

## NOT WORSHIP, BUT RESPECT. Truly Jesuitical Argument Successfully Answered.

To the editor of the Morning Advertiser: I beg to call your attention to a mistake in the following extract from a column of your valuable paper of today, headed "Viewing an Ancient Relic":

But so great have been the crowds in attendance that Father Petrus has been unable to carry out the original idea, and yesterday at 10 o'clock there were so many waiting to see and worship the memento that it was left exposed to view all day.

On behalf of Catholics, I would say that we are not in the habit of worshipping relics, but merely pay to them the amount of respect due to the remains of those whom God hath made his special instruments. The Divine honor called worship is due only to the one divine being, God himself, in either or all of the three persons, Father, Son and Holy Ghost, and not to any created being. By publishing this in your valuable paper, which I never fail to read daily, you will greatly oblige.

Ed. KING.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., May 6.  
That kind of argument may do down in New York among the "Yahoos," but in the *effete* west where every man knows Webster's unabridged dictionary "by heart," it will be viewed with suspicion. Mr. King—he is evidently one of the pope's chosen—says Catholics (meaning Romanists) "are not in the habit of *worshipping* relics, but merely pay to them the amount of *respect* due to the remains of those whom God hath made his special instruments." So! What does Webster say about *worship*?

Why, he says to worship is "to respect, to honor." It is "adoration of God, or a being viewed as God." So much for worship. Now let us see what a relic is. It may be anything which serves to remind one of other days, of some startling epoch, of some pleasant era in life. It may be a work of antiquity recovered from the ruins of Pompeii—it may be a man who claims to be the vice-gerent of God—it matters not what, so long as it is a thing that has remained after all else pertaining to it has decayed or disappeared. The pope of Rome is a relic—a relic of the dark ages, a relic that is looked upon as God—for the pious Constantine called him God—and as God he is *worshipped* by Romanists. But, according to Mr. King, the pope is not worshipped, he is simply *respected*. On this point there is no room to quibble, as the only authority we have holds that *worship* is respect, and as all Romanists respect the pope, all Romanists worship the same personage, and as he is a relic, it follows as a matter of course that all Romanists worship relics. To follow Mr. King a little further, we will inquire who were, and are, according to Roman tradition, the "special instruments of God?" We will start as the Roman Catholic church does, with Peter—though they make the mistake of confounding, and intentionally, too, the words *petra* and *petrus*. He is looked as the head of the Roman Catholic church; to him was given the power to bind or loose upon earth what shall be bound or loosed in heaven; to him were given the keys to heaven and to hell, and to him was assigned the task to "feed My sheep." Time rolled on and Peter died. A few hundred years thereafter the Roman church came into existence, with little of its present pomp and less of its dogma. For a time it struggled with the church of Antioch, with that of Alexandria, and with the Greek church, until finally it gained supremacy over a greater portion of the then known world. With the subjugation of the world she became tyrannical and murderous. The men at her head, first referred to as bishops, afterward as archbishops, then as patriarchs, and later as pope, and now as the vice-gerent of God, forgot, if they ever were aware of the fact, the true mission of the church. They, though ignorant themselves, set up great pretensions to learning, and allowed none to advocate the truthfulness of a thought or an idea which did not follow the trend of their own dwarfed intellect. They acquired the much talked of temporal power by forgery and imposition. On page 11, chapter 1, of "D'Aubigne's History of the Reformation," we find this statement verified in the following language:

"In the eighth century we see the Roman bishops resisting on the one hand the Greek emperors, their lawful sovereigns, and endeavoring to expel them from Italy, while with the other they court the mayors of the place in France, begging from this new power, just beginning to rise in the west, a share in the wreck of the empire. Rome founded her usurped authority between the east, which she expelled, and the west, which she summoned to her aid. She raised her throne between two revolts. Startled by the shouts of the Arabs, now become masters of Spain, and who boasted that they would speedily arrive in Italy by the gates of the Pyrenees and Alps, and proclaim the name of Mahomet on the Seven Hills; alarmed at the insolence of the Astolphus, who at the head of his Lombards, roaring like a lion, and brandishing his sword before the gates

of the eternal city, threatened to put every Roman to death. Rome, in the prospect of ruin, turned her frightened eyes around her, and threw herself into the arms of the Franks. The usurper Pepin demanded her pretended sanction of his new authority; it was granted and the papacy obtained in return his promise to be the defender of the "Republic of God." Pepin wrested from the Lombards the cities they had taken from the Greek emperor; yet, instead of restoring them to that prince, he laid their keys on St. Peter's altar, and swore with uplifted hands that he had not taken up arms for man, but to obtain from God the remission of his sins, and to do homage for his conquests to St. Peter. Thus did France establish the temporal power of the popes.

"Charlemagne appeared: the first time he ascends the stairs to the basilica of St. Peter, devoutly kissing each step. A second time he presents himself, lord of all the nations that formed the empire of the west, and of Rome itself. Leo III. thought fit to bestow the imperial title on him who already possessed the power; and on Christmas day, in the year 800, he placed the diadem of the Roman emperors on the brow of the son of Pepin. From this time the pope belongs to the empire of the Franks; his connection with the east is ended. He broke off from a decayed and fallen tree to graft himself upon a wild and vigorous sapling. A future elevation, to which he would have never dared aspire, awaits him among these German tribes with whom he now unites himself.

"Charlemagne bequeathed to his feeble successors only the wreck of his power. In the ninth century disunion everywhere weakened the civil authority. Rome saw that this was the moment to exalt herself. When could the church hope for a more favorable opportunity of becoming independent of the state, than when the crown which Charles had worn was broken, and its fragments lay scattered over his former empire?"

"Then appeared the False Decretals of Isidore. In this collection of the pretended decrees of the popes, the most ancient bishops, who were contemporaries of Tacitus and Quintilian, were made to speak the barbarous Latin of the ninth century. The customs and constitutions of the Franks were seriously attributed to the Romans in the time of the emperors. Popes quoted the Bible in the Latin translation of Jerome, who had lived one, two, or three centuries after them; and Victor, bishop of Rome, in the year 192, wrote to Theophilus, who was archbishop of Alexandria in 385. The impostor who had fabricated this collection endeavored to prove that all bishops derived their authority from the bishop of Rome, who held his own immediately from Christ. He not only recorded all the successive conquests of the pontiffs, but even carried them back to the earliest times. The popes were not ashamed to avail themselves of this contemptible imposture. As early as 865, Nicholas I. drew from his stores the weapons by which to combat princes and bishops. This impudent invention was for ages the arsenal of Rome."

So much for temporal power. Now, let us look at their popes. Few of them could lay claim to being as pure or as holy as a procurator of today. All were tinted with the aroma that prevailed even to the altar of St. Peter. None escaped the blight, and until the policy of the church, her dogmas and her theologies are changed, none ever will. The same authority which we quoted above says, after Pepin had been crowned:

"Nevertheless, the vices and crimes of the pontiffs suspended for a time the effects of the decretals. The papacy celebrated its admission to the table of kings by shameful orgies. She became intoxicated; her senses were lost in the midst of drunken revellings. It is about this period that tradition places upon the papal throne a woman named Joan, who had taken refuge in Rome, with her lover, and whose sex was betrayed by the pangs of childbirth during a solemn procession. But let us not needlessly augment the shame of the pontifical court. Abandoned women at this time governed Rome; and that throne which pretended to rise above the majesty of kings was sunk deep in the dregs of vice. Theodora and Marozia installed and deposed at their pleasure the self-styled masters of the church of Christ, and placed their lovers, sons and grandsons in St. Peter's chair. These scandals, which are but too well authenticated, may perhaps have given rise to the tradition of Pope Joan.

Rome became one wide theatre of disorders, the possession of which was disputed by the most powerful families of Italy. The counts of Tuscany were generally victorious. In 1033, this house dared to place on the pontifical throne, under the throne of Benedict IX., a youth brought up in debauchery.

This boy of twelve years old continued, when pope, the same horrible and degrading device. Another party chose Sylvester III. in his stead; and Hamdick, whose conscience was loaded with adulteries, and whose hands were stained with murder, at last, sold the papacy to a Roman ecclesiastic."

But this is mild when compared with the lives of Rodrigo Borgia and of Pope John XXII. and XXIII. Many popes were murderers—unrivaled moral lepers—and in some cases they were guilty of all the crimes in the criminal calendar. The three above named certainly were guilty of most of them, and it is but charitable to suppose that they may have failed in the commission of at least some of them. Yet these rascals are part of the chain of "holy apostolic succession." Without them it would be incomplete, and with them Leo XIII. is able to trace back the line of succession to about 108 years after the birth of Christ. Leo XIII. is counted a great and good man by contemporaneous writers, but if that is true, what is responsible for the change in the life of this pope? Simply this: After the present pontiff had been elevated to the position he now occupies, the government at Rome threw off the papal yoke—divorced the church and state—and left him no spoils to disburse, but put him in a position to covet temporal power, which he has done for twenty years, in direct opposition to the tenth commandment.

All this only leads us back to the definition quoted from Webster, and we desire to inquire if Leo XIII. is not a being viewed as God? We contend he is. God makes no mistakes. His plans are perfect, and fit together as invisibly as two drops of water. What man would dare to lay claims to equal power, either to construct or to interpret what is right and what is wrong? None but the pope at Rome, and for daring to assume to "stand for God," millions of illiterate beings fall down and worship him, while millions of others who know better, clothe him with divine power, and declare that what he says *ex cathedra* is infallible. Knowing this, we do not agree with the Jesuitical argument of Mr. King, and shall content that the *Advertiser* used the right word when it said "there were many waiting to see and *worship* the memento."

### Peculiar Patriotism.

The following burst of patriotism was clipped from the last issue of the Boston Pilot:

"It is a poor kind of an American citizen who can look at one picture in *Scribner's Magazine* and keep the tears from his eyes. It represents the morning salute to the flag in a New York industrial school. The long rows of poor little creatures, each with a pathetic story of self-denial or of motherly devotion behind its attempt at neatness, rise when the American flag is carried to the teacher's desk, and say with one voice, 'We turn to our flag as the sunflower turns to the sun.' The little hands touch the forehead, soldier fashion, with 'We give our heads,' then are laid upon the heart with 'and our hearts,' and then, with a shout, comes 'to our country! One country, one language, one flag!' This is better in its effects than thousands of elaborately prepared celebrations, but the picture is infinitely touching."

The editor of the *Pilot* evidently has forgotten that this same flag which he pretends to revere so much, has time and time again been insulted by the clergy of his church, and refused admittance to their church buildings when wrapped about the coffin of a dead soldier, and on every occasion when they dare to do it, this same emblem which he now lauds is placed beneath the flag of Erin.

If these little children whom he thus applauds, were in some parochial schools they would be taught entirely different ideas, and be refused instruction in anything but a foreign tongue. It is all very well for the editor of the *Pilot* to thus parade his patriotism, but would it not be better shown by loyalty to the United States government, and by protection to her time-honored institutions.—*Woman's Voice*.

### Crops.

The fine weather this week has given business an air of confidence, and has no doubt delighted the farmer by giving him a chance to finish his spring planting. From reports throughout the west there is no cause for alarm, as small grain has never looked better and corn may be planted as late as the 10th of June and insure a good crop of marketable corn. Fruits of every kind are in fine shape, and the prospects seldom look better.

Try Harry's "SPECIAL," the BEST three for a quarter in the city. 107 South 15th Street.

### THE ENEMY OR PATRON?

#### A Question Which Americans Can Decide for Themselves.

The great enemy of secret, oath-bound organizations is the Catholic church. We know how dangerous these societies are, and how frequently they plot and plan to subvert government. The principle involved is just this: The man who takes an oath to be loyal to his society may mean well, and may be a good citizen, or subject, as the case may be. But the time may come when the laws of his society may run counter to the laws of the state. He may be called upon to do something or to say something which is in direct conflict with morality or patriotism. There is the dilemma. If he is an honest man he will shrink from becoming a malefactor, but if he is disobedient to his society he may forfeit his life as a consequence.—*John Rush in St. Vincent De Paul Association Bulletin, May 14, 1892.*

And this from a Roman Catholic! A man who belongs to the Ancient Order of Hibernians, which has a military attachment, and to which no one but a Roman Catholic (an Irish Roman Catholic) can be admitted to membership. Ye gods! What next? The Roman church the enemy of secret organizations! Think of it! Why, the Roman church itself is an oath-bound society! The Roman church is an oath-bound society! Any intelligent man knows this! John Rush knows it! Yet he stands before the public proclaiming that the Roman machine is the enemy of "secret, oath-bound organizations." We will not say that he prevaricates when he says that, but we will say he is quite economical of the truth, and that he knows the Romans are a lot of chumps, and makes the mistake of placing the Protestants in the same category.

#### The Roman church the enemy of "secret, oath-bound organizations!"

Why does she have her  
Mafia,  
Jesuits,  
Clan-na-gaels,  
Catholic Knights,  
Knights of St. George,  
Knights of St. Patrick,  
Knight of the Red Branch,  
Catholic Order of America,  
Ancient Order of Hibernians,  
and a score or more of other exclusive Roman Catholic oath-bound organizations, more secret than the Masons, more loyal to the church than to the country, and more dangerous to the government than the nihilists or anarchists if that statement is absolutely true?

Mr. Rush made a mistake. He meant to say, evidently, or it is understood, probably, that when a Roman Catholic refers to oath-bound organizations, he means organizations composed exclusively, or in part, of Protestants. That being so, Mr. Rush should have started that paragraph, or we should render it, "The great enemy of Protestant secret, oath-bound organizations is the (Roman) Catholic church." In the light of that rendition Mr. Rush's first sentence in the paragraph above quoted is absolute truth. For the Roman church sends her minors into every secret order. After they have sworn secrecy, they go out and reveal everything to the society of Jesus. They take any and all oaths and consider them in no manner binding. Perjury and murder are held in no more abhorrence by Roman Catholics than mistakes and accidents are by Protestants. The priest, for a few dollars, can make them white as snow.

Mr. Rush should not forget the history of the Roman machine. It is a history of blood shed, of fraud and imposition, of licentiousness and debauchery, of cunning and deceit. He should remember that the Roman church never changes. He should think of her teachings—"that a servant who is not paid as much as he deems his services are worth may steal from his employer the difference between what he gets and what he thinks he is entitled to, and yet not be guilty of any crime." He should remember her theology—so vile that it cannot be translated from the Latin into English, without subjecting the translator to the hardships of the statute covering obscene matter.

"We know how dangerous these societies are, and how frequently they plot and plan to subvert government," Mr. Rush continues. Now, if Mr. Rush means that the Romans know how dangerous their secret, oath-bound organizations are, and how often they endeavor to subvert government, we shall agree with him. We know how dangerous they are; we know how often they attempt to subvert government. They are dangerous, they are treasonable, for they place the church above the state, and endeavor to make the latter subservient to the former. We know how often they attempt to subvert government. It is as often as an opportunity presents itself—and quite frequently they have been known to manufacture the opportunity. It will be attempted as long as the society of Jesus maintains a foothold upon, and

enjoys the protection of the government they have designs against. That you can be assured of.

Mr. Rush says, in that paragraph, that "The man who takes an oath to be loyal to his society may mean well, and may be a good citizen, or subject, as the case may be. But the time may come when the laws of his society may run counter to the laws of the state. He may be called upon to do something, or to say something, which is in direct conflict with morality or patriotism. There is the dilemma." There must be some reason for all this solicitude for the welfare of the government. Let us see what it is. Does the Roman church teach that her children shall always recognize the demands of the state? Not by any means, Pope Leo XIII. in his encyclical letter, dated January 10, 1890, says: "Cases happen in which the state demands one thing from the citizens, and religion the opposite from Christians, and this undoubtedly for no other reason than that the heads of the state pay no regard to the sacred power of the church, or desire to make it subject to them." In another place it states that "It is an impious deed to break the laws of Jesus Christ for the purpose of obeying the magistrate, or to transgress the laws of the church under the pretext of observing the civil law." He also affirms that "the laws of the state are in open contradiction with the divine law if they command anything prejudicial to the church"—(to assess church property, or throw open nunneries and convents, for instance)—" \* \* \* then it is a duty to resist them and a crime to obey them." This same pontiff, in 1886, said: "The judicial functionaries must refuse obedience to the state and to the laws of the country, which are in contradiction with the Roman Catholic precepts." All this is the teaching of the Roman church. All this is law which NO Roman Catholic dares to disobey. Mr. Rush knows this is the law of the Roman church. He knows that HE dares not disregard it. He knows that if he did he would be damned, for he knows that the teachings of the Roman church are that the pope has the power to bind or loose, to save or to damn; and think you he would not consign the soul of John Rush to the everlasting flames if he dared to *practice* opposition to the laws of the church of Rome? We see behind these Jesuitical utterances of Mr. Rush, more than he intended to disclose to view. We see a desire to divert attention from the Roman church and its multitude of oath-bound secret organizations, while they continued to plot and scheme for the final capture or overthrow of all governments which are not subservient to the Roman church and the old fraud on the Tiber. We see in Mr. Rush's article the rise of the pick-pocket who snatches a pocket book and runs after an imaginary thief crying "stop thief," and who escapes with the booty while a foolish multitude chase an inoffensive citizen who is also chasing an imaginary thief. Of course, Mr. Rush will indignantly resent having the Roman corporation likened to a pick-pocket, but if he will pardon us, we believe the latter is the more honorable of the two, for he robs only those who have money, while the Roman machine robs them of everything—money, independence, honor, truth, virtue and love of country.

Mr. Rush says that "if he be an honest man, he will shrink from becoming a malefactor, but if he is disobedient to his society, he may forfeit his life as a consequence." How true of Rome! Can it be that Mr. Rush took a leaf from the Roman church and made it applicable to all Christendom? One acquainted with its workings, one who knows the length to which that church will go to prevent members from leaving the church, to prevent priests and nuns from renouncing their vows, and to prevent men and women from exposing the damnable practices of the Roman machine, knows that they "may forfeit their lives as a consequence." Look at Chiniquy! How often have the Romans attempted to kill him? Look at Slatery! How have they treated him and his wife? As they have Chiniquy—attempted to murder them! How have they tried to disprove the lectures and books of Rev. J. G. White? Not by argument, but by force! Not with facts, but with clubs, bricks and bullets!

Mr. Rush wrote of Rome and tried to make it applicable to Protestantism—but the effort has been a failure.

#### Our Schools Vindicated.

"The pope has confirmed the decision of the propaganda in favor of the plan advocated by Archbishop Ireland of allowing American Catholic schools to be taught by state teachers, religious instruction to be given after school hours, the object being to relieve Catholicism of the burden of the expense of separate schools."

The foregoing was cabled from Rome and published in yesterday's News. Viewed with other details of Arch-

bishop Ireland's triumph over Cahoonism at the Vatican, which have reached this country through various channels, there can hardly be a doubt of its correctness.

It was a grievous wrong to attempt to burden Catholic citizens of this country with the expense of two systems of schools, one at the instance of foreign fanatics who do not believe in our form of government, and another as an indispensable factor in a civil system based upon popular rule which requires intelligent voters. The plan was forced upon the Baltimore Plenary council by foreign influence, but while it was formally made a policy of the Roman church in the United States it has never been accepted by American Catholics, nor more than seemingly by the American Catholic clergy. After a struggle of thirty years, the enemies of American public education for the greater part of the time being sustained by the forms of church authority, hardly more than a fifth of Catholic children have been influenced to leave our free schools either by blandishments or spiritual despotism. The action of their parents has now found vindication from the head of their church, thanks to a pope who is also a statesman and capable of comprehending the irresistible forces at work in the uplifting of humanity which constitute the march of human progress; and thanks, especially, to an American prelate who had the patriotism and courage to confront and overcome formidable clerical enemies to free institutions within the communion of his own church.

Archbishop Ireland's victory is equivalent to a distinct assertion by the Roman Catholic authorities that secular and religious instruction need not be given together and in the same school, but that they are separable and may be taught separately. This is a complete reversal of the action of the Baltimore Plenary council on that point, and, if officially confirmed, as it doubtless will be, removes the last pretense for oppressing Catholics with a double school tax.

The archbishop has also secured the highest Catholic indorsement for American public schools and the educational methods therein pursued. His plan, the approval of which has been announced, proposes to turn over American Catholic schools to the state, subject to the public school laws in the various localities, and to be placed in charge of state teachers.

The only condition is that provision shall be made for the religious instruction of Catholic children out of school hours. This part of the work, which is certainly right and to be commended, belongs of course to the parents and the church, and Archbishop Ireland so understands it, because in this country the state can not teach religion. The friends of American secular education have maintained that there was ample time for religious instruction, whether Protestant or Catholic, out of school hours, and if it was not given the responsibility lay with the parents and the respective church forces. This rational view of the case has now been ratified by an authority that no good Catholic should object to.

Archbishop Ireland's triumph is an emphatic rebuke to the small caliber bigots who have stigmatized our public schools as godless nurseries of infidelity, that a barrier might be raised between Catholic youth and the ennobling influences of American civilization. The march of intelligence must not be checked. If unimpeded mental development is adverse to any type of theology the remedy and the only remedy will be found in a reconstruction of that theology. The world still moves.—*Rocky Mountain News*.

The *Hovells Journal* says: "There is in existence in this state an organization known as the A. P. A. and the object is to prevent Roman Catholics from holding office." The *Journal* calls this an un-American association, an insult to Catholics, and bigotry, and that no such narrow-minded association should be tolerated in this free land of ours. It is a strange fact that while an organization known as the Catholic Knights of America has been in existence for years, and while they are gaining members every day, nobody says anything about it, but as soon as the Americans organize they are hooted and howled at by Romans and Roman sympathizers. If the *Journal* will glance around, possibly it will see that this glorious country is in danger, and that the danger cannot be averted in any other way but through the A. P. A. But then we are glad to know which side of the fence you hang on.—*Columbus Looking-Glass*.

Buy your cigars at "The Little Gem," 504 south 16th st. "OUR COUNCIL" is the leading 5 cent cigar in the city.