

Entered at the P. O. as Second Class Matter.

THOMPSON & KELLEY, Proprietors. ROOMS 313-314 SHEELY BLOCK. TELEPHONE, 311.

Subscription rates: One Year \$3.00, Six Months \$1.80, Three Months \$1.00. Single Copies 10 Cents.

JOHN C. THOMPSON, Editor. W. C. KELLEY, Business Manager.

OMAHA, FRIDAY, APRIL 15, 1892.

A WORD OF CAUTION.

For years the republican party has been torn assunder by two factions, one headed by Edward Rosewater and his lie, and the other by W. J. Broetch and John T. Clark. The time has come when republicans should not allow that old sore to rankle and be torn and exposed to public view.

AGAIN it is reported that Mr. Blaine is not a candidate for the presidency—that this decision is final.

THE duty of the county attorney is plain. He should prosecute every man who set the primary law at defiance last Friday.

It is now reported that Egan's "leave of absence" is to be permanent, and that he will never return to Chili, at least as a representative of this government.

EVERY loyal Protestant republican should attend the primaries next Thursday, April 21, and see that Americans are sent to the county, congressional, state and national conventions. Be sure of your men.

THE democratic county convention held in Washington hall last Saturday, was the most disgraceful exhibition we have ever attended. Charges of corruption, bribery, intimidation, robbery and every thing else were hurled at delegates by the orators on either side.

A PROMINENT Seventh ward democrat, while viewing the capers of the Romans on the floor of the democratic convention hall, was heard to remark: "Any man who has any respect for himself cannot be that kind of a democrat. From this moment I cease being a democrat, and am only an American."

WHEN one reads the list of Jim Boyd delegates elected in Omaha Friday the wonder that the A. P. A., is in politics in that city ceases.—Lincoln Call.

If you will watch your own delegations you will also see the need of the influence of the A. P. A., in the municipal affairs of Lincoln. The "O's" and "Mc's" are put on every delegation to catch the Roman Irish vote. Who ever thinks of putting a Methodist minister on the ticket in order to get the Methodist vote? Not you, Mr. Call! You would not want to insult them; yet an insult is offered the Germans, the Irish, the Swedes and the Bohemians every time a man is accorded a place upon a ticket because he can capture the German, the Irish or the Scandinavian vote. They are Americans, when they swear allegiance to the United States without a mental reservation, who will look only to a man's qualifications and not take into consideration the place of his birth unless they are Romanists. As soon as Getlib renounces allegiance to all foreign kings, princes and potentates, he should be an American. He cannot be if he helps keep up racial lines. This is what you charge him with every time you nominate him because he is a German.

UNEXPECTED RESULTS.

The last election in Columbus was hard fought and hotly contested. While there was nothing said about casting aside party lines, yet that was pretty effectually done. Instead of the battle being between republicans and democrats, as in former years, it resolved itself into a contest between the Romans and the anti-Romanists, with the odds decidedly in favor of the latter. The standard bearer on the republican ticket, Mr. John G. Pollack, in order to be elected, made a tie-up with the Roman element. His opponent, David Schufsbach, stood by the Americans and was elected by 165 majority. The office of treasurer had been held by a Roman Catholic named John B. Delman for ten years; and before the day of the election he declared he could hold it ten years longer. This might

have been so had the republicans placed a truckling Protestant on their ticket, instead of Alton Haight, a straight-out American Protestant, but as they made no such gracious mistake, Mr. Delman found that 19 more men believed he had held the office long enough, than there were who thought he was entitled to another ten years' lease. Mr. Gus Falbaum got mixed up with the wrong crowd, so the Protestant elected by 27 majority, an old soldier named D. M. Miter, whose loyalty to the flag has never been questioned, but Mr. Falbaum was not the only democrat who got caught in the Roman meshes. Wm. O'Brien, the candidate for police judge, being a Roman Catholic, was accorded a mild rebuff for allowing his name to be placed on the ticket so as to get the influence of the church. The majority against him exceeded his vote. It was 300. Albert G. Arnold was elected city engineer. His vote was 527. He had no opponent. Robert H. Henry and J. N. Taylor were elected members of the school board, while Henry T. Sperry, republican, was elected to the council from the First ward—heretofore democratic—by 9 majority. The same is true of the Second ward, which elected John E. Hoffman, republican, by a majority of 51. In the Third ward, however, the republican majority was set aside and C. E. Newman, a democrat, elected by 49 majority. The Platte County Argus, in speaking of the election, says:

What do you think of this? A democratic mayor, a republican treasurer, clerk and police judge; republican councilmen from democratic wards, and a democratic councilman from the only republican ward. From a purely non-partisan standpoint, this presents a laughable aspect, and even those who have suffered defeat are entitled to laugh merrily and enjoy the joke. There was our friend Gus Falbaum. Before election he expressed a large measure of disgust that the republicans did not put a "man" up for him to run against. Since election he has taken a mathematical survey of the situation, and is still unable to figure out what ran against him.

We congratulate the citizens of Columbus for keeping their city free from the blighting influence of Roman rule. Your example should be emulated by other young cities in the state.

GERMAN EDUCATIONAL BILL.

The Cleveland Leader speaking of the withdrawal of the Educational bill in Germany, says it was a signal defeat to the Roman Catholic church as well as a general rebuke to clericalism. "The proposal to enforce religious instruction in the Prussian public schools was a palpable bid by the government for the assistance and support of the Romish church. For years, notwithstanding Bismark's once famous boast, the German government has been going to Canossa step by step. The restrictions upon Romanism have, one by one, been removed or softened and their privileges extended.

"In every case such concessions have been purchased by the guarantee of Romish support in the reichstag for some measure or measures in the passage of which the government was especially interested. The purpose of the educational bill was in keeping with this record. While dictated primarily by the young emperor's desire to counteract the growth of atheism and socialism, it aimed in a political way also to strengthen the government majority by securing the firm adherence of the Catholic church in both landtag and reichstag.

"The disastrous failure of the Educational bill is accordingly the best possible evidence of German opinion on this subject. The German people have repudiated the idea of further concessions to clericalism, and particularly to Romanism, in a most emphatic manner. The government lost more than it gained, and only the withdrawal of the measure prevented its defeat. The most intelligent and scholarly nation in the world has declared unmistakably against any further Romish interference with education, not in any bigoted sense, but from a pure and lofty desire for religious and political liberty.

"The schemes and plots of the Romish hierarchy have for the time being come to naught, but new ones will doubtless be laid and the battle renewed. The Romish church, the greatest foe of free education in Germany as in the United States, is unceasing in its activity and aggressiveness, and seeks in every possible way to increase its power. In Germany it takes advantage of the parliamentary necessities of the government to exact everything obtainable; in this country it strives to use the democratic party for the same end. In both nations it can only be met and defeated by the united forces of an alert, well-informed, and liberty-loving public opinion."

No one who reads THE AMERICAN published in Omaha, and edited by John C. Thompson, can help but admire it. Typographically it is neat and tasty while the matter is well selected, ably written and always to the point. Every American citizen in Nebraska should be a reader of this splendid paper. If you have not seen a copy call at our office and we will take pleasure in showing you one and explaining its many virtues.—Ezra Ely.

If you want to enjoy an evening of song, attend the concert to be given in Y. M. C. A. hall, Monday evening, April 25, 1892, by the Omaha Quartette. Tickets on sale at this office.

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH.

Unstable Arguments in the Columns of a Professed Protestant Paper.

The crusade of the polemical Protestants in this country against the Roman Catholic church is saved from being a crime only by being a folly. The Christian Union represents an extreme type of Protestantism. It believes and teaches the absolute right of private judgment; that if he accepts church or book as his guide, he must accept it for himself, and therefore its authority over him is an authority self-assumed and self-imposed. Our position respecting the Roman Catholic church is not, therefore, one of ecclesiastical sympathy. Whatever other offense may be laid to the charge of the Christian Union, it cannot be charged with high church principles. It is as a representative of what its critics would regard as extreme individualism in religion that we gladly recognize the spiritual and political worth of the Roman Catholic church in the United States. The pugnacious Protestantism which attacks that church as a modern Babylon, a mother of Harlots, a man of sin, and an anti-Christ, is the last remnant of that sectarian spirit which a century ago excommunicated a Scotch Presbyterian mason for helping to build an Episcopal church, and refused Alexander Campbell shelter from the storm because he was a Baptist.

What would the polemical Protestants do? Have they ever seriously reflected what would be the condition of the United States if their warfare were to succeed—if the Roman Catholic church were to be uprooted, and every Roman Catholic church were razed to the ground, and every Roman Catholic priest were exiled?

There are in round numbers, ten millions of people in the United States whose spiritual sympathies are Roman Catholic. The Roman Catholic church furnishes these people with all the religious instruction and inspiration which they receive. If they did not attend mass, they would exercise no religious reverence; if they had no rosary, they would offer no prayers; if they had no father confessor, they would receive no moral instruction; if they had no priests, their marriages would be civil contracts contracted before justices of the peace, and their dying beds would be unvisited by the consolations and the hopes of the gospel. Let it be granted that the secret method of the confessional offers opportunities for immoral instructions and that there are immoral priests to take advantage of these opportunities; that Pater Noster and Ave Marias are not always true prayers; that worship at the mass is sometimes superstitious and often conventional; that the laity do not always distinguish between adoration and worship in their prayers to the saints. Let it be granted that the Roman Catholic church is not progressive; that it often arrests rather than promotes spiritual growth. Nevertheless, who will say that worship at mass is not far better than none; that Pater Noster in Latin are not better than prayerlessness; that it is not better to go to the confessional than to get through life without any religious instruction; that adoration of saints is not better than atheism?

Can a Protestant campaigner furnish for these ten millions of worshippers a substitute for the church which he desires to destroy? Can he get the attendants on mass into his meeting-house? After he has abolished the confessional, will those that attended it come to his preaching? When the Pater Noster is silenced, will the voice of extempore prayer be heard in its place? The polemical Protestant cannot get his chambermaid or his gardener in to family prayers, and does not often even try. The Roman Catholics are in our households; some of them in relations of intimacy with our children. Yet we rarely attempt to pass over the intellectual gulf which separates us from them, and we still more rarely succeed. Not infrequently their conscientious devotion shames our spiritual carelessness, and we are forced to acknowledge that they can impart to us the spirit of self-sacrifice as much as we can give them the spirit of intelligence and independence.

It is, however, as a political organization that the polemical Protestant attacks the Roman Catholic church. He figures out the immigration and natural increase of population will, in another century, hand this country over to Roman Catholic control. He even imagines the pope transferring his residence from Rome to Baltimore or St. Louis. He warns us of the undying hostility of the hierarchy to the public school and to free institutions. He is always able to cite respectable Roman Catholic authorities in defense of religious persecution, and his lurid imagination pictures the re-establishment of the Spanish inquisition and the auto-da-fe on our soil, or a re-enactment of a Netherlands campaign or a day of St. Bartholomew.

History does not justify these fears. The religious persecution of the middle ages belonged far more to an epoch than to a church, an epoch which trusted to the deterrent rather than to the remedial ailments in punishment, and did not distinguish between crime and intellectual error. The wise man will remember that others as well as

himself are living in the last decade of the nineteenth century and will adjust himself and his actions accordingly. The real dangers which threaten American society are not from imperialism in either church or state. They are from anarchy; from contempt of authority and impatience at control; from demagogic flattering democracy, enthroning its passions and dethroning its conscience; from greed and appetite rampant and uncontrolled; from the tens of thousands of saloons—not from the churches of any denomination. The polemical Protestant inveighs against the control exercised by the priesthood. Has he ever considered what would happen to this country, especially in our great cities, were there no such control? What dangers would ensue were that control weakened any faster than the power of self-control is developed to take its place? The abolition of the Roman Catholic priesthood in any one of our great cities would be almost as perilous to public peace and order as the abolition of the police. We are inclined to think that we could dispense with the police more safely than with the priesthood. The church is the great conservator of social law, and, if other churches are doing a larger work of education than the Roman Catholic, no other church is its peer as a public guardian, because no other church has so won the respect—sometimes fear—of those who, but for the wholesome restraints of religion, would threaten the integrity of society. What the abolition of the Roman Catholic church, except by the substitution of another in its place, may do for a democratic society the French revolution has demonstrated.

There are priests and priests, just as there are ministers and ministers; we gladly honor both the person and the work of such men as Cardinal Gibbons and Archbishop Ireland, and offer them our christian fellowship, and welcome whatever measure of christian fellowship their peculiar tenets allow them to extend to christians who acknowledge no allegiance to the pope and no ecclesiastical authority in the church.—Christian Union March 5, 1892.

Upon reading the foregoing article a prominent gentleman of Council Bluffs directed the following letter to the editor in refutation of some of the arguments, but which was not published for reasons best known to the editor:

EDITOR CHRISTIAN UNION: I have long been a reader of the Christian Union. Each week its pages are unusually fresh with strong progressive ideas, which strengthen and encourage.

But when it attacks the intelligence of the American people as a number of March 5th under "The Roman Catholic Church," I avail myself of the offer given your subscribers for expression.

First, I wish proof of any attack upon the rights of the Catholic church or its worshippers by Americans. What rights are not as freely accorded the Roman Catholic church as to other churches? Upon the surface, the writer of the article in question would appear in first-class standing in the Catholic church, or sorrowfully wanting in knowledge of his subject.

If the writer is a minister, will he tell us when a Catholic priest ever recognized him as a christian minister, or extended to him "christian fellowship," or counseled with him in religious work?

He claims "history does not justify these fears," viz: That the Roman Catholic church seeks to control this country, or the pope to transfer his residence to this country; or that the Roman church is hostile to our public schools, etc. To him the religious persecutions of the middle ages were only an epoch and the church barely at fault.

But the doctrine of infallibility is of the nineteenth century, not of the middle ages.

When was the brand of "heretic" rescinded by Catholic authority in the nineteenth, or any other age?

When has the denunciation of the Catholic church that "heretics" shall be exterminated ever been declared void, and the gospel of love in its place preached and practiced?

Will you say such denunciations do not stand today a living authority in that church, and are only waiting the opportunity for active exercise?

Why are dozens of secret Catholic societies busy throughout the land, to which no Protestants need apply?

Look about you in New York and count the millions of dollars that have passed from Protestant New York state treasury into Catholic control, and illegally, too.

We are not compelled to return to the middle ages for cause against the Catholic church.

When that church demands a percentage of police force and other offices for its support at election; when it does attack our public schools and drives its children out of them when it can; when it does demand a share of the teachers in our public schools, although those same teachers have come up in parochial schools, inferior in knowledge and without training or sympathy in our public school system; when they refuse to allow the American flag within their churches when wrapped about the body of a dead soldier; when, as a church, it keeps a lobby at Washington

to further its schemes for power and pelf, I hold it is time for the American people to call a halt.

The Catholic church has declared the church is above the state, and when has it repealed that claim? Its allegiance is to the pope first and to the government after. Controversy it if you can. The American people are saying to any and every church, Catholic or Protestant, "Mind your own business; hands off the state; hands off our public school system, and out of the treasury."

If the Lord be with this movement of the American people, you cannot stay it by the old pro-slavery line of argument.

Neither will you bull the people asleep by songs of safety, nor blind them to the true situation.

If the Catholic church deserves confidence, let it make itself worthy of it. Let it declare its allegiance in this country to our government and to the genius of our institutions, and renounce all foreign princes, pope or powers, and that without mental reservations. Let it support our public schools, and show it by word and deed. Let it repeal all its church laws or denunciations against those that differ with the Catholic church. And let it advise and show christian fellowship to other churches and their credited representations.

When that is done, the American people may then give the Catholic church the respect it would deserve. Before that time can you stop the irrepressible conflict?

A SUBSCRIBER.

Auricular Confession.

A. J. G. Hawken, M. A. (Oxon), of St. Ervan, in a communication to the West Briton, in answer to Mr. Hartigan, says:

That auricular confession produces immoral effects is proved, first by the nature of the questions in Roman Catholic theological works, second by the severe enactments made to check the immoral practices of confessors and penitents, and third by the testimony of Protestant ministers, who have been themselves priests of the Romish church, and who, therefore, speak from experience.

In "The Garden of the Soul," by Bishop Challoner, page 158, under the heading of "The Sixth Commandment," after a number of indelicate questions, comes this note: "As the sins against this and the ninth commandment are most grievous, and, at the same time, most various, the prudent counsel of your director will assist you in a more particular examination." I may inform the reader that the sixth and ninth commandments of the Roman Catholics are numbered by Protestants as the seventh and tenth. The obscene pages of Dr. Challoner are purely unskillful when compared with those of Peter Dens. In Peter Dens' "Theology," a class-book at Maynooth College, the instructions given to the confessors in reference to the above commandments are really abominable. I would not ask you to publish quotations, for you would certainly not permit them to appear in your columns. I do not think that Archbishop Magee erred when he said that such "volumes form a museum of spiritual iniquity, at which fends may shudder and blush."

Pope Gregory, referring to the prevalence of sacerdotal solicitation in Spain, in connection with the confessional, said: "The priests administer poison instead of medicine." So extensive did the evil become that Pope Paul IV. promulgated a bull against the ecclesiastical solicitants. Thereupon the Spanish Inquisitors issued a solemn edict that any person knowing a priest to have improperly conducted himself during the confession of a female penitent, should discover what he knew within thirty days to the holy tribunal. There were, however, so many accusations that it took the Inquisitors about six months to receive the evidence of the numerous witnesses! At length the holy tribunal put an end to the business by ordering that all crimes of this nature should be consigned to silence and oblivion! The evil was not confined to Spain; it was rife in England, France, and even in Germany, as we are informed from a German council held A. D. 1225, at which it was said of the priests: *Obsequia voluptatibus inhiantes, concubinas usque ad huc tempora publice temerunt.* Gregory XV. issued a bull in 1662, bearing the title "Universal Dominus," from which I give the following extract: "Whoever shall attempt to solicit any persons to the performance of vile acts before, during or after sacramental confession, let him be suspended."

Benedict XIV. confirmed and explained the bull of Gregory by issuing another in 1741. Another bull was also issued by the same pontiff in 1745, repeating and enforcing former enactments.

In this bull penitents were prescribed, also for penitents who solicited confessors. That auricular confession demoralizes both priests and penitents is proved by the existence of these enactments, for they were rendered necessary by the immoral effects of the practice. The abuse of a thing is not always an argument against the use of it; but, in the present case, what my opponents call "abuse" is, I submit, the natural consequence of asking and answering, in the dark and secret confessional, such indelicate questions as are stated

in "The Garden of the Soul," "The Path to Paradise," and Peter Dens' "Theology."

Let me now briefly give the evidence of three gentlemen who were once themselves Roman Catholic priests. The Rev. Antonio Gavin, in his "Masterkey to Popery," writes: "The confessor asks many questions which do the penitents more harm than good, especially ignorant people and young women; they go home with an idea of sins unknown to them before." The Rev. David O'Croly says: "The crime 'solicitatio mulieris in tribunal' is not of such rare occurrence, and would be very common but for the dread of detection." The Rev. Mr. Nolan says: "There is not a Romish priest but must allow that the first subject of his own confession to another priest is an acknowledgment of his having indulged in improper thoughts on account of the recitals made before him in the confessional." These witnesses "speak from experience."

Mr. Jones gives the following quotation from Scavini's "Theology": "If the confessor prudently feels any danger in putting any question, let him rather hold his peace and say nothing; for it is better that something be wanting to the integrity of the confession than that the question should be put." Here Scavini admits that certain questions tend to demoralize the penitent; and so does Dr. Pusey, where he says to the confessor, "Be discreet with everyone, but especially with women in helping them to confess shameful sins." But, as Dr. Magee argues, the confessor, not thinking omniscient, cannot tell where in the heart of the penitent knowledge and ignorance, purity and impurity, meet, and cannot, therefore, be certain that such questions as are put do not teach new sins.

Mr. Hartigan says that I "will not accept statistics for proofs." Here he misrepresents me. My contention is, not that all statistics whatever are to be rejected, but that those produced by him are not conclusive, inasmuch as they apply to only one kind of immorality, and are not confined to members of Roman Catholic and Protestant churches. Mr. Partigan and Father Jones hold that "we get all our knowledge of morality from statistics," and yet that I cannot judge of the effects of auricular confession, as I "cannot speak from experience, never having been to confession." Thus my antagonists absurdly reason on two mutually exclusive principles. It cannot be true that the question between us (first) can only be decided by statistics, and yet (second) can only be decided by personal experience. In favor of auricular confession, Mr. Hartigan quotes Voltaire, Rousseau, Luther, Laing, Buckle and Stead; but these men never confessed their sins to a priest, and, therefore, like myself, "cannot speak from experience." Mr. Hartigan, however, readily accepts their statements, and even calls them "proofs." To be consistent he must reject the evidence of his own witnesses on the same ground that he does mine—the want of personal experience.

Now, just a little about the fathers. St. Augustine says: "What have I to do with men that they should hear my confession, as though they would heal my disease?" St. Chrysostom writes: "I beseech you that you would continually make your confession to God." Father Jones, however, thinks that these fathers teach auricular confession. It is certainly not easy to find out their real views on the subject. In vol. ii, p. 3, in the "Life of Eusebius," Dupin, a Roman Catholic historian, says: "We have not the writings of the early fathers. We have merely some fragments without the context, which controversialists may twist and turn to sundry purposes."

St. Augustine believed in flogging heretics to force them to confess their sins. In his epistle to the *Tribune Marcellinus*, concerning the Donatists, the holy father writes: "Do not recede from your researches after the offenders, in which you have procured confessions of great sins by a repeated application of rods; this method of coercion is often practiced by teachers upon their pupils, by fathers upon their sons, and by bishops upon those whom they find to have been guilty of offenses." Here St. Augustine urges Marcellinus, a man invested with both military and civil power, to flagellate the Donatists to make them confess their heresies; but I have no evidence that this illustrious saint believed in any other kind of auricular confession.

EDITOR THE AMERICAN: I have just read the communication signed "A Lady American." The writer hits the nail squarely on the head. By all means let us have a daily that represents the ideas of patriots as opposed to Romanism." The writer says truly, "the editor of one of our dailies has a strong taint of Romanism. I consider this paper is open for boodle on any issue, no matter how unpatriotic, how unlawful or how immoral. Yours in the fight, TRUE BLUE.

Rubber goods of all kinds at WM. N. WHITNEY'S, 402 north 16th St. 103 south 15th St. Opposite Post Office. Money to loan at Dime Savings Bank, 1504 Farnam St.