

THE AMERICAN.

A WEEKLY NEWSPAPER.

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

PRICE FIVE CENTS.

VOLUME IX.

OMAHA, NEBRASKA, FRIDAY, JULY 7, 1899.

NUMBER 27.

SOME PERTINENT QUESTIONS.

Was William McKinley probably sincere in his ready acceptance of the A. P. A. principles as presented to him by the committee from the supreme council assembled in 1896?

Did Archbishop Ireland know his man in the person of William McKinley before his nomination and election to the presidency?

Is it probable that the president intended to insult his patriotic friends who elected him president in committing himself to the papal policy in the formation of his cabinet and in his subsequent appointments?

Did the president ignore true Americans and choose papists for his chief advisers?

Has the president been wise and statesmanlike in his Philippine policy since the close of the war with Spain, and in his treatment of General Aguinaldo and his armies who were formerly his allies in the war?

How can the pope of Rome be better pleased than with McKinley's papal policy in his administration?

Is not the combined papal and licensed liquor power in politics in this country growing stronger, more defiant and dangerous to the government and nation?

Where are the patriotic Americans formerly called the A. P. A.'s?

Can the patriotic Americans vote for the re-election of William McKinley president in 1900?

Will not the reform voters of the

country, the patriotic Americans, all the different branches of the temperance element and the federation of labor all unite in one great reform political party called by some name, having for its united and all-absorbing political issue the national abolition of the licensed liquor traffic, the papal power in politics and the money monopoly and sweep the country in 1900?

Will not these reform forces now come together and prepare for the mighty struggle of national reform against vice and corruption in politics and civil government which ought to be fought out and gloriously triumph at the next presidential election?

Where is the "Moses" that will set this ball of national reform in motion in this direction?

May it not be possible that God has his eye upon some man or men who will strike the key note in this united national reform which will arouse the people to action, to certain success and triumph?

And now, Mr. Editor, will you or some other champion in the use of the pen answer the foregoing questions according to your best judgment and belief? The friends of humanity and of good government want all possible light upon the matters to which these questions refer, to aid them in the right use of the ballot.

J. G. PINGREE.

Dundee, Ill.

A PAPAL CONCLAVE.

When the seventy cardinals are assembled in the great gallery a brick-layer walls up all doors save one, and in turn the windows, leaving at the top of the latter one or two panes to impart a dim religious light to the interior.

The next morning the master of ceremonies rings a bell at the entrance of each cell and repeats the summons half an hour later. At nine he rings the third time, crying, "To chapel, my lords." Then the cardinals, fully vested, with their scarlet berette, attended by their conclavists or chaplains, march to the Pauline chapel, where mass is sung by the dean of the sacred college. After service in the chapel comes breakfast, following which their eminences, in cassocks only, proceed to the Sistine chapel to prepare for the first scrutiny. The chief feature of this function is the casting of a paper ballot of peculiar design, called a schedule.

When the count of the schedules shows that no election has been reached, the papers are gathered together, and, being put with some straw in a grating in the fireplace, are set on fire. The smoke issuing from the chimney top informs the watchers outside that no choice has been made. This is the celebrated sfumata, of which so much has been written and concerning which so many wagers have been made.

All things come to an end, and so it is with a papal conclave. Political intrigues, differences and jealousies among the cardinals, an honest incertitude as to who is the best one to vote for, may prolong an election, but in due time the question is settled and a new occupant henceforth sits on St. Peter's throne. Then, according to custom, the senior cardinal deacon goes to a window and announces to the people assembled below, "Papam habemus."—"We have a pope;" the artillerymen on watch at Castle Angelo receive the signal and fire their guns; the workmen at St. Peter's, hearing them, tear down the wall which closed up the entry to the great balcony; the new pontiff steps out, and gives his first benediction to an

expectant world, "Urbi et Orbi;" and the strain which has sorely tried, perchance agonized the assembled cardinalate, is over.—From an article on "Pope-Makers and Pope-Making" in Self Culture for July.

TROUBLES OF THEIR OWN.

A dispatch from San Francisco says: "A tremendous sensation has been caused here in Catholic church circles by a suit brought by Father Gray, rector of St. Patrick's church, to recover from Archbishop Riordan \$30,000, with accrued interest, compounded semi-annually from April 1, 1879. This money, Father Gray alleges, was advanced to Father Alemany, then archbishop of the diocese, to pay a debt on a tract of land designed for use as a cemetery. Father Gray, who is an old man, had seemingly been content to let the money remain in the hands of the archbishop, but the priest has two nephews, and these young men, it is asserted, are urging the priest to act. Growing out of this suit has come a quarrel which threatens to become more than national. Father Gray is a member of the San Francisco archdiocesan council of five, and because of the suit, it is said he was lately removed from the rectorship of St. Patrick's and from the council, although it is asserted that he cannot be removed from the council without an order from Rome. Against his removal from the rectory, which is owned by the priest, Father Gray and his parishioners have appealed to Mgr. Martinelli, receiving a reply that the ablegate does not like to interfere in diocesan matters, but will give this appeal most serious consideration."

Says the New York Herald: "Police-man Jeremiah Moran of the Oak Street station was tried by President York of the police board yesterday, on charges preferred by Rosie Barbarini, of No. 38 New Bowery. She charged that on May 30 Moran refused to make an effort to arrest a thief who had stolen her pocketbook. Police Inspector Cross also charged Moran with refusing to answer questions asked him at a hearing before him. In a sworn statement made by Miss Barbarini, she said that on Sun-

day, June 4, Father Oreste of St. Joachim's church in Roosevelt street, sent for her. She found two other priests and Moran there. Father Oreste, she said, told her that Moran had come to him with an excellent recommendation from Fr. Kane, of St. James' church, and suggested that they should settle the case between them. She said that an agreement was drawn up by the priest which called for Moran to pay her \$7. The agreement, she said, she and Moran signed. She was then told to withdraw her complaint when the case came to trial. Moran admitted calling on the priest, and declared that when the suggestion was made that he should make good the girl's loss, he acquiesced, rather than have any trouble. Decision in the case was reserved."

Says the Cincinnati Post: "An attorney has been retained by the children of Ignatius Rosseter with a view of contesting the will of Gregory Rosseter, who bequeathed an estate valued at \$70,000 to religion and charity. Chief beneficiary is the Catholic Orphan Asylum at Cumminsville. St. Xavier's church and the Little Sisters of the Poor are also mentioned in the will."

Says the Cincinnati Post: "Many residents of Camp Washington were before Judge Samuel Smith Thursday, interested in the efforts of Emil A. Aberle, a butcher, who resides at Tafel and Wagner streets, to recover possession of Anna, Alma and Francisca, his minor children from the St. Aloysius Orphan Asylum. Aberle placed the little ones in that institution in May, 1898, after the death of his wife. He married again the following November, and wants to complete his family circle by taking the babies home. The orphan home trustees stand on a contract which Aberle signed, allowing them to keep the children until they had attained their majority. Aberle says he did not understand that contract, and was induced to place his children in the home by his brother-in-law, F. A. Juengling. The latter denied this. Attorney Arnold Speiser, for the asylum, asked Aberle if he had tried to have these children, who are Catholics, placed in a Protestant asylum. Aberle said 'No.'"

The Chicago Times-Herald prints this dispatch, dated Madison, Wis., June 22: "Archbishop Katzer must pay taxes on his residence in Milwaukee. This is the decision rendered by the state supreme court today in the case of the archbishop against the city of Milwaukee. In 1892 the city assessed the archiepiscopal residence and levied a tax on it. The same action was taken in 1893 and 1894, but the taxes were not paid. Archbishop Katzer maintaining that the house was church property, and hence not taxable under the law. Finally he brought suit in the Milwaukee county circuit court to have the property declared not taxable, and that court decided in his favor. The supreme court was asked by the attorneys for the archbishop to recognize the laws of the Roman Catholic church under which the archbishop holds the property in trust. The court does not recognize the law referred to, saying that in a former case at the suit of the archbishop himself, it decided the archbishop was the absolute owner of the church property of the diocese, and that it cannot now go back and find him only the owner in trust. If there is a trust, the opinion continues, it must be such under the laws of the state."

THE INSIDE SITUATION AT MANILA.

Peter MacQueen, special war correspondent of the National Magazine of Boston, and now in the field with General Lawton's troops in the Philippine Islands, writes in the June number regarding the situation at Manila as follows:

"After the occupation of Manila by the Americans the Filipino officers who came into the city of Manila, were well treated by the Americans, wined and dined with our boys and were 'mucho amigos con los Affer, leanos.' Many prominent Filipinos were openly in favor of the American protectorate, but in a few weeks clouds came into the sunny horizon. The American troops drilled every day. The Filipino officers and soldiers watched them. Nothing is more marked in orientals than their wonderful power to imitate. Aguinaldo's men went back to their camps and exactly imitated the evolutions of the Americans, with this significant exception, that while our boys nearly all had the obsolete Springfield rifle, the Filipinos had the Mausers captured from Spain—the most deadly weapon known to warfare."

What shall I say of Filipino valor? The Filipino 'hasn't got no papers of his own; he hasn't got no medals and rewards.' But there is only one opinion concerning his fighting qualities, and that is, that they are beyond all praise. Give the Filipino the same resources we have, and we could not subdue Luzon with 500,000 soldiers. The doctors at the Hospital told me they never had a case of one Filipino soldier who had shown the slightest fear of pain or death. They look at us with dull, sullen defiance. We do not kill nor wound nearly as many of them as is reported. They manage their retreats remarkably well. I saw two hundred of them, with rifles, keep 2,500 of our boys at bay for two hours. Of course the Filipinos had an immensely strong position; but we had cannon and rapid fire guns. I try to get at the very truth of things. Most of our folk are agreed that the Filipinos are very brave, but that they are treacherous and great thieves."

THE CHURCH IN MEXICO.

Suddenly a deep hush fell upon that vast assembly, and down in the dust, that lay several inches deep in the streets, went every man, woman and child, the ragged beggar by the side of the well-dressed bourgeois. Some knelt and covered their eyes with their hands; others fell flat on their faces. A few American tourists alone remained standing. Instinctively I took off my hat as I looked in the direction in which all eyes were turned. A third-class cab, its yellow badge conspicuous in the bright sunlight, was coming quickly toward us, leaving behind it a thick cloud of white dust. As it passed I caught the gleam of the orange vestments of the padre who was carrying extreme unction to some poor soul that had almost done with all things earthly. As if frozen to the earth the people remained like a mighty group of statuary. Nor did they move until the cab had passed and drawn up before a miserable little abode hut, destitute of any passage for air, light, or humanity except an open doorway. Not until the priest entered did they arise; and even then they remained with heads uncovered.

The Mexican flag waves over every church in the republic, as a symbol of the power that the government exercises over all its subjects within the realm, and the priest has not standing in the eye of the law; but the church lives as strongly as it ever did in the hearts of the great mass of the people.—From an illustrated article on "Life on the Vega" in Self Culture for July.

Viewed from the human standpoint, nothing can be more joyless than the daily life of the Roman Pontiff at the present day. The era of magnificence, of pageantry for the Roman Court, has forever passed away. Extreme austerity, at least outwardly, distinguishes the dwellers in the Vatican. The atmosphere there is gloomy and chill. The Pope lives alone; no one shares with him even a meal. A walk in the garden attached to the palace has been for years the only source of relaxation for him who, while styling himself "The Vicergerent of Christ," is nevertheless, by his own volition, "The Prisoner of the Vatican."—Self Culture.

ANOTHER PAPER UPON IMPERIALISM

Imperialism is nothing less than the reign of arbitrary power. And imperialism is the same the world over; ever has been and ever will be. In plain English, arbitrary power is lawless power—the will of the individual or a combination of individuals acknowledging no constitutional restraint. It has well been said that "law and arbitrary power are in eternal enmity." It follows as a logical outcome that arbitrary power cannot be made to conform to principles, or be held in check by constitutional limitations. At every step constitutions are a barrier to the exercise of arbitrary power.

Wherever a constitution is in existence, one of three things must take place. Either the constitution must remain as it was framed, and be interpreted as it was interpreted by its framers; or, it may be misinterpreted, misconstrued and perverted so as to become the constitution of arbitrary power; or else the constitution must be torn down and dethroned as no longer the supreme law of the nation.

So long as the first condition remains, the exercise of arbitrary power can find no soil upon which to flourish, for the constitution defies its claims, and is a barrier against its progress. But arbitrary power may flourish, and arbitrary rule may exist under either of the other conditions; or, with a mixture of the two. Now let us apply these principles to American imperialism.

When we look at the situation as it is, as the history of the nation has actually been written during the last few years, we may well say, in a figure, that slice after slice of the national constitution has been cut off till there remains no more any safeguard for the rights of the people, civil or religious. Yet, as a matter of fact, the constitution remains, safely housed at the capitol of the nation; while imperialists are as loud as may be in declaring their reverence for that sacred document. But, "by their fruits ye shall know them." And in order to prove their loyalty to the constitution they have set themselves to the task of misinterpreting the constitution to make it fit the theories and the acts of imperialists. Some have declared that this is not now a government of law, but of will; that constitutional government has been succeeded by a government of arbitrary power. And this seems to be about the condition of things. Some have said that "this nation has become a giant who is no longer content with the nursery rhymes which were sung around his cradle." Others have said that the "right to acquire," and "the right to govern," are "not limited by the constitution." Still others have said that "governments derive their powers from the consent of some of the governed." And again it is said that "the declaration of Independence was made to suit a particular existing state of things," and that it does not fit the giant. They declare that "the idea that all men are created equal is not the fundamental law of the land." We are further told that we are to "resist the crazy extension of the doctrine that government derives its just powers from the consent of the governed;" which is to say that this doctrine and its benefits are not to be allowed to other people. Besides all this, we are told that "the constitution must bend." "That we have outgrown the constitution. It is not worth while to discuss it."

In view of all this I would ask—in the name of the inalienable rights of all men I would ask: Where is the Federal Constitution? What has been done with the constitution of American republicanism? Where is the safeguard of the rights of the people? That document no longer remains as the bul-

wark of American liberties. It has no restraint upon those whom it was made to bind. It has been made to bend to suit the demands of imperialism. It has, in their hands, become as "elastic" (this is the term they have used) as a rubber band. They admit the greatness of the principles that "underlie our free institutions;" but in the same breath they tell us "they are not capable of literal application."

Thus we see that the constitution of American republicanism has become the constitution of American imperialism. And this means that it has become the constitution of Roman Catholicism. That which was once the instrument of delegated and limited power, has become the instrument of unlimited and irresponsible power. That which was once the safeguard of the rights of the people, has become the instrument of their subjugation and enslavement. That which was once the safeguard against the encroachments of Rome, is now the instrument by which she will ride into universal power. H. F. PHELPS.

A SUGGESTION.

Mr. John Ireland, you are the boy who wants to be boss and show to the pope and the Jesuits what you can do. Some of the American soldiers have deserted and gone to the Filipinos, and are acting as officers, they say, and the circumstantial evidence is that they are your boys, and fighting against the United States, and for the pope, who is at Rome. Now, go to the president and get permission to send ten thousand of your drilled men to help put down these Filipinos. Then, after you get them there, by the money of this government, have them fight with the Filipinos, so as to pay up the United States for fighting against and whipping the dear daughter of the pope—Spain.

In this way you might get the cardinal hat. Of course, God and every man, who has a grain of common sense would know you would have a cardinal hat, to do a thing of this kind, but you are after position, and this would surely give you position—there and hereafter, in the Roman Catholic heaven. Now is the time to act, if you have any acting to do. You should be able to get every faithful Roman Catholic in the army to help you, and the pope would surely give you his blessing. The Jesuits might be mad because they might think that you were taking work that they should attend to, but what have the Jesuits done for you, anyhow? And by doing a trick of this kind you might turn the tide against the son of the saloon-keeper, who lives in New York, and who keeps the Tammany tiger.

This is a world of opportunities, you know. M. J. I.

PAPAL LIFE PRESERVERS.

Soldiers in the Philippines who are under the Roman pope have tattooed on themselves pictures of the Virgin Mary, that they may be spared from the bullets of Remington rifles. This is one of the "fool tricks" of the papal agents. This kind of protection was given to the Indians before the fight at Broken Knee. They called their protection ghost-shirts, and they were told they would protect them against the bullets of the whites. If this is all that papacy can do for these people, the Indians and the Filipinos, that church had better hang its harp on some convenient willow and sneak to some obscure place, out of the sight of man and beast. S. I. T.

Chief Clerk E. M. Snyder of the United States quartermaster's department gives an extended interview to church in the Philippines, to the ruin of discipline and the scandal of the army.

A San Francisco daily, and says that General Otis, is doing everything in his power to help the Roman Catholic