

# THE AMERICAN.

WEEKLY NEWSPAPER.

"AMERICA FOR AMERICANS."—We hold that all men are Americans who swear Allegiance to the United States without a mental reservation in favor of the Pope.

PRICE FIVE CENTS

VOLUME IV.

OMAHA, NEBRASKA, FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 2, 1894.

NUMBER 44

## FRIEND OR FOE!

Which Shall Govern the State, is the Question that Confronts the American People in Nebraska Today.

## SHALL IT BE A PATRIOT?

Or Shall It Be the Nominee of the Party That Was Controlled and Dominated By the Roman Catholic Church.

## A VITAL QUESTION.

And One Which Should Receive the Careful, Prayerful Consideration of Every Protestant Before He Casts His Ballot Next Tuesday.

## SOME SCRAPS OF HISTORY.

Tuesday of next week a jury of nearly two hundred thousand loyal Americans will sit in judgment upon the case of Hon. Thomas J. Majors vs. Hon. Silas A. Holcomb, and from their verdict there will be no appeal.

Before the case is finally left with that jury for a fair and impartial adjudication, we, not as the representative or the paid champion of either of the honorable gentlemen, desire to submit a statement of facts to the jury, which we hope will receive its careful and thoughtful consideration.

In the first place we have not a single word to utter against the personal character of either of the plaintiffs who will appear at the bar of public opinion on the sixth day of November. We believe they are both honest, honorable, fair and capable men. Mr. Holcomb has that reputation among his neighbors in Custer county, and Mr. Majors we know to be such from a personal acquaintance with him of almost a quarter of a century.

With two such excellent men to choose from one would naturally suppose that Nebraskans could make no mistake in choosing; and they could not were there no foreign influences to take into consideration.

To those influences we now invite your attention—admitting in advance that they are more serious than many of you have realized.

To begin with we shall take the case of Hon. Thos. J. Majors. He was nominated by a convention that was overwhelmingly Protestant, even though it was known that he had been publicly branded by the Omaha Bee as a member of the A. P. A. and with the full knowledge that such a charge would be used to his detriment throughout the pending campaign, in every Roman Catholic community.

To be sure there were a large number of A. P. A. men in the convention which nominated him—but a large majority of them favored Hon. J. H. McColl. This you know to be so if you consider the situation carefully. The great hot-bed of A. P. A.ism, Douglas county, cast its 108 votes for McColl, and more than seventy-five per cent of that number were members of the A. P. A. But those gentlemen were Republicans, and are not sulking in their tents. They are today doing all in their power for their party nominee. But suppose Tom Majors was an A. P. A., is there anything in the platform of principles of that association which any loyal American can object to? You shall be the judge. These are the principles of the A. P. A.

The following are the declarations of principles adopted by the National Council of the A. P. A. at Des Moines:

"Loyalty to true Americanism, which knows neither birth, place, race, creed, nor party, is the first requirement for membership in the American Protective Association. It is, therefore, opposed to the holding of offices in state or national government by any subject or supporter of such ecclesiastical power."

"We uphold the constitution of the United States of America, and no portion of it more than its guarantee of religious liberty, but we hold this religious liberty to be guaranteed to the individual, and not to mean that under its protection any un-American ecclesiastical power can claim any absolute control over the education of American children. To keep them such, we protest against the employment of subjects of any

un-American ecclesiastical power as officers or teachers of our public schools.

"We condemn the support of the public treasury by direct appropriation or by contract of any sectarian school, reformatory or other institution not owned and controlled by public authority."

"Believing that exemption from taxation is equivalent to a grant of public funds, we demand that no real or personal property be exempt from taxation, the title to which is not vested in the national or state governments, or in any of their subdivisions."

"We protest against the enlistment in the United States army, navy, or the militia of any state, of any person not an actual citizen of the United States."

"We demand for the protection of our citizen laborers the prohibition of the importation of pauper labor, and the restriction of all immigration to persons who cannot show their ability and honest intention to become self-supporting American citizens."

"We demand the change of the naturalization laws by a repeal of the act authorizing the naturalization of minors, without a previous declaration of intention, and by providing that no alien shall be naturalized or permitted to vote in any state in the union who cannot speak the language of the land, and who cannot prove seven years consecutive residence in this country from the date of his declaration of his intention."

"We protest against the gross negligence and laxity with which the judiciary of our land administer the present naturalization laws, and against the practice of naturalizing aliens at the expense of committees or candidates as the most prolific source of the present prostitution of American citizenship to the basest uses."

"We demand that all hospitals, asylums, reformatories, or other institutions in which people are under restraint, be at all times subject to public inspection, whether they are maintained by the public or by private corporations or individuals."

"We demand that all national or state legislation affecting financial, commercial or industrial interests be general in character and in no instance in favor of any one section of the country, or any one class of the people."

Is there a principle therein you cannot indorse? No; not one; and yet there will be an effort made to defeat Mr. Majors because he is accused of being a member of an organization that is waging a relentless war against foreign ecclesiastical interference in our affairs of state.

This much we can say of Mr. Majors without endorsing him. Now for Mr. Holcomb. He is the nominee of the Populist convention. Made such to secure the support of the Omaha Bee which never supports a Republican for an office whom it does not believe it can control. He is also the nominee of the free silver wing of the Democracy.

The Populist convention which nominated Mr. Holcomb was in the main Protestant, yet Douglas and Lancaster counties sent a large number of Roman Catholics as delegates, and they were active in their support of the nominee. From that day until the meeting of the Democratic convention in Omaha, under the call of Euclid Martin, a concerted effort was made by the church of Rome to obtain control of it. And it succeeded. We illustrated with Douglas county before, when we spoke of the convention which nominated Tom Majors, suppose we do the same thing now while considering the Democratic convention which nominated Mr. Holcomb. Let us see, did the Roman Catholics control that convention? Most assuredly. Look at the list of delegates from Omaha and South Omaha who sent the delegates to the Democratic state convention as published below:

FIRST WARD.  
Owen Slaven. John Powers.  
D. Shannahan. C. Conoyer.  
C. H. Coffner. John Murphy.  
E. P. Mullen. George Bertrand.  
J. T. Conors. H. J. McKenney.  
E. Whalen.

SECOND WARD.  
L. J. Platt. Lee Herdman.  
A. P. Spitko. H. Eisele.  
A. Sloup. J. Sullivan.  
James Sligham. Sol Hopper.  
Peter E. Elsassner. Charles Hinz.  
Fred Bloemer.

THIRD WARD.  
Ed. Rothery. Tom Murphy.  
D. Cosgrove. Gus Carey.

John Reeves. John O'Connell  
Pat Horrigan. Martin Shields.  
Pat Ford. Dick Burdick.  
James O'Donnell.

FOURTH WARD.  
C. H. Brown. P. C. Heafey.  
R. C. Jordan. H. Rosenzweig.  
R. V. Montague. T. J. O'Brien.  
Jeff W. Bedford. Samuel Rees.  
W. S. Shoemaker. C. C. Crawl.  
J. C. Morrison.

FIFTH WARD.  
W. P. Barton. James Daughton.  
I. J. Dunn. Thomas H. Dailey.  
Richard Lawless. P. H. Meehan.  
A. P. McKenna. T. F. O'Brien.  
P. E. O'Donnell. Dr. S. R. Patten.  
John Leahy.

SIXTH WARD.  
George Tierney. John Reed.  
W. H. Chadwick. Joseph Sherry.  
W. A. Page. L. H. Parker.  
Jacob Riner. Charles A. Traay.  
J. E. Reagan. Ed P. Smith.  
Dan B. Honin.

SEVENTH WARD.  
A. Waggoner. Alma Jackson.  
A. Murphy. J. B. Huse.  
M. Hogan. H. J. Farmer.  
William Ackerman. P. Smith.  
J. D. Lacourse. John Dennis.  
James Schneiderwind.

EIGHTH WARD.  
H. C. Miller. J. H. Schmidt.  
John McGorry. W. F. Wappich.  
Barney Boyle. P. E. McKillip.  
James P. Connolly. J. A. Leaney.  
J. A. Connors. John McGreele.  
W. R. O'Shaughnessy.

NINTH WARD.  
C. W. Bryan. John Hope.  
F. W. J. Hart. Joel West.  
M. W. Payne. Ed. W. Kitchin.  
George W. Ames. Ed. Welch.  
C. J. Smyth. C. L. Smith.  
P. W. Birkhauser.

SOUTH OMAHA.—FIRST WARD.  
Ben S. Adams. Sam Gosney.  
Clint Morgan. J. M. Tanner.

SECOND WARD.  
James W. Lowry. John Flynn.  
James Holub. Thomas Flynn.

THIRD WARD.  
C. M. Lyons. P. O. Connor.  
Barney McDermott. Patrick Curtin.

Is there any doubt in your mind as to the complete subjugation of Democracy by the church of Rome? Would a convention of 160 members, of whom more than one-half were Roman Catholics, would that convention send as its representatives men who would betray their confidence? Hardly.

We can say this much without condemning Mr. Holcomb.

Now for the sequel. A large majority of the men who have gone over to the Populist party have been Republicans. Why is it then that ex-Democrats are always to the front asking their suffrages? First it was Edgerton; then it was Holcomb, then Bryan and McKeighan, and now it is Bryan, McKeighan and Holcomb. We heard W. J. Bryan, in nominating Silas A. Holcomb in the Democratic convention declare that "it is true that Mr. Holcomb has changed his party but not his principles—he is as much of a Democrat as ever he was." But we care nothing what ever about his political opinions or his political affiliations aside from the influence that the Roman Catholic church will have over him, by virtue of the votes she can and will deliver to him on election day. Already the edict has gone forth that Tom Majors must be defeated to satisfy the foes of religious freedom and social equality. In Lincoln last Friday John Fitzgerald, O'Shea and a number of other Roman Catholics were in consultation, and they declared that they had intended voting for Thos. J. Majors, but since they had discovered him to be an A. P. A., a member of a Protestant order holding to the principles set forth above, they had concluded to support Holcomb. They also stated at that conference that the following Sunday the priests would through the confessional instruct their members to vote against Majors, and to contribute a certain amount to defray campaign expenses. This is not guesswork on our part. It is an indisputable truth, brought to us by a man who was in the conference and heard the whole deal talked over.

Knowing this to be so; knowing that the church of Rome is secretly moving heaven and earth to encompass Tom Majors' defeat, we feel that Nebraskans, loyal, patriotic American citizens, could and would make a mistake if Holcomb were elected governor of the state of Nebraska.

Today the fight is not between the Republican party and the Populist party, but between loyal American citizens as against a foreign ecclesiastical power which declares its laws above the laws of the state, and that power is the Roman Catholic church.

You may say this is not the doctrine of that church. We say it is and stand ready to prove it. Besides it claims primary allegiance from its communicants. Bishop Gilmore in a recent pas-

toral a few years ago declared that "we are Catholics first and citizens afterwards." John Rush, an ex-city and ex-county treasurer who is president of a bank in Omaha, on the 27th day of June, 1887, gave utterance to exactly the same words. So you see we have a bishop and a layman who believe their allegiance is first to their church then to their country. The reigning pope has given them his opinion of the law, and they have no appeal from his decision, and that opinion is contained in an encyclical dated Jan. 10, 1890, and is "that where the laws of the church and the laws of the state conflict the laws of the church are to be unhesitatingly obeyed."

Such, gentlemen, are the doctrines of the church of Rome, the church that is in politics today and bending every energy to defeat Tom Majors because her henchmen cannot control him, and to elect Gaffin, Ellick and Carey, three men who are known to be abject slaves to the will and wish of the Roman Catholic church.

For these reasons we direct the attention of Protestants to the fact that the defeat of Majors, Churchill and Moore will be hailed by the church of Rome as a signal victory, and we call upon Protestants everywhere to rebuke the pernicious interference of the priests of Rome in our affairs of state.

Of the rest of the state tickets it matters little to Protestants who are elected. Yet we favor the Republican ticket this year because it has no Roman Catholic strings upon it, while the other nominees are in a deal with Rome and expect to profit by her votes.

Will Protestants be a party to the outrage and be used as cats paws to pull Roman Catholic chestnuts out of the fire? If so they will vote with the crowd of priest-ridden Irish who are trying to encompass the defeat of the Republican party. Otherwise they will go to the polls and vote for the very men whom Rome has placed her seal of disapproval upon.

The next thing to be considered is United States senator. That office is filled by the men whom you send to the house of representatives and to the state senate; for that reason care should be taken in the selection of men to that body.

There are, today, practically but two candidates for the position. John M. Thurston and Wm. J. Bryan. The first a Republican the other a hybrid—Romanized-Protestantism and Populized-Democracy. The former wants the flag on every school house, the latter would destroy both by giving public money for sectarian Indian schools—wherein the untutored child of nature is taught to be "Roman Catholics first," and law-abiding wards afterwards. Between these two, what Protestant will hesitate in choosing? Surely not one who loves our free public schools; not one who favors liberty of conscience—a thing denied and condemned by the religio-political organization that is championing Bryan's cause, the Roman Catholic church; not one that believes in free speech and a free press, things which his Roman backers deny in every country where they are in control; nor would it be one who honors the stars and stripes for the success of Rome's subjects, or those who owe their election to her votes, gives birth to and fosters a hate of and contempt for things American on the one hand, and a blindness to and a veneration of the things which are distinctively Roman on the other hand. So, fellow Americans, you who were born here and you who have come from foreign lands, should stand steadfastly and loyally by any man who would make America more American and a trifle less Roman Catholic. The Roman Catholic prelates in convention assembled in Baltimore declared that in 1900 they would take this country and keep it. Are you prepared to give up your liberties for the honors of the inquisition? Are you ready to accept the doctrine of the Roman church that those who are the least educated are the best Christians—in short are you ready to have this nation descend from among the first nations of the earth to the level of Spain, Ireland, Portugal, Mexico, Italy and Hungary—where less than 50 per cent of the people can read and write? If you are not ready you must defeat every man Rome is supporting, from Silas A. Holcomb down to the school director. Now is the time for Americans to bestir themselves, if they would not lose their heritage, and see priest-ruled politicians occupying the various positions, which in time would reek with corruption as vile as the corruption of Tammany in New York, and the Democracy in Chicago.

Protestants in this state should remember that the fight is not between Republicanism and Populism as such as between the church of Rome and Protestantism. Let Mr. Holcomb be elected and Rome will not only claim a victory, but she will rule him with an iron hand.

Are you ready to have church and state united?

Most assuredly you are not.

Then defeat the church of Rome at the polls. She has arrayed herself on the side of Populism, and hopes to ride into power. She has already issued her instructions to her ignorant dupes through the confessional, and those instructions will be repeated before now and election day, and no Roman Catholic will dare to vote against them under pain of eternal damnation, and those instructions are in favor of Holcomb and Bryan. Such is the testimony of not only a man who was present and in conference with Fitzgerald and O'Shea but it is the testimony of Roman Catholic laboring men and Roman Catholic servant girls who keep company with Protestant young men or who work in Protestant families.

The next office on the list is congressman. In the First District the contest is between Strode and Weir. Either one will do. In the Second it is between Boyd, Deaver and Mercer. Boyd trucks to the Roman Catholics, Deaver is a Roman and Dave Mercer is a policy man, and Mercer will be elected. In the Third, Meiklejohn should be elected and so should Andrews in the Fifth. McKeighan voted for every sectarian appropriations which came before congress during his two terms as congressman and Protestants who are opposed to sectarian appropriations should vote against him and in favor of Mr. Andrews. In the Sixth Mat Daugherty and O. M. Kem are the candidates. Mat claims he will get the Roman Catholic vote and he don't give a damn for the A. P. A., while Kem voted for sectarian appropriations. Both should be defeated, yet one or the other is bound to win as there is no third candidate in the field.

Now for the county ticket of Douglas county. The Populist nominees are all unknown except Sam DeNedry who was editor of the Daily News for a time, and Sam is a good fellow, qualified and capable.

The Democratic nominees excepting W. A. Page, W. S. Poppleton, W. S. Felker and Wm. Maxwell are practically unknown to the electors of Douglas county, and Maxwell is a Roman Catholic. Aside from the senatorial ticket, the Democrats never nominated a weaker ticket. Yet, had they nominated the strongest men in their party they would never have elected them on a Bryan platform. The people of this city do not believe in sectarian appropriations being made from our public treasury, and Bryan stands for that very thing. He is on record as voting nearly a million dollars out of the United States treasury and into the coffers of the Roman Catholic church. For that reason the men pledged to his support will be defeated, because Americans believe they will have no power to vote against the man who represents that side of the issue, even though their sympathies may be on the other side.

How different with the nominees on the Republican ticket. Everybody knows them. Start with the senators and go all the way down the list of nominees to the assessor and you find men who have lived in Omaha almost since a time to which the memory of man runneth not, and they will be elected.

In the city of Omaha the Democratic nominees which stand any show of an election are either Roman Catholics or controlled by the Roman Catholic church. In order to secure that vote the nominee for city clerk on the Democratic ticket has denied being a member of the A. P. A. This action will relieve that association of any suspicion of complicity in his failure to report Adam Snyder's shortage as county treasurer, which occurred while he was county auditor. And that failure brands Jack Evans as incompetent or worse. To our way of thinking Evans would be an unsafe man in the office of city clerk, in the light of his official career as county auditor.

Now, let us consider the school board nominations. A fair and candid criticism must leave the nominees of the Republican and Democratic parties on an equal footing as to personal character and qualifications, and any one who undertakes to draw the line on personal character or qualification must base such action on prejudice or favoritism. What then is the difference? One is composed of Democrats, the other of Republicans. But that is a matter of no importance from our stand point. Here is the difference and there is no mistake about it. The Democratic convention was absolutely in the control of the Roman Catholic political power, and it is with the consent and approval of that power that these particular persons are on the ticket.

No one who has given the subject thought can be convinced that the Roman Catholics have suddenly aban-

doned their designs and desires to either Romanize the public school system or destroy it. The methods approved at the present time by the hierarchy of that church are four in number.

The first plan is to procure a division of the school fund, giving to their parochial schools a share of the public money in proportion to the number of their children. When this cannot be done, they resort to a second plan, which is to procure contracts with the board of education to rent the parochial school rooms at a nominal figure and take the schools nominally under the direction of the board, the board paying their teachers and furnishing their school supplies.

The third plan is to procure the appointment of sisters as teachers in the public schools, permitting them to wear their distinctive garb, beads, etc., and permit them to teach their sectarian doctrines certain hours of the day to Roman Catholic children and such others as would voluntarily participate, and to permit the priest to visit at such hours and administer spiritual education.

And the fourth plan is to secure the election of as many Roman Catholics on the board of education as possible, and when it is impossible to elect Roman Catholics secure members of the board who will in return for the support of the Roman Catholics in the election, be "liberal" toward their plans, and secure the selection of as many Roman Catholic teachers as possible who will quietly work to the plans of the organization and keep the priests posted as to the attendance of Catholic children in the public schools; secure the appointment of as many Roman Catholic employees as possible about the school buildings and secure the adoption of text books favorable to the Roman Catholic faith.

The fourth is the usual plan and is in good active working order all over the land—in county, village and city.

Give them the fourth plan this year and they will get the second plan next year, or try very hard for it; and if successful next year, two years hence you may find yourselves fighting against the second plan.

We believe we are informed and therefore assert without fear of successful contradiction, that the Democratic nominees, against whom we have no word of criticism, stand for the fourth plan of the Roman Catholic church to Romanize or destroy the public schools of Omaha. They stand for that plan, even though the individual opinion of some of them is to the contrary. They stand for that plan by virtue of the convention that nominated them, regardless of their individuality.

We believe we are informed and therefore assert without fear of successful contradiction that the Republican nominees stand for the maintenance of the American public school system, without any compromise with the Roman Catholic power, with open arms and outstretched hands inviting every child of any religious denomination, including the Roman Catholic, to come into the public schools without money and without charge. They stand uncompromisingly opposed to any plan of the pope, Satoll, bishop or priest, to Romanize or destroy our public school system, now or hereafter.

That is the honest difference between the two tickets. Which will you prefer?

### WHAT THEY SAY.

"The divine right of kings" is a barbarous myth. "Apostolic succession" may please prelates and bishops and begot the minds of those who never think seriously for themselves, but human liberty never grew into self government under the myths of kingly or hierarchial power.—The Champion-Atchison, Kas.

How Rome does howl at the curtailing of her growing power! She will, have more occasion to howl before she will have less. Rome is the only thing in the United States that is permitted to parade without let or hindrance. Everything else is closed down—shut out—for this great, squalling, illegitimate, beggarly brat.—Queen Bee, Denver, Colo.

The Roman church has seen fit, in its policy to "let up" a little on fraternal societies. We do not ask it. We do not need it. We do not desire it. Our standard of morality is as high. When a candidate knocks at our door for admission we do not ask him to destroy his manhood by ignoring his reason and becoming a bigot. We ask him to be intelligently useful to himself and to his brother. Thus will he most honor God. Our leaders are not tyrants and will not meddle with the private conscience of others, but will insist on the morality of all brothers.—Fraternal News.

Eat Dyball's Candies, 1518 Douglas