

Published weekly by the AMERICAN PUBLISHING COMPANY.

Rooms 412-13-14 Shively Block.

Subscription rates: One Year \$10.00, Six Months \$6.00, Three Months \$3.50.

Advertising rates: One square 10 cents per week, one column \$1.00 per week.

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

OMAHA, FRIDAY, JAN. 20, 1893.

THE AMERICAN IS THE CHAMPION OF ALL PARTISAN INTERESTS—THE ORGAN OF NONE.

SQUARING UP MONTH.

All our FRIENDS know, if they will stop to think, how they stand with THE AMERICAN, and we shall expect to hear from all in arrears this month.

ARE YOU SINCERE?

Are you sincere in your desire to see THE AMERICAN turned into a daily? That is a question which we have often asked ourselves, and as often answered with a no.

How many shares of stock will you take in the American Publishing company at its face value, \$100 per share?

How many subscriptions will you take at \$8 per year for an evening paper. One half down balance monthly.

All money subscribed shall be retained until a sufficient amount has been subscribed to insure the publication of a daily.

Men who have from \$100 to \$10,000 cannot find a better place to invest their money than in a DAILY AMERICAN.

If you want to get in on the ground floor fill out and return this blank accompanied with the cash.

Enclosed find \$... Dollars, for which please send me receipt, the same to apply as first payment on... shares of American Publishing stock.

If you cannot spare enough to purchase one or more shares of stock, subscribe for the paper on above conditions at the following rates:

3 months \$2.50, 6 months \$4.50, 1 year \$8.00.

The weekly has given entire satisfaction and our pledge to make the daily, if it should be started, as good in proportion is sufficient guarantee to those who invest to assure them that their funds will be properly and judiciously handled.

This is in your hands now. If you want a daily you know how to get it. If you do not, hold onto your money. We do not care which way it goes.

Remember, we do not start on promises—the cash must be in sight.

WAKE UP.

According to the manner in which the charter amendments from the next mayor of Omaha is to be the head of a spoiled-spoiling system never before spoiled—and all to be done under the cloak of "reform," "retrenchment," "competency," etc.

Not one of the above positions, aside from the members of the police force, should be filled by appointment. Every one of them, barring the police department, should be filled by a direct vote of the people.

Every official who is to receive a salary of more than \$1000 per annum should be compelled to submit to the will of the people whose servant he is to be, and not secure an appointment to a responsible position as a reward for political services in behalf of any man who may be elected mayor.

The scheme of allowing the mayor, by and with the consent of the council, to fill these numerous positions with a fat salary attachment is wrong. No good reason can be advanced why every position named above, with the exceptions noted, should not be filled by a direct vote of the people.

This appointive scheme is unrepresentative, undemocratic and absurd. If an aspirant for a position is not willing to allow every elector an equal voice in the selection of those who are to serve him, such aspirant does not deserve the position which he would seek to secure by appointment.

It may not be altogether wrong to ask by what right or color of authority does the city council, or nine citizens, arrogate to themselves the right to say to the legislature "the great city of Omaha wants this," when, perhaps, a large majority, had they the opportunity of being heard, would say "we want nothing of the kind, we want to elect our officers."

For one we are opposed to giving the next mayor the power to appoint servants who will, in two years, draw from the public treasury nearly \$60,000.

What do you say readers of THE AMERICAN? Is it not about time you had a voice in the affairs of this city?

An item appeared in these columns last week which the Richardson Drug Co., and some of its friends seem to think was published with the intent of placing it before the public in an unenviable light.

Such was not our intention. The item was published solely with the intention of showing what a Romanist would do when he gets a little authority, not with any thought of conveying the idea that the company even knew of let alone endorsed such acts as were charged against one of its foremen.

Our friend MacLeod and one of the clerks says we were imposed upon and that no man has been discharged within three months, neither has any one's salary been cut down, and that there is but one Roman employed by the firm.

We are informed by a friend whose veracity we have no reason to doubt, that there were no less than twenty-seven Roman Catholic priests in Lincoln the other day.

What were they there for? to attend to the spiritual wants of the representatives of this state, or were they investigating the mysteries of the political oil room? It looks very much as if Rome was pursuing her old tactics of throwing her religious (?) influence into the political arena of this state.

What a howl the daily press would have set up if twenty-seven Protestant clergymen had congregated at the same place.

THE BEE has stopped running the legislature long enough to throw a chunk of mud at our old friend and co-worker in the A. P. A., Samuel MacLeod, one of the most competent, faithful and honest mechanics and builders Omaha can boast of, and a man firm in his convictions as to what is right and what is just.

The Board of Education could well afford to have a few more Sam MacLeods on its payroll.

FATHER GATELY of the Roman church in Bridgeport, Penn., refused to allow the pall-bearers of John Murphy to enter the Roman church with their badges displayed.

The pall-bearers were all members of Zook post G. A. R. The priest even refused to allow the G. A. R. to enter the cemetery and conduct the usual burial services.

What do you think of this, comrades? OUR business manager, W. C. Kelley, is "down" east, putting on subscribers at the rate of thirty per day.

He is the best circulator in the United States. We will devote the first page of our next issue to an account of the mobbing of the Rev. J. G. White at Waukegan, Ill.

Ex-PRESIDENT R. B. Hayes has joined the silent majority. He was a consistent republican and a loyal American.

Of all the low, mean, contemptible

tricks resorted to to carry a point, commend us to the Omaha Bee. If Druggist Lanyon violated the shambhoo law he is not half as deserving of the penalty as is the man who enjoined him into it under the plea of being sick.

There will be some city councilmen re-elected at the next election.

The school board has made a good start.

A Day of Rest.

The following is the history of the setting apart one day out of seven as a day for the laborer to rest. It is taken from Jasher, chapter 70, verses 41 to 51:

Verse 41.—And the day arrived when Moses went to Goshen to see his brethren, and he saw the children of Israel in their burdens and hard labor, and Moses was grieved on their account.

Verse 42.—And Moses returned to Egypt and came to the house of Pharaoh, and came before the king, and Moses bowed down before the king.

Verse 43.—And Moses said unto Pharaoh I pray thee my lord I have come to seek a small request from thee, turn not away my face empty, and Pharaoh said unto him spake.

Verse 44.—And Moses said unto Pharaoh, let there be given unto thy servants the children of Israel who are in Goshen, one day to rest therein from their labor.

Verse 45.—And the king answered Moses and said, behold I have lifted up my face in this thing to grant thy request.

Verse 46.—And Pharaoh ordered a proclamation to be issued throughout Egypt and Goshen, saying:

Verse 47.—To you, all the children of Israel, thus saith the king: For six days you shall do your work and labor, but on the seventh day you shall rest, and shall not perform any work, thus shall you do all the days, as the king and Moses the son of Bathia have commanded.

Verse 48.—And Moses rejoiced at this thing which the king had granted to him, and all the children of Israel did as Moses ordered them.

Verse 49.—For this thing was from the Lord to the children of Israel, for the Lord had begun to remember the children of Israel to save them from the sake of their fathers.

Verse 50.—And the Lord was with Moses and his fame went throughout Egypt.

Verse 51.—And Moses became great in the eyes of the Egyptians, and in the eyes of all the children of Israel seeking good for his people Israel and speaking words of peace regarding them to the king.

My object in sending you this authority for a day of rest, is to have THE AMERICAN re-publish a law which has been in existence for 3,501 years, and as there shown, especially sought and passed for the benefit of the laborer.

I see Chicago desires, for "financial reasons," to set aside this rest day during the "World's Fair," and Mr. Hessing of Chicago, proposes to throw wide open all the gambling houses in Chicago.

I supposed the object of the "Fair" was to bring together the best handiwork and thought of all peoples, and exhibit them in the most enlightened and intelligent city in the world.

Chicago has had everything given her she desired, and now she proposes to throw aside every virtue and set up vice in its place for financial reasons. "Honi soit qui mal y pense."

SUBSCRIBER. Because he was an Irishman.

The following, which recently appeared in the New York Sun, would seem to indicate that Mr. Cleveland has backbones that is not made of sponge:

"ALBANY, December 31.—Ex-State Senator Norton B. Chase, of this city, is responsible for the statement that Mr. Cleveland is opposed to the election of Mr. Murphy for United States senator because he is an Irishman.

Privately, for the past few days, Chase has been circulating this story among his friends, until it finally reached the ears of Mr. Murphy's friends last evening, and consequently they are highly indignant. Chase is the leader of the anti-snappers in this city, and made all arrangements for the meeting of the anti-snappers here last February.

Mr. Murphy's friends regard this as a correct statement of Mr. Chase's position, and recall the fact that Mr. Cleveland in 1891 refused to run for mayor of Buffalo because John C. Sheehan, now police commissioner in New York city, was on the city ticket with him for the office of comptroller. They also recall Rose Elizabeth Cleveland's attack upon the nuns. Cleveland's sole objection to Sheehan being on the ticket was because he was an Irishman.

Chase's statement has stirred up considerable feeling here, and it is looked upon as the true reason of Cleveland's opposition to Mr. Murphy.

John Rudd, 305 North 16th St., has a full line of Ladies' and Gent's Gold Watches.

S. R. Patten, dentist, room 348 Bee building, telephone 56.

AN OPINION FROM W. H. CHANEY.

His Digest of the Disputed Encyclical Letter of Pope Leo.

CHICAGO, Ill., January 5, 1893.—U. G. WILSON, Esq., Sports, Ill.—My Dear Sir: Replying to your question as to my opinion regarding the genuineness of the pope's encyclical alleged to have been issued December 23d, 1891 I will answer both "no" and "yes," and explain afterwards. It is my candid opinion that Leo XIII never issued that letter. Please note, that this is only my "opinion," and I may be wrong. I will not say that Leo is not wicked enough to issue one far more horrible in its provisions, but I give him credit for having more sense. This country is now practically under the control of the Jesuits, the shrewdest men that ever lived, yet the most unscrupulous, and the Jesuits control the pope. It would be as much as his life was worth to disobey them. They are here on the ground, taking strict note of every event, moving slowly with their habitual craft and cunning. An American, earnest, enthusiastic, unaccustomed to plotting and treachery, often speaks on the impulse of the moment, revealing what he should not, but a Jesuit, never; it would be premature to direct the slaughter of heretics, for that is the plain meaning of the diplomatic encyclical, and the Jesuits would not advise it. "O," says the impulsive American, "that letter was to have been kept secret." Don't deceive yourself. The Jesuits know the dangers of exposure which surrounds such documents, and are cautious. Only a few weeks ago Archbishop Corrigan attempted a correspondence he desired to be as secret as the grave, against Archbishop Ireland, and even now that letter of his is on the way to the pope, if not already in his hands. Besides, there was nothing to be gained by issuing such an order nearly two years in advance; with a risk, every day, that it might be exposed. Furthermore, of late years the Jesuits never trust a matter of so much importance on paper. They have millions at hand which Americans are kind enough to exempt from taxation, and whenever important matters are to be communicated they send a messenger to their servant at Rome, the pope, and then he summons to Rome those to whom he conveys the Jesuit command by word of mouth only, and he who betrays the secret thus communicated is as certain of death as the Nihilist in Russia who is caught red-handed with dynamite, trying to blow up the czar. These considerations induce me to answer "No" to your query.

Then why answer "Yes?" Because when I recall the history of Romanism, written in blood all down the centuries, their slaughter on St. Bartholomew's eve, and other horrors the bare thought of which makes the soul sick, and when I remember the boast of Rome that its religion was received direct from Christ and His apostles, and therefore never changes, I look upon this alleged encyclical as a wonderfully mild document—the cooling of a dove compared to the roaring of a lion. Then, wondering how they can quote Christ as authority for their bloody murders, I turn to Luke XIX., 27, and read:

"But those mine enemies, which would not that I should reign over them, bring hither and slay them before me."

In the Romish translation it reads, "kill" for "slay." That they have obeyed this awful precept, for eighteen hundred years, is proven by nearly every page of history. Then, in further justification of their bloody religion, they refer to the law which God gave Moses regarding other gods and serving them, as follows:

"If thy brother, the son of thy mother, or thy son or thy daughter, or the wife of thy bosom, or thy friend, which is as thine own soul, entice thee secretly, saying, Let us go and serve other gods which thou hast not known, thou nor thy fathers. * * * Thou shalt not consent unto him, nor harken unto him; neither shalt thy eye pity him, neither shalt thou spare, neither shalt thou conceal him, but thou shalt surely kill him, thine hand shall be first upon him to put him to death." Deut., XIII, 6, 8, 9.

Romanists claim that theirs is the only true religion; therefore Protestants are heretics and God's enemies, because they serve not the god of Romanism. Hence, this command given by God Himself, a God that never changes, is just as much binding upon them to kill heretics as the commandment, "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy." If further authority is demanded for their warrant to kill, they quote Jesus: "Think not that I am come to send peace on earth. I came not to send peace, but a sword. For I am come to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law. And a man's foes shall be they of his own household." Matt. X, 34-36.

It is useless to tell an ignorant Romanist that these passages should not be given a literal interpretation, for the priest tells him the contrary, and besides, the language seems so plain to him that a child could not misunderstand it. Thus authorized by the Bible from time immemorial the Ro-

mish church has filled the earth with wars, cruelties, and flowing blood. Therefore every word of this alleged encyclical has the sanction of Rome and has had for nearly two thousand years, only the document is so similar that I should have written it had I made a digest of Romish credulity. The denunciations of Rome that Leo did not issue it, is only technical, and confirm some overrules it. Whether or not Leo signed it is not the real issue; it is only a dilatory plea. The true question is, "Do the teachings of Romanism accord with the spirit of this encyclical?" Every unprejudiced, intelligent person must answer "yes," only the teachings are a thousand times more damnable. I think the author of this digest of Romish faith and practice has let them off too easily. Still, I am glad it has been published, notwithstanding its mildness, for it has aroused the Americans and set Rome to howling. Let them go on with their public meetings and decide that the alleged encyclical is a "base forgery," and throw mud at the Americans who have for so long given shelter to the Romish paupers and criminals that are annually dumped by the tens of thousands upon our shores, it will not blot out the record of Romish torture and murder of women and children whose only crime was a disbelief in a religion that teaches crime as a dogma and enforces its decrees with murder.—W. H. Chaney, in Sparta, Ill., Herald.

Will Not Be Deceived.

Some of the performances of Mgr. Satolli, the pope's delegate, since he has been in the United States, have had the effect of widely encouraging the belief that the Roman Catholic church here is about to change front radically on the school question, and that its government in America is to come under the direction of the liberal elements represented by Cardinal Gibbons and Archbishop Ireland. The quiet authoritative way in which Satolli brought Father McGlynn back into the fold without requiring him to apologize or make public submission to Archbishop Corrigan (an affront of immeasurable dimensions to that tyrannical, pig-headed, sixteenth-century Irish ecclesiastic,) and the manner in which Bishop Wigger, of New Jersey, was obliged to retreat before Father Corrigan, of Hoboken, who had publicly arraigned him as an enemy of the American republic, because he had joined other German Catholics in denouncing our public schools as abominations—these two incidents have the appearance of enforcing the right of a Catholic clergyman to speak his mind as an American citizen, even though he be a priest. These incidents, taken together with Satolli's address on the school question, at the recent annual conference of archbishops in New York, wherein he in effect approved the Faribault experiment and advised greater discretion in dealing with the educational problem everywhere in this free country, formed ground for a plausible showing for the claim of liberal Catholics that the vatican is now heartily with them. Father McGlynn, who has proved his right to be regarded as a sincere man, if not a very wise one, in his customary Sunday evening speech at Cooper Union, New York, a week before he was reinstalled in his priestly office, held forth on Satolli's address, which he declared to be significant of a "new and important epoch for the Roman Catholic church in the United States." Continuing, he said:

"I sincerely rejoice over what has happened, and still more over what it portends. The utterance and the actions of the pope through Archbishop Satolli should fill us with hopes of great and good things still to come. No one very dull or very blind to what has been going on over a large part of our country can be unaware of the great injury done to the Catholic church and the state by the agitation of what has been called the school question. But now not merely the hope of relief, but actual and prompt relief, has already come to the consciences and hearts of hundreds of thousands of Catholics, and a serious reproach to the patriotism of American Catholics has been discredited by such authoritative utterances that the Catholic religion does not require American citizens to antagonize and denounce the institutions of the country. It is refreshing to know that Archbishop Satolli will not allow bishops to object to Catholic children being sent to public schools. He will excuse the people and priests from building parochial schools, even though they are ordered by a narrow-minded bishop who delights in telling Catholic people that unless they do not send their children to a parochial school they are sure of eternal damnation. The public school is an American institution and should be supported, no matter what archbishops or bishops may say. I did not find anything in the theology I studied at Rome which said I would have to sacrifice my patriotism for my religion."

That is bold talk, in the right American spirit; but it is not the sort of talk that either Mgr. Satolli or the vatican wishes to encourage when it is uttered in sincerity. The plain truth is that the pope and his advisers have learned at last that the warfare of the church upon our public schools as hitherto

waged has been directed at the church has not through the distinguished for the innocents, she never has been wiser than the wisdom of the serpent. She is not, as Father McGlynn, controlled by his wishes, asserts, changed her purpose as to the public schools, but only determined on altering her plan of tactics. Mgr. Satolli's address to the archbishop, too long for reproduction here, was, with its involved sentences, apparent concessions, deft reservations, and pious rhetoric, about as good a model of crafty competition as could be studied by those who want to know what ought to be avoided in order to learn the art of writing frankly. It is true that the monsignor said that where Roman Catholic children cannot profitably be sent to parochial schools, parents may, without incurring the penalty of damnation, patronize the public schools, and he urged the American hierarchy to make concessions in non-essentials, on the principle that half a loaf is better than no bread. In other words, he merely reasserts the infelicitous pious of the pope as to the Faribault plan, which means that the church, when it can not cure an evil, must endeavor to put up with it as best it may; that if the public schools will not come to the church, the church may go to them and endeavor to make them as Roman Catholic as possible. This Faribault plan, which is offered to American people as an exemplification of Roman Catholic liberality, is in reality merely a device by which the burden of supporting the parochial schools is shifted from the church to the community. Religion is not taught openly during school hours, to be sure, but it is taught to all who are willing or can be induced to remain when the regular session closes. Throughout the day the Roman Catholic teachers retain the garb of nuns and monks. The chief objection raised at the conference of the archbishops against the Faribault plan was that its advocates could give no assurance that it was capable of general extension, particularly to large cities. The pope might tolerate it, but the American people would not.

Cunning encroachment in place of open hostility is the Satolli policy—the policy of the vatican. It is one that naturally commends itself to the Italian ecclesiastical mind. It is not remarkable that the pope and his counselors, living in the mediæval twilight of Rome, should be unable to comprehend the spirit of the American people, or that they should fancy themselves shrewd enough to conquer by indirection where they have been defeated in open battle. Father McGlynn is quite right in thinking that "great and good things are still to come," and the reconciliation of the masses of Roman Catholic citizens with the public schools may eventually be accomplished, but he mistakes the church's intention. The fact that he and Father Corrigan, and many other priests who have been reared in the United States and unconsciously educated by their American environment, except as evidence of new enlightenment what is but a new plan for carrying out a traditional purpose, betoken the danger to the faith in this country which the vatican has not understood and cannot understand. When its priests take its politic utterance for the speech of candor, what may be expected of the laity? What the vatican is aiming at simply is to procure state aid for Roman Catholic schools, and where that is not to be had, to Romanize the state's schools. The American people will not be deceived, although priests like McGlynn and Corrigan, anxious to see their church in harmony with our institutions, may permit themselves to be.

Mgr. Satolli is sowing the seed of discord while seemingly doing the work of peace. The return of Father McGlynn to the priesthood, on easy or no conditions, and the substantial triumph given Father Corrigan over his bishop, are hard blows to good discipline, and can not but encourage independence in the priesthood. McGlynn and Corrigan must, in the nature of things, become common. The spirit of the age is creating them, and since the pioneers in rebellion against authority have, "in order to avoid scandal," been dealt with not as recalcitrants deserving of exemplary punishment, but as more to be feared and coaxed, it will need less bravery hereafter for American priests to be men and citizens.

The vatican, having learned that the people of the United States care more for their public schools than they do for the wishes, exhortations or anathemas of Rome, is now putting itself fairly in the way of learning the further lesson that Americans are as competent to guard popular education against an insidious as against an undisguised enemy. The church, in brief, has found, and will still find, that the United States is the most modern, the best educated of nations, and, therefore, the least amenable to Rome. It has passed quite beyond the stage of intellectual development wherein a people are to be bullied or cajoled by any church.—San Francisco Argonaut.

Go to Dyball's for fine candies, 1518 Douglas St.

CURE SYPHILIS—Any Stage—OR \$1,000 REWARD. Medicine expressed to all parts. No exposure. Write to Cook Remedy Co., Omaha, Neb.