

THE AMERICAN.

Entered at Postoffice as second-class matter. JOHN C. THOMPSON, Editor. W. C. KELLEY, Business Manager.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY THE AMERICAN PUBLISHING COMPANY, 1315 HOWARD STREET, OMAHA, NEB.

THE AMERICAN OFFICES. 1315 Howard Street, Omaha, Neb. 134 Powell Ave., Station "G," Chicago, Ill. P. O. Box 1488, Cripple Creek, Colo.

\$2.00 a Year, Strictly in Advance.

TO THE PUBLIC. THE AMERICAN IS NOT THE ORGAN of any sect, order, association, party, clique, faction or division of the population of this grand Republic...

AUGUST 21, 1896.

THE TICKETS.

- REPUBLICAN. For President, WM. MCKINLEY, of Ohio. For Vice-President, GARRET A. HOBART, of New Jersey. DEMOCRATIC. For President, WM. JENNINGS BRYAN, of Nebraska. For Vice-President, ARTHUR C. SEWALL, of Maine. PROHIBITION. For President, JOSHUA LEVERING, of Maryland. For Vice-President, HALE JOHNSTON, of Illinois. NATIONAL. For President, CHARLES E. BENTLEY, of Nebraska. For Vice-President, J. H. SOUTHWATE, of North Carolina.

No man in Missouri should throw his vote away this year.

MARK HANNA is a thorough politician, but he should not be accused of being a Jesuit.

If free silver increases the price of the articles you consume will it also increase your wages?

The first thing to do to make this country prosperous is to put the idle workmen back into the shops.

WHAT difference does it make to you how cheap things are if you do not have the money to buy them?

SOME of our very rabid free silver exchanges can see nothing good in McKinley and nothing bad in Bryan.

OUR friend G. S. Ambler is still in the race for city councilman from the Seventh ward. His friends are legion.

THERE is no doubt but what the Democrats nominated their most popular man for president. It is equally true the Republicans did the same thing.

ROMANISM is playing both ends against the middle. She appears in the role of special champion of both the leading candidates, but through the confessional she is instructing for but one, so far as we can learn.

EVERY American in the state of Nebraska should go to the polls with the determination of re-electing the best attorney-general the state has ever had. A. S. Churchill is able, painstaking and trustworthy. He should get your vote and the vote of your friends.

WHILE we are not saying very much at present about whom we intend to support for the presidency, we are accumulating as much evidence as it is possible to get hold of, which we intend to use later on. When the proper time comes there will be no lack of interest manifested by THE AMERICAN.

THE letter of Mr. Rayhorn lets the public into the secret of how the daily press stoops to do the dirty work of Rome, by misrepresenting and lying about the A. P. A. The Inter Ocean and the other daily papers of Chicago ought to be ashamed of themselves for being parties to the slanderous attacks upon the A. P. A.

THE Democratic headquarters at Chicago are manned by certain Roman- Irish politicians, and it is safe to say that if Mr. Bryan places his campaign in the hands of this class of people he cannot expect to receive the support of the great mass of patriotic American voters. They have learned to judge politicians by the class of people with whom they train.

THE FOOL KILLER HAS NOT BEEN IN ILLINOIS LATELY.

LACLEDE, Ill., August 15, 1896.—EDITOR THE AMERICAN.—Dear Sir: I understand McKinley's wife is a Romanist. How is it you were ready to lie about Bryan's wife, stating she was a Romanist, when it was not true, and keep silent about old McKinley's? I have been a Republican ten years—voted that way—but I would not vote for McKinley under any consideration, and I do not see how any friend could. I think if THE AMERICAN wanted to be true to Americans it would inform us that live in the country all about these men on both tickets alike. While I lived in Chicago I could attend my council and know all these things; now I rely on THE AMERICAN. Please tell the people that old McKinley's wife is a Romanist, and be honest and fair with all. Respectfully, G. W. BENTLEY.

This paper never was guilty of telling a lie about Mrs. Bryan or any other person. It does not have to lie to uphold American principles, and it would not uphold them if it did have to. Mrs. McKinley, like Mrs. Bryan, is a Protestant, and any man who says she is not is either woefully ignorant or willfully untruthful. There is no principal of the A. P. A. involved in this presidential campaign. If there was we would not be holding our peace and telling you to vote as Republicans and Democrats, as Free Silverites and Goldbugs or as Populists and Prohibitionists. We would be an out and out advocate of some party and of some candidate. We have never hesitated to take sides, and will not hesitate to take sides in the present campaign whenever we have proof that either candidate is antagonistic to the principles or the organization we have fought to uphold for nearly six years. When we get that information we shall publish it, and though every subscriber was like our correspondent, a free silver man, and looked upon W. J. Bryan as a modern Moses, and the evidence was against their candidate, we would publish it and ask them if their obligation was binding only when it suited their fancy and not when their principles or their organization was denounced or assailed. Were the evidence against Wm. McKinley and were our subscribers all McKinley men we would do the same.

The principles for which we have contended for more than five years are as dear to us today as they were the day we espoused them and they shall be as fearlessly and as ably upheld in the future as they were in the past. No blatant member of the order can make us think our duty is different to what it is. We know what our duty is. We have been schooled by that most capable and efficient teacher—experience—and she has left this impress upon our mind—though a man be a Republican, a Democrat or a Populist, yet does not believe in the principles enunciated by the A. P. A. he is not a fit man to elect to office or clothe with official dignity or authority.

GLAD SHE WON.

The Chicago daily papers have had a great deal to say in condemnation of the A. P. A. because they alleged the order refused to give a prize to a young lady because she was a Roman Catholic. Now comes the chairman of the committee with a letter which knocks their lies into a cocked hat. It reads as follows:

"CHICAGO, Ill., August 15.—TO THE EDITOR: As chairman of the committee having charge of the A. P. A. picnic at River Grove Park on Saturday, I desire to make a statement, in behalf of the committee and the order, regarding the prize won by Miss Katie Rider—as her name now appears to be. "Miss Rider entered the race, which was free for all, upon my personal solicitation. She won the prize, and had it been on the grounds she would have received it then and there. It is simply a misunderstanding on the part of the press reports that she would not receive it. None of those in authority—the committee and judges—had any intention whatever of not granting it to her, and none of them stopped to ask the question whether Miss Rider was a Protestant or a Catholic.

"She entered under no false colors whatever, and I am glad she won the prize, and hope she enjoyed herself during the day. She was just as welcome to the grounds as any member of the order, and will receive the prize as soon as the full committee meets to dispose of all matters before it. CHARLES RAYHORN, Chairman."

"Rome Alters Her Face—Her Heart Neyer."

"Like the moon, always changing; but, semper idem, Rome alters her face; her heart, never." In commenting upon the latest encyclical of Leo XIII., Harper's Weekly, of July 25, says: "One learns a lesson from this last encyclical from the Vatican—that Rome has lost nothing of its monumental egotism. The invitation of the thirteenth lion to all the lambs to come into union with might easily have been made by Leo X. or Gregory VII. It is musty with the antiquities of the temporal power of four centuries ago. The dust of the centuries flies out of it as one turns over its parchment pages * * * still there is a difference in the way of putting things nowadays. Even a pope scolds no more. The language of the authoritative magistratum is calm. There is nothing of the older blunder. The anathemas against Protestants are forgotten, as though veritable antiques. This is a gain for the courtesy of words. Never more

will the pope speak as universal master.

However, like the moon, a change of face is no evidence of a change of heart. He still claims supreme authority—sovereign authority which the whole community is bound to obey. And this he declares "is absolutely necessary." Now "sovereign power" means temporal power as well as spiritual power, for he declares that "for the due preservation of the unity of the faith it is not sufficient that the head should have been charged merely with the office of superintendent, or should have been invested solely with the power of direction; but it is absolutely necessary that he should have received real and sovereign authority which the whole community is bound to obey." It is for this temporal power that the popes of Rome have been mourning the desolations of the church, mourning her widowhood for nearly a century. It is for the temporal power—"real and sovereign authority"—that they may apply the screws of the inquisition upon all those who refuse to obey that they continually work. The German Catholic congress at Louisville, Ky., September 26, 1894, voiced the sentiment of the Roman Catholic hierarchy upon this subject, as follows:

"We again express our filial love and reverence to our Holy Leo XIII., and the name of that liberty bestowed upon his church by God himself, we declare that the first condition of such liberty consists in the entire independence of the head of the Catholic church from every earthly power. The only solution of the Roman question accessible to the Catholics must, therefore, imply the territorial independence of the holy see, the terms for which must be stipulated by the holy father himself." It was in March of the same year that M. Jansens (Catholic) contended in the Belgian parliament "that papal independence was essential for the accomplishment of his (the pope's) mission; and that it was in the pope that the hopes for the future of Christendom lay." Woe the day when these hopes shall be realized. Lovers of liberty, sleep not! Study anew the principles involved in a separation from Rome, lest while we oppose that church alone we establish a veritable image to the papacy! The very spirit of the papacy is in the air.

Leased Church Property. Montgomery Ward & Co. have leased from the Catholic bishop of Chicago the property at the northwest corner of Michigan avenue and Madison street, for a period of 43 years, 10 months and 16 days, from July 15, 1896, to May 31, 1940, at a rental of \$6,650 a year, until June 1, 1910; \$7,600 a year for 15 years, and for the last term of 15 years \$11,400 a year. The transaction was negotiated by George P. Merrick, representing Montgomery Ward & Co., and General George W. Smith representing the Catholic bishop. The ground has a frontage of 38 feet on Michigan avenue, and 162 1/2 feet on Madison street. The rentals are based on a valuation of \$3,500 a front foot for the first term of 15 years, \$4,000 a front foot for the second term, and \$6,000 a front foot for the last term of 15 years. It will be seen that the average rental is \$8,743.17 a year, for convenience taking the term as 44 years. Figuring on the same basis the frontage value is \$4,590 a foot and \$23.38 a square foot.—The Economist.

Bishop Foley Is Overruled. MARSHALL, Mich., Aug. 17.—Word was received here by Rev. Friar P. A. Baart to-day that Cardinal Satolli had overruled the decision of Bishop Foley of the Michigan diocese in removing Rev. Frank Kennedy from Ypsilanti to Niles, and had decided that the removal had been made without sufficient cause. The cardinal decided that the bishop had overridden a law of the church which provides that no priest shall be transferred from a larger to a smaller parish unless punishment is intended, and the bishop had expressly stated that in the Kennedy case no punishment was meant.

Father Baart states that he has received definite information that Martinelli has been appointed Satolli's successor, and that the official announcement will be made after next Sunday, when Martinelli will be consecrated as bishop in Rome.

Probably Too Much Booze. HAVANNA, Ill., Aug. 17.—Rev. Father B. E. O'Mahony of the local Catholic church became suddenly insane Sunday afternoon while delivering a sermon at Manito, in this county. He became violent and it required the combined strength of six men to get him into subjection. He was brought to Havana, and has been raving all day. It is thought that brooding over his financial condition, hard study, and the excessive heat of the last few days combined to bring about his present unfortunate condition.

A Good Child is usually healthy, and both conditions are developed by the use of proper food. The Gall Borden Eagle Brand Condensed Milk is the best infant's food; so easily prepared that improper feeding is inexcusable and unnecessary.

ROME MUST SANCTION.

(Continued From First Page.)

The Catholics of this land, in which he declares he has so great an interest. It is not needful that in any of his utterances he should have the sanctions of councils, for his utterances are "irreformable" by any authority whatsoever. The extravagance of Boniface VIII. gained in his day, the 13th century, some force by being approved by the "Fifth Lateran Council," where Pope Leo X. declared: "We, with the approbation of the present holy council, do renew and approve that holy constitution;" but those of Leo XIII. in the 19th century, have in themselves the force of law with all loyal Romanists, and from them there is no appeal. "There can be no doubt," says Baronius, one of the foremost of Roman Catholic theologians, "but that the civil principally is subject to the sacerdotal, and that God hath made the political government subject to the dominion of the Spiritual church."

In his encyclical, given the 10th day of January, 1890, the present pope, after placing his own utterances on the same level with those of the Lord Jesus Christ, affirming that "no one can serve two masters," and that "we ought to obey God rather than man," declares, from this standpoint, what is the duty of Romanists in this century as citizens, in language which either places Romanists in direct conflict with all laws not sanctioned by papal authority, or marshals them as one man, under their priestly leaders, to control the affairs of states in accordance with the laws and canons of the church.

The importance of these utterances cannot be overestimated in dealing with Romanism in the United States, and some paragraphs which most immediately concern the voters of the United States are here quoted. The encyclical proceeds by regular steps from its assumption of authority equal to that of our Lord Himself and gains added significance from previous and subsequent declarations and the trend of events:

"It cannot be doubted," says Leo, "that in actual life the duties of Catholics are more numerous and greater than the duties of those who have not a proper grasp of the Catholic faith or are altogether devoid of it."

To understand what follows one needs to remember that the politics of Leo XIII. and the modern papacy concern themselves with two main objects, viz.: The restoration of the temporal power, and the upbuilding of the interests of Romanism. In a land where the people rule themselves and are formed into political parties, the problem before the Roman Catholic leaders is, therefore, how to control the state through popular suffrage and by political methods, and that the state ought to be separated from the church and the church from the state, and in the case of conflicting laws between the civil and ecclesiastical powers the latter laws should prevail (See pron. 42-55), becomes at once a vital question and must be met by him at the outset. Therefore says the pope referring to the love of country which has made Italian unity, English freedom, the American republic and liberty-loving peoples everywhere:

"The supernatural love of the church and the natural love of country are two loves proceeding from the same eternal principle * * * whence it follows that there can be no repugnance between the duties which they impose * * * nevertheless the order of these duties is sometimes subverted * * * cases happen in which the state demands one thing from the citizens and religion the opposite from Christians, and this undoubtedly for no other reason than that the heads of the state pay no regard to the sacred power of the church or desire to make it subject to them * * * none, however, can doubt which is to receive the preference * * * It is an impious deed to break the laws of Jesus Christ for the purpose of obeying the magistrates, or to transgress the laws of the church under the pretext of obeying the civil law."

To get the full force of this one needs to recall the teachings and practice of Romanism for centuries on such matters as schools, the religious orders, civil marriage, and the Catholic as the only recognized religion. All the positions of the Roman Catholic leaders on these questions had been met by civil enactments in Italy, Mexico, France, Austria and other Roman Catholic countries in spite of the protests of Pius IX. and the bitter opposition of the clerical party. The religious orders have been largely suppressed and their property confiscated by civil processes; marriage was performed by the civil authorities; schools free from priestly control had been established by the state; other persons than Romanists had the privilege of public worship according to the forms they chose; and Leo XIII., in 1890, declares it "an impious deed to transgress the laws of the church under the pretext of obeying the civil law." What is this but inciting to rebellion under cover of religion? Do we wonder that an Italian parliament has enacted almost unanimously in their Penal Code clauses which threaten with:

"Fine, imprisonment and dismissal from office any minister of religion, who, in the exercise of his priestly functions, speaks against the unity of Italy, or excites to the non-recognition of the laws and institutions of the state, or who disturbs the peace of families."

Some such legislation might not be amiss in these United States. If Mormonism and Anarchism need some checks, may not Romanism as well in its denunciation of and warfare upon our public schools, and in its excommunication of persons within its pale who are married by the civil authorities or by Protestant ministers? Shall any pains or penalties of any nature be inflicted by any class upon those who in the exercise of their undoubted rights under our civil laws and free constitutions leave the Roman Catholic church, send their children to the public schools, or are married in accordance with our American laws? Italy and Mexico will have none of it, why should we?

State Law, Church Law.

"But," says Leo in this encyclical, "if the laws of the state are in open contradiction with the divine law; if they command anything prejudicial to the church or are hostile to the duties imposed by religion (the Roman Catholic religion, with its exclusiveness, anathemas and denunciations of liberty, progress and modern civilization), or violate in the person of the supreme pontiff the authority of Jesus Christ, then, indeed, it is a duty to resist them—and a crime to obey them—a crime fraught with injury to the state itself."

This in 1890 is but an amplification of the papal theory as to the supremacy of the church and the pope over all civil authorities, which had been consistently held by Leo XIII., while Cardinal Pecci.

"Can it be intelligible," said the cardinal, "that the living interpreter of the Divine law and will should be placed under the jurisdiction of the civil authority?" * * * Now, as pope, he declares "he must be free to communicate without impediment with bishops, sovereigns, subjects, in order that his word, the organ and expression of the Divine will, may have a free course all over the earth; and be there canonically announced."

Referring as cardinal to the laws enacted in Umbria, requiring the clergy to accept the separation of church and state and to conform to the laws, he said:

"They are offered, as the basis of reconciliation, the acceptance of the condemned and false system of the separation of church and state, which, being equivalent to divorcing the state from the church, would force Catholic society to free itself from all religious influence."

In his first encyclical, after being elected to the papal chair, after deploring all the evils that have fallen upon the times and mankind, he declares: "The cause of all these evils lies principally in this, that men have despised and rejected the holy and august authority of the church, which, in the name of God, is placed over the human race, and is the avenger and protector of all legitimate authority. * * * If any sensible man in our day," he adds, "will compare the age in which we live, so bitterly hostile to the religion and Church of Christ (the Roman church) to those blessed ages when the church was honored as a mother of nations, he will surely find that the society of our day, so convulsed by revolutions and destructive upheavals, is moving straightway and rapidly toward its ruin, etc."

To save these United States from this general destruction, we are to have a permanent apostolic delegate who shall be able to enforce the instructions and decrees of this prince of princes and ruler of the earth.

And what are these instructions in general in 1890 to all Romanists in the United States, as stated in this encyclical?

First.—Obedience. This is the key to the whole papal system.

"Now the Roman pontiff is the supreme ruler of the church."

Second.—Stand together in political action.

"Furthermore, in politics which are inseparably bound up with the laws of morality and religious duties, men ought always and in the first place to take care to serve as far as possible the interests of Christianity"—that is of Roman Catholicism, for in this same epistle Leo, in speaking of the Catholic religion, says, "which is the only true religion."

Third.—Support no one for office who is not Romanist in sentiment, if not in faith.

"And since the fate of states depends principally upon the dispositions of those who are at the head of the government, the church cannot grant its favor or patronage to men whom it knows to be hostile to it. * * * Its duty is to favor those who, having sound ideas as to the relations between church and state, wish to make them both harmonize for the common good."

What those sound ideas are the previous lines show in the language of the pontiff himself, and it only needs to note that they are in direct and irreconcilable conflict with the whole American thought for us to see that

this is practically a call on all Romanists, under ecclesiastical leadership, to directly or indirectly, as far as possible, nullify our constitutions and laws relating to separation of church and state.

Fourth.—The school system of the United States is to be negated as far as possible. For in relation to the education of the children by other than Romanist methods he says to Catholic parents:

"It is therefore a strict obligation for parents to be careful and neglect no effort to energetically repel every outrageous injustice of the kind, and to maintain exclusive authority over the education of their children."

Fifth.—All political action is to be taken under the initiative of the pontiff himself, and through the ecclesiastical leaders of Romanism, for

"The civil prudence of individuals seems to consist wholly in faithfully executing the precepts of legitimate authority. * * * And so much the more because the political prudence of the supreme pontiff extends to a large number of subjects. In effect he has only to govern the entire church, but also to order and regulate the actions of Christian citizens in view of the realization of their eternal salvation. It will thus be seen how indispensable it is that beside the perfect concord which ought to reign in their thoughts and actions, the faithful should always religiously take as the rule of their conduct the political wisdom of the ecclesiastical authority."

Before reaching the statement which thus embodies the substance of all political duty on the part of Romanists, this labored encyclical had carried the "faithful" by careful steps, over such steps, over such general ground as that:

"The union of minds, then, requires * * * perfect submission and obedience of will to the church and to the sovereign pontiff as to God Himself. * * * Obedience ought to be perfect * * * nay, if it is not absolute and complete in all respects it is deprived of its essence. * * * In fixing the limits of obedience, let no one think that it is due to the authority of the bishops, and especially of the Roman pontiff, merely in matters of dogma. * * * Man's duties, that is to say, what he ought to believe and what he ought to do, is by Divine right laid down by the church and in the church by the supreme pontiff."

Nothing can be plainer than the propositions here stated, and lest any Romanist should venture to hint that this is utterly destructive of freedom and makes them all slaves of their bishops and the pope, Leo XIII. declares of the bishops:

"Should any of the latter (bishops) lay himself open to criticism either in his conduct or in the opinions he maintains, it does not belong to any individual to arrogate to himself in his own regard the office of judge, confided * * * to the sole pastor (Leo). * * * The actions of superiors ought not to be struck at with the sword of speech even when they appear to merit a censure."

Bonacum, Satolli and the Civil Laws.

As an illustration of the manner in which Romanists are in bondage to their bishops, under the present regime, the case of Bishop Bonacum of Nebraska is a recent and pertinent illustration. In 1893 Mgr. Satolli had a long list of charges against this ecclesiastical placed in his hands by priests, of which the following are samples: He had gone into speculation with two priests of the diocese of St. Louis to purchase lands at Lincoln, a part of which he seeks to unload on this diocese at more than double the cost. He is untruthful. Few priests in the diocese will believe his word, and in his malicious untruthfulness he has scandalized the public by denunciation of the clergy, publishing that six of his priests are "infamous and" notorious criminals."

He has never made a financial statement and has certainly appropriated large sums of money. He has not preached a sermon since he came here seven years ago, and the priests are heart broken.

These and other charges of a most scandalous nature against this bishop went, signed by ten well-known priests, to the representative of the papacy in Washington without avail. Finally a suit was entered in the courts, as the only remedy available by one of the aggrieved parties, whereupon Satolli wrote to Bishop Bonacum under date of February 7, 1894:

"Language fails me to express how deeply I deplore and condemn the action of Father Corbett in citing before the civil court the sacred person of his own bishop. * * * Therefore Father Corbett's actions, so grievously offending his bishop's dignity, and authority, deserves the highest censure, and also ecclesiastical punishment. * * * Be pleased, then, right reverend and dear sir, to accept the sincerest expression of my condolence, and my solemn protest against all that has been done to the sacred person, dignity, and authority by a priest, who besides trampling under foot the ecclesiastical laws, dared to take advantage of the civil conditions existing in this country, to cause so much scandal," etc. Satolli had previously declared and