

# THE AMERICAN.

VOLUME I.

MAHA, NEB., THURSDAY, AUGUST 6, 1891.

NUMBER 16

## A MISLEADING STATEMENT.

It is not an uncommon thing for a Roman to make a plausible and seemingly a truthful answer to everything which places the Roman church, or her dupes, before the public in their true light. For some time we have seen fit to run the following motto and explanation on the fourth page:

### AMERICA FOR AMERICANS.

We hold all persons Americans who swear allegiance to the United States without a mental reservation in favor of the pope.

Now, this sentiment has evidently stirred up the bile in Archbishop Kenrick's stomach, for he has sent the following letter to a Roman sheet for publication:

### OUR ALLEGIANCE TO ROME.

We owe no temporal allegiance to the bishop of Rome. We recognize in the government under which we live the power established by God for the regulation of society, supreme in all that concerns the civil order, and always to be obeyed, whenever its requirements are not obviously opposed to the law of God. We maintain, indeed, the superiority of the spiritual over the temporal order. We maintain that the church is the supreme judge of all questions concerning faith and morals, and that, in the determination of such questions, the Roman pontiff, as vicar of Jesus Christ, constitutes a tribunal from which there is no appeal, and to whose word all the children of the church must yield obedience.

If this appears incompatible with the allegiance we owe to the civil ruler, it can be only in the minds of those who ignore the right of conscience or suppose that in the most difficult and momentous questions conscience has no certain rule by which to be guided, and who, in denying the paramount obligation of God's law, would establish, under the name of liberty, the most revolting despotism—that which absolves power from its most obvious and sacred obligation of obeying Him from whom all power descends, and substitutes for the moral duty of obedience submission to a force that cannot be successfully resisted.

### ARCHBISHOP KENRICK.

You will notice the first sentence does not state "we owe no temporal allegiance to the pope of Rome." Why did not the bishop state that? No one has intimated that he or any of the Jesuits owed temporal allegiance to the bishop of Rome. If they owe temporal allegiance to any foreign potentate, it is the pope! The pope of Rome is not known as the bishop of Rome. He was known as such at one time, but that title ceased being applied to him a good many hundred years ago, and the tool of the church who would refer—unless to mislead Protestants—to Mr. Pecci as the bishop of Rome would forfeit all his chances for advancement in the church. It would have been just as easy for the archbishop to have written pope as it was for him to write bishop. Then why did he not do it? Because he knew if he did he would be asked to explain a few things to an intelligent public, which are not necessary when he says pope, as he has literally told the world—for their is no bishop of Rome truly named Pecci, who is the pope, as Leo XIII., alias the vicar of Christ, alias the viceregent of God.

By saying bishop he escaped what ever penalty might be attached to a denial of temporal allegiance to the pope. He has reasoned in this case, "I will word my answer to this intimation that Roman Catholics swear allegiance to the United States with a mental reservation in favor of the pope, so that a casual reader will be satisfied; I will not use the title of pope, but that of bishop, and few people will question the difference. If any do, I shall practice the old church dodge of keeping my mouth shut and allow those who are suckers enough to swallow my denials, without questioning my intention to mislead by my truly Jesuitical wording of that sentence, and they will never be any the wiser." Of course the archbishop knows more about the Roman church than we do—and God knows we know enough to satisfy any ordinary mortal—but even he can't prove that the general acceptance of the term bishop applies to the pope of Rome. If he is not a bishop according to the universal use of that term, then the archbishop has been guilty of a premeditated attempt to bamboozle the few readers of the Roman sheet by a wilful and intentional use of titles. If you don't owe temporal allegiance to the pope, why don't you say so? But Rev. Josiah Strong, D. D., secretary of the Evangelical alliance of the United States, says you do, and proves it to the satisfaction of Protestants. We believe the word of a Protestant man will have as much weight in this community as that of even the slickest Roman, so we quote from advance proof sheets of Rev. Strong's book "Our Country" as follows:

There are many who are disposed to attribute any fear of Roman Catholicism in the United States to bigotry or childishness. Such see nothing in the character and attitude of Romanism that is hostile to our free institutions, or find nothing portentous in its growth. Let us, then, first compare some of the fundamental principles of our free institutions with those of the Roman Catholic church.

The declaration of independence teaches popular sovereignty. It says that "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed." Roman Catholic doctrine invests the pope with supreme sovereignty. In "Essays on Religion and Literature," edited by Archbishop Manning, 1867, we read, page 416: "Moreover, the right of deposing kings is inherent in the supreme sovereignty which the popes, as viceregents of Christ, exercise over all Christian nations."

In article vi., section 2, of the constitution we find: "This constitution and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof \* \* \* shall be the supreme law of the land." The canon law of the church of Rome is essentially the constitution of the church, binding upon Roman Catholics everywhere. The bull, "Pastoralis Regimini," published by Benedict XIV., is a part of the canon law and decrees that those who refuse to obey any "commands of the court of Rome, if they be ecclesiastics, are ipso facto suspended from their orders and offices; and, if they be laymen, are smitten with excommunication."

The bull, "Unam Sanctum," of Boniface VIII., which is also a part of the canon law, and acknowledged by

Cardinal Manning as an "article of faith," says: "It is necessary that one sword should be under another, and that the temporal authority should be subject to the spiritual power. And thus the prophecy of Jeremiah is fulfilled in the church and the ecclesiastical power, 'Behold I have set thee over the kingdoms, to root out, and to pull down, and to destroy, and to throw down, to build and to plant.' Therefore, if the earthly power go astray, it must be judged by the spiritual power, which must be judged by God alone. Moreover, we declare, say, define and pronounce it to be altogether necessary to salvation that every human creature should be subject to the Roman pontiff." (Corpus Juris Canonici, Lipsie edition, 1839, tom. 2, p. 1159.)

Here is a distinct issue touching the highest allegiance of the Roman Catholic citizens of the United States, whether it is due to the pope or to the constitution and laws of the land. The reigning pontiff, in an encyclical issued January 10, 1890, says: "It is wrong to break the laws of Jesus Christ in order to obey the magistrate, or under pretence of civil rights to transgress the laws of the church." Again Leo XIII. says: "But if the laws of the state are openly at variance with the law of God—if they inflict injury upon the church \* \* \* or set at naught the authority of Jesus Christ which is vested in the supreme pontiff, then indeed it becomes a duty to resist them, a sin to render obedience."

If it seems to any that I have exaggerated the surrender of reason and conscience required of a good Roman Catholic, weigh these words of Cardinal Bellarmine, one of the most celebrated theologians of the Roman church: "The pope is bound by enjoining vices or forbidding virtues, the church would be obliged to believe vices to be good and virtues bad, unless it would sin against conscience."

The revised statutes of the United States declare: "The alien seeking citizenship must make oath to renounce forever all allegiance and fidelity to any foreign prince, potentate, state or sovereignty, in particular that to which he has been subject." The Roman Catholic profession of faith, having the sanction of the council which met at Baltimore in 1864, contains the following oath of allegiance to the pope: "And I pledge and swear true obedience to the Roman pontiff, vicar of Jesus Christ and successor of the blessed Peter, prince of the apostles." Here are men who have sworn allegiance to two different powers, each claiming to be supreme, whose spheres of authority are "inseparably" bound together and which, therefore, afford abundant opportunity for the rise of conflicting interests and irreconcilable requirements.

By way of throwing light on such a situation, it is interesting to read in the canon law: "No oaths are to be kept if they are against the interests of the church of Rome." And again: "Oaths which are against the church of Rome are not to be called oaths, but perjuries." An American ecclesiastic, Bishop English of Charleston, S. C., quotes this canon, and defending it says: "These are the principles which I have been taught from Roman Catholic authors by Roman Catholic professors; they are the principles which I find recognized in all enactments and interpretations of councils in the Roman Catholic church, from the council at Jerusalem, held by the apostles, down to the present day." In a work prepared by Rev. F. X. Schoppa, a Jesuit, for Roman Catholic schools and colleges, and bearing the imprimatur of Cardinal Manning, we read (page 278): "The civil laws are binding on the conscience only so long as they are

conformable to the rights of the Catholic church." \* \* \*

There would be no necessity for the utterance of the sentiments above quoted if the Romans did not owe temporal allegiance to the pope; neither would there be any sense in the declaration of John A. Mooney, LL. D., in the American Catholic Quarterly Review of July 1891, that the "Catholics throughout the world should unitedly sustain the temporal power of the pope." How can Catholics be loyal citizens of the United States if they would aid a foreign potentate and thereby violate treaty stipulations? What does an impartial public think of this? Is that evidence strong enough to convict the archbishop of intentionally trying to mislead by his assertion, "We owe no temporal allegiance to the bishop of Rome?" The archbishop has simply followed out the doctrine of the church, which is to mislead Protestants at any and all times, in any and all possible ways. The archbishop should now deny that the Roman hierarchy are endeavoring to wreck our school system. We charge the Romans with making such an effort. Nor is this the only way the Romans have of creating suspicion of their boasted loyalty. In a lengthy article in the August Forum on "Government by Aliens," Bishop A. Cleveland Cox says:

The late Roman Catholic bishop of Toronto had the unblushing effrontery to address a letter to Lord Randolph Churchill, during a pending crisis in 1877, from which I quote as follows: "The Irish vote is a great factor in America. Hence you must conclude that numbers will tell, and the combined Irish are a powerful ingredient in the government of this country, and the power of their organizations is increasing every day. They hold already the balance of power in the presidential and other elections. This is beyond dispute."

He goes on to say that it would be easy for them to help us in war with England, adding:

"It would cost the public very little, as Irish-American military organizations would supply largely both men and money."

Assassination is a familiar expedient with this class, who signs himself "John Joseph," with a dagger for a cross, and says:

"We must not forget how the great Roman empire fell. England is not beyond the reach of eternal justice."

As I write, the comment upon such threats comes from Chicago, in the coroner's inquest verdict in the Cronin case. Very significant are the following words concerning "the combined Irish":

"We will further state, that in our judgment all secret societies whose objects are such as the evidence shows that of the Clan-na-Gael or United Brotherhood to be, are not in harmony with and are injurious to American institutions."

Is there national spirit left among us to assert that the time has come to govern America by honest American voters, and to demand that no such prefix as Irish or German or Mormon shall be suffered to qualify the American name? If not, free institutions and popular government must perish even here.

And this from the American Catholic News:

The defections among American-born Catholics has been increased by the fact that the authorities at Rome have never in any way recognized Catholics as Americans.