

THE AMERICAN.

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

OMAHA, NEBRASKA, FRIDAY, OCTOBER 9, 1896.

PRICE FIVE CENTS

NUMBER 41

A WEEKLY NEWSPAPER.

VOLUME VI.

COLONEL J. W. ECHOLS.

The A. P. A. President, Addresses a Large Audience at Rochester, N. Y.

Thinks He Sees a Cloud Rising Out of the East—Only a Question of Time When It Must Be Settled.

The report given below of a certain lecture delivered the other night in this city contains the sentiments of the speaker, and not necessarily those of *The Times*. We give place to the report, the same as to any other local doings, but without comment, as *The Times* is a non-sectarian paper:

On Wednesday evening Sargent Hall was crowded to the doors with an audience marked for its representative character and manifest devotion to the principles advocated by the different speakers.

Chairman James Sargent called the meeting to order, and after the audience had given a hearty vocal rendering of the National Anthem and prayer was offered by Rev. E. W. Shepard, the speaker of the evening, John W. Echols, of Georgia, was introduced. Mr. Echols said in part:

"MR. PRESIDENT AND FRIENDS OF AMERICA AND AMERICAN INSTITUTIONS.—Many a time and oft our forefathers gathered together to take counsel one with another concerning questions of grave interest for their country and its institutions. So we tonight, I trust, meet as practical men and women, to discuss practical questions of practical import, in the hope that our mingling together, our mutual understanding and discussion, may aid us to discern some growing evils which are arising in our country, and by opposing, end them. To most of you born in this, my native land, it is unnecessary for me to speak of the formation of our government. You know full well that way back yonder two or three hundred years ago, our forefathers came to this country as Huguenots, who settled in the Carolinas and lower section of our country, escaping from the persecution growing out of the revocation of the edict of Nantes in France, as Cavaliers who settled in Virginia, as Puritans who settled in Massachusetts, to escape the wrongs of the English church. We well know that in nearly every instance those settlers came here to find a new country where they might worship God according to the dictates of their own conscience, and from that day to this has been a land of liberty. This has been a land where you and every one of us could worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience, and it is in the hope that we may hand down to posterity the same blessing, the same freedom that has been handed down to us, that I trust we meet here to-night, that I trust we are meeting time and again all over this land.

"In times past we have seen the small cloud arising out over the sea no longer than a man's hand, and many times our land has been stained by war's cruel strife, and it has taken father, husband or brother from the building up of the purest of all altars next to the worship of God, the family altar.

"We well know that the seemingly small cloud at the time grew in intensity until it took the first born of nearly every household all over this country.

"I come to you from far off Georgia, where we were upon one side of that great conflict, up here to New York, where you were on the other side, and I thank God that while once we heard only the song of Sherman marching through Georgia, Georgia can now march through New York. (Applause.)

"I come to you bearing a message from that far off southland that while at that time we had to be seriously spanked, I may say, to end the rebellion which existed in our borders, now we are a Union-loving people. (Applause.)

"To-day all over our beloved southland there is an air of veneration, love and loyalty towards our grand old Star Spangled Banner, and we trust that the lessons of the past, the dark and cruel and bloody lessons of the past, will indeed bring home to you the sad story that 'eternal vigilance is the price of liberty.' Let us guard well our outposts here to-day, that never again shall any man or set of men allow any clouds to spring up and grow in our midst to bear such awful results as were seen from 1861 to 1865. It is now beyond question—we all know that the cause of that conflict was human slavery. The question has been asked me why it was that the north had to lose

its best and purest blood to remove the national evil. It was because it was a national evil, and the national blood had to be shed as its propitiation.

"You know where it began. That it was in many instances Massachusetts ships, manned by Massachusetts seamen, filled with cargoes of New England rum, that were sent to the coasts of Africa, and that brought back the negroes to be sold all over this land. We well know that in 1794, when the question was in the American congress, 'shall we prohibit any more bringing in of slaves into this country,' the records show that in Massachusetts and Connecticut they were against the bill to abridge the importation of slaves, and with South Carolina and Georgia voted unanimously against it. The whole country was guilty of slavery and it was a national evil, and the best and bravest of our whole land had to be an offering to the God of battles, and now, from the Penobscot to the Rio Grande, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, we are a free people in fact as in name, worshipping the same God, standing by the same institutions, and we hope, standing shoulder to shoulder, to perpetuate these institutions of this our own native land. (Applause.)

"It is now all peace within our borders. Have we no foes to face? Are there no questions pertaining to good government to be answered? I think there are. I think I see rising far out yonder, rather toward the east, a little cloud now much larger than a man's hand, that is slowly but surely encompassing this country, and as surely as God reigns, if that question is not met, and we cannot end that system which is being fastened upon this country, by the ballot, it will only be a question of time when we will have to end it by the bullet. (Voices: That is so.) Which will you have, the ballot or the bullet? (A voice: The ballot.) I hope there is not one within the sound of my voice or in all this country who will answer except as the answer has been made here, 'by the ballot.' Let us take it in time, friends, and settle it by the peaceable measure of the ballot, and not be compelled to settle it by the musket. But what, say you, are these questions?

"You recognize the honor that I have now is chiefly through this my godfather (turning to Colonel Sargent). It is through him I am lifted up to what I shall always hold the greatest honor of my life, and no more worthy or better epithet do I want over my body when laid in its last resting place than that I tried well to perform my duty in this my official position as Supreme President of the American Protective Association. (Applause.) Representing, as I do, millions of American freemen; standing, as I do, at the head of a column which extends from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and through every state and territory of this broad union, united, as we trust, in broad organization, not to sow the seeds of difference, not to attack any man's religion—a charge we indignantly deny—or to attack any man's religious sympathies, but banded together for the highest and purest motives, and because we believe there are questions to be answered requiring perfect organization and discipline, without which ruin stares us in the face.

"Why am I a member of the American Protective Association? We are called rascals and thieves, and there is not language enough or words enough to do injustice to our order, and so they actually have to curse us in Latin occasionally. (Applause.) Sometimes it comes from away over the sea, pronounced by that old man who seems to be better adapted to cursing than blessing. We are called all these names, and for what? What is the sum of our offending? What hurtful principles is my friend here advocating with all the might and main of that life which has led him to success in business and other circles of life? I suppose many of you have read them. We have some good clergymen in the land who say we are some new device of the devil. (A voice: Lord forgive them.) I would say, have mercy on their souls. (A voice: Amen.)

"Our first and leading tenet, the first principle of our organization, is loyalty to true Americanism, which knows no birth, race, creed or party. That is the first requisite of membership in the American Protective Association. Is there in all this land a heart so dead as to say there is anything inimical to our institutions or to our country in that? Neither race, creed or party, let them be born where they may, Jew or Gentile, bond or free, high or low, so long as they simply pledge themselves to support well our American institutions, we bid them welcome, and yet for that we are not honorable gentlemen, it is said. The American Protective Association is not a political party and does not control the political affiliations of its members, but it teaches them to be intensely individual in the discharge

of their political duties, because it believes that all the problems confronting our people may best be solved by the conscientious discharge of the duties of citizenship by every individual. Is there one in the sound of my voice who can take exception to that plank? I know there is not, for it would be merely a stultification of yourselves in so doing."

The speaker then enumerated one by one each of the dozen principles of the order, analyzed and elucidated, and offered them for criticism. One by one he showed the principles of the order to be identical with the principles of American citizenship. At the conclusion of his address the speaker gave an interesting and graphic account of a personal experience in the Orange-merit riot in New York, in 1873, where he had a bullet put through his clothing. Suddenly drafted as a detective by the municipal authorities of New York, he was compelled to help in quelling the riot, and his description of the battle which there took place was eagerly listened to by his audience.

The opposing tenets to Americanism of Roman Catholicism were clearly explained and references made to many sources, long past and recent utterances of the bishops, cardinals and egoists of the said church. He described the attitude of the papal system toward the Good Book and their claim of an inherited standard of divine right of interpretation; their denial of possible legal marriage relation to the Protestant Christian church. The relations of church and state were ably expounded, showing their union to be the ambition of the Roman priesthood, whereas the object of American institutions, and their safety, he explained, depended upon church and state and their separation.

Mr. Echols was followed by the superior president, who referred to the principles of their order as being the same for which our forefathers fought and died.

It is necessary, he said, to eradicate a political policy which has steadily limited the seating capacity of our public schools, to add to patronage of private schools. He objected to the use of public funds for support of private institutions. The solution of the problem, he said, was the election of none but patriotic citizens to public office.

A few years would see the grandest results in the election of patriotic and intelligent citizens to office that any country ever possessed.

President Echols delivered an address last night in Buffalo before a mass meeting of the Polish Catholics who have renounced the authority of the pope. The gathering was made up of Polish citizens of Cleveland, Toledo, Detroit and Buffalo, to the number of 6,000, who are now in the ranks of Protestant Christians. It was by a special invitation of the president of their organization, a former Roman Catholic Polish priest, that he addressed them on the occasion of their annual convention in Buffalo.

President Echols will return again to Rochester to-night, when a meeting will be held in Sargent Hall.—*The Rochester Evening Times, September 26.*

Silver Party and Rome.
The *Independent* asserts that every Roman Catholic church paper in this country is for Bryan and free silver. As the Roman press is under complete control of the hierarchy, and is only allowed to voice the sentiments of the hierarchy, this fact is a big straw.

The *New York World* says that the silver mines of the United States are principally owned by the following, with the value as follows:

John McCay (Roman Catholic), \$40,000,000; Marcus Daly (Roman Catholic), \$25,000,000; Flood estate (Roman Catholic), \$25,000,000; O'Brien estate (Roman Catholic), \$25,000,000; Fair estate (Roman Catholic), \$25,000,000; besides other men and estates either Roman Catholic or connected by marriage with Rome, such as W. A. Clarke, \$40,000,000; John P. Jones, \$25,000,000; J. B. Haggin, \$25,000,000; Sharons, \$35,000,000; Hearst estate, \$35,000,000; Senator Stewart, \$20,000,000; and James Murray, J. C. Powers, the French syndicate, de la Mar, Moffatt and others, representing sixty millions more—in all, \$340,000,000.

Is it any wonder Rome howls for Bryan and free silver?

Foreigners in America.

"We guarantee," writes Bill Nye, "that every man in America shall fill himself up full of liberty at our expense, and the less of an American he is the more liberty he can have. If he desires to enjoy himself, all he needs is a slight foreign accent and a willingness to mix up with politics as soon as he can get his baggage off the steamer. The more I study American institutions the more I regret I was not born a foreigner, so that I could have something to say about the management of our great land. If I could not be a foreigner, I believe I would prefer to be a Mormon or an Indian."

WARNED AS TO JESUITS.

Ex-Member of the Order Says They Cannot Be Trusted.

The Order a Menace to Protestantism in All Nations—Why They Should Not Be Tolerated.

That noted ex-Jesuit nobleman, Hoensbroech, has again come out with the explicit declaration that Jesuits are always and everywhere disloyal. A Berlin paper recently urged the government to reconsider its action to readmit the Jesuits to Germany, on the ground that it would counteract the Polish agitation and at the same time reward the Jesuits for their loyalty. To this Graf Hoensbroech replies as follows through the *Zukunft*, of Berlin, which is translated for the *Literary Digest*:

"Catholic orders in general, and the Jesuits in particular, have no 'fatherland' and do not wish to have one. They are and want to be cosmopolitan and international, not as Christianity is cosmopolitan and international, but to the utter sacrifice of their personal fatherland. Not only do the rules of the order require the Jesuit to say, 'I had parents, sisters, brothers,' etc., but the spirit of these rules requires that he should think, 'I had a fatherland.' No one knows this better than I. Over and over again my patriotism has been held up to me as one of my 'imperfections,' as a remnant of worldliness, and I have tried long and hard to become indifferent in this respect, thinking thus to please the Almighty. Even when I defended the order I have been censured for my indestructible patriotism."

The gentlemen who declare that the Jesuit has a country, loves his country, wishes to work for the good of his country, simply do not know the facts! Dr. Lieber declares that the exiles celebrated the German victories. I can prove—and my proofs are much stronger than his—that the 'bitterness in the heart of the Jesuit' is not due to separation from their country, but to the fact that they cannot openly advance the interests of their order among their relations. Two 'German' Jesuits (I relate a positive fact) expressed the hope that France would win, at the beginning of the war, to a Catholic family in Westphalia. How can the German Jesuits take an interest in German patriotic anniversaries when the German province of the order is largely composed of Swiss, Danes, Swedes, North Americans and South Americans? I remember the time when some of these Germans had to leave the settlement of Ma-la-Loch. The man who spoke most strongly out of the 'bitterness of his heart' was a Swiss.

"The 'bread of exile'! Well, I have eaten it. Few of even the most well-off German families live in such comfortable circumstances as the Jesuits. The 'poverty' of the order does not consist in being poorly clothed, poorly housed and poorly fed; the Jesuit is poor only in so far as he may not call his own the very comfortable quarters, very good clothing and excellent food which he is provided out of the extraordinary rich funds of the order. The people at large have an altogether wrong conception of poverty of the cloister. I was much astonished myself at the comfort of our life, and no one can speak pathetically of the 'bread of exile' who has had an insight into the grand establishments at Dilton Hall, in England; or at Bl enbeck, Exaeten and Wyandsrade, in Holland. Even the old leader of the Centrists, Relchensperger, acknowledged this when he visited Blyenbeck. I do not censure the Jesuit maxim that he who is expected to work well must eat well; but the legend of the hard 'bread of exile' must be put out of the world. It is misleading."

"Nor do the Jesuits themselves desire to return to their settlements in Germany, and their reason for this is very characteristic. Wherever the Jesuits settle down they are bitterly at enmity with the rest of the Catholic clergy. What they want is the right to return singly and to carry on their propaganda openly—as they do now clandestinely."

The writer warns against the Catholic orders which are closely connected with the Jesuits, of which connection he gives an exhaustive description. In concluding he reiterates his warning that the Jesuits will never cease to oppose Protestantism and the Protestant

dynasty, and that Protestant Prussia is as much as ever an eyesore to them.—*Boston Standard.*

TRAINING OF JESUITS.

A Jesuit Must Be as a Walking-Stick in the Hand of His Superior.

The Jesuit Father Clarke's article in the *Nineteenth Century* on the "Training of a Jesuit" has been very much noticed. The curious thing about it is that he admits that a "blind obedience" is given by Jesuits to the orders of their superiors; but he tries to save the credit of his order by declaring that the Jesuit must not, however, obey an order which is manifestly sinful. Here, however, comes in the question, How can a "blind" man see anything? If he is to obey blindly he cannot open his eyes to see where he is going. In "The Spirit of St. Ignatius," printed by English Jesuits, I read this: "If my superior occasionally order something which seems to me to be against my conscience, whilst he thinks otherwise, I ought to trust him rather than myself, unless I am obviously in the right" (page 73). But, how can anything be obvious to a blind man? Such directions as those I have just quoted are well calculated, under some circumstances, to lead to the commission of any crime. On the next page to that just cited I read: "I ought to consider myself as a dead body which has longer either will or opinion." If the miserable Jesuit is not allowed to have even an opinion of his own as to the justice or wisdom of the commands of his superior, will he ever be able to see anything wrong in doing whatever he is told to do, however criminal it may be? I have no doubt that those who in the past have committed murder under Jesuit influence were well instructed in "blind obedience."

It so happens that I possess a secret book of the Jesuits, printed by them in their college at Roehampton, near London, in 1863. It is entitled "Rules of the Society of Jesus." In the section devoted to the question of obedience the proviso, "unless I am obviously in the right," is omitted. As the subject is an important one, and as my readers cannot see this book, I will quote from it here: "At the superior's voice we must be most ready, no less than if it came from the mouth of Christ our Lord, leaving unfinished anything whatsoever, even the letter begun and not ended. Let us direct all our powers and our intention in our Lord to this point, that holy obedience be always most perfectly observed by us, as well in the execution as in our will and judgment; performing with great speed, spiritual joy and perseverance whatever shall be enjoined us; persuading ourselves that all things are just; denying with a certain kind of blind obedience any contrary opinion or judgment of our own. Let everyone persuade himself that they who live under obedience must suffer themselves to be carried and ruled by Divine Providence in their superiors, as if they were a dead body which suffers itself to be borne to any place and to be treated in any manner whatever; or, like an old man's staff, which serves him, who holds it in his hand, where and in what use it pleases" (pages 15 and 16).

While I am about it I may as well give one or two more extracts from this secret Jesuit book. Here are some directions to the ignorant which are sufficiently startling: "None of those who are admitted for the work of the house must learn either to read or write; or, if he have any knowledge of letters, acquire more; nor shall anyone teach him, without leave of the general; but it shall be sufficient for him to serve Christ our Lord in holy simplicity and humility" (page 27). So much for ignorance. Now for secrecy. The 35th rule is as follows: "No one must relate to externs what things are done, or to be done, in the house, unless he knows the superior approves of it; and he must not lend them the constitutions or other such books or writings in which the institute or privileges of the society are contained, without the express consent of the superior" (page 33). There are other curious things in these secret rules of the society of Jesus which I may quote on another occasion.—*Protestant Observer.*

GREEN FLAG CASE.

A Ruling of an American Judge That Ireland Practically Has No Flag.

LAWRENCE, Mass., October 1.—Judge Hopkins, in the supreme court, has quashed the somewhat famous green flag case against Contractor Patrick O'Brien. O'Brien was arrested July 6 for displaying an Irish flag on a portion of the staging of the new ward school house on Independence Day. As there is a statute forbidding the display of any foreign flag upon a public building,

O'Brien was found guilty, and Judge Stone, of the police court, fined him \$10. An appeal was taken to the superior court and the decision was given. Judge Hopkins ruled that Ireland was not a country in the meaning of the statute governing the case, and had no flag, except that of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. The case was accordingly dismissed.

National Schools in Quebec.

The result of the general election in Quebec has lessened the incredulity which otherwise would have greeted the report that the Liberals of that province are thinking of abolishing the dual system there also, and establishing a single system of non-denominational national schools. Indications of awakening in the French Canadian mind increase daily, and it is by no means impossible that a conflict between the Clericals and the Liberals over the settlement of the Manitoba school question might result in the suggested programme. The abolition of separate schools in this province has already produced results reaching far beyond the designs of those who introduced that measure. Should it result in striking from Quebec the shackles of mediaeval education, it will, indeed, have been a great thing for Canada.

It has been rumored that the hierarchy, being largely connected by personal ties with the party which has ruled the country for nearly twenty years, intends to refuse its sanction to any reasonable settlement of the difficulty here, with the intention of raising the cry at the next general election that the Liberals, after killing the remedial bill and defeating the government which represented a policy of remedial legislation, had failed to bring about any satisfactory arrangement. It is quite possible in that contingency that the Quebec Liberals, finding the Clericals determined to act as a political enemy, may resolve upon carrying the war "into Africa." And do doubt they could do so with a fair hope of success. The last election has shown that the tory ultramarines are not invincible where they have hitherto been regarded as strongest.

No doubt Quebec is awakening from her sleep, and perhaps she may do so like a giant refreshed. The splendid natural capacities of the French Canadian race will then no longer lie dormant. Beyond doubt, many new ideas are abroad in that province, and the habitant is beginning to think. He is no less devoted than formerly to his religion, but he is not quite so devoted to the Clerical control, the fruit of which he finds rather sour. When he sees one of his own people at the head of the government of Canada, he may feel dissatisfied that he himself and his children should be handicapped by lack of education. We may yet see Quebec, peopled as it is by descendants from the best populations of old France, rival that country in her awakening to modern life. We may yet see Quebec no less a pillar of Canadian nationality and civilization than her sister province of Ontario.

We have some times been asked how we should like it if the majority in Quebec should act as did the majority here, and take away separate schools from the minority. Our reply has always been that we should rejoice to see it. We should rejoice to see the people there establish a single system of non-sectarian national schools. We fear the day for that lies some way in the future; but an obstructionist policy on the part of the hierarchy may do much to hasten that well opened time.—*Winnipeg Daily Tribune.*

Have Changed.

It may be well to remember that the first apostolic delegate to the United States, Father Bedini, who was sent here in 1853, did not find the government or the people quite so subservient as has Satolli. No government vessel was sent out to meet him, nor was he the chief figure in assemblies of national importance. On the contrary, his credentials were refused recognition, and he was nearly mobbed in one or two cities which he visited. His mission proved a failure. Satolli is suave, shrewd and diplomatic, but even he has not succeeded in settling the dissensions in the Catholic church of America, which in spite of its boasted unity are likely to grow worse instead of better. How well Martinelli will succeed remains to be seen, but his task is not an enviable one. It may not be generally known that before Satolli was sent to America as representative of the pope, there were only three other apostolic delegates in America, one in Colombia, one whose jurisdiction comprised Ecuador, Bolivia and Peru, while the third represented the vice-gereat of Christ in San Domingo, Hayti and Venezuela. These are the countries which share with the United States this dubious honor.—*Woman's Voice.*