, unbridled liberty of opinion, licentiousness of speech, and lust of novelty, which, according to the experience of all ages, portend the downfall of the most powerful and flourishing empires. Hither tends that worst and never sufficiently to be execrated and detested liberty of the press for the diffusion of all manner of writings, which some so loudly contend for, and so actively promote.—Campbell and Purcell Debate, pp. 331-2

Yours for freedom of speech and press,

— D. A. SOMMER.

Rome Is Opposed to the Freedom of Conscience and Worship.

Dear Cardinal:—Protestants have generally condemned Catholics because they persecute those opposed to them when they get

a chance. In your book you show that Protestants are not guiltless on the subject. The simple truth is that Protestants learned to persecute from Rome. But I am rejoiced to know that they have about forgotten their lesson. I am sorry to say, however, that Home is "semper eadem" (always the same), as she herself puts it, and she will persecute today if she has the power, just as she did in the days of the terrible Inquisition. You try to allay the fears of the people by saying that the first colony in America that gave religious liberty to men of every faith was Roman Catholic, and hence that she is a promoter of religious freedom. You have repeatedly said upon the platform, as well as in your book, that Lord Baltimore, a Roman Catholic, was the first colonist to grant toleration to all faiths. By refusing to state all the facts on this subject, you have no doubt deceived many people. Let us admit that Maryland was the first colony to grant religious liberty. It is sometimes necessary to inquire after the motive for doing a thing before we praise the act too highly. To praise a man in jail because he is quiet and law-abiding is foolish, for he can not be otherwise and go unpunished. So it was with Lord Baltimore. Did this colonist give religious liberty to his subjects because of the magnanimity of his soul or the principles of his religion? Is it reasonable to suppose that a Protestant King of England would permit a Catholic to establish in his realm a colony which would exclude Protestants? The idea is absurd. The historian, Green, in his "Short History of the English People" says concerning the matter, "As a purely Catholic settlement was impossible, he [Lord Baltimore] resolved to open the colony to men of every faith." This explains the matter. Lord Baltimore gave religious liberty to his colony because he had to. It doesn't seem to me, Mr. Gibbons, that there is so much in such an act that you should praise. But let us notice now the teaching of Pope Pius IX on the subject of freedom of worship. In the "Papal Syllabus of Errors," that "infallible" person pronounces as errors the following doctrines:

In the present day it is no longer expedient that the Catholic religion shall be held as the only religion of the State, to the exclusion of all other modes of worship.

Whence it has been wisely provided by law, in some countries called Catholic, that persons coming to reside therein shall enjoy the public exercise of their own worship.

Moreover, it is false that the civil liberty of every worship, and the full power given to all of overtly

manifesting their opinions and ideas, of all kinds whatsoever, conduce more easily to corrupt the morals and minds of the people, and to the propagation of the pest of indifferentism.

By condemning these doctrines, we clearly see that the Pope of Rome, and hence the Roman Catholic Church, is opposed to the freedom of worship.

These quotations, which we have adduced on this subject, show conclusively that the Roman Catholic Church is opposed to the freedom of speech and of the press and the freedom of worship. And does not history prove this, too? In every country where she has power, doesn't she control the press and hinder other religious people from worshiping God as they please? Wasn't this her practice through the Middle Ages when she had almost absolute power? Though we had none such plain teachings which we have adduced, we could show conclusively from her history that the Roman Catholic Church is something which religious liberty needs to fear. And what she has done, and is doing elsewhere, she will do in America, if she gets the chance. Yours for freedom of conscience and worship,

— D. A. SOMMER.

Rome Is Opposed to Our Non-Sectarian School System.

Dear Mr. Gibbons:—It is too well known to need repetition here that our non-sectarian school system is one of the main pillars in our Republic. And yet I affirm what I have already stated, that the Roman Catholic Church is opposed to this system.

Just here I wish to recommend for your perusal the book entitled, "The Parochial School, a Curse to the Church, a Menace to the Nation, by Rev. Jeremiah J. Crowley, a Catholic Priest of the Archdiocese of Chicago." This man is not an apostate from the Roman Catholic religion, at least he was not when the book was written, but is a moral, conscientious priest, loving the Catholic Church, but hating its corruption. Concerning Mr. Crowley, Archbishop Katzer says, "I am convinced that Almighty God brought Father Crowley to America to save the Catholic Church, and that the present scandal in Chicago—the most terrible that has ever occurred in America—was permitted by Providence to bring to a climax the reign of rottenness, that it might be unearthed, exposed and wiped out." Mr. Crowley shows from un-impeached testimony that the leaders of the Catholic Church, in

the press, in the pulpit, and on the platform, oppose our non-sectarian school system. Read the book and you will see the undermining that is going on against the free institutions of the American Republic.

There was a time when the Bible was taught in our schools, but chiefly through the priests this has been eliminated. Now they decry our schools as godless, and try to influence their people against them. In Crowley's book, page 03, we have this clipping from an editorial entitled, "Reaping the Whirlwind," in The Catholic Telegraph, of Cincinnati, August 18, 1904, page 4:

Various reasons have been assigned for these frequent eruptions of the anarchistic spirit, but, in our opinion, the lynching spirit is due to the irreligion, the exaggerated idea of personal freedom and the repugnance to authority imbibed by the pupils in the godless schools of the country. "All authority comes from God and "Morality can not be taught without religion," are principles which should dominate every system of education which may hope to produce law abiding citizens, and until they do dominate our primary school education, we must not expect to be free from increasing outbursts of the lynching spirit.

Here is a statement (telling the trend of affairs), "about a speech delivered by Archbishop Quigley, December 19, 1903, at Masonic Temple, Chicago":

Declaring that Catholics simply desired their constitutional right to educate their children *as* they saw fit, Archbishop Quigley attacked the erection of the new Chicago Normal School and the principles on which it was founded. He explained that the State could support Catholic parochial schools without violating any constitutional provision or statute.

A few weeks ago the following appeared in the Herald and Presbyter:

With prominent headlines, the Catholic Telegraph gloats over the fact that, in accordance with an appeal from a Catholic priest, C. A. Logue, the State Commissioner of Education, has forbidden the reading of the Bible in the public schools of Free-port, L. I. Thus a meddling priest does all he can to interfere with appropriate religious and moral training of the children, and will soon be heard crying for a division of the school funds on the ground that the public schools are "godless." The Roman Catholic priests of the country are the great promoters of godlessness of this sort, in using all their efforts to banish the Bible from the public schools.

But let us go to the highest authority in the Roman Catholic Church, to the pope himself, to see what he has to say respecting the control of the public schools by the government alone.. If his

teaching is not authority in this matter then the Catholic Church has none. "The Syllabus of the principal errors of our time, which are stigmatized in the Consistorial Allocutions, Encyclicals and other Apostolic Letters of our Most Holy Father, Pope Pius IX," mentions these "errors" along with many others:

The entire direction of public schools, in which the youth of Christian States are educated, except (to a certain extent) in the case of Episcopal seminaries, may and must appertain to the civil power, and belong to it so far that no other authority whatsoever shall be recognized as having any right to interfere in the discipline of the schools, the arrangement of the studies, the taking of degrees, or the choice and approval of the teachers— Allocution In Consistoriali, 1st Nov., 1850. Allocution Quibus luctuosissimis, 5th September, 1851.

The best theory of civil society requires that public schools open to the children of all classes, and, generally, all public institutions intended for instruction in letters and philosophy, and for conducting the education of the young, should be freed from all ecclesiastical authority, government, and interference, and should be fully subject to the civil and political power, in conformity with the will of rulers and prevalent opinions of the age.—Letter to the Archbishop of Fribourg, Quim non sine, July 14, 1864.

This system of instructing youth, which consists in separating; it from the Catholic state and from the power of the church, and in teaching exclusively, or at least primarily, the knowledge of natural things and the earthly ends of social life alone, may be approved by Catholics.—Letter to Archbishop of Fribourg, Quum non sine, 14th July, 1864.

These quotations teach just what our government teaches respecting the separation of our public schools from all ecclesiastical authority, and these very doctrines are condemned by the Pope Pius IX as "errors." If these extracts from the Papal Syllabus do not teach that the Roman Catholic Church with the pope at its head is opposed to our school system, then I confess that I do not understand the meaning of words.

But the American people are more acquainted with your name, Mr. Gibbons, than any other prelate in the Catholic Church. In The Chicago Inter Ocean, of July 18, 1908, we have your words: Segregate the public schools of the country. Let each denomination maintain its own school where its Christian teachers can inculcate a love of God into the hearts of the children while teaching them other things. And the expense? Let it be borne by the State.

The teaching, then, of prelates and popes is against our non sectarian school system. How can a man obey such teachers and be at the same time loyal to American principles ?

Yours for our non-sectarian school system,

D. A. SOMMER.

Rome Is Opposed to the Separation of Church and State.

Dear Mr. Gibbons:—Cardinal Manning, the most influential Catholic in England in the latter half of the nineteenth century, speaks thus concerning the temporal sovereignty of the Holy See (Vatican Decrees, page 37):

The Catholic church can not be silent—it can not hold its peace; it can not cease to preach the doctrines of Revelation, not only of the Trinity and of the Incarnation, but likewise of the Seven Sacraments, and of the Infallibility of the Church of God, and of the necessity of Unity, and of the Sovereignty, both spiritual and temporal, of the Holy See.—The Present Crisis of the Holy See, by H. E. Manning, D. D., London, 1861, page 73.

This same cardinal speaks again (Vatican Decrees, page 12):

There is not another church so-called (than the Roman), nor any community professing to be a church, which does not submit, or obey, or hold its peace when the civil governors of the world command.—The Present Crisis of the Holy See, by H. E. Manning, D. D., London, 1861, page 75.

Hear now what Pope Pius IX says in "Syllabus Errorum" (The Papal Syllabus of Errors, A. D. 1864), "The Syllabus of the Principal Errors of Our Time, which are Stigmatized in the Consistorial Allocution Encyclicals and other Apostolic Letters of our Most Holy Father, Pope Pius IX":

Kings and princes are not only exempt from the jurisdiction of the church, but are superior to the church in litigated questions of jurisdiction.—Apostolic Letter, Multiplies inter, June 10, 1851.

The church ought to be separated from the State, and the State from the church.—**Allocution Acerbissimum**, September 27, 1852.

Remember that these statements are "stigmatized" as "errors," hence the pope teaches just the opposite, that the State and the church should not be separated. Listen now to Pope Leo XIII. as he speaks of the "absurdity" of the separation of church and State:

We shall not hold to the same language on another point, concerning the principle of the separation of the State and church, which is equivalent to the separation of human legislation from

Christian and divine legislation. We do not care to interrupt ourselves here in order to demonstrate the absurdity of such a separation; each one will understand for himself.—The Great Encyclical Letters of Leo XIII, pp. 261-2.

Note Leo's words again on the same subject:

And just as the end at which the church aims is by far the noblest of ends, so is its authority the most exalted of all authority, nor can it be looked upon as inferior to the civil power, or in any manner dependent upon it.—The Great Encyclical Letters of Leo XIII, pp. 112-13.

But here is a statement from the Encyclical of Leo XIII, entitled "Catholicity in the United States," dated January 6, 1895, to which I call your special attention:

Many facts have been brought to Our notice, whereby We are animated with hope and filled with joy, namely, that the numbers of the secular and regular clergy are steadily augmenting, that pious sodalities and confraternities are held in esteem by the Catholic parochial schools, the Sunday Schools for imparting Christian doctrine, and summer schools are in a nourishing condition; moreover, associations for mutual aid, for the relief of the indigent, for the promotion of temperate living, add to all this the main evidence of popular piety. The main factor, no doubt, in bringing things into this happy state, were the ordinances and decrees of your synods, especially of those which in more recent time were convened and confirmed by the authority of the Apostolic See. But, moreover (a fact which it gives pleasure to acknowledge), thanks are due to the equity of the laws which obtain in America and to the customs of the well-ordered Republic. For the Church amongst you, unopposed by the Constitution and government of your nation, fettered by no hostile legislation, protected against violence by the common laws and the impartiality of the tribunals, is free to live and act without hindrance. Yet, though all this is true, it would be very erroneous to draw the conclusion that in America is to be sought the type of the most desirable status of the Church, or that it would be universally lawful or expedient for Church and State to be, as in America, dissevered and divorced. The fact that Catholicity with you is in good condition, nay, is even enjoying a prosperous growth, is by all means to be attributed to the fecundity with which God has endowed His Church, in virtue of which, unless men or circumstances interfere, she spontaneously expands and propagates herself; but she would bring forth more abundant fruits if, in addition to liberty, she enjoyed the favors of the laws, and the patronage of the public authority.—The Great Encyclical Letters of Leo XIII, pp. 323-4.

Yours for a separation of church and State,

D. A. SOMMER.

Rome Is Influencing Our Politicians.

Dear Cardinal:—Not only is the Roman Catholic Church opposed to our free institutions, but she is working to overthrow them, and she is influencing our politicians to help her for her votes. In *The Home Herald*, a monthly religious publication of Chicago (formerly called the *Ram's Horn*), we find the following editorial in the June, 1908, issue:

Is the Catholic Church gradually gaining the official recognition at the hands of our government for which it has so earnestly contended? Ever since Secretary Taft broke all our precedents by treating directly with the Pope in the Philippines, there have been well-defined rumors that it is. Now comes this paragraph in the letter of one of the ablest of American correspondents in Rome, written to a paper famous for its conservatism, [*Boston Transcript*]:

"The Vatican has stretched out its long arm and the postmaster-general of the United States has forbidden the entrance into the United States mails of a Roman paper called "L'Asino" This paper has been exceedingly anti-clerical and it is said to have sold over four thousand copies a week in America. For a long time the Vatican authorities have been trying to have its publication stopped, but they have not succeeded in Italy, although they did in the United States. The action of the postmaster-general was hailed with joy in Vatican circles."

Here is an anti-Catholic paper coming to our shores from Italy, and through the influence of our corrupt politicians, this paper is excluded from the mails. This instance alone should cause the American people who love the freedom of the press to open their eyes. But in many other ways is the evil work going on of destroying our free institutions.

As another instance of the undermining work Catholics are doing, I call your attention to the case of the \$100,000 of Indian trust money, which Roosevelt permitted to go for sectarian schools among the Indians. While debates were going on in the House of Representatives on the subject, some important points were brought out in a senatorial hearing held in Washington on January 31 (1905), at which Mr. S. M. Brosin agent of the Indian Rights Association in Washington, made the following written charges:

A statement has been made to me by an honorable Senator which will be amplified before the committee on Indian affairs, if requested, to the effect that a Mr. Scharf, a representative Catholic (Prof. E. L. Scharf, of the Catholic University at Washington), submitted a table of twenty close Congressional districts

with the alleged Catholic vote in each, and a written proposal to deliver the necessary votes to carry these districts that might be selected by the Republicans, if the appropriations for Catholic Indian schools, to the amount of \$200,000 were continued for two years longer. Even threats were made by this Mr. Scharf that the defeat of certain Congressmen would be brought about unless opposition to sectarian appropriations was withdrawn.

I will state further, that a member of the House of Representatives, who was opposing legislation which provided for support of Indian contract schools from government funds, was approached by the same Mr. Scharf, and threatened that if he did not withdraw his opposition to the legislation, he (Mr. Scharf) would see that the Catholic Church organization would defeat him at the next election. I am authorized to make this statement to this committee. The member referred to is Hon. John H. Stephens, of Texas.—The Outlook, Feb. 11, 1905.

This incident at the Nation's capital gives us an insight into the workings of the Roman Catholic religio-political machine, and shows how she is influencing our politicians. Grover Cleveland was one of the first presidents to give his influence to the Catholic machine, and he obtained thereby its vote. Theodore Roosevelt was the next president to lend aid to these anti-American people. By his tongue and pen and power he did much to advance the influence of the Roman Catholic Church. Yea, he even did some unconstitutional things to obtain their favor. He permitted over \$100,000 to go for the establishing of sectarian schools among the Indians. It is true that four or five thousand dollars went to other denominational schools, but practically all of it went to the Roman Catholic Church. Here is what Lyman Abbot, the editor of The Outlook, the very paper of which Mr. Roosevelt is now an editor, said concerning the matter:

No man has laid more stress than Mr. Roosevelt on the fact that the same principles are to be applied to Indians and to Anglo-Saxons, to black men and to white men. He has violated this fundamental principle of his own life teaching in proposing to allow the public monies of the Indians to be used at the request of some Indians for denominational schools of their own selection.—The Outlook, Feb. 18, 1905.

The next prominent man to sell himself to Rome was William H. Taft. Many of those who may read these letters know something of Mr. Taft's liberality to Rome in the Philippine deal, but that you may know more I shall enter somewhat into the details. It fell to the lot of William H. Taft to separate the church from the State in the Philippine Islands, and to settle

matters generally, which task he performed very satisfactorily to the pope of Rome, but not so to many American citizens. In his Nashville speech on May 21, 1908, he endeavors to present the whole matter from beginning to end. He begins by telling the relations of Spain to the Catholic Church in the Philippines:

To understand the relation which Spain bore to the Roman Church, one must go far back in Roman history to the time when Pope Alexander VI issued the bull by which he divided the newly discovered east and west between Spain and Portugal. By several bulls he delegated to Spain his power as an ecclesiastical patron of many religious enterprises and organizations which were instituted under the authority of the Church, and he made an agreement with the King of Spain, called the "Concordat," in respect to the government of the colonies, under which the king appointed bishops and priests, paid them, and agreed to construct, maintain and repair churches and religious edifices in his dominion.

Remember that in the Concordat made between the King of Spain and the pope, "the king appointed bishops and priests, paid them, and agreed to construct, maintain and repair churches, and religious edifices in his dominion." This Concordat was made about 400 years ago, hence all the "churches and religious edifices," now in the Philippines (with perhaps the exception of a few which private charity may have built), were erected mostly by the Spanish government and belonged to them. Now when the United States paid \$20,000,000 for the islands, she bought all that which belonged to the Spanish crown. Common sense teaches a man that all these churches and religious edifices, for the most part, at least, must then belong to the American government. But Mr. Roosevelt, through Mr. Taft, by some kind of a maneuver, which nobody seems to understand, transferred this property, worth perhaps millions of dollars, from the Spanish government to the Romish hierarchy. Then, besides the giving of these millions of dollars' worth of property to the Catholic Church, over \$400,000 were given it for damages incurred by the United States soldiers while occupying these buildings, which belonged to the American government through the \$20,000,000 purchase. Then again, Mr. Taft purchased the friars' lands for \$7,000,000, when he himself admitted that they were worth only \$0,000,000. Here are Mr. Taft's own words:

The commission had employed a well-known agrimensor, that is agricultural surveyor, to go over the lands and give an estimate of their value from an agricultural standpoint, and his

report showed that they were worth about \$6,000,000 gold. This price was scouted at by representatives of the friars and their assignees (for the friars had conveyed the lands to companies in which they retained the majority of shares) and they offered to sell the land at \$12,000,000. Finally they came down to \$10,500,000, and after a long time, just in order to buy peace, and not because the lands were, in our judgment, worth it, we increased the offer from \$5,000,000 to \$7,000,000. This was doubtless in excess of the value of the land. We deemed it of such importance to remove this constant source of irritation, however, that we were willing to pay more than the lands were worth for political and governmental reasons.—Nashville speech.

That you may know that the conclusions mentioned above are not mere assertions, but are founded on facts, I quote the exact words of the minority report of the Taft Commission, Sixtieth Congress, first session, House of Representatives, Report 696, part 2;

It is manifestly right and proper that the disputed claim to the ownership, as well as to the occupancy and possession, of this vast property should be definitely and finally settled before any question as to the liability of the United States for damages done to it can be passed upon by Congress. If the property in dispute (churches, convents, etc. passed to the United States as the successor of Spain, as is earnestly maintained by many lawyers and publicists of ability and eminence, who have carefully examined the subject, then unquestionably no liability for damages attaches to the United States.

In view, therefore, of the testimony of Colonel Hull, whose labors appear to have been performed conscientiously, intelligently, and with painstaking care, we must conclude that the \$40,000 recommended to be paid in addition to the sum (\$36.3,000) awarded by the board (for damage to church property) is intended as a mere gratuity, for which no justification can be found in the instructions given the board by the Secretary of War defining the scope of its difficult task, and which we believe to be wholly unwarrantable by any evidence produced before us and upon which evidence these claims are supposed to be founded.

We are equally unable to agree to the recommendation of the report that this sum be paid to the archbishop of Manilla, for all the testimony offered upon this point clearly indicates that this church dignitary is not empowered under any canonical or other law to execute a proper acquittance therefor. We hold that whatsoever sum may be paid by Congress for the occupation of and damages to church properties in the Philippine Islands, if paid to the Roman Catholic Church, should be paid to the bishops of the various dioceses, and that its use should be limited to the repair and construction of churches, convents, and seminaries in the islands.

Besides these millions of dollars which many eminent lawyers believe were unlawfully given to the Roman hierarchy, Mr. Taft recommended that an additional \$140,000 be given the Catholic Church, which recommendation, however, was rejected by a more patriotic commission. Of course this liberal treatment of the Catholics at the expense of the American and Filipino taxpayer, gained Mr. Taft the favor of the pope, hence of the priests, hence of their people. Thus we understand why Mr. Taft received so many votes in the last election. All these things may be good for one individual and one class of religious people, but not for the principles and people generally of the American Republic. And the serious question comes to us, Where shall we be led by these un-Americanisms of our presidents and other politicians?

Yours against Romanism in American politics,

D. A. SOMMER.

Rome Will Do Anything to Accomplish Her Purpose.

Dear Mr. Gibbons:—Perhaps it seems strange that I should attempt to prove this proposition, but the teachings and practices of Rome embolden me to make it. The Roman Catholic Church teaches that "the end justifies the means"; and when a church teaches that, we may expect anything from it. But perhaps you deny that such is its teachings. Listen to these words from an authority on the subject:

"And the result of dispassionate examination of these and kindred works—always bearing in mind that no Jesuit writings can be published without special license from the general, after careful scrutiny and review—is that the three principles of probabilism, of mental reservation, and of justification of means by ends, which collectively make what educated men mean by the term 'Jesuitry,' are recognized maxims of the society. As the last of these three is at once the most odious in itself, and the charge which is most anxiously repelled, it is well to cite three leading Jesuit theologians in proof. Busembaum, whose *Medulla Theologia* has been more than fifty times printed, and lately by the Propaganda itself, lays down the maxims in the following terms: 'Cum finis est licitus, etiam media sunt licita,' and 'Cui licitus est finis, etiam licent media.' [When an end is lawful, the means also are lawful, and, To whom the end is lawful, the means are also lawful.] Layman, similarly, in his *Theologia Moralis*, 'Cui concessus est finis, concessa etiam sunt media ad finem ordinata,' [To whom an end is permitted, the means appointed for the end are also permitted.] And Wageman, in his *Synopsis Theologiae Moralis*, yet more tersely, 'Finis determinat probitatem actus.'

[The end determines the uprightness of the act.]"—Encyclopedia Britannica, under "Jesuit."

When men believe that the end justifies the means, who can tell what they may do? Every Jesuit believes that to advance the interests of his church is the greatest thing -which he can do on earth. Who can say that deception, persecution, assassination, etc., will not be used by such men? The truth is that they have been employed by them in the past, and they will be used by them in the future, if indeed Rome is what she claims to be— "always the same." As further proof to our proposition, listen to Gregory IX:

"Be it known unto all who are under the dominion of heretics, that they are set free from every tie of fidelity and duty to them; all oaths or solemn agreements to the contrary notwithstanding."—Decret. Greg. lib. 5, tit. 7.

Does not every loyal Roman Catholic regard every Protestant president as a "heretic," and if he obeys this teaching of an "infallible" most holy father, what kind of an American citizen will he make? In confirmation of all we have thus far said on this subject, listen now to part of the oath of every Roman Catholic bishop:

The rules of the Holy Fathers, the Apostolic decrees, ordinances, or disposals, reservations, provisions, and mandates, I will observe with all my might, and cause to be observed by others. Heretics, schismatics and rebels to our said Lord, or his fore-said successors, I will to my utmost power persecute and oppose.—Campbell-Purcell Debate, on Roman Catholic Religion, page 280.

Now as all Protestants are "heretics," and as all Roman Catholics must obey their superiors, we can see what is in store for the Protestant people of this and other countries. If Roman Catholicism obtains the ascendancy in the United States, there is not a Protestant who will be safe.

In this connection read the boast of Archbishop Quigley, as reported in The Chicago Tribune, May 5, 1903:

Since I have seen the western parochial schools I have come to the conclusion that in fifty years, if things go on as I see that they are going on at present, the Catholic Church will actually own the West. Within twenty years this country is going to rule the world. Kings and emperors will soon pass away, and the democracy of the United States will take their place. The West will dominate the country, and what I have seen of the western parochial schools has proved that the generation, which follows

us will be exclusively Catholic. When the United States rules the world, the Catholic Church will rule the world.

From these quotations we see that the ambition of Rome is to rule as she did once; and as we have seen that her great moralists teach, and her history shows that she fully believes, that "the end justifies the means," we may expect her to deceive, break oaths, persecute, or do anything else, to accomplish the end which she has in view. Now, Mr. Gibbons, while you are running up and down the country telling the people of the loyalty of the Catholics, Archbishop Quigley and other prominent Catholics are telling their people that in a little while Catholicism will rule America, and they are working to that end. Hosts of American people are coming to believe that you are an adept in "Jesuitry."¹

Yours for ministers without guile (1 Pet. 2:1),

D. A. SOMMER.

The Reason Loyal Americans Should Not Vote for a Roman Catholic.

Dear Cardinal;—No doubt many good quiet Catholics wonder why it is that their religion is held before the American people in an unfavorable light, and not the beliefs of the different Protestant denominations. There can be but one answer to this question, and that is that Rome is continually meddling in politics, where she does not belong, while the Protestant denominations keep to their proper sphere, religion. Mr. Gladstone expressed the truth on this point in these words, in "Vatican Decrees," p. 11:

Before all things, however, I should desire it to be understood that, in the remarks now offered, I desire to eschew not only religious bigotry, but likewise theological controversy. Indeed, with the-.logy, except in its civil bearing—with theology as such —E have here nothing whatever to do. But it is the peculiarity of Roman theology that, by thrusting itself into the temporal domain it naturally, and even necessarily, comes to be a frequent theme of political discussion. To quiet-minded Roman Catholics, it must be *a* subject of infinite annoyance that their religion is, on this ground more than any other, the subject of criticism; more than any other the occasion of conflict with the State and of civil disquietude. I feel sincerely how much hardship their case entails. But this hardship is brought upon them altogether by the conduct of the authorities of their own church. Why did theology enter so largely into the debates of Parliament on

Roman Catholic Emancipation? Certainly not because our statesmen and debaters of fifty years ago had an abstract love of such controversies, but because it was extensively believed that the Pope of Rome had been and was a trespasser upon ground which belonged to the civil authority, and that he affected to determine by spiritual prerogative questions of the civil sphere. This fact, if fact it be, and not the truth or falsehood, the reasonableness or unreasonableness, of any article of purely religious belief, is the whole and sole cause of the mischief. To this fact, and to this fact alone, my language is referable; but for this fact it would have been neither my duty nor my desire to use it. All other Christian bodies are content with freedom in their own religious domain. Orientals, Lutherans, Calvinists, Presbyterians, Episcopalians, Non-Conformists, one and all, in the present day, contentedly and thankfully accept the benefits of civil order; never pretend that the State is not its own master; make no religious claim to temporal possessions or advantages; and, consequently, never are in perilous collision with the State. Nay, more, even so I believe it is with the mass of Roman Catholics individually. But not so with the leaders of their church, or with those who take pride in following the leaders. Indeed, this has been made matter of boast:

"There is not another church (than the Roman), nor any community professing to be a church, which does not submit or obey, or hold its peace when the civil governors of the world command."—The Present Crisis of the Holy See, by H. E. Manning, D. D., London, 1861, p. 75.

Mr. Gladstone, that "grand old man" of England, had a considerable experience with Roman Catholics, and knew what he was talking about when he spoke concerning them. This great man said further concerning the Roman Church:

That no one can now become her [Rome's] convert without renouncing his moral and mental freedom, and placing his civil loyalty and duty at the mercy of another [the Pope],

We now come to the final point in our argument which is to show the connection between the popes of Rome and the ordinary Catholic in our country. It is not necessary for me to prove that the pope of Rome is the highest authority in the Roman Catholic Church, for this is disbelieved by none. The bishops in the Catholic Church are made such by the pope on the recommendation of other bishops, and at their installation they swear loyalty to the pope of Rome. Here is part of their oath as found on page 280 of "Campbell and Purcell Debate on the Roman Catholic Religion": I, —, elect of the church of —, from henceforward will be faithful and obedient to St. Peter the Apostle, and to the Holy Roman Church, and to our Lord, the Lord —, Pope —, and his suc-

cessors, canonically coming in. I will neither advise, consent, or do anything that they may lose life or member, or that their person may be seized, or hands any-wise laid upon them, or any injuries offered to them, under any pretense whatsoever. The counsel which they shall intrust to me withal, by themselves, their messengers, or letters, I will not knowingly reveal to any to their prejudice. I will help them to defend and keep the Roman Papacy, and royalties of St. Peter, saving my order, against all men. The legate of the Apostolic See, going and coming, I will honorably treat and help in his necessities. The rights, honors, privileges, and authority of the Holy Roman Church, of our Lord the Pope, and his foresaid successors, I will endeavor to preserve, defend, increase, and advance. I will not be in any council, action or treaty, in which shall be plotted against our said Lord, and the said Roman Church, anything to the hurt or prejudice of their persons, right, honor, state or power; and if I shall know of any such thing to be treated or agitated by any -whatsoever, I will signify it to our said Lord, or to some other by whom it may come to his knowledge. The rules of the Holy Fathers, the Apostolic decrees, ordinances, or disposals, reservations, provisions, and mandates, I will observe with *all* my might, and cause to be observed by others. Heretics, schismatics, and rebels, to our said Lord, or his foresaid successors, I will to my utmost power persecute and oppose.

Now, everybody knows and Catholics admit that the priests or pastors must obey the bishop and the people must obey the priests. From "A Full Catechism of the Catholic Religion, from the German of Joseph Deharbe, S. J.," we have, on page 135, obedience to the pope taught to the Catholic people in these words:

By what means are unity and good order maintained in the whole Church? By this: that all those who are not priests always continue, with ready obedience, subordinate to the Priests, the Priests to the Bishops, and the Bishops to the Pope. (Application)—Always cherish in your heart a profound reverence and a humble submission to the Holy Father, the Pope, and to the Bishops and Priests united with them; for they are set over you in the place of God, and it is their duty to instruct you in the name of God, to make you partake of the divine graces, and to lead you to eternal salvation. Woe to them who despise the clergy and create schisms!

The task which now remains before us is to review the facts and arguments which have been presented on this subject of Roman Catholicism and American Liberties. We have seen that the popes and prelates of Rome are opposed to the freedom of speech and of the press and the freedom of worship, are opposed to our non-sectarian school system, and are opposed to the sepa-

ration of State and church as it exists in America. We have seen that the Catholic Church in America is carrying out these teachings of popes through our corrupt politicians. We have seen, too, that the Jesuits, who are strong supporters of the Papal See, teach that the end justifies the means, and hence may resort to anything to carry out their plans. And we have seen further that every bishop swears loyalty to these popes who hold such anti-American principles, and that all the common people must render obedience to their superiors. Hence our only conclusion can be that if this system is carried out as the high Romish authorities intend, every Roman Catholic must be opposed to the freedom of speech and of the press and the freedom of worship, and our non-sectarian school system, and the separation of State and church, and will work to carry out the wishes and teachings of the most holy fathers. Beyond a doubt, then, our proposition has been proved that **THE PRINCIPLES OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH ARE REPUGNANT TO THE PRINCIPLES OF THE AMERICAN REPUBLIC, AND NO MAN CAN' BE AN ACTIVE, LOYAL ROMAN CATHOLIC AND A LOYAL AMERICAN CITIZEN AT THE SAME TIME.**

If I had no history to substantiate what I have said in this letter, perhaps I should not be so bold in my assertions, but the fact that the history of the Church of Rome through the past thousand years corroborates what I have theoretically proved, makes my reasoning doubly sure. From the time that Rome has had any prospect for superiority in temporal matters, she has claimed the authority to rule the bodies as well as the spirits of men. "It must be borne in mind," says a prominent historian, "that the bishops of Rome put forth a double claim, namely, that they Were the supreme head of the church, and also the rightful, divinely-appointed suzeraine of all temporal princes, the earthly king of kings. Their claim to supremacy in spiritual matters wag very generally acknowledged throughout at least the West as early as the sixth century, while that as to supremacy in temporal affairs was not approximately established before about the eleventh or twelfth century." But still Rome believed and taught before she had acquired the temporal power that she should be supreme, and worked to that end. Italy, Germany, France, Spain, England and all other important States of Europe, Russia excepted, have one time acknowledged the supremacy of Rome in temporal matters as well as spiritual. But all

these countries, with one or two exceptions, have thrown aside the papal yoke. Since, however, the pope has lost so much of his temporal authority, has he relinquished his claim to this temporal power? Nay, verily; but he presses onward as before, ever ready to grasp the scepter of temporal kings. And there is no country to which he is looking with brighter dreams as to his future than to our America. Rome boasts of being "semper eadem" (always the same), and as she has hoped and taught and dreamed and fought for temporal power in the past, so will she do today.

Who can doubt, then, Mr. Gibbons, with all this testimony before him, that the Catholic Church will try to unite State and church in America? Is she not trying it all the time when she is seeking to have a representative at the national capital? You may try to deceive the American people by saying that Catholics are satisfied with the separation of State and church in America, but we firmly believe that this is nothing but deception on your part, and that you are practicing the "mental reservation" taught by the Jesuits; for Pope Leo said: "It would be very erroneous to draw the conclusion that in America is to be sought the most desirable status of the church. * * * She would bring forth more abundant fruits if, in addition to liberty, she enjoyed the favors of the laws and the patronage of the public authority." In other words, the "infallible" Leo was dissatisfied with the separation of State and church in America, just as Protestants say that Catholics are, and longed for something more than liberty—"the favors of the laws and the patronage of the public authority." And yet, Mr. Gibbons, you have the audacity to parade the country and tell the people of the loyalty of Catholics to our free institutions. **BUT THE NON-CATHOLIC PEOPLE ARE GETTING THEIR EYES OPEN TO THE DECEPTIVE ARTS OF ROME.**

Yours for America as she has been,

D. A. SOMMER.

FAIRBANKS, ROOSEVELT AND THE POPE.

Dear Mr. Gibbons:—As a confirmation to my proposition that the Roman Catholic Church is anti-American, I call your attention to the dealings of the pope with Messrs. Fairbanks and Roosevelt. The world has about concluded that Rome is what she

claims to be—"semper eadem" (always the same)—when it comes to intolerance, at least. The attitude of the pope toward these two Americans should certainly be a warning to our liberty-loving people.

The pope seems to have a spite at this little band of Methodists at Rome. He sees in them a dark cloud which foretells a coming storm. For centuries the pope has ruled Italy with a rod of iron, but since the re-establishment of the Italian kingdom, about half a century ago, that religious despot has been deprived of his temporal power, and religious liberty has been granted to the people, a thing which they never enjoyed as long as the pope held the reins of temporal power. Because the pope's temporal power has been taken from him, he has shut himself in the Vatican, there to pout over the loss of his temporal domains, and there to devise plans by which he can obtain it again in Italy, America, or some other place. The Catholic Telegraph, a prominent Romanist journal, speaks thus concerning the Roosevelt incident:

Pius X is King as well as Pope. Rome is his episcopal see as well as the capital city of his temporal kingdom. It is only the superior physical force of the Italian invader that prevents the Papacy from protecting itself in its home city, from lese majeste against its dignity as a sovereign spiritual power and as a sovereign civil power. The throne of Victor Emmanuel in Rome is a standing insult to the Pope-King; therefore, Vatican diplomacy declines to permit Catholic sovereigns to make royal visits to the Italian King in Rome.

The Methodists at Rome are spreading literature to open the eyes of that benighted people, and it is this that causes the pope to hate them so. He says that they are slandering the Roman Catholic Church, but in this he is mistaken, for one does not need to fabricate anything in order to turn unprejudiced, honest men away from that religio-political machine. Wherever Romanism has had full sway, there corruption has reigned, and the Methodists in Rome are only showing the people the difference between Romanism and a purer form of Christianity. If it were not for the strong hand of the law, the pope would soon wipe out of existence the Methodists now in Rome, and what he would do there he would do in America if he had the power.

When, then, Mr. Fairbanks came to Rome and said that he would like to see the pope, that dignitary said that he would be glad to receive him, provided he would not give any countenance to the Methodists in Rome. Now, Mr. Fairbanks is a Methodist,

and the pope was practically requiring of him that he renounce his own brethren. Mr. Fairbanks immediately answered; to his honor, that his engagement with the pope was canceled and that he would speak for his brethren at Rome.

On the heels of Mr. Fairbanks came Mr. Roosevelt to Rome, to suffer the same humiliation. While in Egypt he declared that he would like to see the head of the papal church, and negotiations were begun with the pope; but when the "holy father" intimated that he must promise not to visit the Methodists while in Rome, Mr. Roosevelt nobly answered that the engagement was off, for he did not wish his liberty restricted while in "the Eternal City." The actions of Messrs. Fairbanks and Roosevelt on these occasions have been praised by the world in general, for they went on record as opposed to intolerance of this kind. But we might ask just here, How could they have honorably done otherwise? Even if these men had been Catholics, they would have been looked down upon by the tolerant people of the world had they submitted to the disgraceful terms of the pope. But, being Protestants, they would have been literally hissed for their servility had they given up their liberty, as the pope demanded. In view of the fact that Mr. Roosevelt has talked so much for the Catholics and permitted a hundred thousand dollars of the people's money to go for the establishment of parochial schools, he did much better than we had reason to expect when he refused to throw away his manhood to kiss the hand or foot of the pope.

The great mistake which Mr. Roosevelt makes in the matter is in saying that the affair is a personal one between him and the pope. Who is the pope of Rome, and who was Theodore Roosevelt at Rome? The pope is the head of the Catholic Church and Mr. Roosevelt was a representative of American liberties. It was a matter, then, between Rome and America, intolerance and tolerance; and if these can not agree in Rome, how are they going to agree in America? The lesson that we learn from the experience of Fairbanks and Roosevelt with the pope is that the Roman Catholic Church is anti-American.

If Mr. Roosevelt is a man of knowledge and wisdom and walks according to them, there are some things in his conduct which I do not understand. A little over a year ago, he came out boldly and said those people are "narrow bigots" who refuse to vote for a man because he is a Roman Catholic. Had he learned from history what he should have learned, he would have known, as we

have seen in these letters, that the Roman Catholic Church is opposed to the freedom of speech and the press, a non-sectarian school system, a separation of State and church, and that every Catholic bishop takes an oath to support the pope in his claims, and that every Catholic must obey this bishop. He refused to learn from history what we say concerning the Romish Church. Now, by his own experience at the Vatican, he sees that the pope *is* opposed to religious toleration. Instead of plainly announcing to the world what his experience and judgment certainly tell him is the truth, he cables to America that the matter is a personal one between him and the pope, and that there should be no discussion of the matter. We may suppose that he said this in order to try to hold his popularity with the Catholic people. If Mr. Roosevelt has not learned from history and his own experience that the Roman Catholic Church is anti-American, then he is an unsafe man as a leader of a great people; and if he bag learned that this church is anti-American, he should try to repair the mischief he has done and should not try to hide his convictions, but should love his country enough to make them known and try to save this land from the hand of the religious despot; and he, furthermore, should apologize to those liberty-loving Americans whom he branded as "narrow bigots" because they will not vote for a servant of the anti-American head of an anti-American church.

The position taken by the Romish clergy in this matter shows that our conclusions are just. It is true that some Catholics expressed sympathy for Mr. Roosevelt in the matter, but these are conspicuously few and of little authority in that religious body. It was made conspicuous at the time of the incident that many Catholics were in sympathy with Mr. Roosevelt, but those who had the boldness to express themselves have since been chastised by the higher authorities for their freedom of speech. John Callan O'Loughlin, who conducted negotiations between Roosevelt and the pope, seemed to sympathize with the former, but this is what William H. O'Connell, archbishop of Boston, says concerning him:

In the case of John Callan O'Loughlin, who is he? He says he is a Catholic and he boasts of it, and in the same breath he cables all over the world that the head of his church is wrong and Mr. Roosevelt is the greatest thing in creation. That is the sort of a Catholic we are ashamed of. He will live to see the day that he will regret those words.

Now, what do these plain words teach us? O'Connel, one of the highest dignitaries in the Roman Catholic Church, represents the Roman hierarchy and certainly is acquainted with its principles and workings, and O'Loughlin represents those Catholics who have the courage, rather should I say rashness, to speak out for religious tolerance. He who claims to have the power to "bind and loose" says to him who has only the power of being bound or loosed, "He will live to see the day that he will regret those words." Does this not show that the liberty-loving Catholics who dare to speak the sentiments will be punished for their audacity? And does it not further show that the Roman Catholic Church is as anti-American in America as it is in Rome itself?

Some might have supposed that the Romish Church is tolerant because Abbot Janssens, the most prominent prelate in Rome outside the cardinalate, sent a word of commendation to Mr. Roosevelt when he was in Rome, but the following clipping shows that that gentleman not only lost his prospect for a cardinal's cap for his action, but must bow and scrape in apology before the pope, and no doubt will be compelled to undergo an awful penance of which the world will hear nothing:

Rome, April 19.—Abbot Janssens, of the benedictines, today sent to the pope his resignation as secretary of the sacred congregation, accompanying it with a letter apologizing for his call on Theodore Roosevelt while the latter was here, after his break with the vatican. The resignation and the letter created a tremendous sensation here immediately on its announcement. In his letter of apology Abbot Janssens expresses sorrow for his "grave, inadvertent blunder," in writing a line of commendation to Mr. Roosevelt in the name of the sacred congregation of which he was secretary. Abbot Janssens' leaving a card of commendation with Mr. Roosevelt attracted much attention at the time. Abbot Janssens is the most prominent ecclesiastic outside the college of cardinals, and his elevation to the cardinalate at the next consistory was considered certain. The Roosevelt incident has now made it impossible.

Now we have seen that those Catholics who spoke a word of commendation for Mr. Roosevelt have been rebuked for their words; let us now see whether any one who spoke against Mr. Roosevelt has had it said concerning him, "He will live to see the day he will regret those words." As reported in The Wash-

ington Post, April 6, Rev. Father Eugene Hannon, of Washington, spoke thus on the Roosevelt incident:

Theodore Roosevelt, the politician, has met his Waterloo. * a * The Catholics of America have little use for a "man on the fence," and, although he was the first Republican President who polled the great Catholic vote of America, he will find that he can expect little from the Catholics in the future,

Now when we remember that there were several Roman Catholic bishops in Washington when this was said, also yourself, Mr. Gibbons, the head of the American church, and the immediate superior of this priest; and remember, too, that no priest can speak for publication without the approval of his superior; this passionate statement has far-reaching significance.

Listen now to O'Connell, archbishop of Boston at Lowell Mass., May 2, as he speaks on the subject of Loyalty:

The cardinal secretary of state, Merry del Val, when he was asked for an audience for Mr. Roosevelt, said "we are very happy to receive him. The holy father would be very happy to receive him because he has been the head of a great nation and for whom the holy father has every respect." He also said: "When you communicate that to him, please say we hope nothing will interfere with this decision by both the holy father and Mr. Roosevelt, of seeing each other, as for instance, this incident which happened about the Methodist college to Mr. Fairbanks."

The answer was: "Oh, well, I can not enter into any conditions. The audience is now off."

That is insulting, Mr. Roosevelt. When you were present in the White House, did you stand at the door welcoming into your parlor or your dining room the riff-raff of the street who hurl stones at your head and insult your family? Would you do that? These are the conditions, Mr. Roosevelt. You were not strictly loyal, even to your own principles, Mr. Roosevelt. You, who talked so much about the square deal. Mr. Roosevelt, you at least could have waited until you came to Rome and informed yourself well of the position of this institution, and having done so, if you really meant the square deal, which men now begin to doubt, you would have said: "No, holy father, I come to you, I stand for honor and reverence and right, and I can not, as an honest man, in any way participate or have anything to do with the institution."

And, remember, I am talking really and truly on principles, not personalities. I am talking as I would to any man. Now, Mr. Roosevelt has always said and has given, us to understand that he is very fond of Catholics. We will let that pass. We suppose it is true. If it were true, then Mr. Roosevelt, why did you dare insult the holy father, the pope? Why did you dare to pass over the common rights of man to turn down an affair of hospitality

of the holy father, the head of the great Catholic Church, whom we revere as the vicar of Christ?

Now, who in all the Catholic world has denounced O'Connell for his attack on Americanism through Roosevelt? It certainly wasn't Archbishop Ireland, who is the most prominent Catholic in America, yourself excepted, Mr. Gibbons. That distinguished gentleman denounced the Methodists at Rome as "pernicious proselyters," and tried to show that the pope was justified in doing what he did, and thus condemned the actions of both Fairbanks and Roosevelt. If these facts mean anything at all, they mean that the Roman Catholic Church is opposed to religious toleration just as she has always been. And why, Mr. Gibbons, have you said little or nothing about this whole matter yourself? When asked your opinion, you said that this question was too delicate for you to discuss. Yes, it is a delicate question for you, but why? Is it not because your words in your book are directly opposed to the actions of your church? You have blinded the eyes of many Protestant people, making them believe that the principles of your church are entirely in harmony with the principles of the American Republic, and now everybody can see that you have been falsifying the facts in the case- No wonder that you say that the question is a delicate one. The truth is that the American people are coming to realize that the aged and gentle prelate whom they have exalted in prestige almost to be a ruler in our land has been acting a double role, and that under the Jesuitical principles that "the end justifies the means," and that there can be a "mental reservation" concerning troublesome facts, has been deceiving the American people in order to advance the cause of his "Holy Roman Catholic Church."

I do not think for a moment, Mr. Gibbons, that the intelligent people of America will forsake Protestantism for Catholicism while our means of education are untrammelled. The status of morality in the latter is too great a hindering cause. The only way you can convert America to your principles is through a censorship of the press and the corruptions of the politicians. That you are making great progress in suppressing facts which are detrimental to your church and that you are corrupting politicians, all well-informed people know. While it is true that you do not probably hold one-third of the Catholics who come to our shores, still you hold enough to form a political machine which practically controls the politicians of our land. Those who will

not cater to your wishes, you turn down, and those who will help your church contrary to American principles you will exalt by your votes. These are the reasons I shall never knowingly vote for a Roman Catholic for president, or any other office of importance in our government, and these are the reasons I shall teach my children to do the same thing after me.

Yours for American liberties,

D. A. SOMMER.

STARTLING FACTS CONCERNING ROMAN CATHOLICISM.

Immorality of the Friars in the Philippines. The general principle which Jesus laid down applies to Roman Catholicism that "by their fruits ye shall know them." We know the demoralizing tendency of the Catholic Church by looking at the condition of those nations under the control of the Roman hierarchy. Spain, Mexico, the States of South and Central America, and many islands of the sea, show the marks of Romish tyranny and corruption. This has been forcibly impressed on our minds since the Philippine islands have fallen into our hands, after being under the power of the Roman Catholic Church for four hundred years. In his effort to gain votes in the last election, Mr. Taft sycophantly said that "The Roman Catholic Church must always be the most important influence for the uplifting of the Filipino." It seems so strange that if this be true the friars have made no progress at all in the four hundred years in which they have ruled the people. I permit my readers to decide for themselves whether Mr. Taft was right, after calling your attention to Senate Document, No. 190, of the Fifty-sixth Congress, Second Session, which tells about the immorality of the friars (monkish priests) in the Philippine Islands. It is strange that this document went suddenly "out of print," but it has been reprinted by the American Citizen, Box 2968, Boston, Mass, (a strong anti-Catholic journal, well worth the reading), where the document may be purchased for 50 cents. Here is some of the sworn testimony elicited by the United States government in the investigation of titles of certain lands and properties in the Philippine Islands claimed by the Roman Catholic Church:

Interview with Senor Don Felipe Calderon—They act indecently and use indecent expressions—even now the rule is for

a friar to have a mistress and children. I can cite the names of 100 children of friars. * * * The friar who was not mixed up with a woman in some way or other was like a snow bird in summer.

Interview with Jose Roderigues Infante—They were cruel, not only in their treatment of their servants by beating them, but they also took great delight in being eye witnesses to tortures and beatings of men in jails. * * * All the priests now officiating have the same vices. * * * There was no morality whatever, and the story of their immorality would take too long to recount.

Interview with Senor Nozario Constatino—They carried things in this regard with a very high hand, for if they should desire the wife or daughter of a man, and the husband or father opposed such advances, they would endeavor to have the man deported by bringing up false charges of being a filibuster or a Mason, and after succeeding in getting rid of the husband they would, by foul or fair means, accomplish their purposes. * * * This is the reason the priests don't want the public to become educated.

Interview with Dr. Maximo Viola—(Question)—"What was the morality of the parish priests?"¹ (Answer)—There was no morality. If I was to rehearse the whole history it would be interminable; but I shall confine myself to concrete cases, beginning with the vows of chastity. * * * I do not know of a single one who does not violate his vow of celibacy. * * * From my own personal experience I think the priests are on the same level. I have never seen one that was pure.

Interview with Dr. T. H. Pardo De Tavera—The friars had great notoriety as immoral men in the Filipino sense. It was so common that hardly any notice was taken of it.

Testimony of Pedro Surano Laktaw—(Question) —"What do you know of the morality of the friars?" (Answer)—I have already related in my statement a few cases, and I would prefer to answer the question by saying that the details of the immorality of the friars are so base and so indecent that instead of smirching the friars I would smirch myself by relating them. * * * The morality of the Filipino people becomes looser and looser as it nears the neighborhood of a convent.

Interview with Ambrosia Flares—Then there was the fact of the fear which beset every man, that if the friar's eye should light upon his wife or daughter and if he did not give them up he was lost.

American Journalist Testifies—The priests held them under, oppressed them, robbed them, and used their women and daughters just as they pleased.

Memorandum of Conference with Ceferino Jovan, Alcade of Balcolar, Province of Pampanga—I have known a large number of friars living in concubinage with women, and a number of children the fruit of such illicit relations.

Brig. Gen. R. P. Hughes, U. S. Army—It was a very general complaint that they (the priests) corrupted the daughters of families.

Attorney-General of the Islands Testifies—The social relations which the friars have maintained with the Filipinos are most injurious and opposed to culture and to moral and material progress. * * * Gaming, concubinage and loose relations with women are well-known of parish priests.

Franco Gonzales—This friar, addicted to petticoats, was accustomed to play "monte" with his mistress and other neighbors in his own convent.

Leading Residents of Arigay, Province of La Union—The priests abused all kinds of females without distinction of class or age, and when some of them became with child, they gave them the medicine to kill the fetus.

Testimony of Jose Templo—Rather were they the corrupters of youth. During the Lenten period, when the country people would come in to confess, the pariah priest would give strict orders that the young unmarried women be sent to his apartments, whom he obscenely solicited.

Testimony of Don Jose C. Mijares—Some Reverend friars arrogated to themselves rights, which in feudal times were called rights of "pernada" (the right asserted by certain feudal lords of entering the marriage bed of a newly-wedded bride before the husband).

Testimony of Francisco Alvarez—Neither the sacredness of the bridal chamber nor the modesty of the virgin detained him (the priest). He seduced many married women by ordering their husbands from home.

Immorality of Popes and Other Clergy in the Middle Ages.

It is with sadness that any man who professes to be a Christian reads of the lives of the Romish clergy through the Middle Ages. Her system of celibacy has been the cause of the immorality among her ecclesiastics. In the Dark Ages Romanism had full sway and bore its legitimate fruits. Why is it that wherever she has full power she bears the same fruit? Roman Catholicism in the United States is tolerably respectable, but that is because of the influence of Protestantism. Travelers coming back from the South American countries and other lands where Romanism prevails give a sickening description of the deplorable state of morality in those lands. That you may have an idea of the state of the papal church in the Middle Ages, I cite a few instances of clerical immorality as written by two of the most prominent Catholic historians which they have:

There were eighty councils held in France during the eleventh century, and of these there was not a single one in which a pro-

test of the fathers was not directed against the lawlessness and brigandage of the laity and the imchastity and simony of the clergy.—Dr. Alzog's Manual of Universal Church History, Vol. H, p. 368.

Cupidity, manifesting itself in the prevalence of simony and the accumulation of benefices, selfishness, pride and ostentatious luxury were but too common among ecclesiastics. The extent of the corruption is seen in the complaint of contemporary writers, and proved by well authenticated facts. Unhappily, the infection spread even to the Holy See. The corruption begins with Paul II, it increases under Sixtus IV and Innocent VIII, and comes to a head in the desecration of the chair of St. Peter, by the immoral life of Alexander VI. The depravity of these times struck even such outside observers as the knight Arnold von Harff with horror.—Dr. Pastor's History of the Popes, Vol. V, pp. 169, 170.

Morals of the Clergy, A. D. 1303-1517.—The gradual decline of papal influence and the evil example of some of the popes reacted with terrible effect upon the morals of the bishops. As many of these had secured their sees by the employment of questionable means, it need excite no surprise if, having once entered upon the duties of their office, they led lives the reverse of exemplary, and did absolutely nothing to elevate the standard of morality among the faithful. * * * It must be admitted that morality, especially among the lower clergy and in the monasteries, was dissolute indeed in the fifteenth century. * * * Concubinage was the crying vice among the clergy of many dioceses.—Alzog's Manual of Church History. Vol. II, p. 298.

Indulgences Are One Explanation of Decay in Spiritual Life.—The decay of spiritual life is inevitably followed by a relaxation of penitential discipline. The abuse consequent upon granting indulgences to crusaders, to those contributing to the building of St. Peter's church in Rome, and to others in commutation for similar works, modified the rigors, and eventually wrought the destruction of the whole penitential system. To the earnest zeal of the early Christian ages succeeded an incorrigible levity. The insolent sarcasm of sectaries, which grew daily more violent and offensive, tended to cool the ardor for penitential practices; and they were largely aided in their work by the lethargy and remiss-ness of many of the clergy, who, instead of instructing the faithful, strengthening the weak, and encouraging all in the works of penitence, wholly neglected their priestly duties.—Dr. Alzog's Manual of Church History, Vol. II, pp. 1056-57.

Pope Alexander VI, 1492-1503 (formerly Cardinal Borgia).—They * * * (the world cardinals) allowed themselves the utmost license in morals; this was especially the case with Borgia. His uncle, Calixtus III, had made him a cardinal and Vice-Camerlengo while he was still very young, and he had accumulated benefices to an extent which gave him a princely income. In the time of Sixtus IV, he was already, according to d'Estoutville, the wealthiest member of the college of the cardinals. One of his

contemporaries describes him as a fine looking man and a brilliant cavalier, cheery and genial in manner, and winning and fluent in conversation; irresistibly attractive to

women. His immoral course brought upon him a severe rebuke from Pius II. But nothing had any effect. Even after he had received priest's orders, which took place in August, 1468, and when he was given the bishopric of Albano, which he afterwards exchanged, in 1476, for that of Porto, he still would not give up his dissolute life; to the end of his days he remained the slave of the demon of sensuality. From the year 1460 Vanozza de Cataneis, * * * was his acknowledged mistress. * * * The names of the four children whom she bore to the cardinal are inscribed on her tomb.— Dr. Pastor's History of the Popes, Vol. V, p. 362.

But this is enough of this unpleasant reading from these most reliable Catholic historians concerning those ecclesiastics whom Romanists call "Most Holy Father"! Before me lie fifty pages of just such reading from these same historians concerning the popes of Rome. God save us from a system which produces such men as its spiritual guides.

3. The Low Standard of Morality Among Catholics in America.

The immorality of Roman Catholics, especially the foreign population, is notorious throughout America. It is not uncommon in certain districts to see Roman Catholics go to mass on Sunday morning, and get on a drunk in the afternoon. The "Irish wakes" are debauches from which decent minds recoil in disgust. An eye-witness of one of these disgraceful affairs related to me that the watchers around their dead companion became drunk, yelled and sang all the night through, that they stood the corpse up in its coffin in a corner of the room, stuck a pipe in its mouth, and danced and played and rolled before it by the hour. The priests could, but do not stop such proceedings, but are often themselves participants in such affairs. The "Irish wake" is imported from Roman Catholic Ireland, so what may we expect to find in that priest-ridden country? The Roman Catholic Church, as a whole, is opposed to the temperance movement now sweeping the country. Cardinal Gibbons condemns it, while Protestant preachers are the main supporters of it. It is true that a few Catholics are against the saloon, but they are indeed few. Why this opposition of Catholicism to the temperance movement? The truth is that nearly all the brewers and distillers and saloon keepers, if they make any profession of religion at all, belong to the Roman

Catholic Church. The Protestant denominations almost without exception will not have such disreputable members. Morality in the Catholic priesthood of America is

certainly at a low ebb, and it is better here than in other countries of the world. I would not, however, for a moment, shield wicked preachers in Protestantism and condemn wicked priests in Catholicism. But the difference between the two classes is that when a Protestant preacher goes bad they kick him out, and when a Catholic priest goes bad they keep him in. "Once a priest, always a priest," seems to be the rule in Catholicism. When a conscientious priest attempts to reform clerical corruptions, he is excommunicated. I call your attention again to the case of Father Crowley, of Chicago. In his book, entitled "The Parochial School; a Curse to the Church; a Menace to the Nation," a book which every American should read, he exposes the corruption of the clergy of the arch-diocese of Chicago. But the higher authorities, instead of investigating and cleansing things, winked at it all, and excommunicated Crowley. In doing this, the Catholic Church only showed to the world how corrupt it is. Here is an interesting account of the affair from The St. Louis Republic of Dec. 1, 1901:

Unique Case of the Rev. Jeremiah J. Crowley. The case of the Rev. Father Jeremiah J. Crowley, a priest of the Roman Catholic Diocese of Chicago, who was excommunicated recently by authority of Cardinal Martinelli, furnishes at once the most unique and the most interesting controversy that has ever arisen between that wonderful church and one of its anointed ministers.

Father Crowley is a man and a priest of high intellectual endowments; one of rare, almost fanatical piety. His career as a student, as a citizen and as a minister of his church is exemplary from the standards of measurement within and without the Roman Church. A product of Carlow College, a living example of the genuine Irish gentleman, young, handsome, a giant physically, and yet, a person of much tenderness, as well as courage, Father Crowley stands forth in his own right as a personage sure to prepossess acquaintances and likely to win and hold their high regard. He is abstemious in his habits, industrious to the limit of his great physical power, studious to a degree, intensely sincere, direct and frank of mind and manner.

The very character and reputation of the man make his present sad plight incredible to strangers. He has been cursed by Rome through a published document of excommunication uttered by Cardinal Martinelli. If he died today his body would be denied burial in holy ground. His presence at mass in the parish church of Archbishop Feehan in Chicago has been sufficient to stop the

ceremonial. If Lucifer himself had appeared in the church no greater consternation could have reigned among the priests celebrating the sacrifice. The music ceased, the lights were quenched and the high ceremonial was abandoned. The preacher leveled his logic and his eloquence against the outlawed priest, who, in spite of her malediction, was kneeling there, worshipful, silent, alone, and, as it seemed, defenseless against the pontifical thunderbolts falling around him.

Having thus pilloried a good man and a good priest before all men, the authorities of the Roman Catholic Church have at least invited the astonished curiosity of all religionists, all thoughtful men. What has Father Crowley done to incur the most awful curse that can befall either a Catholic layman or priest?

According to his own statement, lie began, many months ago, to oppose and expose the alleged sinful machinations of a number of clergymen then and now high in the councils of the Chicago diocese. To his archbishop, and through him to Rome, he protested against certain deeds of priests whose lives, thought Father Crowley, were a menace to his church and a blasphemy against her holiest teachings. At first he waged his crusade through the secret channels of the hierarchy, not that he feared candor, but to evade scandal if possible.

His efforts were absolutely ignored. If his communications, offers of evidence, names of witnesses and other statements ever reached the proper authorities, they elicited no action or response. Then came Archbishop Fochau's declaration that he would appoint the Rev. P. J. Muldoon as auxiliary bishop of Chicago. Twenty-five priests of the diocese, one of whom was Father Crowley, protested against the appointment on grounds already exploited in the secret crusade against corruption and sin in the high places. The archbishop ignored this protest and preparations for the consecration of Father Muldoon proceeded.

Then Father Crowley gave to the world a story of alleged priestly decadence and corruption such as has been seldom charged even against ordinary self-respecting men of the world. The question as to whether these charges were true was never raised by the church authorities. The first action of the diocesan was to begin civil proceedings to relieve Father Crowley of his mission as pastor of St. Mary's church, at Oregon, 111. The priest defended the injunction suit thus brought on the ground that lie had neither been accused, tried nor found guilty of anything that could debar him from his rights as pastor. But he bowed to the arm of the civil law and obeyed the enjoiner. A priest was sent thither to supplant him. The case took its place on the docket of the circuit court of Ogle county. The briefs then issued by Crowley's attorneys contained between the fly leaves a slip of paper announcing that later Father Crowley would publish a book exposing the alleged state of affairs in the diocese of Chicago.

Father Crowley and his friends believe that this threat (never carried out) was the true cause for the commotion which followed in the high councils of the Catholic Church.

The offending priest was warned that unless he withdrew all past charges, expressed penitence and accepted punishment which Archbishop Feehan might mete out within ten days he (Crowley) would be excommunicated. The priest, yet believing that his charges were true and uttered in a holy cause, refused to recall his words. He permitted the ten days to elapse.

A printed circular, with Cardinal Martinelli's name attached, was served upon him by three constables, hired laymen, while the priest was at dinner. It proved to be a stereotyped form of excommunication and upon the same day was posted in the sanctuaries of every Catholic Church in the diocese. It was a shocking surprise to Crowley, who expected at least a trial. The causes for the decree of excommunication were summed up as (first), "appealing to a civil court." To this Father Crowley replied that it was his archbishop and not he who went into *the* civil court. The second charge was that Crowley had sought to defend himself in a civil court at law. To this the priest replies that neither priest nor man needs an excuse for self-preservation. The third charge was to the effect that he had threatened to expose the "unfortunate diocese of Chicago as he believes it to exist."

To this last and most significant accusation Father Crowley answers; "I threatened to tell the truth about this diocese from no other motive than to further the best interest and to preserve the sanctity of my Holy Mother Church. I do not believe that my church is benefitted by the suppression of truth and the continuation of evil men in her holiest offices. If I have falsified, why do they not investigate, and prove me false? But I have not. My charges were supplemented by willing and credible witnesses, names and dates. I am not fighting my church and never will. I am fighting the evil men who, in this diocese at least, are sapping her power, dishonoring her sanctuaries and blaspheming the God of all Christians. If that be a crime, I do not understand what loyalty, decency and virtue mean. But, right or wrong. I am entitled to a trial. The meanest criminal is supposed to be innocent until proven guilty. My worst enemies accuse me of no sin. I believe that my church will yet hear me; that she will uphold me. But, come what may, I shall never fight against nor vilify my church. I shall remain a Roman Catholic, as I was born and as I am today." 4. Convents, Academies, Etc.

God never intended for man to be alone, and so he has never forced celibacy on any of his creatures. If a man, however, has power over his body to such an extent that he can lead a single life, he has the privilege of doing that for the advancement of

truth and righteousness in the earth. Rome, however, not only gives her ecclesiastics this privilege, but makes it binding on them. Celibacy in the Roman Catholic Church is one of the chief causes of immorality among her teachers. Since the establishment of monasticism, the monks and nuns in their monasteries and nunneries have been a reproach to Christianity. Although there have been noble and pure souls leading this kind of a life, still the system as a whole has dishonored Christ our Lord. In many countries, the State has been forced to exercise a surveillance over these institutions for their misdemeanors. In many lands where these institutions are, they have learned that they are a menace to society, and the State has abolished them. The last country to do this was France. In Roman Catholic countries where these houses are fully known, they are less tolerated than in Protestant countries where they are not fully known. In England and America, these institutions are flourishing now, perhaps, more than in any other countries. They build their massive structures with their prison walls around them, and no one except the inmates knows what is going on behind those walls. Innocent girls are persuaded to take the vows of a nun and to enter those walls never more to come out again to freedom. The "sisters" portray to them the celestial joys of living a secluded life, hidden from the world, and the youthful religious mind is inflamed to take the fatal step which separates them from all that is dear on earth, and which joins them to—what? All, that is the question. Only those who have escaped to tell the tale can justly portray the horrors of the place. Of course, Rome takes every precaution to keep any of the inmates from coming forth to liberty. It is almost as impossible to escape from these nunneries as it is to escape from a State prison. And when a poor girl does get away, she generally falls into the hands of a Romish policeman (who are wisely placed by their church around these places), and taken back to their prison.

A recent trial here in Indianapolis gives one an inkling of what is going on in these religious houses. There is here a Roman Catholic institution known as the House of the Good Shepherd, a home for girls. Six or seven years ago, so the testimony went in court, a girl was placed there and has been held against her will ever since. She testifies that she was poorly clad and poorly fed and was compelled to work in a laundry as a mere slave. Several times she escaped, but falling into the hands of Catholic

policemen she was each time put back. Finally she fell into the hands of those who love mercy more than tyranny, and who helped her in her freedom and encouraged her to bring suit against the institution. The trial was a sensational one, although much of the important testimony was kept out of the papers through the arts, no doubt, of the priests. One of the "holy fathers" sat in the audience and prompted his witnesses by telling them, by a nod of his head, how to answer. When the attention of the judge was called to it, he reprimanded the priest severely. The result of the trial was that the girl was given judgment against the institution for \$4,000. Of course they appealed the case, and the next time they may have a chance to buy or intimidate the judge. Now this little bit of fact is only an index to what is happening in the Catholic houses. If such things are occurring in professedly open institutions like the House of the Good Shepherd, and in a city where the Catholics are far in the minority, what is being done in the larger cities where there is such a mass of Romish population, and in nunneries where things are supposed to be done altogether in secret? We say that this is a land of liberty, and is it not about time for the liberty-loving Americans to throw open the doors of these institutions and permit all who desire to go free?

There are some girls whose parents are Protestants who have gone into these nunneries never to go out again. Rome is laying her trap to catch all the unsuspecting girls she can. She has established her schools for this express purpose. These academies are generally nice buildings and are taught by "sisters" who have been trained in the art of ingratiating themselves into the hearts of unsuspecting Protestants. They are kind and gentle, and no doubt some of them are well educated in art, music and poetry, and know how to weave into their teaching the dreamy tales of saints. The feminine religious mind is caught by these things, and before the parents know it their loved daughter has quietly joined the Catholic Church. At last the parents are reconciled to the religious belief of their loved one, only to see that their child is getting farther from them all the time. The influence of the "sister" grows stronger and stronger, and the influence of the parents grows weaker and weaker, and finally they learn, to their horror, that their daughter intends to take the "black veil," and leave them forever. All their efforts to break the force of the religious dream are of no avail, and

with broken hearts they see their loved one go behind the convent walls to a self-inflicted living grave. Oh, the sad hours they spend in loneliness, talking of their foolish act in sending their child to a school where she would be taught to hide the light of her life instead of letting it shine, as Jesus says, before men, that they may see the good works and glorify the Father in heaven. And the poor girl—God have mercy on her! She learns that she has been deceived, and that the Roman Catholic Church is like a whitened sepulcher—outwardly it is beautiful, but inwardly it is full of corruption. Father, mother, do you love your child? Keep her, then, away from the dreamy allurements of the Church of Rome, until at least she has passed that period in life when the imagination predominates over the reason.

Two of the most notable women to leave the Church of Rome within the past few years, and to tell us that the things we have been saying in these letters are true, are the Caldwell sisters. These two girls were brought up as Roman Catholics and taught to love their church. Even in their tender years, however, they saw many inconsistencies in their church, but they thought that when they grew in knowledge these would vanish. The women married foreigners and spent many years in foreign lands. As they were wealthy and gave much money to their church, they were honored by the highest ecclesiastics of that body, and were intimate, not only with cardinals, but with Pope Leo XIII himself. Perhaps no women in modern times were in closer touch with the inner workings of the Romish Church. One of these sisters was so devoted that she gave between two and three hundred thousand dollars for the establishment of a Catholic college in Washington, D.C. But the intimate acquaintance of these sisters with the Romish Church shook their faith in its apostolicity and holiness, and they both renounced it after many inward struggles. The portrait of the donor, which had been put in the college she had given, she ordered to be taken down, for she did not wish to lend any more of her influence in building up such a gigantic system of error. The sister of the donor has written a booklet, entitled "The Double Doctrine of the Church of Rome," which may be purchased from The American Citizen, Boston, Mass., for 35 cents. Now, no woman who has ever lived has had a better chance to understand the true workings of this church than this woman, and she shows, in a general way, and from her own experience, that all we have said in these letters

is true. She shows that there is an exoteric and an esoteric Romanism—an outward and an inward doctrine. She shows what people, intelligent on this subject, already know—that Rome teaches morality to those who will have nothing else, and corruption to those who demand it. These women were well acquainted in the college of the cardinals, and they saw the corruption there; so they deliberately renounced the yoke of that church which makes such great claims to being "Holy," when they saw that it is everything but "what it claims to be. American citizens, let us beware, lest we think that Rome has but one doctrine, and that that doctrine is the one we hear about in the smaller cities and towns. She is "putting out her best foot" in order to deceive the people, so that when she has gained an advantage she may display her other doctrine. This woman of learning and intelligence who has been behind the scenes and knows, warns us to beware, for the Church of Rome has a "Double Doctrine." Is it not time, then, that the American people begin to open their eyes? Jesus, our Master, has likewise warned us of these things when he said, "Beware of false prophets who come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves." "By their fruits ye shall know them." We may apply this to political as well as spiritual things, and we may recite further in the ears of those Americans who are continually saying that there is no danger, the warning words of Paul, when he said, "Let him that thinketh he standeth, take heed lest he fall." ETERNAL VIGILANCE IS THE PRICE OF BOTH PHYSICAL AND SPIRITUAL LIBERTY!