

REV. JOHN WILLIAMS'

Articles on the A. P. A., The American and Christianity.

A Vain Attempt of a Weak Old Man to Stay the Tide Against Political Rome.

"The patriots" who have all at once sprung up all over the land, to save American institutions from the grasp of the pope, have, or appear to have a corner on all the American spirit, and love of this glorious land of the free. He is an American and he only who stands opposed to the pope, to save the land and its institutions from his grasp which is already stretched forth to enslave if not to murder us all. No matter where a man was born, or whether he has or has not taken the oath of allegiance to support the flag and constitution of this land, or renounced his allegiance to every foreign prince or potentate, including William of Orange, he is a good enough American if he only hates the pope and the priests, and is ready to take any public office in sight, to rule over the land.

It is true the constitution and laws of this land make no such test of Americanism, and until they do, it would seem perfectly competent for any citizen, native or foreign-born, to love or hate the pope as he sees fit, provided he refrains from interfering with his neighbor's lawful right to do the exact opposite.

But our new "Americans" proceed solemnly to declare that every man who will not swear with them, and train with them is no true American at all. He is a slave to the pope; he is a tool of the Roman hierarchy; he is bought up; he is courting the favour of the Catholics; or most dreaded of all, he is a Jesuit in disguise.

"THE AMERICAN" politely but firmly declares of us that we are "a Jesuit in the garb of a Protestant minister." Of course that settles the question of our American citizenship, and of our power to speak the truth, once for all; and we feel very much like the man without a country or a religion. THE AMERICAN has read us out of the honored roll of American citizens, and from the only salvation insuring company of the Protestant churches, and yet we know we are resting under the papal anathema, and the Jesuits, we are positive, would not acknowledge us. Surely we are in a strait betwixt two dreadful gulfs, and what we shall do we know not.

Well, if it actually lay between the two, between our becoming a Jesuit, or becoming one of the secret, oath-bound political association whose one only bond of union is religious hate, intimately bound up with the desire of public plunder, then we should not hesitate five minutes as to the resolution at which we should arrive. For whatever sins may be laid at the door of the Jesuits, no one can justly charge them with moral cowardice, or with the infamy of warring upon women, as is the case with those "American patriots" who are represented by such sheets as THE AMERICAN.

OUR POSITION.

Our position is simply that of christian manhood. For every purpose of this debate we stand simply as a man and as a christian, utterly laying aside for the time every contention that may exist between Canterbury and Rome, just as we would lay aside every contention that might exist between Canterbury and Geneva, if it were the Presbyterian church that was attacked by such anti-christian defamation as that with which THE AMERICAN assails Roman Catholics week after week. We are not in position to speak for the Roman Catholic church as an ecclesiastical organization, whose dominating head sits enthroned at Rome, supreme by Divine right, over all christians and over all earthly powers. That goes without saying, or we would not stand where we do, not "in the garb of a Protestant minister," for it would be hard to determine just what this is, but in the vestments of an Anglican priest.

The Roman contention and the Jesuit position are perfectly open to the world. Neither Rome nor the Jesuits seek to conceal it. So far as that differs from Anglican christianity, minus Anglican prejudice, we must relegate the task of defending it to other hands. But if to be an Anglican meant to be a christian whose heart burned not with christian indignation to see his fellow christians slandered, and christian womanhood insulted by every ruffianly assault, then we would fling the name from us with utter loathing and contempt.

But over and above what it pleases THE AMERICAN to say of Roman Catholics, as to their personal character, it pleases it also to assail what is, or what should be sacred to every real christian, of whatever name or country. THE AMERICAN is pleased to say that it will not impugn our motives or our christianity. We care not. For our own personality in this debate we care not a straw. We stand simply as a man to denounce the unmanly warfare which "THE AMERICAN" wages on christian womanhood; as a christian to denounce its infidel attack on principles that are common both to

Catholic and to Protestant christianity; as an American citizen, not by the accident of birth indeed, but by the deliberate choice of our manhood, to denounce the utterly un-American methods of an alien organization, that seeks, not only to infringe the right of citizens of the republic to earn their own living honestly, or to serve in public station or to worship God as they see fit, but which also seeks to impair the liberty of other citizens by the imposition of secret oaths, so that they are no longer free and untrammelled, to vote as judgment and conscience may dictate, without having hanging over them the baleful shadow of a violated oath. If Roman Catholics are plotting, 10,000,000 of them to destroy the civil and religious liberty of the other 60,000,000 of us, that would be susceptible of proof. It needs no secret oaths, no slanderous conclusions, to put real Americans on guard, or to arm them to make sure and swift warfare on the ungrateful hands who first found a refuge and an asylum from oppression and starvation under the broad, enfolding banner of this American nation, and then conspired to destroy it.

Accursed surely would be the Irish heart, or the Irish hand that could plot, or uplift itself against the sacred folds of the banner that floats in azure above the land that saved the Irish people from perishing wholly, on the bleak, windwept hillsides of poor, wretched, landlost cursed Ireland. But if they are such doubly damned traitors to the land that sheltered and protected and saved them, as to plot, with arms in their hands, to subjugate America to an Italian prelate, then let their old time Orange enemies come out into open day and present the proof of the conspiracy. The American people are not in the habit of dallying with treason from any source. If the Jesuits are plotting, and the Irish are arming, and the priests and monks are making ready to exchange the surplice and the cowl for the sword and the rifle; if the Roman Catholic hierarchy are assassins and traitors, and the oath-bound patriots who tell us all this, know it, let them come out like men and declare the proof. If they have proof of Roman Catholic treason in the assassination of Lincoln and Garfield, the courts are open, and American juries can be readily found, without remotest taint of sympathy with Rome, to convict the priestly assassins. But if this new race of Americans, with an Orange hue, have no such proof to offer, then let them and their abettors stand convicted of infamous slander and falsehood, of unlawful conspiracy against the reputation and liberty of citizens, and against the peace of the republic.

But Roman Catholics are aiming to bring America into spiritual subjugation to the bishop of Rome! Who ever doubted that? Of course they are. That is their sacred right, guaranteed them by the constitution. But in this they are doing no more and no less than what any other class of religionists, or anti-religionists are doing, if they have a spark of earnestness about them. Only the other day some American came back from a foreign shore, fully resolved to convert us all to the religion of Islam, of which the Sultan of Turkey is the spiritual head. His right to do it is unquestioned, and when he wins over the majority of us, we shall make short shrift with the rest.

When the Roman church wins over the majority in this land it will have the unquestioned right, on democratic principles, to govern the nation. If the rest of us are alive and do not like it, we can emigrate to Africa or elsewhere, where the pope has not yet extended his sway, if there should be any such country left unconquered by the Omnipresent, Omnipotent Jesuits.

The Roman Catholic church and the Jesuits have the legal, the constitutional right to win America for the pope by all lawful methods, just as Annie Besant has the legal right to win it for Madam Blavatsky.

Whenever they resort to unlawful methods, the courts are open, and Americans have a very swift way of dealing with treason. As for accusing Roman Catholics of treason because they hope, and are seeking to convert this land to their faith, that is the bitter prompting of their hereditary enemies. We are all seeking to win the land to our views, religious or otherwise. And the Roman Catholics would be double dyed traitors to their faith and to their country if they did not try to do it. If they are seeking to do it in any other way than as the laws of the land permit, let it be proven against them, and let the unlawful crusade be brought to an end. But until the anxious patriots, who are trying to prevent the conversion, with force of arms and with Jesuit guile, of 60,000,000 by 10,000,000, can bring actual proof of our peril, we do not think that there need be any immediate alarm about the near future. As for the remote future we can trust that to God, and to our posterity. These can take care of the land with the starry flag still floating above it, we trust, without necessity of blending its tri-coloured symbol of love, purity, and hope, in hateful alliance with the Orange symbol of jaundiced hate.

THE AMERICAN asks us to make answer to a long string of questions which it says it asked Bishop Scannell

who die without embracing that religion are damned, and that they all go to hell? Answer. No, the Roman Catholic church teaches no such merciless doctrine. John Calvin it was and his disciples who taught that the vast majority of the human race were hopelessly condemned to eternal flames. William of Orange was a disciple of Calvin, and as he is THE AMERICAN's patron saint, by whom it swears, it ought to be fair-minded enough to admit that according to Roman Catholic teaching an innumerable host will be among the redeemed in heaven, who are consigned to everlasting flames by Orange teaching.

Is it not a fact that your church is seeking to destroy the efficiency of our public school system? Answer. A question to help fire the great American heart, and one calculated to help the Orange contingent "to offset the Irish in American politics," and to withdraw American sympathy from Ireland's dreams and aspirations. But the question is too vague for us to answer with a categorical yes or no.

The Roman Catholic church is straining every nerve to do for all its children, even the poorest, what every other religious body, respectable in numbers, is seeking to do for the children of their well-to-do people. It is building its own schools, and seeking to gather its own children into them, to train them up in its own principles of religion and morality. If that be a crime, then we are all guilty in principle as the Roman Catholics. In Lincoln there are four or more Protestant schools or colleges side by side with public schools and the state university. At Crete there is a Congregational college; at Hastings there is, we believe, a Presbyterian college; at Kearney there is an Episcopal grammar school, and here we have our own Brownell Hall; besides, all over the land religious and non-religious private schools are springing up everywhere, and those well-to-do Protestants, who are able to pay for it, are withdrawing their children from the public schools to send them to these schools, as they have the lawful right to do. Roman Catholics are simply following the logic of their principles, and at a vast sacrifice are following out the dictates of their conscience. The rest of us are doing it haltingly, and in the interest of special classes only.

But Roman Catholics are seeking for a division of the school fund, or at least for release from taxation, in favor of their schools! Well, they violate no law, and no just principles, in making that request, so far at least as asking to be exempt from burdensome taxation for the support of schools which they do not use, and where they stand ready to give such a secular education to their children as the state has a right to require. If, as Protestants stoutly maintain, the state has no right to levy a tax for the support of religion, as it would be a violation of the sacred rights of conscience to compel men to pay for the support of a religion in which they did not believe, how is it wrong for Roman Catholics to claim that it is a violation of their conscience to be forced to support a system of education that is confessedly opposed to the interests of their religion. Protestants and infidels assert that the public schools, in their inevitable trend, are opposed to the Roman Catholic religion. Roman Catholics believe it. We ourselves have no shadow of doubt but that they are, and opposed as well to all other forms of the christian religion. Why, then, should it be a crime in Roman Catholics to claim the right to educate their own children in their own faith, and to be exempt from taxation for the support of Protestant children?

Of course, it is entirely competent for the majority to refuse the Roman Catholics plea, because of the manifest difficulty of the case; but as things are, the public school system, as conducted at present, is a menace to the christian religion in any form. The wretched misery of our shattered christianity has delivered up the education of our youth to secularism, pure and simple, to the manifest glory of infidelity. Of course, we are very well aware of the plea that christian schools do not always succeed in sending forth christians from them. It is very true. But neither do christian Sunday schools, neither do christian homes. But for all that we would hardly be willing to maintain that Sunday schools and homes without a christian atmosphere and christian training are a bad or an unnecessary thing to have.

If any one would like to observe the difference between the trend of christian and of secular education in our own city, we would suggest to him to attend the commencement exercises of both Creighton College and the High School, and note the trend of the essays on both occasions, as we have done. The one school breathes forth a christian spirit in almost every instance, the other the purely secular spirit. We may or may not agree with the special form of christianity exhibited, but the christian ethics is in the one case directly exhibited. In the other it is almost invariably absent.

Whether it is treason or not, if we were forced to choose between purely secular training, and Jesuit training, for sons of ours, as we look for salvation

Does not the Roman Catholic church hold that persons married outside the influence of said church—those married by ministers of other denominations and by civil officers—ARE NOT LEGALLY MARRIED? Answer. No, the Roman Catholic church holds nothing of the sort. But if it did, it would be doing nothing worse than that which William of Orange and his successors did, by English law, until a very recent period. Within our own lifetime it was necessary for Roman Catholics and other non-conformists to be married by an Anglican clergyman in order to be LEGALLY MARRIED. Before the wife of even a private soldier who was fighting under England's flag, could draw half-pay, she had to be married by an Anglican priest, even though she were married by a Roman Catholic priest, or a dissenting minister. Her marriage was not LEGAL otherwise.

Surely an Orangemen ought not to quarrel with the Roman Catholic church for doing what England used to do. But the Roman church takes no such absurd position. It would have to fling the dark stain of illegitimacy across the brows of too many illustrious sons whom it has won from Anglicanism and Protestantism if it did it.

Does it not hold that the wives of ALL men so married are CUCKBITES and their children illegitimate? Answer. No; but if it did, that is what English law did a generation ago to Roman Catholics married outside of the pale of the Anglican church. It is what THE AMERICAN would doubtless be glad to see done here and now to them, if its envenomed hate could have its way.

Do you not believe and teach that the pope has power to absolve from all sins, and FROM OATHS OF ALLEGIANCE? Answer. Let the question be divided. To the first half, yes, *unconditionally*, as a Jesuit might say. When penitence intervenes between the sinner and his sin the Roman church teaches that the pope can absolve from all sins. Otherwise God Himself cannot absolve from sin, for it would be contrary to His justice and nature to do it. But the Protestant ministerial *attache* of THE AMERICAN would do as much as the pope and more, for the latter generally suffers the transgressor to endure the pains of purgatory, while the Protestant ministerial *attache* sends him straight to heaven the moment he dies. If the editor of THE AMERICAN believes in a heaven or a hell at all, and had opportunity we are quite sure he would also send the vilest sinner straight to heaven as soon as he found grace sufficient to take the "patriotic" oath. But woe betide the unfortunate Jesuit, though he were a St. Francis Xavier in holiness of life, who had to depend on him for absolution in order to scale the heights of heaven.

As to absolving subjects from their allegiance the power to do that used to be asserted by the popes, and the right has never been formally abandoned; but if THE AMERICAN would only take the time to make a historical pause for a minute or two, the power to absolve subjects from their allegiance by their sovereign was not an exclusively papal claim in these by-gone times. The subjects of Mary, Queen of Scots, were absolved from their allegiance by John Knox and the Scotch Presbyterians. The subjects of Charles I. of England were absolved from their allegiance by the Presbyterian divines, and Charles' own head cut off without the slightest question as to the divine right of a Protestant minister to give absolution for treason to a sovereign. The subjects of James II. were absolved from their allegiance and his crown given without scruple to THE AMERICAN's patron saint, William of Orange, whose "glorious, pious and immortal memory" is being held in devout contemplation among us to this day, by processions, bands, banners and such like things.

In olden times popes and other ministers used to claim extraordinary powers, which sometimes were used well, and sometimes not well. But to make bugaboos of these things when the world has swept by them is only worthy of "patriots" of THE AMERICAN order. There is not a Roman Catholic country in the world today in which the pope would dare attempt to dethrone the ruler of it; and here in America when the citizens wish to be released from their allegiance to their own flag and constitution, they have already the power in their own hands. They will not be at all apt to go abroad for absolution. They did not go abroad a century ago for absolution when they released themselves from their allegiance to King George. And as for Irish Roman Catholics, who are the special objects of THE AMERICAN's hatred, we do not believe that all the ancient thunders of the vatican could ever make them render straight allegiance to Queen Victoria.

who die without embracing that religion are damned, and that they all go to hell?

Answer. No, the Roman Catholic church teaches no such merciless doctrine. John Calvin it was and his disciples who taught that the vast majority of the human race were hopelessly condemned to eternal flames. William of Orange was a disciple of Calvin, and as he is THE AMERICAN's patron saint, by whom it swears, it ought to be fair-minded enough to admit that according to Roman Catholic teaching an innumerable host will be among the redeemed in heaven, who are consigned to everlasting flames by Orange teaching.

Is it not a fact that your church is seeking to destroy the efficiency of our public school system?

Answer. A question to help fire the great American heart, and one calculated to help the Orange contingent "to offset the Irish in American politics," and to withdraw American sympathy from Ireland's dreams and aspirations. But the question is too vague for us to answer with a categorical yes or no.

The Roman Catholic church is straining every nerve to do for all its children, even the poorest, what every other religious body, respectable in numbers, is seeking to do for the children of their well-to-do people. It is building its own schools, and seeking to gather its own children into them, to train them up in its own principles of religion and morality. If that be a crime, then we are all guilty in principle as the Roman Catholics. In Lincoln there are four or more Protestant schools or colleges side by side with public schools and the state university. At Crete there is a Congregational college; at Hastings there is, we believe, a Presbyterian college; at Kearney there is an Episcopal grammar school, and here we have our own Brownell Hall; besides, all over the land religious and non-religious private schools are springing up everywhere, and those well-to-do Protestants, who are able to pay for it, are withdrawing their children from the public schools to send them to these schools, as they have the lawful right to do. Roman Catholics are simply following the logic of their principles, and at a vast sacrifice are following out the dictates of their conscience. The rest of us are doing it haltingly, and in the interest of special classes only.

But Roman Catholics are seeking for a division of the school fund, or at least for release from taxation, in favor of their schools! Well, they violate no law, and no just principles, in making that request, so far at least as asking to be exempt from burdensome taxation for the support of schools which they do not use, and where they stand ready to give such a secular education to their children as the state has a right to require. If, as Protestants stoutly maintain, the state has no right to levy a tax for the support of religion, as it would be a violation of the sacred rights of conscience to compel men to pay for the support of a religion in which they did not believe, how is it wrong for Roman Catholics to claim that it is a violation of their conscience to be forced to support a system of education that is confessedly opposed to the interests of their religion. Protestants and infidels assert that the public schools, in their inevitable trend, are opposed to the Roman Catholic religion. Roman Catholics believe it. We ourselves have no shadow of doubt but that they are, and opposed as well to all other forms of the christian religion. Why, then, should it be a crime in Roman Catholics to claim the right to educate their own children in their own faith, and to be exempt from taxation for the support of Protestant children?

Of course, it is entirely competent for the majority to refuse the Roman Catholics plea, because of the manifest difficulty of the case; but as things are, the public school system, as conducted at present, is a menace to the christian religion in any form. The wretched misery of our shattered christianity has delivered up the education of our youth to secularism, pure and simple, to the manifest glory of infidelity. Of course, we are very well aware of the plea that christian schools do not always succeed in sending forth christians from them. It is very true. But neither do christian Sunday schools, neither do christian homes. But for all that we would hardly be willing to maintain that Sunday schools and homes without a christian atmosphere and christian training are a bad or an unnecessary thing to have.

If any one would like to observe the difference between the trend of christian and of secular education in our own city, we would suggest to him to attend the commencement exercises of both Creighton College and the High School, and note the trend of the essays on both occasions, as we have done. The one school breathes forth a christian spirit in almost every instance, the other the purely secular spirit. We may or may not agree with the special form of christianity exhibited, but the christian ethics is in the one case directly exhibited. In the other it is almost invariably absent.

Whether it is treason or not, if we were forced to choose between purely secular training, and Jesuit training, for sons of ours, as we look for salvation

by the cross, we would not hesitate an hour, and that in the cause of both God and country. And yet we rest cheerfully under the Jesuit ban, and are untroubled at being allowed salvation by them, only because of our invincible ignorance of the true Catholic faith. But then we would feel just so with regard to any well conducted Protestant christian school, for sons of ours, or daughter. To us, a purely secular education, which leaves the youth of our land untroubled, day by day, by a christian atmosphere, is treason both to God and to the state. If christians do not see this now, some day their children shall see it.

When was the edict of Pius VII. rescinded, etc? Answer. Popes rarely rescind their own, or their predecessors edicts, although they sometimes do, but they frequently permit them to fall into "innocuous desuetude" with the change of times and circumstances. Pius VII. can scarcely be reckoned among the wisest or best of the Roman pontiffs. We have not before us the edict referred to by our inquisitive contemporary, but we are quite sure that the pope impugned the virtue of the wives of Protestant ministers and others, and the legitimacy of their children from the point of view only of the canon law, and of the sacrament of holy matrimony, just as English law, only a little while ago, impugned the lawfulness of marriage performed by a Roman priest, or by a dissenting minister, and the legitimacy of the children born of such marriages. The civil law of Europe, and the statute law of many of our own states does exactly the same thing today, when marriages are solemnized by priest or minister, in neglect or defiance of its provisions. In 1808 the canon law was the law of all Roman Catholic states, and doubtless Pius VII. may have considered it the higher law of every christian state.

There is no human or divine necessity resting upon us to defend the papal view of what the perfection of christian marriage requires. If Orangemen and other anxious Protestants are disturbed about this far away papal judgment as to the lawfulness of their wedlock we are sorry, but we cannot sympathize deeply. We are quite sure the old canon law is not in operative force here now, even among Roman Catholics; and that no Protestant who is the husband of one wife is in the slightest danger of being refused admission to the Roman church unless he submits to a remarriage. No Roman Catholic bishop or priest will even call in question the perfect LEGALITY of many marriages, which are plainly repugnant to the word of God, and utterly UNLAWFUL by every christian law.

Do not priests often have men and women confess to them that they have perpetrated serious crimes? Answer: Certainly. Do they not allow them to go their way, after giving them absolution, without informing a policeman of the scoundrel? Answer. Certainly. And worse, the civil law sustains them in their perfect right to do that dreadful thing. But lawyers and doctors do exactly so, whenever their clients and patients tell them, confidentially of their crimes, in their professional capacity; and the law sustains their right to do so. Their professional code would pronounce them inamously were they to do otherwise.

Are not the Jesuits today exactly what they always have been—the worst enemies of the governments which harbour them? Answer. The Jesuits, we presume, are today what they have always been. Still we confess to a certain sort of diffidence in revealing this much, while we are in our "Protestant garb." But we do not think them the worst enemies our own government has. We would give the palm, in that respect, to men who flout their Orange banner in this free land, with the view of stirring up religious passions and mutual hatred between citizens, and run all risk of provoking riot and bloodshed by calumny and insult offered to people, because of their religion ostensibly, but really because they wish to produce a certain effect upon the politics of another nation.

By what process of reasoning do you arrive at the conclusion that a Roman Catholic who has committed the most atrocious crimes, and has been hanged, goes straight to the bosom of Christ, while Abraham Lincoln, who was murdered by a Roman Catholic, goes to hell, and suffers unspeakable agony while time endures? Answer. It is authoritatively denied that Booth was a Roman Catholic; but if he were, his crime would be neither better nor worse than it was, whatever his religion may have been. His crime was prompted by political feeling and not by religious conspiracy.

Bishop Scannell arrives at no such conclusion as that propounded by THE AMERICAN. He does not believe that a Roman Catholic convicted of, and hung for atrocious crimes goes straight to the bosom of Christ; neither does he teach that Abraham Lincoln went straight or at all to hell, or that he suffers, or will suffer unspeakable agonies while time endures. That is intended to be another clever question to fire the American heart, but it is born of utter ignorance of what the Roman church does teach, either as to bad Catholics or to good Protestants. But the old-fashioned Calvinist of the William of Orange type, would cer-

tainly send Abraham Lincoln straight to hell, since he died without making any "profession of religion," and all good works without regeneration are utterly worthless, and deserving of the wrath of God.

Is not Peter Dens' theology a standard work in the Roman church? Answer. Yes, so we believe. Is it not the most obscene book ever issued? Answer. Peter Dens' moral theology is published in the Latin tongue. It is intended only for priests, and for the use of students in moral theology, in preparation for the priesthood. A book dealing with the sacred functions of life, or with the transgression of their rightful laws is to be considered obscene or otherwise according to the moral purpose of the writer, and the use to which the writer intends to have his book put.

The "Kreutzer Sonata" was excluded from the mails by a prudish officer of the postal service. And yet the book was no doubt written by Tolstol with the one purpose of stripping the veil from the infamous violation of the law of purity which God has ordained for the marriage bed, a violation which is too infamously prevalent. The Kreutzer Sonata was not an obscene book, for it came from the heart of its author with a high moral purpose. If it were written by Zola it would doubtless be obscene. The motive makes the difference.

A medical treatise on the functions of life and generation, for the proper use of medical students, physicians, and lay people, is not obscene. A pamphlet edition of the same treatise scattered far and wide for greedy gain, for prurient use, would be obscene.

The Bible, which deals most plainly, in some places, with the laws and functions of life, and in condemnation of fleshly sins, is not obscene. But if these passages were culled out from it and published by hostile infidels, or by prejudiced or low-minded gain-dealers a good prima facie case could be made out against the purity of holy scripture.

It is so with Peter Dens' moral theology. Personally we do not think it at all necessary that it should deal, with such particularity, concerning some things that even nature itself should be sufficient for the guidance of any fairly intelligent priest. But however revolting, there is no circumstance, no transgressions of moral law, in relation to natural functions, treated of by Peter Dens', with which priests may not be called to deal, and concerning which they ought not to have knowledge. It is written and published under the veil of an unspoken tongue, and for the sole use of men who ought to be able to use it purely, if they are at all fit, morally, for their calling.

But when the veil is stripped from this work, when it is translated into two tongues in common use, and scattered broadcast by a so-called minister of the gospel, with malignant or mercenary motive, or both, for everybody to read, then it does become obscene and revolting. When THE AMERICAN advertises this wretched book and does all it possibly can to put it recklessly into the hands of people for whom it was never intended, then it is guilty of a crime against morality and good citizenship.

It assumes, and tries to convey the impression that because a priest is instructed how he is to examine the conscience of men and women who have sinned grossly, therefore he is urged to ply every woman who comes to him in confession with questions which are fit to be asked only of the grossly depraved. Peter Dens distinctly warns priests that they are to be most cautious in approaching the inner life of their penitents, and that they must not go on to the graver questioning, until they have warrant to proceed by what has been already confessed.

THE AMERICAN desires evidently, to convey the impression that priests are urged to inquire into the virtue of every woman, be she wife or maiden, even to the asking of the grossest questions. But that is infamously false, as the editor must know after reading even the scurrilous book which he is infamously circulating with malignant, hateful intent.

What excels it in nastiness? This question is already answered. Peter Dens' Moral Theology is veiled from the youth of both sexes, by its publication only in a dead language. The Reverend J. G. White has taken the infamous pains of translating so much of it as may be perverted to a prurient purpose, in cheap pamphlet form, and of scattering it, far and wide, reckless of moral consequences, for the double purpose of reaping the reward of his pains, in mercenary gain, and of flashing the charge of probable lust and dishonour in the face of every Roman Catholic woman in the land. This is both "nasty" and infamous, and for a partner he has THE AMERICAN.

In pursuance of their vindictive hate, and their greed of gain the Rev. J. G. White and THE AMERICAN leave no stone unturned, in their endeavour to clothe with infamous dishonour ten millions of our people, and to circulate a literature whose effect on the Protestant youth of our land cannot be other than low and debasing. Hitherto America has been peerless among the nations for its manhood's protection of womanhood against wan-