

THE AMERICAN.

A WEEKLY PAPER.

"AMERICA FOR AMERICANS."—We hold that all men are Americans who swear allegiance to the United States without a mental reservation in favor of the Pope.

PRICE FIVE CENTS

VOLUME V.

OMAHA, NEBRASKA, FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 1895.

NUMBER 7

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

A CORRESPONDENT of Pine Bluff Arkansas, January 26, 1895, writes: "A friend in Cincinnati, Ohio, requests me to write you a strong appeal for literature for free distribution among the colored people of Arkansas, where the Catholics are trying to swallow up the people wholly. I am state missionary and am co-operating with the A. P. A., but I am, and they are, too poor to purchase literature, and I appeal to you in the name of God to send us all the matter you can to help us in our struggle against the inroads that Catholicism is making against us. You know why better than I can tell you. Your co-operator for untrammeled American institutions."

LINCOLN, Neb., furnishes a refreshing bit of news. A friend in that city sends it in the following shape: "On the 23d of last month, a boy 16 years old named Ed. Aleer was arrested by the police of Lincoln for stealing a lot of brass and destroying property to the value of \$125. The boy was taken before Judge Wurtzburg, the county judge for Lancaster county, where he pleaded guilty. The boy's mother said she could not get him to go to school, and stated that she paid for the clothes the boy had on with money she earned washing. The judge then interviewed the boy as follows: 'Ed., do you go to your duty regular?' Ed. replied, 'I do.' The judge then inquired, 'When was the last time you confessed to the priest?' Ed. answered, 'Last June.' The judge, 'If I let you go, do you think you can behave yourself, and go to confession regular?' Ed., 'I do.' The judge, 'You can go.' This young McAleer is the leader of a gang of young toughs, and has been before the court on several occasions, and is known to be one of the toughest young rascals in town. McAleer's partner, who was not a Catholic, was sent to the reform school last November, and a warrant issued for McAleer at the same time, but he dodged the officer until January 23, when by watching his home he was arrested after midnight when sneaking in."

COMING as it does from an Independent or Populist paper, the following article is worthy of careful perusal and thoughtful consideration by every member of the legislature of the state of Nebraska. It is so near our own idea that we feel tempted to appropriate it entire without the courtesy of a credit, but as that is the meanest and most contemptible thing an editor can be guilty of, we refrain from giving best to our inclination and allow the Platte County *Argus* to reap all the credit. The *Argus* says: "The Australian ballot law should be amended so that no judge nor anyone can help fix another man's ticket. The law provides a sample ballot, a booth, pen and ink and five minutes' time for the voter to prepare his ballot. After months of discussion in the newspapers and around the family hearth-stones of the merits and demerits of political parties, principles and candidates, if a voter can't fix his ballot it is because he is too ignorant to be trusted with the right of suffrage. The crimes of the heeled, brow-beaters and bulldozers around the polling places have been transferred to the judge of election, who is selected to fix tickets. For instance, at a certain polling place in this county there were a class of voters that were bought up by the precinct manager. These men would go into the polling place and ask for a certain judge to come into the booth and fix their tickets for them. This would be done of course. After some half dozen or more of these cheap slaves had had their ballots fixed, the judge would walk outside and have a little conversation with the precinct manager, and then return to his post of duty. In a few minutes the precinct manager and one of the slaves he had purchased would step aside and wind up the deal according to contract. This clearly illustrates how it is not only possible to buy up the purchasable votes, but the splendid way in which the buyer can keep tab on his purchases and pay for only that which he gets. By repealing that clause in the Australian ballot law which allows a judge to help a man fix his ticket, it would take out of the hands of the venal vampires a floating purchasable vote of about 15,000 or 20,000."

IN ORDER that a full understanding may be had of Rome's work in her alleged charitable institutions we republish this article from the *New York Daily World*, without comment, as it speaks for itself: "Five-year-old Georgie Bachman was taken by his father on New Year's Eve from the Morgan avenue branch of the orphan asylum attached to the church of the Most Holy Trinity at Graham and Mont-

rose avenues, Brooklyn, E. D. The lad was suffering from inflammation of the throat, and his body was marked with bruises. He alleged the bruises had been inflicted by one of the lay sisters who had charge of his ward in the asylum, and that she had also, as a punishment, washed him in a tub of cold water. Georgie's brother, Peter, nine years old, who is still in the branch orphan asylum, says he saw Lay Sister Rita beat Georgie with the handle of a whip about a foot and a half long and half an inch in diameter. He also says he saw Georgie taken towards the bathroom, and when he returned he complained that he had been put in a tub of cold water. Francis Bachman, an employe in the Havemeyer Sugar Works in Williamsburg, is the father of the two boys. He and his wife are devout Catholics, and for some time past have attended the church of the Annunciation in North Fifth street. They have two other children. Two months ago the mother became deranged, and after spending a short time in a hospital was taken in charge by her sister, under whose care she still remains. The family was broken up, and while relatives took charge of two of the children, Georgie and Peter were sent to the asylum adjoining Holy Trinity. They remained there until the Friday before New Year's, when they were transferred to the branch asylum in Morgan avenue. Sister Polycarp, of the first-named institution, says there were no marks or bruises on Georgie's body when he was transferred to the branch house. He had been at the latter place less than four days when his father had him removed to the house of a relative, Mrs. John Miller, of No. 149 Frost street. The father said to a reporter of the *World* yesterday: "I called at the asylum the last Sunday in December, and my boy was brought into the reception room. He was shaking and trembling, and kept saying over and over, 'Papa, papa, take me home.' I asked his brother Peter what was the matter with him, and he said Georgie had committed a slight offense and Sister Rita had punished him for it. The next day I made arrangements with my relative, Mrs. Miller, to care for the child, and brought him to her home in a carriage. In washing him we found dark marks and bruises on both legs and on the right arm. He was also suffering from pain in his throat. I called in Dr. Boes, of Graham avenue, who examined him. He said the child had inflammation of the windpipe, and that he had apparently been ill-treated. The doctor made a statement in writing to this effect, saying that the bruises looked as if they might have been made by kicks." In the presence of the doctor, Mr. Bachman said, he pointed to the bruises and asked Georgie, 'Who hurt you there?' to which the little fellow replied, 'The sister.' Later the lad was taken to St. Catherine's hospital, where he repeated his statements, and died a few hours later. A cavity filled with puss was found on the boy's left side, which was to have been operated upon yesterday if he had lived. Dr. Judd, the house surgeon, said he thought Georgie had consumption. The cause of death was given in the certificate as emphysema. John A. Koebel, a relative of the Bachmans, took the written statement made by Dr. Boes, alleging ill-treatment, to the orphan asylum a week ago yesterday. It was read to Lay Sister Rita, and little Peter was sent for to confront her with his statement of what he had seen. Sister Rita herself went to fetch him. When brought in, Peter said he had not seen Sister Rita strike his brother, thereby contradicting what he had previously stated to his father. When the father called the next day Peter told him that the sister had warned him not to repeat the charge against her, and that he had contradicted himself for fear of being beaten with her stick. Dr. Boes declined to discuss the case when a reporter called yesterday, but Sister Polycarp admitted receiving the statement from him telling of the bruised condition of the child's body. 'I can't account for it,' she said. 'I have known Sister Rita several years, and always looked upon her as a gentle person in the care of children. We did all we could for the little boys here before they were transferred to the branch where Sister Rita is. I tried to build them up, but they were so homesick that it kept them back. They did not seem to get used to the place, as some children do. When I ordered them to be transferred I sent word of their home-sickness with them, and asked that they be given special attention.' At the branch asylum in Morgan avenue the *World* reporter had a long talk with little Peter. 'Georgie was sick,' he said, 'and broke one of the rules. Sister Rita came in with a piece of a whip handle about a foot and a half long and half an inch thick. She struck him with it about three times and he cried till he went to sleep. The next

morning she took him to the bathroom. I could not see what happened there, but when Georgie came back he was shivering and trembling, and told me the sister had put him in a tub of cold water. I only saw her punish him once. When Sister Rita took me down the day that the questions were asked, she told me at the head of the stairs to say nothing about the beating of Georgie, and I was so afraid of her that I obeyed. I told my father next day that I had been frightened into contradicting what I had told him.' Sister Rita denied to the reporter that she had ever struck Georgie. 'It is true,' she said, as Peter has stated, 'that he broke the rules. I told him if he did it again I would punish him. I should have done so if I had not seen, when I took him up, that he was too ill to be punished. It is also true that I took him to the bathroom, but the water I placed him in was warm, and not cold.' Asked if she had a piece of whip handle such as described by Peter, with which she inflicted punishment, Sister Rita replied, 'I have several sticks. Sometimes I use one and sometimes another. You could not keep order here at all with all these children if you did not inflict corporal punishment.' Sister Rita said she did not believe the punishments she administered left marks or bruises. She had never looked to see."

THE *American Patriot*, of San Francisco, in an article upon the relationship of the public schools to the republic, recently said: "The relations of the public schools to the republic is close and vital; for republicanism means the sovereignty of the people. It is a government of the people, for the people and by the people." It means free thought, free speech and free press, free religion and free education. The public schools of this country are the palladium of our liberties and the aegis of our civilization. They are the poor man's friend; they bring to the cottage and to the hut, as well as to the mansion and to the palace, the choicest treasures of wisdom and knowledge. Most people are poor, and with the masses life is a perpetual struggle. Popular education becomes a boon because it puts the poor man's boy in possession of this sovereign power; it lifts him from a low plane of ignorance to the high level of equality with the rich man's child. It develops his reason, stimulates his imagination and enlightens his conscience. These schools are also the rich man's opportunity, and give to the wealthy the privilege of helping the poor. The best gift to an earnest and ambitious boy or girl is a liberal education, a practical education, which will prevent poverty and crime and render the individual independent and self-reliant. It has been demonstrated that it is cheaper and better to build school houses than almshouses. It is believed that the socialization of culture is the antidote for nihilism and anarchy. Our public schools are the safe-guards of liberty. A free people must be an intelligent people; ignorance and freedom are incompatible; popular government must be maintained by universal education. Our public school system is the best means ever yet devised in human history for the education of the whole people. These schools exist for the many and not for the few; for the masses and not for the classes. If American institutions are to endure, the beneficent works of the public schools must be maintained. These schools are like the nurseries of a genuine democracy. They belong to the people knowing neither caste nor distinction save those that arise from merit and scholarship. In these halls of popular learning, all meet on a common level; the rich, the poor, the high and the low, the aristocrat and the pauper. There is no recognition of race, creed, color or social distinction. In these schools merit alone wins. Equality is the watchword which become at once a spur to the rich sluggard and an inspiration to the humble child of the poor. These schools are thoroughly American. They are, perhaps, the most distinctive product of American civilization. In them a common language is taught. Race and class distinction give place to natural characteristics; hatred and suspicion are obliterated and old country traditions are supplemented by a new patriotism. If the pupils enter heterogeneous aliens they emerge from the schools homogeneous Americans. These schools are the drill halls of character. They furnish a foundation of broad intelligence. They foster industry, order, neatness, punctuality, thoroughness, respect for authority and obedience of law. They develop a love of truth and insist on fidelity of trusts; they awaken self-respect, independence of thought and beget the habit of regulating the life in accordance with reason and conscience. They teach the pupils respect

for the rights of others and regards for the rights of property and the rights of conscience. They awaken love for the true, the beautiful and the good, and reverence for law, justice and God. In short, they develop many characters and fit their students for lives of honor and usefulness. To attack these schools, therefore, is a most serious and significant matter; a problem of profound concern to every lover of American liberty and American institutions. That the assault has been made by Romanism goes without question, and we are gathered as patriots and citizens to protest against such encroachments upon and infractions of our national liberties. We are forced to look with the gravest suspicions upon any interference in our public school system, that originates in the Roman Catholic hierarchy and record our vehement protest against the exclusion of a history of the middle ages from our schools, simply because it narrates the actual occurrences of the papal church during that period."

THE *Protestant Observer* of a recent date contained these very pointed allusions to the practices of the church of Rome: "The famous and learned Erasmus lived and died a Roman Catholic priest. In his old age the pope proposed to make him a cardinal, but he declined the offer. In Mr. Froude's new 'Life and Letters of Erasmus,' just published, there is a long letter which Erasmus addressed to Lambert Grunnius, in which his opinion of Monks and Monasteries is expressed in unmistakable terms. Our modern 'Ransomers' may try to laugh at Protestant testimony as to the corrupt condition of the Monasteries of the Sixteenth century, but what will they say to the testimony of this learned Roman priest, who was in high favour with the pope, and enjoyed the confidence of many of the Roman Catholic sovereigns of Europe? Erasmus writes: 'Young men are fooled and cheated into joining the religious orders. Once in the toils, they are broken in and trained into Pharisees. They may repent, but the superiors will not let them go, lest they should betray the orgies which they have witnessed. They crush them down with scourge and penance, the secular arm, chanceries and dungeons. Nor is this the worst. Cardinal Matteo sat at a public dinner before a large audience, naming place and persons, that the Dominicans had buried a young man alive whose father demanded his son's release. A Polish noble who had fallen asleep in a church saw two Franciscans buried alive; yet these wretches call themselves the representatives of Benedict and Basil and Jerome. A Monk may be drunk every day. He may go with loose women secretly or openly. He may waste the church's money on vicious pleasures. He may be a quack or a charlatan, and all the while be an excellent brother, and fit to be made an Abbot: while one who for the best of reasons lays aside his frock is howled at as an apostate. Surely the true apostate is he who goes into sensuality, pomp, vanity, the lusts of the flesh, the sins which he renounced at his baptism. All of us would think him a worse man than the other, if the commonness of such characters did not hide their deformity. Monks of abandoned lives notoriously swarm over Christendom. These are the true apostates, and on them the hated name ought to fall, though they may still wear the cowl. Is it not wicked then, my friend, to entangle young men by false representations in such an abominable net? Monks whose lives are openly infamous, draw boys after them into destruction. The convent at best is but a miserable bondage, and if there be outward decency (as among so many there must be some unimpaired), a knot which cannot be loosed may still be fatal to soul and body. It is pretended that novices are not admitted till mature age. Maturity suffices for marriage, why not for the monastic profession? Yet men have joined at thirty, and have been aghast at what they found. They have been taken in by specious words. The orders talk of purity, as if they were themselves pure: of obedience, as if while obeying man they were not disobeying God; of irrevocable vows, when no vows ought to be irrevocable. I do not condemn the regular orders as such. If there are persons for whom the rule is salutary, the vow may stand. But the more sacred the profession, the more caution must be observed in the admission to it. There must be no influencing, no violence or terror. It ought not to bind when a frightened lad has had the halter forced upon him. Shame on a law which says that a vow taken when the dawn is on the cheek is of perpetual obligation!' ('Life and Letters of Erasmus.' By J. A. Froude, pp. 166-168.) Perhaps some of our modern 'Ransomers' will not believe even Erasmus, the friend of popes. But

what will they do with the subjoined testimony of one whom the present pope, Leo XIII., has enrolled amongst the beautified saints in heaven? We refer to Sir Thomas More, Lord Chancellor of England in the reign of Henry VIII., who declared: 'Erasmus is the dearest friend that I have.' More supported Erasmus most heartily in his attacks on the Monks of his time, for he was well aware of the foul condition into which most, if not all, of the Monasteries had fallen. The Roman Catholic 'Truth Society' have issued a full-length picture of Thomas More, in their book on 'The English Martyrs,' and underneath they have printed the words: 'Blessed Thomas More; Pray for us' (p. 16). Well, now, will our 'Ransomers' and the members of the 'Catholic Truth Society' listen for a while to what the man they pray to has to say about the Monasteries of his time? More wrote thus to a correspondent: 'Erasmus is the dearest friend that I have. He sneers, you exclaim, at the religious orders. Why be so sensitive? When he ridicules your ceremonies, he ridicules only the superstitious use of them. Do not your orders quarrel and abuse each other, and fight over the cut and colour of their petticoats, and set up their crests as though they were seated on the sun's rays? Yet the same men who think the devil will have them if they change the shape of their frocks, are not afraid to intrigue and lie. They shudder if they have left out a verse in a psalm, and they tell each other dirty stories longer than their prayers. They strain at the gnat; they swallow an entire elephant. They live in the third heaven, as if they were saints in council. They fancy themselves the holiest of men, and commit the most abominable crimes. I knew a man belonging to a strict order—not a novice: he was prior of the house. He had gone from wickedness to wickedness. He had planned murder and sacrilege, and he hired a party of cut throats. The deed was done. The men were caught. I saw them. They told me themselves that before they went to work the prior took them to his cell, and made them pray on their knees to the Virgin there. This completed, they did their business with a clear conscience. I am not holding good men answerable for others' sins. Wholesome plants and poisonous plants may grow on the same stem. The worship of the Virgin may do good to some people. With others it is an encouragement to crime. This is what Erasmus denounces, and if you blame him you must blame Jerome, who says worse of Monks than Erasmus.' (Froude's 'Life and Letters of Erasmus,' p. 138.)"

SUPREME PRESIDENT TRAYNOR writing from Washington under date of February 11, says: "The results of the late election upon the political parties are becoming visible in the United States senate. That body is no longer controlled by the Democrats, but it does not follow that its action will be in line with Republican policies, for the Populists hold the balance of power. The Republicans and Populists will cooperate in organizing the senate; but after that it is likely that the latter will work on lines distinctly marked out by the third party. The most unfortunate feature of the new situation is the increase of the power of the papacy, caused by the election of such men as Carter and Elkins; the former being a rank papist, and the latter a Roman sympathizer. If Addicks should be elected in Delaware, there will be another papist to strengthen the hands of the Jesuitical cabal in the senate. For this state of things the Republican party is entirely responsible; and, whatever may be the views of individuals in that party respecting the patriotic reform movement, the aid and comfort which the organization has given to Carter, Addicks and Elkins, together with the countenance given by Tom Reed and other Republican leaders to the presence of Satolli at the famous Gridiron banquet, is likely to cause a reversal of the popular verdict as expressed last November. The patriotic orders did not vote for Republican candidates because they were Republicans, but because they were supposed to be patriots and honest men. And now that this illusion has been dispelled, there is no reason for the repetition of such a blunder. The sentiment in favor of an American party is rapidly crystallizing. The name of Hon. W. S. Linton as the presidential candidate of the proposed American party, is heard on every hand. In fact, it is a comparison of Linton's course with that of the average public man of the times, which lends strength to the new movement here in Washington, where until recently the idea of a new party was tabooed by the very men who are now most active in pushing the programme. I would not be understood as endorsing either the scheme for a party or the

selection of any particular person as its standard bearer in case it should be organized; but the recent conduct of the Republicans in Montana, West Virginia and Delaware, constrain me to look with favor upon any proposition tending to dissociate the masses from the treacherous leaders who are seeking by corrupt methods to allow the bloody hands of Lincoln's assassins to grasp and retain the helm of the republic for whose preservation he gave his life. I am told that the motive which impels the Roman imposture to intrude itself in the senate at this time is to be found in the fact that the senate holds a veto power on the action of the president in respect to appointments. If the papists can lay hands upon this prerogative, then the supreme court of the United States, and all other federal courts, will, as rapidly as possible, be Romanized. The army, the navy, the diplomatic and consular service, and the entire civil service of the government will be brought under the control of papists. The "advice and consent of the senate," to which the president is bound to yield, will be practically the advice and consent, or rather the imperative command, of the papal authorities; for the president cannot budge one way or another in the administration of his office without such "advice and consent." Nor would the house of representatives be in any better condition than the president; for the senate has a veto upon their acts also. In this view of the case, the recent gains of the papists in the senate are alarming. I am told that they now have eighteen members of the senate upon whom they can rely in any emergency—men whose voices, indeed, are English, but whose hearts are Roman. These men, in the present state of parties, are able to control our foreign policy, as well as our domestic affairs; for the senate can modify treaties as it pleases, and these men hold the balance of power in the senate. Reciprocity, under their direction would mean favoritism to such Romish countries as the South American states, and injury to such Protestant nations as England and Germany. Both our commercial system and our monetary system would, under their influence, be kept in a state of perpetual disturbance and instability, because the commercial nations being Protestant, would suffer most by reason of such a policy in this country. When may we expect to have wise and patriotic legislation affecting money and trade, if through Romish influence our public money is to be made the means of scourging not only our own people, but all the progressive peoples of the world? An exclusively papist senate is, therefore, in my opinion, the *sine qua non* of national and international prosperity. No other body of men on earth exerts so powerful an influence upon the material interests of mankind the world over as the senate of the United States. Shall it be made a reactionary force by filling it with the puppets of a hierarchy whose policy produced the barbarism of the dark ages? Let us purify the senate, and keep it pure, even though it takes a new political party to accomplish that end—even though it takes a political revolution to do it. No sacrifice can be too great, if necessary to preserve the purity of the senate; for that is the pivot upon which our whole system of government turns. Congress has just passed a bill, which originated in the senate, reviving the grade of Lieutenant-general of the army, for the benefit of General Schofield, whose wife is said to be a Romanist. The Sundry Civil bill, the District bill, and the Indian Appropriation bill all carry this year the usual subsidies for papist institutions: In this city Providence hospital gets \$18,000, and the six papist establishments for doing missionary work among the children of the poor get sums ranging from \$9,900 down to \$1,800 apiece. It is understood, however, that the papist Indian schools will receive 20 per cent less than last year, unless the senate, ever alert in the interest of Rome, should veto the action of the house of representatives on that point. The bill for the establishment of the university of the United States, which was reported favorably by Senator Hunter at the last session of congress, has been pigeon-holed at the behest of the Jesuit lobby, and will not come to the surface again probably for many years. The suggestions that such an institution was "a patriotic necessity," and that its faculty would be able successfully to combat "the most skillful devotee of false gods," was enough to kill it, as things now stand. But I hope to see it make an issue in the next presidential campaign."

WHEN you subscribe for or purchase a copy of THE AMERICAN, bear in mind that it is an independent American paper—the organ of no man or set of men, and of no association. It is the organ of its editor.