

the civil and political arena, and has everywhere sought to dominate in civil and political matters as well as in ecclesiastical affairs. Its history has been such as to justify fully the assertion of John Milton concerning it, when he said, "Popery is a double thing to deal with, and claims twofold power—ecclesiastical and political." That Milton by no means misrepresented or exaggerated the claims of the papacy, which dominates and represents the Catholic element in all lands and time, is made evident from the following excerpts gleaned from the "Canon Law," which is the undisputed and fundamental code of the Roman Catholic church.

"All human power is from evil, and must therefore be under the pope."

"The church is empowered to grant, or to take away, any temporal possession."

"The pope has the right to annul state laws, treaties, constitutions, etc., and to absolve from obedience thereto as soon as they seem detrimental to the rights of the church, or those of the clergy."

"The pope possesses the right of admonishing, and, if needs be, of punishing temporal rulers, emperors, and kings, as well as of drawing before the spiritual forum any case in which a mortal sin occurs."

"The pope can annul all legal relations of those in ban, and can release from every obligation, oath and vow, either before or after being made."

The purport of the canon law is summarized in a famous encyclical of one of the popes, which says: "The Roman Catholic church has a right to exercise its authority without any limits set to it by the civil power; the pope and the priests ought to have dominion over temporal affairs; in case of conflict between the ecclesiastical and civil powers, the ecclesiastical powers ought to prevail."

The records of the past show beyond possibility of contradiction that the pope, and through him, the Roman Catholic church, of which he is the head and ruler, has not been slow to utilize to the utmost the powers and prerogatives which the canon law and papal encyclicals declare him to be possessed of, and whenever and wherever he has been in a position to enforce his claims.

In the beginning of the sixteenth century, the Roman church attained to the pinnacle of power and dominated the religious, social, civil and political life of all Europe. Civil rulers bowed at the footstool of the papal power, trembled at its threats, accepted its dictations, and implicitly obeyed its injunctions. It dispensed crowns, de-throned kings, absolved subjects from allegiance to their rightful sovereigns, or sanctioned their bondage under tyrants, according to its own pleasure or caprice, and ruled everywhere—in the political realm as well as in ecclesiastical affairs—with a rod of iron. The church, through the pope, its acknowledged head, embroiled cabinets, concocted conspiracies, kindled wars, and made peace. The papal power was superior to all political, temporal, and human government, and its slightest whisper on political affairs caused every throne in Europe to nod assent.

It is well to note in this connection that the motto chosen by the Catholic church as best representing its character, nature, and principles is, *Semper Idem*—"always the same." This motto is significant of the fact that whatever claim the church puts forth, she always holds to tenaciously; whatever power she has once obtained and exercised, she claims forever after; whatever policy she once inaugurates, she inflexibly pursues. If compelled by the force of circumstances to relinquish temporal dominion, she never abdicates the throne, nor ceases to assert her right to rule; if driven from the political arena, she waits with patient watchfulness her opportunity to re-enter whenever a favorable opportunity presents itself.

In this country universal suffrage affords the Catholic church the opportunity of becoming a factor in politics such as is open to it nowhere else, and which it has not been slow to take advantage of. Within the Catholic communion in the United States there are between two and three million voters. All that is needed to make the Catholic hierarchy a most potent factor in American politics is to cause these millions of Catholic voters to interest themselves in political matters, and to cast their ballots so as to promote the welfare and further the interests of their church. This they are now being trained, urged, and commanded to do. This is being done largely through the agency of the Catholic press. In a leading article in *The Catholic World* entitled "The Catholic of the Nineteenth Century," we find the following significant statement: "The most obvious, interesting and important view of the Catholic in his relations to the century is that of voting. We do not hesitate to affirm that in performing our duties as citizens, electors, and public officers, we should always and under all circumstances, act simply as Catholics." In a recent number of the *Catholic Review* the following explicit directions are given to Catholic voters: "When a Catholic candidate is on a ticket and his opponent is a non-Catholic, let the Catholic candidate have the vote, no matter what he represents."

Referring to a petition gotten up by himself and other prominent Catholics for presentation to the New York legis-



"When a Catholic Candidate is on a Ticket, and His Opponent is a Non-Catholic, let the Catholic Candidate have your Vote, no Matter What he Represents."

lature at its ensuing session asking for the division of the public school funds, Dr. Michael Walsh, editor of the *New York Sunday Democrat*, said: "We propose to get the members of the legislature on record on this question. The politicians are all afraid of it, and it will have a lot of opposition to meet, of course; but we expect it and we are prepared for it. The politicians know that any position they take will hurt them with one party or the other; but we do not care for either party. The Catholics hold the balance of power and they will not permit the politicians to forget that fact. The politicians now have hold of a poker that is hot at both ends, but it is hotter for them in the middle, and they will have to take hold at one end or the other."

The pope, a greater power than the press in Catholic circles, has been making earnest appeals to his followers to make their influence strongly felt in the political arena. In an encyclical issued by Leo XIII a few years ago, the following significant sentences occur: "We exhort all Catholics to take an active part in municipal affairs and elections, and to favor the principles of the church in all public services, meetings and gatherings. All Catholics must make themselves felt as active elements in daily political life in the countries where they live. They must penetrate wherever possible into the administration of civil affairs, and should do all in their power to cause the constitutions of states and legislation to be modeled in the principles of the true church."

In another encyclical, Pope Leo gives still more explicit directions to his subservient subjects in reference to using their political power and influence to promote the interests of the church. He says: "Furthermore, in politics, men ought always and in the first place to serve, as far as possible, the interests of Catholicism. The church cannot grant its patronage or favor to men whom it knows to be hostile to it, or who openly refuse to respect its rights. On the contrary, its duty is to favor those, who, having sound ideas as to the relations between church and state, wish to make them both harmonize. These principles contain the rule according to which every Catholic ought to model his public life." How the utterances of the pope on all subjects are to be regarded and treated by all true Catholics may be learned from the following extract from a sermon preached by Vicar General Preston in New York, Jan. 1, 1888: "Every word Leo speaks from his high chair is the voice of the Holy Ghost, and must be obeyed. To every Catholic heart comes no thought but obedience. It is said that politics is not within the province of the church, and that the church has only jurisdiction in matters of faith. You say, 'I will receive my faith from the pontiff, but I will not receive my politics from him.' This assertion is disloyal and untruthful. You must not think as you choose; you must think as Catholics. The man who says, 'I will take my faith from Peter, but not my politics from Peter,' is not a true Catholic."

Such *ex Cathedra* statements as these, coming from the highest authorities in the Catholic hierarchy are sufficient to convince any fair-minded person that it

is the purpose and intention of the parties who dominate the Catholic church to use its members as their agents in the political arena for the aggrandizement of the church; and that the influence and votes of its adherents must be cast at their dictation for that party and for such candidates as will pledge themselves to best subservise the interests of Catholicism.

How shrewdly, even when comparatively few in number, the Catholic vote, under the direction and astute leadership of Catholic prelates, is made most effective, may be learned from a statement made by Cardinal Wiseman concerning their method of operation in England a number of years ago. He says that at that time "only one Catholic member was to be found in parliament; yet we did not despair. Catholics observed that the electors were divided between two parties, and they found that by combining their strength and then bringing it to bear in favor of one side or the other, they could cause that side to succeed which appeared the most disposed to do them justice. Thus we have taught the two parties in the state to count the Catholics as something."

Where they have a larger following they will take a bolder course as the following fact will show: In 1875 the seven bishops of the Catholic church in Canada, when an important election was pending, issued a pastoral letter to their people. They instructed the priests in their pastoral letter to direct their parishioners how to vote, what candidate to support and whom to oppose; and the sole basis of their favor or hostility was to be the friendliness or the hostility of these various candidates to the papal church. The electors in Canada were threatened with excommunication if they should vote differently from what the priests directed. It was sworn by many electors, when the matters were brought before the courts after election, that they voted under the threat of excommunication, and believed that they would be damned in hell if they voted differently from what the priests commanded them. Such occurrences substantiate the truth of the statement made by the eminent English historian, James Anthony Froude, that "every true Catholic is bound to think and act as his priest tells him, and a republic of true Catholics becomes a theocracy administered by the clergy."

It was because the archbishop of Toronto knew that he could control every Catholic vote in Canada that he recently audaciously wrote to a British peer that his church held the balance of power in Canada, and that it would direct that power according to its preference, and that the home government might take notice and govern itself accordingly.

In July, 1896, Bishop Charbonnel, of Toronto excommunicated four members of the Canadian government for not voting in the provincial parliament according to his requirements.

Similar efforts have been put forth by Catholic prelates and priests in this country to influence and control elections in the interests of persons and parties favorable to the plans and purposes of their church.

In October, 1841, Archbishop Hughes

publicly appeared before a large audience of Catholics and gave his episcopal approval to a political ticket for senators and assemblymen from New York City, advocated their election, and required from his auditors a pledge of adherence to his nomination, which was at once heartily and enthusiastically given.

Bishop Gilmour, of Cleveland, in his Lenten pastoral of 1873, instructed his parishioners that no candidate for office should receive their votes without first pledging himself to support the division of the school fund.

In September, 1880, a convention met in Santa Fe, N. M., and framed a constitution to be submitted to the people, under which it was hoped that New Mexico would be admitted into the union. The Roman Catholic archbishop warned the convention that if provisions should be made for the creation of an unsectarian system of public schools, the Roman Catholic church would oppose the adoption of the constitution. Undeterred by this threat, the convention inserted a provision for a system of unsectarian public schools. On the Sunday before the date for voting on the adoption of the constitution, the pulpits of forty-two Roman Catholic churches in New Mexico fulminated denunciations against the proposed constitution, telling their parishioners "they would be permitted to go to hell-fire if they voted for the constitution." In the cathedral in Santa Fe, the vicar-general commanded his hearers to vote against "that wicked constitution." Priests went from house to house commanding the women to see that the male members of the family should vote as instructed by the church. When the election took place, it was found that the American cities and towns gave the constitution good majorities, while the Mexican population voted almost solidly against it, in accordance with the instructions given them by their priests.

The Bennett and Edwards school laws adopted by the states of Wisconsin and Illinois were repugnant to the Catholic hierarchy because they provided that all children between the ages of seven and fourteen must attend, for at least twelve weeks in the year, some school where reading, writing, arithmetic and United States history were taught in the English language, and giving the school authorities power to decide whether given schools, other than public schools, were fulfilling the conditions of the law. The Catholic bishops of Wisconsin issued a manifesto against the law; a similar manifesto was read in the Catholic churches of Illinois, calling upon the Catholics of that state to vote only for candidates who would disfavor this law. The result of this Catholic campaign is still fresh in the public mind.

Not content, however, with coercing their own people in matters of politics, the Catholic leaders seek by threats of "political damnation" to intimidate legislators who manifest unwillingness to yield to their behests, or who oppose any of their measures. Such an unseemly menace was made a few years ago in the *Catholic Review*, a periodical in high favor with the hierarchy, and commended by the bishop of Brooklyn, Cardinal McClosky, the bishop of New York, Cardinal Cullen, and many other

prelates. Commenting on the refusal of the legislature of New York to grant certain favors to the Roman church, the editors boasted that those legislators, through the political influence wielded by the Catholic church, had been retired to private life, and they affirmed that they had a list who would follow them into political retirement unless they yielded to do the bidding of their Catholic constituency.

Father McGlynn, in his speech on "The Pope in Politics," delivered in New York before an immense audience, accused the Catholic prelates and priests of that diocese of seeking to control their parishioners in political matters. He declared that political tracts were sent through ecclesiastical channels at the direction of the "vicar-general and the boss of Tammany hall," which is a political Catholic institution, to be distributed in the pews of the churches, directing the members how and for whom to cast their votes. He urged his hearers to refuse to take their politics from Rome. "For," said he, "the more you take your politics from Rome, the less religion you will have; and the more you refuse to take your politics from Rome, the more likely you are to preserve your religion in its purity, and to win for your religion the respect, the friendship, and perhaps the fellowship, of your fellow-countrymen."

Neither the hierarchy nor the church is disposed to hear and heed Father McGlynn's sensible and timely advice; but with their constantly increasing numbers they are endeavoring to secure for themselves a commanding position in national as well as in sectional political affairs, and, as in Canada, by holding the balance of power, becomes a controlling factor in national elections; and thus, in some degree at least, be able to determine the policy of the government.

Shortly before the late presidential election, Bishop Spaulding, in an address before the Catholics of Peoria, Illinois, directed them "either to vote the democratic ticket or not vote at all." The priest in charge of St. Joachim's Roman Catholic church in Detroit preached a sermon the Sunday before the above-mentioned election, which was published in the *Cleveland Leader*, and in which the following sentences occur: "Vote for the democratic party. It is the party that supports us, and it is our duty to support the democratic party. The church is the voice of God, and the church, through its priests, tells you whom to vote for and whom not to vote for." And all true Catholics are bound to obey the dictates of the priests and church. But neither church nor priests care anything for the party with which they act, save as that party can be made a tool to further their designs and carry out their plans and promote their interests. The Roman Catholic church itself is a compact, wily and unscrupulous political party; when unable alone to carry out its designs it uses other organizations to further its purposes if possible; but when it is strong enough alone it employs its own methods and men.

For many years it has been the policy of the Catholic church to concentrate its forces in our great and growing cities. In 1853 D'Arcy McGee, editor

of the *Peregrine's Journal*, a Catholic organ, started a movement for taking poor Irish Roman Catholics out of the cities and inducing them to settle on the broad and fertile prairies of the west. This movement was a failure, being everywhere opposed by Catholics, prelates and priests, who insisted that their followers should remain in the cities, which are the great centers of political power and action. Already, under this policy, our great cities have become Catholic strongholds—and in many of them the Catholics not only hold the balance of power, but are the dominant power in city politics. In New York the Roman Catholic authorities estimate their communicants at 500,000; in San Francisco they lay claim to more than one-half the city's population; while in Chicago, New Orleans, Boston, Cincinnati and St. Louis they nearly equal it, indeed, they do not surpass the Protestant element of the population. Wherever they predominate they take the lion's share, and sometimes all of the public offices. The *Churchman* of New York, commenting on the election that made Hugh J. Grant mayor of New York, called attention to the fact that "the municipal officers" just now elected are, without exception, Romanists.

After the above election the *Mail and Express* gave the following summary of New York officials who were Catholics: "They have the mayor, the sheriff, the comptroller, the council to the corporation, the whole board of tax assessors, the commissioner of public works, the superintendent of the street cleaning departments, the clerk of the board of aldermen and a majority of that board, every member of the board of tax commissioners, several of the justices of the supreme, superior and common pleas courts, the control of the board of estimate and apportionment, the majority in many of the ward board of trustees, a large majority of the board of education, the control of the department of charities and corrections, the majority of the police force, the control of the fire department, of the board of street openings, the whole of the armory board, the register of deeds, the commissioner of jurors, one-half the commissioners of accounts, supervisor of the city records, the collector of the port, the sub-treasurer, a majority of the commissioners of the sinking fund, the majority of the delegation to congress, and in the state senate and assembly."

Commenting on a recent election in San Francisco *The Western Witness* said: "Nearly one-half of the city government of San Francisco will be in the hands of Catholics for the coming two years." A gentleman widely acquainted in Marion county, California, a very strong Catholic county, said to the writer of this article: "I am personally acquainted with every county official in this county, and every one of them is a Catholic." The statement has recently been made that while twenty-five years ago there were but six Roman Catholics among the city officials of Boston, now there are over fifty, and that more than 4,000 of the employes of that city are Roman Catholics.

Such facts as these, and they might be indefinitely multiplied did space permit, conclusively show that wherever the Roman Catholics are in the majority, they elect Romanists to every office and run the office as far as they can in the interests of their church.

Thus it comes that their political power has a money value to the church. This explains how it has come to pass that the Catholic church has received such large grants from the public treasury of cities, and sometimes from even the general government, so that it supports many of the institutions of the church out of the public funds. The Tweed ring in one year made an appropriation of \$800,000 of the public funds of the city of New York for the use of the Catholic church, in return for its political influence. Mr. Dexter A. Hawkins, in 1880, gave a detailed account of how the Roman Catholics of New York were given by the city authorities five and one-half blocks of city property, valued at three and one-half million of dollars, in consideration of political services rendered. Out of an appropriation of \$900,000 made by the legislature of New York for denominational purposes, \$510,000 was bestowed on the Roman Catholics. The partiality exhibited toward the Catholics in this distribution had its origin in the fact that it alone, of all the denominations, uses its influence for partisan purposes, and by means of influencing the votes of its adherents in the interest of those who favor it, seeks to make the church a controlling factor in politics, and thereby reap large benefits for itself and its constituency.

The ultimate purpose of all this intermeddling in political affairs on the part of the Catholic hierarchy is to secure the supremacy of the church in this country. Dr. Brownson, a prominent Catholic authority, in his *Review* for July, 1864, said: "Undoubtedly it is the intention of the pope to possess this country. In this intention, he is aided by the jesuits and all the Catholic prelates and priests." Under the direction of their wily leaders, they are advancing to complete control in the nation as fast as they can. They are subjugating our cities; they are debauching our politicians; they are throttling our newspapers; they are robbing our treasuries; they are planning the destruction of our public schools; they are seeking to subvert our constitution and destroy our liberties. The past history of this mighty and merciless organization, that is "always the same," ought to convince our American people that its presence in the political arena is a menace to the public welfare and presages grave danger to the state.—Rev. E. D. McCreary, Ph. D., in *February American Journal of Politics*.