

DR. FULTON'S REPLY

To Grover Cleveland—Does Mr. Cleveland's Denial Deny?

The letter published in THE AMERICAN of July 29, from Ex-Pres. Cleveland, has been copied in every Democratic paper in this country. We give below Dr. Fulton's reply, in the form of an address delivered in the Wabash Avenue M. E. Church, Chicago, on Sunday morning last, July 24:

TEXT.—No lie is of the truth.—1 John ii. 21.

"No lie is of the truth," whether told by preacher or politician. In a sermon preached in Boston, Mass., prior to the nomination of Grover Cleveland, after paying a tribute to him because of his magnificent bearing to wife and child, I said: "Had he given to Rome a wide birth, the country could have trusted him. But when we remember that he who vetoed the Protectory bill, as soon as he became President, according to common rumor, had a wire run from the White House to the cardinal's palace and placed a Roman Catholic at the head of every division of the 15,000 employees in the departments, and permitted nuns without an introduction and against the positive printed instructions, hanging on the walls, to go twice each month through them and solicit contributions, with the understanding that if the request was refused the yellow envelope would be sent them, we can see how unworthy such a man is of support."

Grover Cleveland brands this statement in all its details and in its spirit and intention as unqualifiedly false. Does his denial deny? Does his branding the statement as false prove that he did not sustain the most intimate relations with Cardinal Gibbons whom he is quick to praise and who had the run of the White House during Mr. Cleveland's occupancy? The wire business may be true or false, but can there be a question as to the fact that every important question touching the interests of Romanism was placed before him, and he became a public man in no broad, the best is

disappointed. The rumour of a rebellion of Burchard is to the record of Grover Cleveland's Roman Catholic connection. At once attention was called to his veto of the Protectory bill. In a sermon preached in 1884 I used this language: "It will be remembered that one of the many reasons urged by the opponents of Grover Cleveland was that he had unjustly vetoed an appropriation of \$20,000, included in the supply bill of 1883, for the support and maintenance of juvenile delinquents at the Catholic Protectory." He said, "The name of this institution implies that only Roman Catholic children are there provided for. If this be so, this fact furnished a good reason why public funds should not be contributed to its support. A violation of this principle, in this case, would tend to subject the State Treasury to demands in behalf of all classes of sectarian institutions, which a due care for the money of the State and a just economy could not concede, and which would have a justification in precedent."

Thousands on thousands approved of it, and voted for a man that dare say no to Rome. Here came our sorrow. No sooner was Grover Cleveland warm in the Presidential chair than he wrote a letter to the Lady Superior of the convent in Albany and sent her a check. People wondered at it. Then came other facts which gave immense sorrow to the hearts of patriots. Without enumerating them, I will simply say that in May, 1888, I went to Washington to attend the Baptist anniversary. I was invited by five different ministers, who were the pastors of prominent churches, to preach, but was told that I must not say one word about Romanism. The subject of Romanism was tabooed. I inquired the cause and found to my surprise and sorrow that Washington was in the lap of Rome; that 15,000 department clerks were under the surveillance of Rome, and that if I should touch Romanism in any church the clerks there in attendance would be disturbed and that it would not do. Then it was the rumor came to me, to which I have referred, and in the preface to "Washington in the Lap of Rome," then and there written, I said "If it is not true, as is charged, that a private wire runs from the White House in Washington to the cardinal's palace in Baltimore, and that every important question touching the interests of Romanism in America is placed before his eye, before it becomes a public act, it is true that the cardinal is a factor in politics. Romanism is the dominant power in the Capitol of the United States. Lincoln, Grant, and Arthur withstood it and suffered the consequences. The power is unseen. It is shadowy. It inhabits the air and infects it. Romanism is the malaria of the spiritual world. It

stupifies the brain, deadens the heart, and sears the conscience as with a hot iron. It comes as did the tempter, with the gifts of power or of wealth in its hands and offers them to all that will fall down and worship it. They who yield have peace and praise. They who refuse must fight a terrible foe.

The cry has been for peace. The lips of some of the ministers and members of the church have been padlocked. Politicians in the grasp of this power are unable or unwilling to move. They clank their chains with delight and glory in being allied with an organism so potent and so astute. Others see the peril and withstand its open and insidious demands. To-day the city of magnificent distances resemble the child in the presence of the snake. It is being charmed by the viper. Duty demands that the truth be told which shall break the back of the monster. "Why Priests Should Wed" unscathed the pollutions of Romanism in the hope of saving the women and girls of the Roman Catholic church, now held in the grasp of superstition. "Washington in the Lap of Rome" appeals to mankind.

This book shows that Grover Cleveland left "the Presbyterian Assembly" in Philadelphia to ride with the cardinal at the head of a procession which they believed was to number 50,000 and was to march to the grounds where the corner-stone of the Jesuit University was to be laid, which procession in answer to prayer was broken up. It shows that 15,000 department clerks were asked for money twice a month, and if they did not respond the yellow envelope was sent them and they were dismissed from the service for one reason or another. This I saw with my own eyes, and for weeks every Monday morning we sent great long petitions and placed them in the hands of his private secretary asking him to look into the matter and have the law enforced which shut all nuns out of the departments. His denial does not do away with this fact, which thousands remember. No attention was paid to them while Grover Cleveland was President, but under Benjamin Harrison's administration Uncle Jerry Rusk issued an alarm and they have been shut out of the great department buildings and I hope out of all. At any rate they ought to be excluded from every public building in the United States and from the entrances of our navy yards, and wherever men are employed in the public service.

I am not here as a Republican or as a politician. Some one asks, Have the nuns been shut out of all the departments under President Harrison? I do not know, for I have not been in Washington for two years, but previous to that I lectured there and found them still traversing the departments, and in great meetings we protested against the whole business. The hospitals are largely in Roman Catholic hands and some terrible facts were brought to the attention of the people.

Just here let us thank God that the people have had their attention called to the aggressions of Romanism as never before. Rome got a black eye when the Orangemen's telegram protested against the nomination of a man felt to be subservient to Rome, and in Chicago the utter ignoring the Tammany, the business partner of "The man of the Tiber," and the denial of this alliance with Rome on the part of Grover Cleveland, are full of encouragement.

It is unfortunate that Mr. Cleveland did not discriminate a little. The wire part might be difficult to prove, but thousands know that the latter part of the statement is true.

Why deny it? Is it wrong if proven true? Will Mr. Cleveland if elected agree to relegate Romanists to the place occupied by other denominations—Presbyterians, for instance? Would the country stand discriminations in the favor of Presbyterians or Baptists? All would answer, No! Why, then, permit Romanists to be an exception? It is a good time to ask the question of all candidates for the suffrages of the people. Let the board question be discussed through all its moods and tenses.

I. Shall an alliance be tolerated between the State and the Roman Catholic Church? Why do the nuns manage so many of our government hospitals? It cannot be that they are superior as nurses, for the history of the war shows the contrary.

Why should there be a female seminary built in close proximity to every government post in hopes of having Roman Catholic girls capture our young officers?

Why should priests have such power in securing appointments in every department of social and civil life? Why should Mr. Cleveland deny that Roman Catholics were in charge of nearly every division of the departments? Was it wrong to have it so? Many of

us thought so and protested. Does his denial admit we were right?

It was a pitiable story that was poured into my ears from hundreds of employees who were persecuted in the most cruel way in the departments, by Roman Catholics. Rome thought she had the middle of the road, and she did have it, until we called attention to the facts, published in "Washington in the Lap of Rome."

It is not in Washington alone this state of things exists. You meet it in every place where great quantities of Roman Catholics labor. The nuns are there when pay-day comes, and demand a portion of the hard earned wages. As a result, thousands of Romanists are kept in the direst poverty.

What Grover Cleveland said against the tariff will say against the power of Rome: "We are not at enmity with the rights of any of our citizens, or our countrymen. We are not recklessly heedless of any American interests, nor will we abandon our regard for them; but invoking the love of fairness and justice which belongs to true Americanism, and upon which our Constitution rests, we insist that no plan of legislation shall be tolerated which has for its object and purpose a forced contribution from the earnings and income of the mass of our citizens to swell directly the accumulations of a favored few."

To-day Romanists are in bondage to Rome. Their wages are farmed out and their earnings are mortgaged to the church. The promise of spiritual help held out to them is founded on a lie, and "No lie is of the truth."

Not only is the money of the poor demanded, but their votes are sold as sheep are sold in the shambles. This fills every congressman with fear. Any question in which Rome is interested is watched by priests, who are always present, and if the vote of any congressman is averse, the whole Roman Catholic vote is against him. Then again it is possible to buy the Roman Catholic vote, no matter how Romanists may personally feel in regard to the man to be voted for. A member of Congress lost his seat because a man of wealth went to the bishop and offered to build him a chapel, providing the Roman Catholic vote was given him. Hundreds came to him and expressed their regret that they must vote against him, but vote against him and the chapel was built in a country nominally Protestant. Now I understand there are those connected with Orange, orders that call this politics, and declare that they are opposed to having politics touched in those discussions.

Then it is hopeless to proceed. Rome now knows how to pull the wires, and Protestants sit still and allow them to do so.

2. What ought to be done? We answer, Treat all alike. There is no reason why every American should be excluded from employment, so that the favorite of a priest might be taken care of. Say it and act it and all will be well. Tell Rome to take a back seat, as was done at Minneapolis when the Orange resolution was published for the first time and the name of Romanism was spoken in a great convention. As was done when Tammany (which is but another name for Romanism) was compelled to grind her teeth in rage when the leaders saw that their rule was not absolute beyond New York. As Lord Salisbury said, Rome is always and everywhere opposed to Liberty.

Americans, we know this to be true. Let us avow it. Rome has gone far too far; let us call a halt. This is the time to act. We are almost at the top. This letter of Grover Cleveland that does not deny, shows the sensitiveness of the man to the charge that he sold out to Rome. Let him be asked for guarantees that Rome shall take a back seat, with Harrison, Weaver and Bidwell, and let the anti-Romanists give our support to the man who will be true to the flag and to liberty.

"There is a warfare where none but the morally brave. Stand nobly and firmly thy country to save! 'Tis the war of opinion, where few can be found. On the mountains of principle guarding the ground With vigilant eyes ever guarding the foes Who are prowling around them and aiming their blows."

A Roman Catholic Nut.

A Roman Catholic priest one day. Into his pulpit went; And thought that the words he had to say, From God were truly sent. To impress the message on his flock, He took a walnut fair; And then with boldness began to mock—The flocks not of his care. "The shell," said he, "is valueless; That was old Calvin's church. And the skin it is nauseous and worthless; That was old Luther's church. 'The holy Roman Catholic church, Is of God begotten;'" And as he cracked the nut to show, Behold he found it rotten.

—F. W. EMERSON.

PAPAL ABANDONMENT.

Historical Side-Lights on Romanism—Relinquishment of Bourbonism.

John Bond, in the Covered Catholic, says:

"The pope, we hear, has refused his special blessing to the 'Union Chretienne.' The 'Union Chretienne' is the last living remnant of that once powerful combination of popery and despotism, which had held France in bonds for many centuries. The Union Chretienne must soon go out of existence, for its hopes are dead. The pope has smiled upon republican principles. He has instructed the French clergy to make best of the 'fait accompli.'"

"There is no event in recent history which conveys more instruction to the observer of Roman policy than this cold and contemptuous abandonment by Rome of Bourbonism and monarchy in France. Americans in particular have a special interest in looking into the true significance of this latest move on the part of the Vatican. No dynasty in Europe has done more for Rome and for the papacy than the descendants of Louis Capet. The glories of Bourbonism are the triumphs of Rome. The keynote of the history of France is loyalty to Rome. One scion of that ill-starred house of Capet figures as a saint in the Roman calendar, and due mention is made of his sanctity and his miracles in the breviary. Another Bourbon sullenly forever an otherwise respected name, and still another steeped his hands in innocent blood to deserve the praise of Rome. While the Bourbons continued powerful, Rome was not slow to show her gratitude and to strengthen herself in strengthening the hands of her servile ally. When under Louis XVI. the people of France first began to show signs of discontent and were preparing to make a strong demand for their ancient liberties, the Jesuits solidly ranged themselves on the side of despotism, and the sharp and heavy knife descended on the neck of the heir to a thousand sins. A priest stood at the side of the grim-looking instrument of death and held up a crucifix and cried, 'Ascend to heaven, soul of St. Louis!'"

"Surely Rome was bound to this dynasty by the strongest bonds of gratitude. Surely the Bourbons had a right to claim her as a friend in need. For ten centuries monarchy and Romanism had in France been convertible terms. Why now this betrayal of a friend? Why does Rome break without a blush, without one word of apology, those strong ties of ancient friendship? Ah, but was it friendship? Had it been an honest and sincere union? History cries 'No.' Rome knows not what friendship is; she cannot be sincere. Let us learn a lesson from the fate of Bourbonism and monarchy in France. We need not waste any sympathy on the Bourbons nor drop one tear of regret for the political system they represented, but we cannot without a feeling of abhorrence and disgust contemplate the base policy and the traitorous ingratitude of Rome."

"Why has Rome coldly turned away from an old but weakened and useless friend? The answer is simple. Rome is not and cannot be loyal to any form of what she calls temporal government. Let no man be deceived. Whether Rome professes loyalty to republican principles or to kingly rule, whether she blesses oligarchy or despotism, she is always in reality ultramontane, i. e., her interests lie beyond the mountains. They center in Rome. Rome swore allegiance to Bourbonism and monarchy only to betray both when her ultramontane policy demanded a change. Rome vows fealty to American principles for a selfish purpose and not in good faith. Is there an American who thinks she will hesitate to receive heretics when she betrays her oldest friend in Europe? Professions of loyalty are easily made. Rome was untrifling in her professions of attachment to monarchy in France. We could easily cite a thousand instances. Yet when the real test came these professions were shown to be hollow and worthless."

But, it will be objected, why not give Rome a chance? It is true she has betrayed the royalists of France, but what of that? It has never been shown, objecting friends will say, that she is unfaithful to her political obligations in a republican country. Let such go with me over the recent history of the oldest republic of the Christian era. I do not wish to speak of those alleged republics to the south of us. Let us briefly glance over the history of Switzerland in the period extending from 1830 to 1848.

In the year 1830 a tidal wave of democracy and reform swept over the rock-bound republic. The events in Paris in the summer of that year gave new impetus to those Swiss patriots who felt the necessity of remodeling antiquated forms and institutions on a broad, liberal, modern and national

basis. The desire for reform extended even to the Catholic church, or more properly speaking, to Swiss Catholics, who felt the insufficiencies and positive defeat of their church. A very distinct reformed Catholic movement was started by three honest and able Catholic friends in Switzerland—Felix Hebeling, Christopher Fuchs and Alois Fuchs. By their sermons and writings these three priests succeeded in rousing education from ultramontane influences. When the bishops of St. Gall threatened them with ecclesiastical censures the retaliated by proclaiming the necessity of diocesan synods after the manner of the ancient church. Shortly after this one of the priests preached a sermon fraught with Protestant ideas, and as he was unwilling to recant, he was deposed from office by an inquisitorial tribunal. The reformed Catholic movement had alarmed the ultramontanes, and they now set to work to prevent if possible the recurrence of such a movement. The Catholic or Ultramontane party forced the issue, first on the full and complete restoration of the convents, and in the succeeding years on the admission of the Jesuits into Switzerland.

And right here begins the remarkable resemblance between the American war of secession and the Swiss Roman Catholic confederacy called the Sonderbund, that is, the separated federation. The Romanists who were powerful in seven cantons, conceived the idea of breaking away from the old Helvetic union and forming a new confederacy, dedicated to the proposition that the Roman Church is supreme in political not less than in spiritual matters. The Jesuits found an entrance into the powerful cantons of Lucerne and Schwyz. The one object of the Jesuits was from thence forward to split the Swiss union and to destroy every vestige of Protestantism in those cantons which they already controlled. The attention of the great American apostle of Roman toleration is herewith respectfully called to an instance of the Catholic brand of this equality. As soon as the Jesuits had gained complete ascendancy in the canton of Wallis, where the Protestants, though in the minority, were yet a respectable large part of the inhabitants, they summarily suppressed all forms of Protestant worship and would not even allow prayer meetings in private houses.

This, tolerant and persuasive cardinal, happened not in the dark ages or in the days of the Spanish Inquisition, but in the months of June and July in the year of our Lord 1844. This occurred at the very time when the Protestant and liberal City of Zurich had made new and large concessions to the Romanists, who were very scarce in the community of Zurich. The Jesuits in Wallis and the bishop of Wallis went yet further. They made it a misdemeanor to bury Protestants in any cemetery under the control of either city, church or state. They reorganized and subjected to their control every school in the canton, and the bishop solemnly declared that toleration was in contradiction to the fundamental laws of the Roman Catholic Church. Nor did the Jesuits stop here. The good old democratic form of government was swept away; the right of suffrage was curtailed; the right to revise the constitution was circumscribed and limited; arbitrary power was conferred on the State Council and the judicial tribunals were practically made powerless. (See constitution of the Canton of Wallis of 1839 and 1844, Snell, Swiss jurisprudence Vol. II, pp. 856 and 895. Baumgarten Vol. III, pp. 170-172.)

Then began the real contest by the Jesuits against the old Swiss union. The government of Lucerne had put down with an iron hand the popular revolt against the hated order. Many brave and daring men were put to death because they loved their country more than the society of Loyola. The jails were filled with anti-Jesuits. The Jesuits, however, when the year 1847 came around, had been so successful in their agitation for a new Swiss Roman Catholic confederacy that seven cantons had fully resolved to break away from the old Helvetic union if they could not force Romanism and Jesuitism upon the whole of Switzerland. Secession was preached in the name of Rome. The Catholic canton Schwyz was one of the hot-beds of secession. The rebels made pilgrimages to St. Mary's Convent at Einsiedeln in Wallis the officers of the secessionist forces touched their swords to "holy relics." In Lucerne the Papal ambassador blessed the flags of rebellion. In every separatist canton the priests and monks distributed *amulets* and *agnus Dei* to the soldiers of the new confederacy. The Protestants and liberal cantons did not want the war. No stone was left unturned to avert the fraternal conflict. Basel, a Protestant

canton, on behalf of the loyal Swiss offered to submit the Jesuit question to the Pope, but the Romanists refused to entertain the proposition unless the question of convents generally was also submitted to the same tribunal. The Jesuits were the enemies of peace. Their only object was the disruption of the Swiss union. The agents of the Order of Loyola sought to effect an alliance between the new confederacy and foreign Catholic powers. Austria and Sardinia supported the rebels with money and arms. France instructed her ambassador to give all possible aid and comfort to the Sonderbund. But the old Swiss spirit was at last roused to its highest pitch. In every Protestant canton the cry went up, "The Union forever! The Jesuit must and shall go!" A small array advanced against Lucerne, the bulwark of Romanism. In vain did the Jesuit priests seek to animate the courage of the rebel guards by telling them about apparitions of the Virgin Mary. Lucerne was taken. In every canton the Helvetic federal troops were welcomed as deliverers. The Sonderbund was gone. The Jesuits were driven out of the country forever. Never since has Switzerland been threatened by internal dissensions. She has entered on a career of prosperity, which lasts to this day.

History repeats itself. The plans of the Papacy never change. Rome's means will always vary; her end will always be the same. The advancement of the Papal power is the end, everything else is a means to that end. Will Americans and Protestants take heed and oppose the arrogant claims of the Vatican. There is one sure way to do it. It was said of old Cato that he rightly foresaw the danger from the growing influence of Carthage. He let no opportunity escape to call the attention of his countrymen to the necessity of conquering Carthage. In the council chamber, at his table, in conversation with a friend on the street, he always ended his remarks by saying, "Ceterum censeo Carthaginem esse delendam."—"Lastly I believe that Carthage must be destroyed."

I say Romanism must be opposed by the simple preaching of Christ. We must incessantly pray to God that He might bless our efforts to free Roman Catholics from bondage. The Catholics are our brothers; they live and work with us; they have hearts and intellects and aspirations like ourselves; but they are the victims of prejudice and ignorance. With the grace of Christ let us brush away this prejudice and overcome this ignorance. In the loving spirit of the Master let us show to them the truth as God has given it to us to see, and then let us ask the blessing of Christ on our humble but sincere efforts.

Death of Ex-Gov. Gardner.

Henry J. Gardner, ex-governor of Massachusetts, died at his home in Milton, this state, on the 21st inst. Mr. Gardner was elected governor for three successive terms by the native American or Know-nothing party, his first election in 1854, being the most sweeping ever known in the Commonwealth.

In his inaugural address in January, 1855, he said:

"The honor of the American flag should be confined only to those who are born on the soil hallowed by its protection. They alone can justly be required to vindicate its rights. One of my earliest official acts then, will be, if sanctioned as the law requires, by the advice and consent of the executive council, whom you will select, to disband all military companies composed of persons of foreign birth."

Immediately after, seven military companies, composed largely of Irish Roman Catholics, were disbanded as inimical to the safety of the Commonwealth.

Our fathers were wiser in their generation than we are.—Boston Citizen.

COMPLIMENTARIES.

Ex-Gov. Furnas, secretary of the agricultural association, who kindly remembered the editor of THE AMERICAN, and sent him a complimentary ticket to the state fair which is held in Lincoln from September 2nd to September 9th, inclusive, is entitled to and is tendered our thanks.

Hon. L. E. Walker will accept our thanks for a complimentary ticket to the Beatrice chautauqua August 3rd, when Hon. Wm. McKinley, Jr., addressed the multitude in attendance.

Chief Seavey has also remembered us. He has forwarded us a ticket to the tenth annual picnic of the Omaha police which occurs August 10, 1892. For which we are duly thankful. Waterloo is the place where the hours of recreation will be spent. All Protestants should attend. We understand the Romans have boycotted the enterprise.