

OPEN THE NUNNERIES.

The Primitive Catholic Says They are Sinks of Immorality.

Unmarried Priests Should not Have Access to Them When Parents are Excluded.

Open the Nunneries.

They are hiding places of immorality! History abundantly proves the fact. The testimony of escaped inmates added to that of others who have had access to the privacy of these institutions confirms the statement.

Similar scenes to those described by Maria Monk are today being enacted behind the prison-walls which screen cloistered communities in this country from the indignant eye of public decency.

We openly charge that the gloistered nunneries are maintained for the purpose of entrapping confiding females in order that they may serve to gratify the carnal propensities of a self-indulgent celibate priesthood.

We dare the Roman priesthood to disprove the charge! We dare them to submit to an investigation certain institutions which we shall name, and have the inmates questioned under the assurance that said inmates shall be protected from all ecclesiastical vengeance!

Under the threatening eye of the mother superior, the poor victim of priestly brutality will not dare tell the visitor that story of wrong under which her heart is breaking. But place the same witness where she can feel that she shall be fully protected against further violence, and see if there is not a material change in her story.

American citizens should unite their demand that nunneries be open to official inspection, and that a strong presumption of guilt in the evident desire for concealment, not to mention the disgraceful facts which from time to time have come to light.

Barbara Ubryk, who died a short time ago, was rescued from a foul dungeon in which she had been confined in a Cracow convent. On being released, she accused the nuns of breaking their vows of chastity, and sprang upon her confessor, saying "thou beast!"

Miss Edith O'Gorman (Sister Teresa de Chantal) fled from a convent in Jersey in order to preserve her honor from the attacks of a celibate priest.

A magisterial inquiry results in the discovery of newly born bodies of infants in a convent in Rome, he found that in every case the vaults were dedicated to the reception of bones of infants.

In Lombardy, Tuscany, Parma and Milan, subterranean passages have been discovered between monasteries and convents. Rev. William Hogan described the manner in which the offspring of priests and nuns were suffocated by their unnatural parents.

The Rome correspondent of the Pall Mall Gazette, October 13, 1868, referring to a convent scandal which then occupied the attention of the Vatican authorities said: "Nearly the whole of the nuns, who are very young, were found to be as nuns should not be. At length search revealed a subterranean passage communicating with a monastery of Belgian monks."

Monsignor Castellani was blamed by the holy father for having failed to discover this secret communication, and for defending the nuns, particularly the abbess, though she was in the same condition as too many of her flock."

The Paris correspondent of the London Times of May, 1871, in describing the exposures which drew public attention to the Rue de Piepus, tells how the Jesuit establishment stood next to the convent of the white nuns, and that the two buildings communicated with each other by means of a door at the back of a stable and other apertures in the garden wall which showed signs of having been recently closed up. In a building in the nun's garden were found mattresses furnished with straps and buckles, as such are used in French midwifery, as well as a rack and other instruments evidently designed for torturing the human body.

Inexperienced girls, full of religious enthusiasm, are enticed into these prisons by the specious falsehood of the priests and their female decoys, and awake when too late to the fact that they have been robbed of their liberty, property and honor. The white veil is a sentimental disguise. The renunciation of the world is made purposely to represent a marriage ceremony. Who are to be the husbands of these deluded

brides? We are told that "they are the brides of Christ." They are married to the church." But Roman theology makes the pope the vicar of Christ, and the Roman priests constitute the church.

Priests in the confessional teach innocent penitents that their sacerdotal persons being holy, certain acts which would be sinful in others become a means of spiritual grace when shared with them. We can thus estimate the result of this "spiritual marriage" on impressionable young females who are deceived into nunneries in their teens.

The escapades of such priests as Yodysius, McCarthy, etc., show the carnal tendencies of the stall-fed priests. The fact that they are still kept in the church proves that licentiousness is no bar to sacerdotal privilege. Had all the escapades of Yodysius and Florence McCarthy taken place in a nunnery, the public would have been none the wiser. But if celibacy cannot control itself when under public supervision, to what extremes of license will it not run when favored by the opportune seclusion of the convent interior?

By what right has Archbishop Corrigan access to the females imprisoned at Hunt's point, which is denied to even the female relatives of these deluded victims?

If a Roman prelate is allowed to keep a pass-key to the dungeons wherein so many young females are confined, American citizens have a right to see what purpose is served by such violation of the requirements of social decency.

Nunneries are prison houses in which women are restrained of their liberties. They are the establishment of a foreign despotic power that aims at the destruction of our independence, as such, they are un-American, and a blot upon our national honor. Women have been kidnapped and carried into these institutions. Escaping nuns have been dragged back screaming to these prisons, as happened in St. Louis, in December, 1891. No investigation follows these outrages. Women are tortured and murdered in these institutions, and no coroner's jury ever views the remains.

American civil authority turns pale and stops at the threshold. Why is this? Are we degenerated into a nation of cowards? Nunneries are being abolished in almost every country except our own. Foreign governments barely tolerate them at the present day, and even Romish countries are driving them out.

They are a trap and a snare baited with the semblance of piety, and when their religious fever cools down, many of the inmates wish for the freedom they can never regain. Here is where the rights of citizenship are violated; and a periodical inspection by civil authority must be insisted upon by Americans, that the inmates may have release and protection should they desire it.

Why do Americans shut their eyes to the wickedness of these nunneries? Their horror of investigation proclaims their evil character.

The testimony of unnumbered priests and nuns go to prove the immoral nature of these so-called religious houses.

Why do Americans persist in accepting the interested denials of the priestly rascal rather than listen to the complaint of outraged female honor?

The practice of polygamy is an infraction of our laws. Why should the evasion of the law under cover of the cloister system be less objectionable than the use of the "seal" which secured to the Mormon saint superfluity of female companionship?

When a secret conclave of archiepiscopal conspirators are in session to determine whether in the eyes of the Roman pontiff our American public schools "can be tolerated," it becomes American patriots in the interest of the preservation of female virtue to inquire why the nunneries should not be abolished. Compel them to submit to official inspection, and these dark plague-spots will vanish. The pope has sent Satolli over to destroy our public schools. Let Americans retaliate by overthrowing his nunneries!—Primitive Catholic.

OUR DES MOINES LETTER.

Sentences Found in Roman Weeklies not Published in Iowa Dailies.

DES MOINES, Ia., December 26, 1892.—EDITOR AMERICAN: We suppose that all the friends have long since heard of Mgr. Satolli's address on the "Public School Question," and that you have read the summary as published in the daily papers of or about December 7, 1892. As the full address was not published we concluded that the article was shorn purposely of some of its principle features, and quietly waited until we could get it in full from Roman Catholic papers. It finally came, but when? Why so long after it was de-

livered? Simply because the Roman Catholic authorities knew that the American people would read the summary furnished, not see any particular danger in it, and pay no more attention to the subject. It appeared in two Roman Catholic weekly papers, one of December 17, and the other December 21. Let us notice some of the principle points of the full address:

"The Catholic church in general, and especially the holy see, far from condemning or treating with indifference the public schools, desires, rather, that by the joint action of civil and ecclesiastical authorities there should be public schools in every state, according as the circumstances of the people require, for the cultivation of the useful arts and natural sciences; but the Catholic church shrinks from those features of public schools which are opposed to the truth of christianity and to morality; and since in the interest of society itself, these objectionable features are removable, therefore, not only the bishops, but the citizens at large should labor to remove them in virtue of their own right, and in the cause of morality."

(The italic is the part that did not appear in the telegraphic summary in the daily papers.)

What does this paragraph mean? To us it means that the Roman Catholic church will encourage public schools where school boards will seek the advice and guidance of the bishops as to what should be left out of the course of study that is objectionable to the church. Every reader of THE AMERICAN knows what the objectionable features are. "The citizens at large should labor to remove them in virtue of their own right." In other words Mgr. Satolli, with the sanction of the pope, calls on the Roman Catholic citizens, where they are in majority, to obtain control of the school boards, put their own teachers in to teach the catechism, or make the public schools Roman Catholic. If the reader does not agree with the writer, let him explain this paragraph.

We find another paragraph that was not quoted from at all by the daily papers, which being shown to a prominent man of this city, and but recently initiated into the A. P. A., remarked: "Well I'll be d—d." It is as follows:

"We further desire you to strive earnestly that the various local authorities, firmly convinced that nothing is more conducive to the welfare of the commonwealth than religion, should by wise legislation provide that the system of education which is maintained at the public expense, and to which therefore Catholics also contribute their share, be in no way prejudicial to their conscience or religion. For we are persuaded that even your fellow-citizens who differ from us in belief, with their characteristic intelligence and prudence, will readily set aside all suspicions and all views unfavorable to the Catholic church, and willingly acknowledge her merit as the one that dispelled the darkness of paganism by the light of the Gospel, and created a new society distinguished by the luster of Christian virtues and by the cultivation of all that refines. We do not think that anyone hereafter looking into these things clearly will let Catholic parents be forced to erect and support schools which they cannot use for the instruction of their children."

So the local authorities are to "be convinced that nothing is more conducive to the welfare of the commonwealth than (Roman Catholic) religion," and that the "characteristic intelligence and prudence" of the Protestants are to be counted on to stop all this anti-Catholic talk.

The Roman Catholics have been depending upon the good will of the American people too long already, and there is now a thorough awakening all over this country.

There is a great deal in these two paragraphs clipped from Mgr. Satolli's address, and would advise the reader to read and re-read them, and see what can be made out of them. ZIMRI.

CITY NEWS.

The little daughter of our friend Charles Emitt slipped and fell, Wednesday. The fall resulted in a broken arm.

Clara's preliminary trial which was to have taken place last Friday was postponed on account of the defendant being sick. It is understood that she has recovered sufficiently to be present at the examination this afternoon.

The largest and most destructive fire that has broken out in this city for some time occurred Tuesday night. Orchard's carpet house and its contents was a total loss, while the upper floors and the stock in the Continental block were badly damaged. Mr. Foley's saloon and the gambling room above which joined the Orchard building escaped all damage. If a little of the water wasted on the Foley building had been turned upon the Continental the latter would not have been injured.

MILLER FUND.

We desire to acknowledge the following subscriptions to the Miller Fund during the past week:

Marcus, Iowa.....\$1 50
St. Louis, Mo..... 50

Friends, we want your assistance in raising funds to push this investigation. What will you give? Send in any sum you feel able to give.

The Paxton Hotel Barber Shop and Baths, with filtered Water, the Best.

FATHER CORRIGAN.

The Charges Upon Which He Was Arraigned by the Archbishop.

And Also his Dignified and Patriotic Reply—The Effect Upon the Church of Rome.

THE CHARGES.

"Diocesan Criminal Curia of Newark. "Charges against the Rev. P. Corrigan, of Hoboken, N. J.

In accordance with the request of the Right Reverend Ordinary of Newark, the undersigned in his capacity of fiscal prosecutor prefers the following charges against the Rev. Patrick Corrigan, of Hoboken, N. J.

"1. That he has maliciously, knowingly and wilfully published in the New York Freeman's Journal and Catholic Register of October 29, 1892, the false statement that the animus of the organization known as the German-American Catholic congress which met in Newark in September, 1892, and which was composed of German-American bishops, priests and laymen, was that of actual hostility to the country; that he has thus endeavored publicly to arouse against the above-named persons, notably against the present bishop of Newark, the bitterest hatred and enmity of the entire non-Catholic community of the whole United States to the detriment of the Catholic church in this country.

"2. That in the same newspapers on the same date as above, he falsely, knowingly, maliciously and wilfully accuses the present ordinary of Newark, the other bishops, priests and laymen representing the German Catholics of the whole United States, and assembled in said congress, of treason to church and state, deserving the severest punishment, both to the injury of all the above prelates and laymen and of the Catholic faith throughout the whole country.

"3. That in the same newspaper and on the same date as the above, he knowingly, falsely and maliciously accuses the above bishops, notably the present bishop of Newark, and the priests, of teaching the people to have actual hostility and disloyalty to the state, thus greatly injuring the good name and standing of said bishops and priests, injuring their usefulness and making them an object of the most violent hatred to the whole country. That in the same newspaper and on the same date he wilfully, falsely and maliciously accuses the above bishops, priests and laymen of dissimulation, insincerity and disloyalty to the holy see, and of wilfully deceiving the pope, in their protestations of loyalty to him to the great injury of said bishops, priests and laymen.

"4. That in the same newspaper, on the same date, he falsely and maliciously accuses the said bishops, priests and laymen of being animated by an anti-Catholic and anti-American spirit.

"5. That in the same newspaper, and on the same date, he falsely and maliciously accuses the above bishops, priests and laymen representing the church in this country as a foreign politico-religious factor to the American people, and as such to be abhorred, to the grave detriment both to the church and of the above persons.

"6. That in the New York Freeman's Journal and Catholic Register of November 12, 1892, he falsely and maliciously in a fable called "Utopia," accuses the present bishop of Newark of being dominated in the government of the diocese by Cahensley, of displaying the grossest partiality for the German Catholics, laity and priests and the greatest injustice and aversion to the English-speaking clergy and people.

"7. That in the same newspapers and on the same date, November 12, 1892, he wilfully, maliciously and falsely attributed to Bishop Wigger, language and treatment claimed to have been used by him with regard to Irish Catholics which are calculated to excite the fiercest national hatred of the whole Irish race against the bishops and to so arouse a schism in the diocese.

"8. That in the same newspapers and on the same date, he falsely and maliciously attributes to the present bishop of Newark, language and conduct which make him ridiculous and grossly insulting, and tend to completely undermine his legitimate authority.

"9. That in the same newspaper and on the same date, he maliciously insults Bishop Corrigan.

"10. That in the above newspaper and on October 29, 1892, and on November 12, 1892, he falsely and maliciously makes statements against the bishop of Newark and the other bishops of the congress, the priests and laymen belonging to it, which are (a) greatly injurious to their good name, useful-

ness and standing, (b) calculated to arouse against them the bitterest hatred of the country, (c) tend directly to stir strife, dissensions and disorders between Catholics and Protestants and between Catholics and themselves, (d) cause unwanted harm to the Catholic church in this country.

"11. That he has wilfully and contumaciously disobeyed and violated the precept given him by the bishop of Newark in a letter dated November 15, 1892, has, moreover, in his answer to said letter, added new insults and injuries to the bishops and to the German-American priests and people.

"That he has wilfully and maliciously violated the decree No. 231 of the third plenary council of Baltimore by his publications in the New York Freeman's Journal of October 29, 1892, and November 12, 1892.

"Wherefore the undersigned, in his capacity of fiscal prosecutor, requests the ordinary of Newark to proceed 'prou de jure,' and cite the Rev. Patrick Corrigan to express before the diocesan criminal curia in order to answer the above charges.

S. S. SMITH,

Fiscal Prosecutor.

PATERSON, November 25, 1892."

And here we publish the reply of the priest:

DEAR BISHOP: I am in receipt of your registered letter of the 16th ult., in which you request me to retract an alleged false statement in letters published by me in the New York Freeman's Journal, October 29, and November 12, and to apologise to yourself and the other members of the Newark German-American congress of last September for criticism in my first letter and to apologise to you and Archbishop Corrigan for alleged disrespect shown to both of you in alleged false insinuations made by me against your government of your diocese under the guise of the "Fable." You also request me to publish no more such articles in the future.

You do not specify any of the statements that you regard as false, and after a careful re-reading of the first letter, I am not aware that I have made any false statements. My criticism was substantially the same as that which appeared in some of the leading newspapers of New York and Jersey City, during, and immediately after the sessions of the Newark conference, and no objections, so far as I am aware, was made by yourself or any other member of the congress to the truth of the statements, although they appeared fully a month before my letter. The substance of my first letter was the anti-American spirit of the convention and its reflection on the American hierarchy. I referred to the congress as a body and not as individuals. I think, as an American priest, I had a perfect right to express my views on what appeared to me important as a national and religious question and to resent the insult offered to American prelates by the ecclesiastics who assembled in a purely English-speaking diocese as a professedly foreign element. It was they who should have been called upon to apologise. If my remarks annoyed a few that were there and whose presence there was a source of mortification to their own English-speaking flocks, I do not think they can reasonably complain. There was no offense intended for you personally, or annoyance to you in any form in your capacity as bishop of the diocese, and if any soreness was manifested by me it was in consequence of your official connection with that foreign organization over which you preside every year outside your diocese; for it is well known that this organization has manifested its anti-American spirit on various occasions and has caused bad blood wherever it held its meetings.

The congress then was a rare subject for criticism, too, and any reference to yourself or Archbishop Corrigan was confined to the action of both in connection with the congress. I did not at all speak disrespectfully of you as my bishop, and I was silent because of your official capacity when the newspapers represented you as speaking of me personally with great contempt and calling me a crank, though there is no other priest in the diocese that has done more for religion than myself. With regard to the alleged disrespect to yourself and Archbishop Corrigan, and false insinuations against your government of your diocese in the "fable" contained in the second letter, I think it is far better for all concerned to take no cognizance of the fable. As to my not publishing such articles in the future I can only say that as far as I am concerned the discussion is closed and I hope that this is the case on all sides, for I think the subject has been fairly exhausted. I shall, however, always regard myself free to publish my views in a proper manner whenever the interests of the country or the church seem to demand them. I have never had the intention of annoying yourself or any one else, and if in the discharge of what I thought was my duty toward the country and church I have occasioned annoyance by inadvertence or heat of expression, I regret it. I am perfectly willing to drop the matter, and I trust that you may be pleased to look at it in this light. I am your humble servant in Christ.

P. CORRIGAN.

The above letter is a dignified defense of actions that were at once patriotic and honorable. Perhaps never in the history of the Romish church has a priest been known to put the state before the church as Corrigan has done. He showed by what articles he published in his paper that he had the true interests of the country at heart and held them to be above and of more

importance than papal authority or desires. That he would not cringe and grovel before Romish dignitaries may seem strange, but he didn't. For once we find a priest who is a patriot. That he cannot stay thus long is evident. No man can be both. Either he must give up the Romish or else the patriotic sentiment and which he prefers is plainly shown by the charges upon which he is arraigned and also in his reply. That he will soon leave the Catholic church, and for good, there is almost absolute surety, and welcome indeed will he be who holds our constitution to be of more value than the excommunication and damnation of the pope. A few priests have, in late years, left their church and become Protestants, but never has one been known to fight the endeavors of the papistry to gain control of our government, on their own grounds, as has he. His example is worthy of emulation from all of the priestcraft. His aim was to cleanse the church, not to steep it further in hypocrisy and treason. Just what effect this action of Corrigan's will have upon Romish despotism it is hard to say, but there is a strong probability that two more New York priests, at least, will follow in his footsteps and leave papistry and that the dignitaries of the church are becoming uneasy is plainly perceived. A few more Corrigan's and there would be some startling revelations made which would, no doubt, cause many to leave the ranks.—Tri-City Blade.

Priest and Politics.

Citizens regret the tendency to manifest at present in this section of the country with politics. In this section of the country the most earnest protest comes from Rome. Making it pertinent to inquire if they really mean what they say. If the Detroit Evening News is authority we may well doubt if all Romanists are so averse to bringing religion into politics as they profess. From the News of the 24th inst., we clip the following:

"At the various Polish Catholic churches yesterday the priests advised the voters of their congregations to be sure and register, and to vote for Catholics, or for those who are known to be friendly to the church."

The above contains but few words, but it embraces a world of meaning. It signifies that according to the views of the priests referred to, it is the Roman church first and American institutions afterwards. This is not according to the spirit of American citizenship, and if the chief aspiration of the papist priests is to put Romanists in office, then it behooves all true Americans, native or naturalized to keep them out. Among Protestants the question is never asked, "To what church does he belong?" when a candidate's qualifications are summed up, but it appears that the Polish priests of Detroit regard Romish qualities as paramount to all other qualities for holding civil office. Is it fair to presume that Detroit priests alone entertain this idea? Is it not more probable that this same method will be pursued in Bay City and elsewhere? If Romanists are determined to make American politics a cover for their church, then let Protestants look out for their own interests. The way to accomplish this is too plain to require explanation or even suggestion.—Bay City Tribune.

The Immigration Evil.

Mr. Henry Rood, in the Forum, has an excellent article on immigration. He says: "One who desires to study the vital phase of the immigration problem should go to the anthracite fields of Pennsylvania. There he will find one of the richest regions of the earth overrun with a horde of Hungarians, Slavs, Poles, Bohemians, Arabs, Italians, Sicilians, Russians and Tyrolese of the lowest class—a section almost denationalized by the scum of the continent; where women hesitate to drive about the country roads by day; where unarmed men are not safe after the sinking of the sun."

It is a fact that large numbers of immigrants come here for no other purpose than to accumulate money enough to live on when they return to their own countries. This class of foreigners ought to be kept off our shores. The invitation extended to the oppressed of the old monarchical governments to come here and find a haven of refuge, did not imply the importation of a horde of leeches who thrive upon our resources and render no equivalent. These barbarians who infest the coal fields of Pennsylvania have no intention of becoming American citizens. They are simply depriving our wage-earners of a living, while they send from \$75,000 to \$125,000 each month to Southern Europe. The cities of Wilkesbarre, Pittston, Hazleton, Mahoning, Shenandoah, etc., and in fact the whole Wyoming Valley is hedged about by thousands of these non-producing foreigners, and the whole commonwealth of the state is fast assuming a black patch upon the psychic character of the country.

Here is an evil, glaring and untouched as yet in the methods employed to curtail and control immigration.—Light of Truth.