
Romanism as a World Power

ADDRESS OF

Luther S. Kauffman

President of

The Anti-Sectarian Appropriation Association

Before

The Methodist Episcopal Ministers Meeting

of Philadelphia, New Jersey and Vicinity
on December 12, 1921

Published by

True American Publishing Company

311 Victory Building

1001 Chestnut Street

Philadelphia, Pa.

Second Edition—August 1, 1922

PRICE \$1.00

(Page Break for margin correction and notes)



Luther S. Kauffman.

**Copyright 1922 by
LUTHER S. KAUFFMAN**

Wesley Hall, 1701 Arch Street,
Philadelphia, Pa.

Luther S. Kauffman, Esq.,

311 Victory Bldg.,

Philadelphia, Pa.

Dear Sir:—

The Philadelphia-New Jersey and Vicinity Methodist Episcopal Preachers' Meeting had the pleasure of listening to your address before that Body on Monday December 12th on "Romanism as a World Power."

The statements you made were revelations to many of us and convinced everyone present that our citizens should be awake to the perils of the situation. All were delighted with the manner in which the question was presented and it was looked upon as one of the most practical and informing addresses ever delivered before that body.

As a Preachers' Meeting we earnestly ask you to have the address published in booklet form as we feel it will be of great service to this Commonwealth and helpful to those who want information concerning this matter.

This action was taken at the regular weekly meeting held January 9th, 1922.

President of Meeting

W. J. DOWNING

Secretary of Meeting

GEORGE W. YARD

January 11, 1922.

Rev. William J. Downing,
President.

Rev. George W. Yard,
Secretary.

The Philadelphia-New Jersey and Vicinity M. E.

Preachers' Meeting, Philadelphia, Pa.

I have today received the copy of the Resolution adopted by The Philadelphia-New Jersey and Vicinity Methodist Episcopal Preachers' Meeting, in which you ask me to publish the address which I made before your body on December 12th, 1921.

I do not have any manuscript of the address, but I will dictate it to my stenographer, as I recollect it, and publish it as you request. I hope I may have it ready by April 1st, 1922.

I thank you very much for your kind expressions of opinion concerning the character of the address. I hope the publication of it will do much good in arousing public attention to the great evils which threaten the existence of our great American Republic.

Sincerely yours,

LUTHER S. KAUFFMAN.

(Page 4 of Book Text is Blank)

Romanism as a World Power

Mr. President and Friends:

It is with very great diffidence that I venture to appear before such a distinguished assemblage of pulpit orators, leaders of thought and men of God, but the great importance of the message which I have to bring to you today, inspires me with courage.

I fear that you, as well as the rest of our fellow citizens, have been so engrossed in the performance of your several duties, that you have paid little attention to the progress of events, and the real condition of affairs affecting, not only the vital interests in this Country, but its very existence, and the permanency of our free institutions, which we all love so well.

The great sin and crime of the American People is indifference to public affairs. We are all of us, so much concerned with the accumulation of wealth, or the pursuit of pleasure, that we forget the great heritage of a free government and free institutions which have been handed down to us by our patriotic fathers.

The American people, as a whole, are very much in the position of a spendthrift, who has inherited a magnificent estate from his forefathers—an estate in which he has had no part in the accumulation thereof—but which he is neglecting and permitting to go to ruin. The beautiful palace in which he lives is going into decay; the beautiful lawn is being filled with weeds; the fences tumbling down; and a general spirit of negligence and wastefulness prevalent everywhere.

So we, in our mad pursuit of wealth and pleasure, and of our own special interests, have neglected the great heritage, which has come down to us from our fathers; a heritage of a free government, and of free institutions; and these we have abandoned, because of our neglect, to our enemies, who are doing their utmost to destroy our Constitution and our Laws and the free institutions, which we ought to hold so dear.

6

IS THE COUNTRY IN PERIL?

Is the Country in peril today from the machinations of its foes? I firmly believe that never in its history was it in such great peril as it is today. If I did not so believe, I would not, at my age, be devoting myself to the task of arousing my fellow-countrymen to the dangers of the situation in the hope that I may be able to induce them to action in defense of these priceless liberties before it is too late.

I believe that the prophetic words of Lincoln are being fulfilled today. Rev. Charles Chiniquy, in his autobiography, on page 715 in describing an interview with President Abraham Lincoln, in Washington, D. C., in June, 1864, thus quotes the President:—"You are almost the only one with whom I speak freely on the subject. But sooner or later, the nation will know the real origin of those rivers of blood and tears, which are spreading desolation and death everywhere. And, then, those who have caused these desolations and disasters will be called to give an account of them."

"I do not pretend to be a prophet. But though not a prophet I see a very dark cloud on our horizon. And that dark cloud is coming from Rome. It is filled with tears of blood. It will rise and increase, till its flanks are torn by a flash of lightning, followed by a fearful peal of thunder. Then a cyclone such as the world has never seen, will pass over this country, spreading ruin and desolation from north to south. After it is over, there will be long days of peace and prosperity: for Popery, with its Jesuits and merciless Inquisition, will have been swept away from our country. Neither I nor you, but our children, will see those things."

Have these days so predicted, arrived?

It is a very serious question therefore, whether or not we have become "degenerate sons of noble sires." Let me call your attention to a few facts. I have before me a leaflet issued by the Bureau of the Census at Washington, entitled "Men

and Women of Voting Age in the Various States of the Union." In this statement I find the following facts:

NUMBER OF POSSIBLE VOTERS IN PENNSYLVANIA

There are in the State of Pennsylvania men of voting age, according to the census of 1920 2,586,323
 There are women of voting age by the same census, 2,452,768
 A total of men and women over 21 years of age 5,039,091

At the Primary Election in this State on September 20, 1921 the vote for all the candidates for all parties for Congressman-at-Large was 1,031,782.

Thus it will be seen that only one-fifth of the voting population in the State of Pennsylvania, took any part in the primary election of 1921.

If these figures are divided by two, because there are but two great parties in the State, it will show that the entire government of the State of Pennsylvania is controlled by about 500,000 voters, or about one-tenth of the voting population of the State.

These figures also show that four-fifths of the possible voting population of the State stay at home; but these stay-at-home-voters are loud in their denunciations of political bosses and corrupt politics.

And who are the men that vote at these elections? Not the refined, the good, the intelligent, the respected of the community—but the voters from the slums, the ward heelers, the criminal classes; whereas the good, and respectable citizens stay at home, and then find fault with the results of the election.

WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR CORRUPT POLITICS?

Who is responsible for corrupt politics and corrupt political bosses? I answer emphatically the men and women, who stay at home and do not vote. These men and women, who thus neglect their political duties are just as much

“Slackers” as the men, who in the late war refused to perform their military duties, when called upon by the Government.

This is said to be a “Government of the People, by the People and for the People.” In the Declaration of Independence it is said that “Governments are instituted among men deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.”

The Constitution of the United States says “We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this CONSTITUTION for the United States of America.”

The Constitution of Pennsylvania in Section 2 of Article I says: “All power is inherent in the people, and all free governments are founded on their authority and instituted for their peace, safety and happiness.”

Thus in our form of government, the whole responsibility for the form and character of the government is placed upon the people themselves, and not upon officials. The fact of the matter is, that every citizen in a Republican form of government owes to that government certain distinct and well defined duties; for instance, there is the duty to serve as Juryman; under existing laws, every man and woman must respond to the Court when called upon to serve upon the Jury.

So also, every citizen is liable to military service, and must respond when called upon for such service.

Equally is it the duty of every man and woman to exercise the elective franchise; and every man and woman who fails in his or her duty as a voter is a slacker in this respect and is responsible primarily for bad government, bad officials and bad laws. There is no evasion of this duty, and those who fail to so perform their duty in this respect have no right to complain of bad government and bad politics.

I am reminded of that story in ancient history when a famous King of Israel stole another man's wife. And when the news came to the Prophet of God, he was wroth about it. The record says (II Samuel Chap. 12:1-7.)

1. "And the Lord sent Nathan unto David. And he came unto him, and said unto him. There were two men in one city; the one rich, and the other poor.

2. The rich man had exceeding many flocks and herds:

3. But the poor man had nothing, save one little ewe lamb, which he had brought and nourished up; and it grew up together with him, and with his children; it did eat of his own meat, and drank of his own cup, and lay in his bosom, and was unto him as a daughter.

4. And there came a traveller unto the rich man, and he spared to take of his own flock and of his own herd, to dress for the wayfaring man that was come unto him; but took the poor man's lamb, and dressed it for the man that was come to him.

5. And David's anger was greatly kindled against the man; and he said to Nathan, As the Lord liveth, the man that hath done this thing shall surely die;

6. And he shall restore the lamb fourfold, because he did this thing, and because he had no pity.

7. And Nathan said to David, *Thou art the man.*"

I can imagine that dramatic scene when the indignant Prophet of God, pointing the finger of scorn at the King upon his throne, said to him in thundering tones *Thou art the man.*"

So I say to you today that you men of God and leaders of thought—who have failed, or neglected to vote, or who have not urged your people to vote, so that our liberties may be preserved, I say to you, as in the words of the Prophet, "THOU ART THE MAN" responsible for the condition of affairs in our Nation, as we now see them.

In the Public Ledger of October 20, 1921, is an item copied from the New York Times entitled "Political Duties" as follows:—

"The man who can vote and does not vote is an unworthy citizen. He ought to be made a criminal by law. He is a dangerous citizen. He weakens the City Government. He jeopardizes the highest interest of the people. He undermines the foundation of democracy."

These are not soft words. Yet they were not uttered impetuously or hastily or in anger. They are the measured words of that valiant but peace—preaching citizen, Dr. Charles E. Jefferson, written in a tract on "Political Duties." And they are made to apply to women as well as to men. Indeed, they should be applied especially to women, who have the supreme opportunity to prove the wisdom of their enfranchisement."

God grant that you may become awake to your duties as citizens and leaders of men, so that you can and will in the future perform your full duties as citizens of this great Republic.

DO WE APPRECIATE THE GOVERNMENT UNDER WHICH WE
LIVE?

I very much fear that we do not appreciate the real character and value of the Government under which we live; nor how it was organized; and the great principles involved in its formation.

If you will pardon me for a moment permit me to review the early history of this Government and how it came to be formed. A few centuries ago, men and women, oppressed and persecuted by both civil and religious authorities looked across the sea to this virgin land and came here to escape from these persecutions, and to, if possible, establish a government in which there might be civil and religious liberty.

These colonies were thirteen in number—all of them Protestant, and extended along the Atlantic Coast from Massachusetts to Florida with territories extending very little more than one hundred miles from the coast.

It is true, that one of these Colonies, Maryland, was alleged to be a Roman Catholic Colony. But this like a great many other things, alleged by our opponents, is not true. The fact of the matter is, as Abraham Lincoln once said "There are a great many people in the world who know so many things that ain't so."

THE CHARTER OF MARYLAND

The Colony of Maryland was cut out of the territory of the Colony of Virginia, to whom a charter had been granted May 23, 1609 by the King of England, many years before the issue of the Charter to Maryland. When Lord Baltimore desired to establish a Colony in the territory of Virginia and asked a charter from the King of England, the King could not do otherwise, in granting such a charter, than to put in the charter itself, the clause of religious toleration, because in the charter of Virginia, the Church of England was made the Established Church of the Colony. Therefore, to preserve the rights of the Colonists of Virginia, it was necessary to put such a provision of religious toleration in the charter.

Hon. R. W. Thompson, in *The Papacy and the Civil Power*, on page 674, says of this Charter:—

"One of the purposes expressed in this Charter was "the conversion and the reduction of the people in those parts unto the true worship of God and the Christian religion." And inasmuch as the true worship was at that time in England considered to be that provided by the Established Church, in opposition to that of Rome, King James further said, "We should be loath that any person should be permitted to pass that we suspected to affect the superstitions of the Church of Rome." It required also that the English oath of supremacy

should be taken by all colonists. By these provisions of the Charter, therefore, Roman Catholics were positively prohibited from settling in any part of the colony.—————

“In 1628, Lord Baltimore visited Virginia. This nobleman was a monarchist both from inclination and education. He was so devoted to, the interests of the King as to have become a special favorite of both James I and Charles I. In 1624—only four years before—he had become a Roman Catholic.—————

“The Charter to Lord Baltimore was granted in 1632; but in consequence of his death it was transferred to his son, who took his title.—— This Charter contained the celebrated provision that while Christianity was made the law of the colony, yet no preference should be given to any sect,” but “equality in religious rights (not less than in civil freedom,)” was secured. This constitutes the groundwork of the Roman Catholic claim of toleration in the United States. A critical examination of it will demonstrate not only that this claim is groundless, but also what was understood by Charles I and the elder Lord Baltimore by giving security to civil freedom in Maryland—in other words, by granting the right of legislation to those Roman Catholics who should emigrate to the colony.”

In Shea's History of the Catholic Church in the United States, on Page 53 is this statement:—

“The number of Catholics in 1783 might amount in Maryland to sixteen thousand souls, chiefly farmers and planters in the rural districts. In Pennsylvania there were about seven thousand, and in the other States about fifteen hundred. (Note. This is Bishop Carroll's calculation.)”

In Sadler's Elementary History of the United States, on page 88 is this statement:—

“What event important to Catholicity took place in 1789?”

“Father John Carrol, S. J., was consecrated the first

Bishop of the United States. At this time there were not more than six Catholic churches in the Atlantic colonies."

These facts from Catholic authorities show how insignificant was the Catholic population and influence at the time of the Revolution. It can therefore well and justly be said that the thirteen colonies were predominantly Protestant.

All of these Colonies were under the political domination of the Kingdom of Great Britain, and were governed by Royal Governors sent out by the King. As the number of the colonists increased, and their desire for civil and religious freedom became intensified, they resented the action of these Royal Governors, in their oppression of the people, and their ignoring of the rights of the colonists.

These oppressions of the Governors and the Home Government were many and various. Among other things, a very great effort was made to compel the various Colonies to recognize the Church of England, as the Established State Church of the Colonies. This effort to bring about a union of Church and State is fully described in Lossings History of our Country in Vol. 11, pages 646, 647, 648.

THE COLONISTS OPPOSED TO THE UNION OF CHURCH AND STATE

"We have hinted that the Church and State in England worked in concert for the enslavement of the Americans. So early as 1748, Dr. Secker, Archbishop of Canterbury, had proposed the establishment of Episcopacy in America, and overtures were made to several eminent Puritan divines to accept the mitre, but they all declined it. It was known that among other reforms in the colonies, proposed by the ministry at the beginning of the reign of George the Third, was the curtailment or destruction of the Puritan, or Dissenting influence in the provinces, and to make the ritual of the Anglican Church the State mode of worship. This movement was made as secretly as possible, but it could not be wholly concealed. Rev. George Whitfield said to Dr. Langdon, a Puritan divine at

Portsmouth, New Hampshire, "I can't, in conscience, leave this town without acquainting you with a secret. My heart bleeds for America. O poor New England! There is a deep-laid plot against both your civil and religious liberties, and they will be lost. Your golden days are at an end. You have nothing but troubles before you. My information comes from the best authority in Great Britain. I was allowed to speak of the affair in general, but enjoined not to mention particulars. Your liberties will be lost."

Remembering the aspect of Episcopacy or rather of the Anglican Church in the early colonial days, the Americans had ever looked upon that Church as a partner of the State in its acts of oppression, and they feared its power. They well knew that if Parliament could create dioceses and appoint bishops, they would establish tithes and crush out dissent as a heresy. For years controversy on the subject was very warm and sometimes acrimonious in this country. The Anglican Church had many adherents in nearly all the colonies, and they naturally desired its ascendancy. Essays by able writers appeared in pamphlets and sometimes in newspapers for and against Episcopacy. Among those of its opponents, none held a more trenchant pen than William Livingstone, just mentioned. Dr. Ewer, Lord Bishop of Llandaff, had preached a sermon before the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, in which he recommended the scheme for establishing Episcopacy in America, and heaped abuse upon the colonists, who were mostly Dissenters. "Upon the adventurers themselves," he said, "what reproach could be cast heavier than they deserved? Who, with their native soil abandoned their native manners and religion, and ere long were found in many parts living without remembrance or knowledge of God, without any divine worship, in dissolute wickedness and the most brutal profligacy of manners. Instead of civilizing and converting barbarous infidels, as they undertook to do, they became, themselves, infidels and barbarians." With this view of the state of religion in the colonies, the prelate concluded that the only remedy for the grave evil was to be found in a

church establishment. His recommendations were laid hold of with a firm grasp by churchmen in this country, and urged with zeal. Dr. Chandler of Elizabethtown, in New Jersey, published "*An Appeal to the Public in behalf of the Church of England*"—an able and moderate performance. Men of less note followed, and echoed the sentiments of the worthy rector.

The Dissenters were aroused. They perceived in the Bishop's sermon the spirit of the old persecuting Church, and visions of Laud and the Star Chamber troubled them. They felt that their "liberties were in danger," without a doubt. The unjust reproaches of the prelate were severally commented upon, and his erroneous assertions were met with truth. Dr. Chauncey of Boston first entered the lists against him and his abettors; and early in 1768, Mr. Livingston issued, in pamphlet form his famous *Letter* to the prelate, in which, with sarcastic indignation of tone, he refuted the charges of that dignitary so completely that they were not repeated. The pamphlet was republished in London, and excited much attention in England. It was highly commended by all Dissenters in America; and in the summer of 1768, when Massachusetts was in a blaze of indignation because of the instructions of Hillsborough and the duplicity of Bernard, the consociated churches of the colony of Connecticut assembled in convention at Coventry, with Noah Wells as their scribe or secretary, passed a vote of thanks to Mr. Livingston "for vindicating the New England churches and plantations against the injurious reflections and unjust aspersions cast upon them in the Bishop of Llandaff's sermon."

(Lossing's "Our Country" pages 646-648.)

PROTESTS OF THE COLONISTS

So, it will be seen, that even before the formation of our present Government, the question of the Union of Church and State occupied a very prominent position in the minds of the Colonists.

At the very beginning of this Government, the founders thereof saw in the then existing governments of the world the disastrous effects of the union of church and state, because in all the governments of that time, whether they were Roman Catholic or Protestant, if there was such a union, it worked injury to the general welfare of the people.

The first reference to the matter which we find is in the Declaration of Rights put forth by the Stamp Act Congress of 1765 said to have been written by John Cruger of New York, when in reciting the fact that a British Parliament has established the Roman Catholic religion as a State religion in the Province of Quebec, it was said:

“Nor can we suppress our astonishment that a British Parliament should ever consent to establish in that country a religion that has deluged your island in blood and dispersed impiety, bigotry, persecution, murder, and rebellion through every part of the World.” (Lossing’s History of the United States.)

(Shea’s History of the Catholic Church in the United States, Page 43.)

Next, in an appeal “to the several Anglo-American Colonies” written by William Livingston, afterwards Governor of New Jersey, and adopted by the Continental Congress October 21st, 1774, complaint is made of the establishment of the Roman Catholic religion in Quebec by the British Parliament, instead of merely tolerating it.

The “Petition of Congress to the King” drawn by John Adams and adopted October 26th, 1774, contains a like complaint to the above.

In the immortal Declaration of Independence, the patriotic Americans of the day protested against the action of England, “For abolishing the free System of English Laws in a Neighboring Province, establishing therein an Arbitrary government, and enlarging its Boundaries so as to render it at once an

example and fit instrument for introducing the same absolute rule into these colonies.”

AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

And so, when the present Constitution of the United States was formed, the first amendment thereto provided as follows:

“Congress, shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.”

So thoroughly imbued were the leaders of government in those days with this principle of the complete separation of church and state, that from time to time the executive and legislative branches of the government expressed their decided opinions upon this important and vital question to a free government.

In the administration of President Madison, an appropriation was made to the Baptists of a certain tract of land in the then territory of Mississippi, and the President vetoed the bill in the following language:

“Having examined and considered the bill entitled ‘An Act for the relief of Richard Tervin, William Coleman, Edwin Lewis, Samuel Mims, Joseph Wilson, and the Baptist Church at Salem Meeting House, in the Mississippi Territory,’ I now return the same to the House of Representatives, in which it originated, with the following objections.”

“Because the bill in reserving a certain parcel of the United States for the use of said Baptist Church comprises a principle and precedent for the appropriation of funds of the United States for the use and support of religious societies, contrary to the article of the Constitution which

declares that 'Congress shall make no law respecting a religious establishment.' ”

Messages of the Presidents—Richardson Vol. I, page 490.

WHO WERE THE FOUNDERS OF THIS GOVERNMENT?

So it is very evident, that the settled policy of this Government is a complete separation of Church and State.

But who was it that formed this Government of ours? Were the founders of this Government, infidels, atheists and men without fear of God? I know that there is a prevalent idea, that this Government was the result of efforts of men, who were regardless of God. I deny this assertion. I maintain that this Government was God inspired and God maintained and God protected.

Let us look at the facts of history in this matter for a moment. In the Declaration of Independence, after reciting the grievances which the Colonists had against the Government of Great Britain, and declaring the rights of the people to form a new government, the concluding paragraph of the immortal document is as follows:

“And, for the support of this declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other, our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor.”

Then the Congress of the United Colonies, which had control of the War of the Revolution, at its daily sessions invited some one of the clergy of the City of Philadelphia, to open every session with prayer.

The General, who was selected by this Congress to command the armies of the United Colonies, was George Washington, of Virginia. His religious attitude was well known. You are all familiar with that story of his being seen at Valley Forge praying beneath the trees for protection of Divine Providence for the Colonial Cause. This scene has been per-

petuated in a painting, a small copy of which I have here in my hand.

Again, while at Valley Forge, General Washington issued the following general order to his Brigade Commanders, dated May 2, 1778:

"The Commander-in-Chief directs that divine service be performed every Sunday at 11 o'clock in each brigade that has chaplains. Those brigades which have none will attend the places of worship nearest to them. It is expected that officers of all ranks will, by their attendance, set an example to the men. While we are performing the duty of good soldiers we certainly ought not to be inattentive to the highest duties of religion. To the distinguishing characteristics of a patriot it should be our highest glory to add the more distinguished character of a Christian.

"Signal instances of Providential goodness which we have experienced and which have almost crowned our arms with complete success demand from us in a peculiar manner the warmest returns of gratitude and piety to the Supreme Author of all good."

THE SPEECH OF BENJAMIN FRANKLIN IN THE CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION

So, it is very evident that the contest for freedom and independence was conducted by, and won by religious men, under the guidance of God.

And now we come to a very interesting fact, in the history of the Nation; a fact too, not generally known. I must confess that I, though a student of history, did not know of this interesting fact until about five years ago, when I picked up, in my library a book entitled "A History of the United States of America" by Charles A. Goodrich, and published in 1833. And therein I found an account of the formation of the Federal Constitution.

It seems that this Constitutional Convention, which had been called after the war had closed, to form a constitution, gathered in Philadelphia in 1787, with George Washington, as the President of the Convention.

It seems, however, that these representatives had grown conscience of their own importance, and forgot that God had aided them in the conquest of their civil liberty. And so, they ignored God, and the sessions of the Convention were held without any opening prayer. The consequence was, that the delegates to the Convention became involved in interminable disputes and discussions, concerning their conflicting views of government, so that after five weeks of acrimonious debates and discussion, it seemed as if, the Convention was about to adjourn without accomplishing the purpose of its convening.

At this remarkable juncture of affairs, Benjamin Franklin, a representative from Pennsylvania, to this Convention, rose and said:

“Mr. President—The small progress we have made, after four or five weeks close attendance and continual reasonings with each other, our different sentiments, on almost every question, several of the last producing as many *noes* as *ayes*, is, methinks, a melancholy proof of the imperfection of the human understanding. We indeed seem to feel our own want of political wisdom, since we have been running all about in search of it. We have gone back to ancient history for models of government, and examined the different forms of those republics, which, having been originally formed with the seeds of their own dissolution, now no longer exist; and we have viewed modern states all around Europe, but find none of their constitutions suitable to our circumstances. In this situation of this assembly, groping, as it were, in the dark, to find political truth, and scarce able to distinguish it, when presented to us, how has it happened, sir, that we have not hitherto once thought of humbly applying to the *Father of Lights* to illuminate our under-

standings? In the beginning of the contest with Britain, when we were sensible of danger, we had daily prayer in this room for divine protection. Our prayers, sir, were heard; and they were graciously answered. All of us who were engaged in the struggle, must have observed frequent instances of a superintending Providence in our favor. To that kind Providence we owe this happy opportunity of consulting in peace, on the means of establishing our future national felicity. And have we now forgotten that powerful friend? or do we imagine that we no longer need its assistance? I have lived, sir, a long time; and the longer I live, the more convincing proof I see of this truth, that *God governs the affairs of men*. And if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without his notice, is it probable that an empire can rise without his aid? We have been assured, sir, in the sacred writings, that except the 'Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it.' I firmly believe this; and I also believe, that without his concurring aid, we shall succeed in this political building no better than the builders of Babel; we shall be divided by our little partial local interests; our projects will be confounded, and we ourselves shall become a reproach and a by-word to future ages. And what is worse, mankind may hereafter, from this important instance, despair of establishing government by human wisdom, and leave it to chance, war, or conquest.

"I therefore beg leave to move, that henceforth prayers, imploring the assistance of Heaven, and its blessings on our deliberations, be held in this assembly every morning before we proceed to business; and that one or more of the clergy of the city be requested to officiate in that service."

(The Congress immediately and unanimously adopted this motion, and, thereafter, all of the proceedings of the Convention were opened with prayer. Immediately, the character of the proceedings changed and, where there was formerly discord and contention, harmony and agreement prevailed. The

result was the production of this wonderful Constitution under which we now live and have prospered.)

THIS GOVERNMENT WAS INSPIRED BY GOD.

So it is clearly evident, that this great Government of ours was inspired by God, and led by His Almighty Power to Victory. Surely, therefore, every Patriotic Citizen, should be proud of the early history of this Government and be proud of the institutions created by such a government. It is a Government that free men can glory in, live for, and if necessary, die for.

Under this Government, so founded, every man is guaranteed the right to worship God, according to the dictates of his own conscience, and no man can legally make him afraid. He can worship God as he pleases; have any religion he pleases; or have no religion at all, and he is under the protection of the Constitution and Laws of this great Land of Liberty.

But, while religious liberty, to the widest extent, is accorded to every citizen, yet such liberty must be exercised in accordance with the rights of others and the public welfare. If any religious organization, under the guise of religion, sets itself up to oppose the Government, in the exercise of its proper powers, and attacks the fundamental principles of the Government, and the free institutions established thereunder, then the religious liberty of such organization ceases and it commits an act of treason against the Government.

IT IS TREASON FOR ANY RELIGIOUS SOCIETY TO DEFY THE
GOVERNMENT

THE MORMON INSURRECTION

This doctrine was clearly expressed by James Buchanan, President of the United States in his proclamation to the Mormons in 1857, when they attempted to establish in Utah a

government in opposition to and independent of the United States.

He said:— “If you have calculated upon the forbearance of the United States; if you have permitted yourselves to suppose that this Government will fail to put forth its strength and bring you to submission, you have fallen into a great mistake. You have settled upon territory which lies, geographically, in the heart of the Union. The land which you live upon was purchased by the United States and paid for out of their Treasury; the proprietary right and title to it is in them, and not in you. Utah is bounded on every side by States and Territories whose people are true to the Union. It is absurd to believe that they will or can permit you to erect in their very midst a government of your own, not only independent of the authority which they all acknowledge, but hostile to them and their interests.

“Do not deceive yourselves nor try to mislead others by propagating the idea that this is a crusade against your religion. The Constitution and Laws of this country can take no notice of your creed, whether it be true or false. That is a question between your God and yourselves, in which I disclaim all right to interfere. If you obey the Laws, keep the peace, and respect the just rights of others, you will be perfectly secure, and may live on in your present faith or change it for another at your pleasure. Every intelligent man among you knows very well that the Government has never, directly or indirectly, sought to molest you in your worship, to control you in your ecclesiastical affairs, or even to influence you in your religious opinions.”

In his message to Congress, December 8, 1857, President Buchanan said:

“Brigham Young was appointed the first Governor on the 20th of September, 1850, and has held the office

ever since. Whilst Governor Young has been both Governor and Superintendent of Indian affairs throughout this period, he has been at the same time the head of the church called the Latter-day Saints, and professes to govern its members and dispose of their property by direct inspiration and authority from the Almighty. His power has been, therefore, absolute, over both church and state.

The people of Utah almost exclusively belong to this Church, and believing with a fanatical spirit that he is governor of the territory by divine appointment, they obey his commands as if they were direct revelations from Heaven.

If, therefore, he chooses that his government shall come into collision with the Government of the United States, the members of the Mormon Church will yield implicit obedience to his will * * * This being the condition of affairs in the Territory, I could not mistake the path of duty. As Chief Executive Magistrate I was bound to restore the Supremacy of the Constitution and laws within its limits.

In order to effect this purpose, I appointed a new governor and other Federal officers for Utah and sent with them a military force for their protection and to aid as a posse comitatus in case of need in the execution of the laws."

And so it was, as the people of Utah refused to comply with the proclamation of President Buchanan, he sent an army of three thousand men, under the command of General Sydney E. Johnston—to crush out this religious rebellion against the lawful authority of the United States.

When the army appeared before Salt Lake City, the Mormon flag was lowered, the Stars and Stripes raised in its place, and the authority of the United States re-established, while

the State of Deseret—the name given to the new religious state—disappeared forever from the map.

WHAT WAS TRUE IN THE CASE OF THE MORMONS IS TRUE
NOW OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC GOVERNMENT

These fundamental principles of government, and their relation to religious societies are just as much in force today, as they were in 1858.

Now, we are confronted with the fact, that another religious organization claims the right of sovereignty and to exercise that sovereignty in defiance of the Constitution and Laws of the United States. The Roman Catholic Church claims to be, not only endowed with spiritual power, but also with temporal power, with the right to rule over all the nations of the earth—a super government. What the Mormons tried to do in 1858, on a limited scale, the Roman Catholic Church is endeavoring to do today on a much larger scale.

And now let me say right here, that I do not intend to discuss the dogmas or tenets of the Roman Catholic Church. That Church has a perfect right to teach and preach all the dogmas they choose, and its adherents have the right to believe and practice such beliefs, however foolish and absurd they may seem to us. They are entitled to their beliefs, and in the exercise of them to the protection of the Constitution and Laws of this free Commonwealth. But when that Church goes a great step further, and claims that it is a nation, with all the sovereign attributes of a nation, and can interfere with and annul our Constitutions and Laws, and can destroy our free institutions, then as an American citizen, I have a right to protest against such usurpation of power by an alien sovereignty.

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH CLAIMS UNIVERSAL TEMPORAL POWER

Does the Roman Catholic Church claim such universal temporal power? Permit me to quote to you from various

authorities of the Roman Catholic Church, upon this subject:

In "Elements of Ecclesiastical Law" by Rev. S. B. Smith, D. D., published by Benzinger Brothers, Printers to the Holy Apostolic See, in Vol. 1, page 82, is this statement:

"The Church is not merely a corporation or part of civil society. Hence, the maxim is false, "Ecclesia est in statu" or the Church is placed under the power of the state. The Church is rightly named a SOVEREIGN STATE."

In the same book, Vol. 1, page 242:—

"Now the immediate rights of the Papal Supremacy are these two: infallibility and supreme Legislative Authority."

In the same book, Vol. 1, page 259:—

"The famous Bull Unam Sanctum, issued by Pope Boniface VIII in 1302 concludes:

"And this we declare, affirm, define and pronounce, that it is necessary for the salvation of every human creature that he shall be subject to the Roman Pontiff."

On page 259 of Dowlings History of Romanism is this statement:

"At the Council of Clermont, held in November, 1095, Pope Urban proceeded a step further than even Gregory had done by enacting a decree forbidding the bishops and the rest of the clergy to take the oath of allegiance to their respective kings or governments." Pope Leo XIII in his Encyclical Letters, page 112, says:

"And just as the end at which the Church aims is by far the noblest of ends, so is its authority the most exalted of all authority, nor can it be looked upon as inferior to the civil power, or in any manner dependent upon it."

The same Pope in his Encyclical Letters on the "Evils Affecting Modern Society," page 11, says: (1903)

"Such too is the purpose of the seizing of the temporal power, conferred many centuries ago by Divine Providence on the Bishop of Rome, that he might without let or hindrance use the authority conferred by Christ for the eternal welfare of the nations."

"The Rome of the Middle Ages claimed universal monarchy. The modern Church of Rome has abandoned nothing, retracted nothing."

The present Crises of the Holy See, By H. E. Manning, D. D., 1861, page 75.

An editorial in the "Catholic Tribune," Dubuque, Iowa, April 12, 1917, says:

"Well informed Catholics will bear in mind that the Pope is not only their spiritual father in Christ, *but also a crowned Head, a King with Temporal Possessions.*"

"Only editors imbued with the principles of the Reformation will insist that the happiness of mankind depends on the triumph of the Republican form of Government."

Extract from a sermon by the Roman Catholic priest and editor, D. S. Phelan of St. Louis, Mo., and printed in his paper, the Western Watchman, June 27, 1912:—

"Tell us we are Catholics first and Americans or Englishmen afterwards; of course we are. Tell us, in the conflict between the church and the civil government we take the side of the church; of course we do. Why, if the Government of the United States were at war with the church, we would say tomorrow, *To Hell with the government of the United States*; and if the church and all the governments of the world were at war, we

would say:—*To Hell with all the governments of the world.*

“Why is it, that in this country, where we have only seven per cent of the population, the Catholic Church is so much feared? She is loved by all her children and feared by everybody. Why is it the Pope has such tremendous power? Why, the Pope is the ruler of the World. All the emperors, all the kings, all the princes, all the presidents of the world are as these altar boys of mine:—

THE POPE IS THE RULER OF THE WORLD.”

In April, 1921, in Wisconsin, the members of the Catholic Church at Kenosha, endeavored to get control of their own church, and came in conflict with the authority of the Archbishop of that diocese. The Archbishop wrote a letter to the members of the church, which was published in a local paper, and part of it is as follows:

April 8, 1921.

To the members of the Holy Rosary Congregation,
Kenosha, Wis.

Beloved Brethren:

The disgraceful disturbances caused last winter by some parties in your congregation make it necessary that I should address directly the whole congregation. After hearing both sides, I come to the conclusion that the trouble was mostly caused by ignorance of the laws of the church and by foolish gossip. Hence I wish to explain to you shortly the laws of the Catholic church regarding parish administration in America, and to rectify some false statements which have been circulated in the Italian colony regarding your Reverend Pastor:

First: 1. The general law and principle of the Catholic church is clearly stated in the handbook of the diocese, page 23:

“American Catholics should understand clearly the teachings of their faith, namely, that the church is not a republic or democracy, but a monarchy; that all her authority is from above and rests in her hierarchy, that while the faithful of the laity have divinely given rights to receive all blessed ministrations of the church, they have absolutely no right whatever to rule and govern. Such is the essential constitution of the church given her by Jesus Christ, who placed all the powers and rights of government in His visible kingdom on earth, both in things temporal and things spiritual, exclusively into the hands of her visible Head, the Pope, and of her visible rulers, the bishops.

“Hence we declared as absolutely false the opinion holding that church bodies or congregations to whom civil authorities have granted the power of acquiring administering and alienating temporalities may exercise these powers independently of the ecclesiastical authority. Nor can the lay people claim any right of interfering on the plea that their money has built the church, school, priest house, etc., and that these properties belong to them and that therefore they have the right of saying how this property shall be administered. This is a thoroughly Protestant principle.”

Brownson's Review in 1858 said:

“The Church is a kingdom and a power, and as such must have a supreme chief (pope) and this authority is to be exercised over States, as well as individuals. If the pope directed the Roman Catholics of this country to overthrow the Constitution (and put down the American flag), sell the nationality of the country, and annex it as a dependent province to Napoleon the Little (a papist sovereign), they would be bound to obey. It is the intention of the pope to possess this country.”

The following is a part of the Jesuit's oath to the pope:—

“I do denounce and disown any allegiance as due to any heretical king, prince or state, named protestant; or obedience to any of their inferior magistrates or officers.”

Pope or President—Page 237

The Pope of Rome has claimed Temporal Power—to be the Supreme Ruler of the World—for many centuries.

In Elliott's Delineation of Romanism, on Page 596, is this statement:

“Thomas Aquinas says: (1595)—

“The Pope, by Divine Right, hath spiritual and temporal power, as supreme King of the World: so that, he can impose taxes on all Christians, and destroy towns and cities for the preservation of Christianity.”

On the same page is a quotation from Ferraris, in his *Bibliothica Prompta* (1763) which is adopted as a standard of Roman Catholic law as follows:

“On account of the excellence of his supreme dignity, he is called Bishop of Bishops, Ordinary of Ordinaries, universal Bishop of the Church, Bishop or Diocesan of the whole world, divine Monarch, supreme Emperor and King of Kings.”

Vicar General Preston, in a sermon, in New York, on January 1, 1888, said:

“Every word that Leo speaks from his high chair is the voice of the Holy Ghost and must be obeyed. To every Catholic heart comes no thought but obedience. It is said that politics is not within the province of the Church and that the Church has jurisdiction only in matters of faith. You say, I will receive my faith from the Pontiff, but I will not receive my politics from him.

This assertion is disloyal and untruthful. You must not think as you choose. You must think as Catholics. The man who says, I will take my faith from Peter, but I will not take my politics from Peter, is not a good Catholic."

Thus it will be seen from these Roman Catholic authorities that the Pope of Rome, as the Head of the Papal Government, claims absolute sovereignty and supremacy over all the governments of the earth. It will be noted that he claims to be an absolute monarch, owing no allegiance, or subserviency to anyone on earth. He claims to be in the same class as Louis XIV, the Grand Monarch of France, who on one occasion, when a courtier asked him "Sire, who is the State." The Monarch drawing himself up proudly, and pointing to himself said "I am the State."

So the Pope of Rome claims that he is the State, to whom all nations must bow in obedience.

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC GOVERNMENT CLAIMS TO BE A SUPER-GOVERNMENT

In this free land of ours, this alien monarch comes and claims supremacy over this government, which we regard as republican, and which derives, in the language of the Declaration of Independence "All its just powers from the consent of the governed." I deny the right of this alien government to come here and claim an overlordship over this Land of the Free. As a citizen, I have a right to protest against such usurpation of power, even though this alien nation may call itself a church.

THE POPE EXERCISES ALL THE ATTRIBUTES OF A STATE

The Pope exercises all the attributes, and powers and privileges of a State and a sovereign. Let us examine a few of these attributes as claimed and exercised by this autocratic head of an alien government.

HE IS SEATED ON A THRONE.

1. The Pope is seated upon a throne as other kings and emperors are; and all his princes of the Church are also seated upon thrones in their respective dioceses. Think of the absurdity of thrones, existing in this republican form of government, upon which sit in their various provinces the princes of this holy Roman empire. Think of that scene in the Academy of Music a few months ago, when the Cardinal of this City was received in State in the Academy of Music; he sitting in state on a throne specially prepared for him; and then on the one side, in a lower seat, the Governor of the Great Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; and on the other side, in a lower seat, the Mayor of this great City of Philadelphia; by their very presence, giving official sanction and allegiance to this prince of an alien government. For according to Cardinal Dougherty, a cardinal is no longer a citizen of the country in which he was born, but is a resident of Rome, and can only live abroad by the permission of the Supreme Pontiff. So at least, Cardinal Dougherty himself said in a sermon delivered April 23, 1921, in which he said:

“Only a Cardinal has a vote in the election of a Pope; and only a Cardinal can be chosen Pope.”

“By his investiture with the Sacred Purple, he becomes incorporated into the clergy of the City of Rome, as if he had been born and bred a Roman; and he is made Rector of a church in the Eternal City. A special dispensation of the Pope is needed in order that he may dwell elsewhere, or hold an office incompatible with his residence in Rome.”

And so, the great Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the Great City of Philadelphia acknowledged the overlordship of this foreign government, represented in the person of the Prince of the Church. Oh, that on that occasion we had had a governor in Pennsylvania, animated by the sturdy American ideals of that brave governor of Massachusetts, who when he

received an invitation of a Catholic Society to attend a banquet, at which Cardinal O'Connor, was to have the seat of honor, declined the invitation and said "This State of Massachusetts, is not inferior to any foreign government, and I decline to attend a banquet where the seat of honor is given to a representative of a foreign government in preference to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts."

Another little incident about the reception of the Cardinal was, that some days thereafter, there was to be some Church function in Germantown, at which the Cardinal was to be present; and so, a section of the Municipal Cavalry—that is the mounted police—was detailed to escort the Cardinal to this meeting; and so with great pomp they performed their duty and when the procession arrived in Germantown, the Commander of this force, with great dignity advanced to the presiding officer in the room, where the meeting was to be held and announced "The Cardinal has arrived." And then the audience went down on their knees to do reverence to this great Cardinal.

How nice, imposing and impressive that ceremony was; but the query comes up, if a Roman Catholic Bishop is entitled to such honors, when he attends a function in his church, why should not a Methodist Bishop be also entitled to the same honor.

How nice it would be when the Bishop of your great Methodist Church desires to attend your weekly meeting in this Hall, that a squadron of the Municipal Cavalry should be detailed to escort him to this place, and then the officer in command would enter the room and announce with great dignity "The Bishop has arrived." And then all you reverend brethren should go on your knees and kiss his official ring. Wouldn't that be nice. Bosh! The whole thing is utterly absurd, and foreign to the spirit of American institutions.

THE POPE WEARS A CROWN.

2. The Pope as a sovereign, wears a crown, like other kings

and emperors. His crown is a triple one—to typify that he is Lord of Heaven, Earth and Hell.

In Elliott's *Delineation of Romanism*, on Page 596, is this quotation from Ferraris, in his *Bibliotheca Prompta*, concerning the powers of the Pope and the significance of his crown:—

“Hence the Pope is crowned with a triple crown, as King of Heaven, of Earth, and of Hell.”

I question the authority of the Pope to any of these titles. Concerning his claim to be Lord of Heaven, I can only say, with the canny Scot, I have my “doots about it.” As to the second claim, that he is Lord of the Earth, I also very much question that. There was a time, up until the year 1870, when he was in fact Lord of the Papal States of Italy; but since that date, when Victor Emmanuel and Garibaldi entered the City of Rome at the head of their victorious troops, and overthrew the temporal power of the Papacy, he has not been lord of any territory in Italy, except within the limited confines of the Vatican.

But now as to the third claim that he is Lord of Hell. Let us for a moment examine the evidence as to that. I have here an advertisement taken from a Roman Catholic paper:—

From the Pittsburgh Observer—Oct. 6, 1921.

“Information Regarding Spiritual Favors granted by
Pope Pius X to members of the Society and
Subscribers.

The following spiritual favors have been granted to the members of the Catholic Church Extension Society of the U. S. A. and those who assist its work by the late Holy Father, Pope Pius X, who raised the Society to the dignity of a Canonical institution:

- I. St. Philip Neri shall be the heavenly patron of the Society.

- II. A plenary indulgence to each member on the day of admission, on the feasts of St. Philip Neri, St. Francis deSales, St. Rose of Lima, the Holy Apostles, and at the hour of death.
- III. To every member of the Society an indulgence of seven years and seven quarantines for every good work done in the interests of the Society.
- IV. An indulgence of three hundred days, as often as they piously recite the formula, "St. Philip, pray for us."
- V. The above indulgences, plenary and partial, may be applied to the soul in purgatory.

What is an indulgence?

The Roman Catholic Canon Law defines it as follows:

(From the Pittsburgh Observer, Jan. 26, 1922.)

"THE DOCTRINE OF INDULGENCES."

As Changed and Modified by the New Code of Canon Law.

(Specially written for The Observer)

1. "An indulgence is the remission by the Church, on specified conditions, of the whole or a part of the temporal punishment or satisfaction, due for sins after their guilt has been repented of and forgiven.

2. Living members of the Church may gain direct remission of the merited temporal penalties of their sins by fulfilling the conditions with the proper dispositions. Indulgences are applied to Souls in Purgatory, by way of suffrage, that is by supplication, for these souls have passed beyond the direct power and jurisdiction of the Church. (Canon911)"

How has the Roman Catholic Church used these Indulgences in the past? Let history speak for itself.

In "Romanism and the Republic" by Rev. J. Lansing on page 198 is this statement:—

"These are the exact words of John Tetzel, the agent of the Pope, and of Albert, Archbishop of Mainz, who went all through Germany selling indulgences, before and after Martin Luther pronounced the ninety-five theses against them. He says: "The very moment that the money rattles at the bottom of the chest, the soul escapes from purgatory and flies liberated to heaven." Further: we give one of these letters of absolution. I am sure you will be interested. It is worth learning the contents of these diplomas which led to the reformation of the Church: "May our Lord Jesus Christ have pity on thee, N. H., and absolve thee by the merits of His most holy passion. And I, in virtue of the apostolic power that has been confided to me, absolve thee from all apostolic censures, judgments, and penalties, which thou mayst have incurred: moreover from all excesses, sins and crimes that thou mayest have committed, however great and enormous they may be, and from whatsoever cause, were they even reserved for our Most Holy Father the Pope and for the Apostolic See. I blot out all stains of inability and all the marks of infamy that thou mayest have drawn upon thyself on this occasion. I restore thee anew to participation of the sacraments of the Church. I incorporate thee afresh in the communion of saints, and re-establish thee in the purity and innocence which thou hadst at thy baptism. So that in the hour of death, the gates by which sinners enter the place of torments and punishments shall be closed against thee; and, on the contrary, the gate leading to the paradise of joy shall be open. And if thou shouldst not die for long years, this grace will remain unalterable until thy last hour shall arrive. In the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, Amen."

The foregoing was signed by John Tetzel "with his own hand." (D'Aubigne's "History of the Reformation," vol. 1, p. 247.)

On page 437 of Dowling's History of Romanism, is this statement:— (16th Century)

“The officers of the Roman chancery published a book containing the exact sum to be paid for any particular sin. A deacon guilty of murder was absolved for twenty crowns. A bishop or abbot might assassinate for three hundred livres. An ecclesiastic might violate his vows of chastity, even with the most aggravating circumstances, for the third part of that sum. To these and similar items, it is added, “Take notice particularly that such graces and dispensations are not granted to the POOR, for not having wherewith to pay they cannot be comforted.”

So it would seem from this testimony that this Head of this Alien Government, the Pope of Rome has the power to remit the punishment due to those who commit crime in this world or those who have gone to Purgatory or Hell. It is like to the power of the Governor of this State who can re-trieve or pardon a prisoner in the State Prison. So as in the Catholic Theology the Devil is the jailor of Hell, the Pope can issue an indulgence to a sinner and the Devil honors the indulgence and releases the convict from the punishment due to him for his crimes. The evidence that the Pope has this power is not very convincing and would not stand the test of the Law Courts; but we will take it for what it is worth, and say from his own evidence and claims, that he is “the Lord of Hell.”

To claim that he is Lord of Heaven, Lord of Earth and Lord of Hell is a pretty big claim not warranted by the facts and I think he is trying to cover too much territory.

3. THE POPE MAINTAINS A ROYAL COURT.

The Pope maintains a Royal Court where he receives Ambassadors from other nations. Thirty-two such Ambassadors are now in attendance at the Vatican.

This Country is not so represented, and I do not think it will ever be so represented.

The Roman Catholics made a great effort to have such an Ambassador to the Vatican appointed. The Catholic papers just prior to the inauguration of President Harding, were full of the scheme and boasted that President Harding as soon as he was inaugurated would make the appointment.

As soon as I saw this statement, I wrote to the President protesting against such an appointment; and I suggested to various Patriotic Societies that they should also so write to the President. The consequence was that he received a flood of letters concerning this matter. He therefore caused to be published the following official statement:—

The official White House Statement is as follows:

May 7, 1921.

“Many inquiries have come to the President relative to a contemplated nomination of a diplomatic representative to the Vatican, and the President has thought it best to answer all of them by a public statement that no consideration has been given to such a step, and there will be no occasion to consider it unless Congress by the enactment of law provides for such representative. The President does not understand that any such proposal has been made to Congress.”

I have for some time been curious to know exactly what the official position was of Monsignor Bonzano, the representative of the Pope at Washington. So I wrote to the Secretary of State the following letter:—

39

Phila., Pa., Sept., 12, 1921.

Hon. Charles E. Hughes,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir:

Please give me information on the following:

1. What is the official relation of Monsignor Bonzano, the representative of the Pope of Rome at Washington?
2. Is he the accredited representative to this government of the Temporal Power of the Pope of Rome?
3. If so, when was the Temporal Government of the Pope, as now existing, officially recognized by the Government of the United States?
4. Is it true, that at public functions at the White House, in preceding administrations, the Monsignor, as such representative of the Temporal Power of the Pope, was given precedence over all other representatives of Foreign Governments?
5. If that is true, why was it done?

I shall be much obliged, if you will answer these questions fully, so that as an American Citizen, I and others may know the exact status of this Monsignor as representative of the Pope of Rome.

Thanking you in advance for the information, I remain,

Respectfully yours,

LUTHER S. KAUFFMAN

PAUSE

(Dear truth-seeker, in 1984 President Ronald Reagan committed the greatest act of High Treason in the history of our Calvinistic Republic (1789-1868) as well as in the history of our Jesuit-controlled, “Holy Roman”, Fourteenth Amendment American Empire (1868-Present). Reagan, the Irish, pro Catholic pawn of the Archbishop of New York who at the time was John Cardinal O’Connor, was guided by the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, the Jesuit trained Irish Roman Catholic and powerful Knight of Malta, William Casey, to bring our nation into a treaty making status with the Papacy. After one hundred and seventeen years of all diplomatic ties being broken with Rome as a result of the Lincoln assassination (1865) and the trial of the conspirator, John Surratt (1867), Reagan, with the consent of our treasonous Senate, formally recognized the “Sovereign State of Vatican City” as a sovereign nation. This act of betrayal to our White Celtic-Anglo-Saxon Protestant and Baptist Biblical heritage, which includes the Declaration of Independence, the United States Constitution, the Bill of Rights and the Monroe Doctrine, has enabled a future President as the “Commander-in-chief” (with the consent of the Senate) to enter into a treaty with a future Pope. That treaty will be a “Concordat” through which the Jesuits, in control of an American fascist military dictator, will enforce the wicked and evil Council of Trent across our great land. Past dictators having open or secret Concordats with the Jesuit General’s “White Pope” in the Vatican are:

Germany’s Roman Catholic Adolf Hitler,

Spain’s Roman Catholic Francisco Franco,

Italy’s Roman Catholic Benito Mussolini, and

Communist Russia’s Roman Catholic Joseph Stalin.

May the risen Son of God bring His American Bible believing Church to repentance before our nation is destroyed exactly as Satan’s high Jesuits, in control of the Intelligence Agencies of both the Allied and Axis Powers through each nation’s ambassadors to the Papal Court, destroyed apostate Lutheran Germany during the ~~P~~apal Caesar’s bloodiest Crusade in history, the ~~S~~econd ~~T~~hirty ~~Y~~ears’ War, which raged worldwide from 1914 to 1945 and claimed one hundred million lives.

(Page Break for margin correction and notes)

To this letter I received the following answer:—

Department of State,

Washington,

October 26, 1921.

Mr. Luther S. Kauffman,
President of the National Council,
True American League,
1001 Chestnut Street,
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Sir:

In reply to the inquiries contained in your letter of September 12, 1921, I have to advise you that the Government of the United States has not officially recognized the Temporal Power of the Pope since the Papal States ceased to exist as a sovereignty, in 1870, and that consequently Monsignor Bonzano, the Apostolic Delegate of the Pope in the United States in charge of ecclesiastical affairs, not having representative diplomatic capacity, is not officially accredited to the Government of the United States and has no official relations with it. He can, therefore, have no precedence at any official functions conducted by the Government of the United States.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient servant

For the Secretary of State

Alvey A. Adee,

Second Assistant Secretary.

4. THE POPE HAS A NATIONAL FLAG.

This Alien Nation has a distinctive flag representing its nationality—the Yellow and White Flag.

During the recent World War it came into great prominence. You will remember that when the great drive was made for the War Chest, the posters and literature came out with a great display of yellow, white and green—the colors of the Pope and of Ireland. And you Protestants fell for it—until some of us protested against the outrage—and then at a late day the Managers of that campaign remembered that the colors of America were the Red, White and Blue.

You know the results of that campaign for the War Chest.

The Knights of Columbus received out of that Fund the sum of \$32,618,000; a much greater sum than they were entitled to because of the false assumption as to the number of Roman Catholics in the Army as compared with all other denominations.

The other organizations spent their allotments for the purposes for which it was given; but the Valiant Knights did not so spend all their allotment but have some millions left; and of that remainder a million has been appropriated to fight the Y. M. C. A. and the activities of that "pestilent sect" the Methodists as the late Pope so politely described your Church. Well, what else could you expect when the funds were collected under the flag of the Pope?

5. THE POPE AS A RULING MONARCH, CONFERS TITLES OF NOBILITY.

The Pope as a Temporal Ruler, as the head of this Foreign Monarchy is filling this land with titles of nobility in violation of Section 9 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States which provides:—

"No title of nobility shall be granted by the United States; and no person, holding any office of profit or

trust under them, shall, without the consent of Congress, accept of any present, emolument, office, or title of any kind whatever, from any king, prince or foreign state."

So, the Pope is creating numbers of Marquises, Counts, Countesses, and Knights of the Military Order of St. Gregory and other Military Orders, in defiance of the Constitution of the United States which clearly forbids the granting of such titles of nobility to citizens of the United States, unless Congress first consents thereto.

No other Church assumes to grant such titles; it is not within the powers of a Church to do so—: such titles can only be granted by a sovereign, by a Monarch and not by a Republic. Every person who accepts such a title from a foreign government thereby acknowledges allegiance to that government and should not be permitted to remain a citizen of this government. When a nobleman comes to this country and desires to become a citizen he must take an oath that he renounces all his titles of nobility and his allegiance to the government from which he came.

So in like manner every citizen of the United States who accepts a title from the Pope of Rome ought to be compelled to give up his citizenship here.

6. THE POPE AS A MONARCH, MAKES TREATIES WITH OTHER NATIONS.

The Pope as a Temporal Ruler, as a Monarch, makes Treaties, known as Concordats—with other Powers.

It was such a Treaty or Concordat made by the Pope of Rome, with Austria in relation to Servia, which brought on the last Great War.

In Papal Sovereignty by Gilbert O. Nations on page 107 is this clear statement of the power to make Treaties:—

"The power to make treaties is an attribute of sovereignty. Only those who are clothed with sovereign power can become parties to these solemn international conventions."

In view of this fact, Section 10 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States prohibits the making of treaties between the several States of the Union or between any State and foreign nations.

The Supreme Court of the United States has recently approved the following definition:—

"Treaties are contracts between Nations." *Rainey vs U. S.* 232 U. S. 310.

The American and English Encyclopædia of Law, Volume XXVIII, at page 476, says:—

"A treaty is a contract between two or more Sovereigns."

"As a general rule, every sovereign state whose powers have not been limited or modified by compacts with other states has the power to make treaties."

7. THE POPE, AS A MONARCH, REQUIRES FIRST ALLEGIANCE FROM ALL HIS SUBJECTS EVERYWHERE.

The Pope as Supreme Ruler of the World requires all his subjects everywhere to give him first allegiance superior to their allegiance to the country in which they live.

This creates a dual citizenship—an impossible condition in a free Republic.

Theodore Roosevelt said in 1916: (N. American)

"We should not for a moment tolerate the assumption by any foreign Power that foreign born citizens of the United States can retain any citizenship in or allegiance to the country from which they come."

General John J. Pershing has lately said:

"We shall henceforth permit no such thing as a dual citizenship in America. The American people are weary of foreign propaganda. Under no subterfuge can this country be used by persons of alien lineage to harbor intrigue against them."

Hon .Gilbert O. Nations in his book *Papal Sovereignty* on page 181 says on this subject:—

"So long as the Sovereign Pontiff claims and exercises temporal jurisdiction and participates in the diplomacy and politics of the world, his subjects are bound by the same conditions that bind subjects of other monarchs. No Roman Catholic, while retaining membership in the Papal Empire, which is identical with the Roman Catholic Church, is entitled to citizenship under any civil government. He can escape this disability exactly as subjects of other empires and governments escape it, by severing entirely his connection with the political empire which the Pope rules with supreme power. Till he does this, he is not entitled to any political rights as an American citizen."

Rev. Isaac J. Lansing, in his *Romanism and the Republic*, on page 138, says:—

"I do not hesitate to say that, in all candor and reason, every Roman Catholic who confesses this allegiance to the Papacy, ought to be disfranchised in the United States, and forbidden the right to participate, as a citizen, in either holding an office or casting a ballot.

For that is exactly the attitude which we take to Mormons, who affirm primary allegiance to their hierarchy. Here is the case of a man asking to be naturalized before the court, who vows that he is not a polygamist, but does believe in polygamy; that he is a Mormon, and if a polygamist were brought before the court, he, the applicant for naturalization, would not as a juror vote to condemn his fellow-Mormon for polygamy. Whereupon the United States Court, in an elaborate, learned, and rational opinion, refused to naturalize him,

on this ground, that no man who is pledged to disobedience to the laws of the United States, or who is pledged to uphold and maintain others in obedience, can, or by right should, become a citizen of the United States. The application of the principle would disfranchise every Roman Catholic in America, and ought to. Slowly, as we are awakening to our dangers, even politicians, much more statesmen, are becoming filled with alarm; while all wise publicists are recognizing with dread, as the dangerous element in American politics, the ecclesiastical power of Rome."

8. THE POPE, AS A MONARCH CLAIMS OWNERSHIP OF ALL ROMAN CATHOLIC PROPERTY: AND EXTRA-TERRITORIAL RIGHTS FOR ALL SUCH PROPERTY.

The Pope, as the Sovereign of a foreign nation, has established and maintains in every part of this land, under religious names, prisons, with barred gates and windows, in which are imprisoned thousands of boys and girls, men and women. The inmates of these institutions are practically slaves, who are deprived of their rights as American Citizens. They can not appeal to the Courts for the redress of any wrongs which may be done to them. And these prisoners are so kept in these institutions in violation of the Thirteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which reads as follows:—

"Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime, whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction."

No law officer can enter these prisons, because this Alien Power claims that these Prisons are part of his Royal Domain in which our laws are in-operative.

This claim is made because under international law Ambassadors from foreign countries are allowed to have residences, either rented or owned, in which they live and transact

their business; and these official residences while so occupied are regarded as a part of the territory of such foreign government, with all the rights and privileges attached thereto. No civil or criminal officer of the State or United States can legally enter upon this property: and the Ambassador and all his employees are immune from arrest or civil suit.

The Pope as head of his Government claims the ownership of all the property of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States: so that all of this property is part of his royal domain and can not be intruded upon by any civil or criminal officer. This is an unwarranted extension of the doctrine of extra-territorial rights of a foreign government.

According to this theory no crime committed on such property can be punished by the law of the land. As a practical illustration of this read this item from the North American of Philadelphia ,of July 17th, 1921:—

“During the height of the carnival, for the benefit of St. Columba’s Church, Twenty-fifth Street and Lehigh Avenue last night a detail of police, led by Captain Van Horn, arrived, arrested Philip Boyle, of 2623 North Twenty-first Street; Thomas O’Brien, 2230 North Harold Street; and Joseph W. Lacey, of 2218 West Oakdale Street, on the charge of setting up and maintaining a gambling device.

Magistrate Stevenson after looking over a basket containing kitchen ware and groceries which was being put off on chances, asked if this was being done on church property. Informed that it was, he discharged the men.”

Why should a Roman Catholic Church be immune from the punishment for the violation of law any more than a Methodist, or Presbyterian, Lutheran or Baptist Church?

I trust that the day may soon come when this rank injustice may be destroyed; and that the barred doors of these private prisons of a foreign government may be opened.

9. THE POPE, AS A MONARCH, MAINTAINS AN ARMY.

The Pope like other Monarchs maintains an Army.

Read the following item from a Roman Catholic paper of this city:—

From the Catholic Standard and Times, Oct. 15, 1921.

“HOLY FATHER’S CORONATION ANNIVERSARY
CELEBRATED.”

(By N. C. W. C. News Service)

Rome, Sept. 22.—Tuesday was the seventh anniversary of Pope Benedicts XV’s coronation. Although the official ceremony (with the Papal choir in the Sistine Chapel) is as usual postponed to December 22, the feast was kept at the Vatican. The different armed corps donned the parade uniform; Flags were hoisted above the Papal barracks and other buildings, the bands of the Swiss Guards and of the Gendarmes played choice music ending up with the Papal hymn. The commanding officer, the other officers and the representatives of the Palatine Guard assembled in the Paolina Chapel and when Mass was over they sang the “Te Deum” as did the Gendarmes. The Holy Father received congratulatory telegrams from the heads of many governments, illustrious personages, notables, societies and institutes.”

In this country, the Pope has his armed forces organized who at his call will do his bidding.

That the Roman Catholic Church is organizing armed forces to be used if need be for the accomplishment of its purposes is admitted by the Hierarchy. Archbishop Quigley, speaking before the German Catholic Central Verein of Chicago on September 10, 1911, (Published in the Chicago Record-Herald the following day), said:

“Organization is the hope of the Catholic Church here. The question confronting the organization is what to do about the dangers now threatening Christianity in

this country. In France and Portugal the Catholic Church was persecuted because the Catholics were not organized. Although there were thousands of devout and loyal Catholics, who would have given their lives for conscience sake, they were merely a mob without leadership and were defeated. I want to say that when the time comes in this country, *as it surely will come*, and the same forces attack the Church here they will not find us unprepared nor unorganized, and they shall not prevail. We have well ordered and efficient organizations *all at the beck and nod of the Hierarchy and ready to do what the Church Authorities tell them to do.*" . . .

Monsignor Capel has said: "The time is not far away when the Roman Catholic Church of the Republic of the United States, at the order of the Pope, will refuse to pay their school tax; will send bullets to the breasts of government agents, rather than pay for it. It will come as quick as the click of the trigger and will be obeyed, of course, as coming from God himself."

The students in Roman Catholic Colleges are being trained and drilled in military practice.

The Washington Times of September 18th, 1921, in an article describing and praising Gonzaga College, a Jesuit institution in Washington, D. C., says:—

"Physical training is secured by military drill, as well as by out-door and indoor games and sports. The War Department details an army officer to instruct the students of the school in military tactics. Military training inculcates prompt obedience, respect for authority, a manly carriage, and self-reliance. A boy is taught to obey and ultimately to command.

"The equipment of the military department, consisting of rifles, belts, swords, and ammunition for gallery practice, is supplied by the War Department, and students are given

every encouragement to become efficient officers in time of war."

What a spectacle this is! The Government of the United States educating students for Roman Catholic priesthood to become skilled officers to command in time of War. What war? And these students owe allegiance not to this government but to a foreign Monarch who demands their undivided allegiance even against this very government which is now educating them to war against it. Will American people ever awake to the dangers of this situation.

What do you think of this item published in a Roman Catholic paper in Washington, D. C. a few years ago:—

"It must have been hard on General Miles, when he stood in the stand for the unveiling of the Columbus statue in Washington, to see the Knights of Columbus pass by in parade. The swords of the fourth degree men must have convinced him that the order is but waiting the opportunity to cut a path for the pope into the White House."

10. THE POPE AS A MONARCH ISSUES PASSPORTS.

One of the powers and attributes of a Government is to issue passports to its citizens who desire to travel beyond the confines of their own country.

The Pope, as a Monarch, through his Secretary of State, assumes to do that very thing:—

Read this item from the Pittsburgh Observer of September 29, 1921:—

Pontifical Passports.

Will be issued to the Holy See's Diplomats.
(N. C. W. C. News Service)

"Rome, Sept. 15,—Diplomatic representatives of the Vatican hereafter will leave Italy with passports issued by the Secretary of State of the Holy See.

Heretofore ecclesiastical diplomats were obliged to secure Italian passports like any other Italian subject, the pontifical passport being regarded by the government as of no value. Recently the Holy See presented a request to the Italian government through indirect channels, asking if it would be content to vise the passports issued to representatives of the Pope in foreign countries by the Cardinal Secretary of State. The reply was affirmative and as a result the Holy See hereafter will issue passports, which will be vised by the Minister of Foreign Affairs at the Quirinal."

So that is another recognition of the Temporal Power of the Pope.

11. THE POPE, AS UNIVERSAL MONARCH, CLAIMS THE RIGHT TO ANNUL ALL CONSTITUTIONS AND LAWS OF OTHER NATIONS.

Now we come to the most astounding claim of this Autocratic and Imperial Monarch—the claim that he can at will annul the Constitution and Laws of any Nation which may be displeasing to him. And this is done under the Canon Law of the Roman Catholic Church. This Canon Law is the undisputed fundamental code of Romanism and is utterly incompatible with the Constitution and Laws of our Republic, as witness the following leading provisions, gleaned therefrom by Dr. G. F. Von Schulte, Professor of Canonical Law at Prague:—

I. All human power is from evil, and must therefore be standing under the Pope.

II. The temporal powers must act unconditionally, in accordance with the orders of the spiritual.

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

IV. The Pope has the right to give countries and nations which are non-Catholic to Catholic regents, who can reduce them to slavery.

V. The Pope can make slaves of those Christian subjects whose prince or ruling power is interdicted by the Pope.

VI. The laws of the Church, concerning the liberty of the Church and papal power, are based upon divine inspiration.

VII. The Church has the right to practise the unconditional censure of books.

VIII. The Pope has the right to annul state laws, treaties, constitutions, etc.; to absolve from obedience thereto, as soon as they seem detrimental to the rights of the Church, or those of the clergy.

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

X. Without the consent of the Pope no tax or rate of any kind can be levied upon a clergyman, or upon any church whatever."

THIS CLAIM OF OVER-LORDSHIP IS MONSTROUS.

This proposition of over-Lordship—the power to set aside all our Constitutions and Laws—is monstrous, an unwarranted assumption of power—and ought not to be tolerated for a single moment. Hon. R. W. Thompson, in his "The Papacy and the Civil Power" on page 45 says:—

"It requires no pause for reflection to see how directly a "Catholic system" of government, thus constructed, would conflict with the existing civil institutions of the United States. Nor do we need a prophet to tell us that the establishment of such a system here would be followed by their immediate destruction. To permit a Church—any Church—to decide upon the validity or invalidity of our laws after their enactment, or to dictate, beforehand, what laws should or should not be passed, would be to deprive the people of all

the authority they have retained in their own hands, and to make such Church the governing power, instead of them."

Again on page 49, the same author says:—

"Therefore it is proposed that the Roman Catholic citizen of the United States shall be carried along, step by step, in the following process of training for the duties of citizenship: he shall be brought to recognize his Church as the only custodian of God's law; that the Pope is the infallible, and therefore, as the vicegerent of God, has plenary and sole power to interpret that law, and can not err in its interpretation; that he shall find his only guide in the Church in deciding whether he shall obey or disobey the civil laws of the state; that the Pope is the infallible representative of all truth in the world, and infallibly employs all the power and authority of the Church; that, as he can not err in anything concerning faith and morals, he must, in their domain, be implicitly obeyed; that as the Pope is infallible, as the chief instructor in doctrine and duty, his prelates are also infallible as his subordinate workers; that the Pope as he shall speak through the mouths of these prelates, must be obeyed absolutely and uninquiringly—all his utterances being taken as the voice of God, coming directly from his throne in the heavens; and that infamy in this life and eternal damnation in that to come will be the inevitable doom of all who shall impiously reject these teachings. A citizen thus trained, disciplined, and humiliated would become, necessarily, a mere machine in the hands of superiors who would allow him to obey those laws only which the Church—that is the Pope—should decide to be consistent with the commands of God; and would require him to resist and oppose those which should he decided to be otherwise. If the laws requiring the Roman Catholic Church to hold property in subordination to them, and in the same way that Protestant churches do, are forbidden by God's law, as interpreted by the Pope and placed in the canons and discipline of that Church—as the Baltimore Council declares—they must be swept out of the way or violated with impunity, so that the Church itself, and all its monastic

orders, and all its societies, may hold property to an unlimited amount, and make all the laws which shall govern its acquisition and enjoyment, without any regard whatever to the legislation of the States or to their rights and dignity! With this achieved, the hierarchy would be far along upon the road that would lead them to their final triumph—the mastery over the people. The Pope, as the source of all authority in the Church, would put forth his royal edicts and decrees in regard to their Church property in this country, prescribing how they should acquire, hold, and enjoy it, and these edicts and decrees would take the place of all our State statutes upon that subject. This would build up at Rome an imperialism that would reach out further over the world than did that of the Caesars, and might become far greater and more injurious to mankind.”

Concerning this absolute supremacy of the Pope over his adherents everywhere, Rev. Isaac J. Lansing in his book, “Romanism and the Republic” on page 76 says:—

Bishop Gilmour, in his Lenten letter of March, 1873, said: “Nationalities must be subordinate to religion, and we must learn that we are Catholics first and citizens next. God is above man, and the church above the state.” Cardinal McCloskey, who as Cardinal of Rome is a foreign prince exercising authority in the United States, contrary to the Constitution and laws, says: “Catholics of the United States are as strongly devoted to the sustenance and maintenance of the temporal power of the Holy Father as Catholics in any part of the world, and if it should be necessary to prove it by acts, they are ready to do so.” What does he mean by this? In a sermon preached when he was archbishop, Cardinal Manning put the following sentences in the mouth of the Pope: “I acknowledge no civil power; I am the subject of no prince, and I claim more than this; I claim to be the supreme judge and director of the conscience of men, of the peasant that tills the fields, and of the prince that sits upon the throne, of the household that lives in the shade of privacy, and the legislator that makes laws for kingdoms; I am the sole, last

and supreme judge of what is right and wrong." He also says: "Moreover, I declare, affirm, define and pronounce it to be necessary to salvation for every human creature to be subject to the Roman Pontiff." What this subjection means we may learn from Cardinal Bellarmine. He says: "If the Pope should err 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."

"Every bishop of the Roman Catholic Church in America and throughout the world, and every archbishop, has taken an oath of devotion to the Papacy, in which occur the following words: "I will from henceforward be faithful and obedient to St. Peter, the apostle, to the Holy Roman Church, and to our Lord the Pope, and to his successors canonically entering. That counsel with which they shall entrust themselves, their messengers or letters, I will not, knowingly, reveal to any, to their prejudice: I will help them to define and keep the Roman Papacy and the royalties of St. Peter, saving my Lord against all men. The rights, honors, privileges and authority of the Holy Romish Church, of our Lord the Pope and his aforesaid successors, I will endeavor to preserve, defend, increase and advance. I will not be in any council, action or authority in which shall be applied, against our said Lord and the said Roman Church, anything to the hurt or prejudice of their persons, right, honor, state or power; and if I shall know any such thing to be tried or agitated by any whatsoever, I will hinder it to my utmost, and, as soon as I can, will signify it to our said Lord, or to some other by whom it may come to his knowledge. The rules of the Holy Fathers, the apostolic decrees, ordinances or disposals, reservations, provisions and mandates, I will observe with all my might; and cause to be observed by others. *Heretics, schismatics and rebels to our said Lord, or his aforesaid successors, I will, to my utmost, persecute and oppose.*" (Dowling's "History of Romanism," pages 615-16)

And again on page 37 the same author says:—

Gladstone says, "The Pope demands for himself the right to determine the province of his own rights, and has so defined it in formal documents as to warrant any and every invasion of the civil sphere * * * * Rome requires a convert who joins her, to forfeit his moral and mental freedom, and to place his loyalty and civil duty at the mercy of another." Prince Bismarck, in a speech delivered April 16, 1875, said: "This Pope, this foreigner, this Italian, is more powerful in this country than any other person, not excepting even the king. And now please to consider what this foreigner has announced as the programme by which he rules Prussia and elsewhere. He begins by taking to himself the right to define how far his authority extends; and this Pope, who would employ fire and sword against us if he had the power to do so, who would confiscate our property and not spare our lives, expects us to allow him full, uncontrolled sway."

12. THE POPE, AS A MONARCH AND OVER-LORD ANNULS OUR MARRIAGE LAWS.

Is this assumed super-government merely theoretical and visionary? Has the Pope ever attempted to exercise this awful power in this land of the free? Of course he has, and sad to say we have thus far tamely submitted to this assumption of autocratic power and yielded obedience like willing slaves.

Let us look at the evidence of such unwarranted assumption of autocratic power over us—over our Constitution and Laws— First, look at our Marriage Laws. When a man and woman desire to be married in this country, the laws of the several States provide the manner in which it may legally be done. As a rule a license must be obtained and duly recorded; and then the marriage ceremony can be performed by any civil officer or by any duly authorized clergyman. But the Roman Catholic Church through its autocratic Pope says "No: that is all wrong; that is no marriage; no one is legally

married unless they are married by a Roman Catholic priest; and persons claiming to be married otherwise are simply living in adultery; the women are simply concubines, having no legal standing as wives; and the children of such marriages are only bastards."

The impudence of this defiance of our laws is colossal. I must confess it makes me mad every time I think of it. I do not think it would be safe for any priest to tell me to my face that I am living in adultery or that my children are bastards. Small as I am and however large the priest might be, I think he would measure his length on the pavement so quickly that he would not know what hit him. Indeed, I feel somewhat like the little man who when he was asked how heavy he weighed replied "Well ordinarily I weigh 125 pounds but when I get mad I weigh a ton."

The effect of this *Ne Temere* Decree is thus stated by a Roman Catholic writer in a pamphlet entitled "Marriage" published by the Catholic Truth Society.

1.—"The marriage of all Catholics (both parties Roman Catholics) before a (Protestant) minister or civil magistrate is no marriage at all."

2.—"The marriage of all fallen-away Catholics (Roman Catholics who have become Protestants or non-papists) before a (Protestant) minister or civil magistrate is no marriage at all."

3.—"The marriage of a (Roman) Catholic to a non-baptised person is never a real marriage, unless the (Roman Catholic) church grants a dispensation."

4.—The marriage of a (Roman) Catholic to a Protestant (one never baptised in the Roman Catholic church) before a (Protestant) minister or civil magistrate is no marriage at all."

So far as these paragraphs go, they are Rome's own interpretation of the decree—the way it is taught to Roman

Catholics, and the way it is enforced against both papists and Protestants to the extent Rome has the power and opportunity to enforce it.

The Decree, called "Ne Temere" is so named from the first two words of its Latin text. It was promulgated at Rome on August 2, 1907, thereby becoming part of the Roman Catholic law and therefore binding on all Roman Catholics everywhere and at all times with certain few exceptions to be noted.

It is said that the then Chancellor of Germany, sent a special messenger to the Pope who issued it that unless he immediately rescinded it as far as it might apply to the Empire of Germany, he would immediately expel every Roman Catholic priest from the Empire; and the Pope obeyed orders and the Decree was modified accordingly, and made not to apply to Germany. Oh that we had a President of the United States who had the same courage and who would have demanded the same thing for this country. The Catholic countries of Belgium, France, Italy and Spain quickly responded to that decree by passing laws requiring all marriages to be performed by a civil magistrate before any religious marriage can take place.

It is high time that in this country we pass a similar law. In Australia and New Zealand they have gone a step further and passed a law making it a criminal offense for any person, priest or layman, to assert that the marriage laws of the State are illegal. That is perfectly right and ought to be done here. I know of a number of cases where married couples who have lived together happily for years, have been separated by priests who have filled the mind of one or the other of the couple with this idea that because they have not been married by a Catholic priest that they are not married but are living in adultery. Every man, though he be a priest who thus derides the law of the land and causes such separations ought to be arrested for conspiracy and sent to jail. It has come to a pretty pass indeed when a foreign monarch can so annul

the laws of the land and induce and authorize his agents to cause so much domestic sorrow and desolation. It is time that something should be done to put a stop to this monstrous wrong. Every priest who violates the laws of the Land should be treated as the editor of a Roman Catholic paper in Canada was treated by the Courts of that country.

In its issue of Nov. 18, 1911, a Roman Catholic paper, "La Croix," edited and published by Mr. Joseph Begin, a Roman Catholic, published an article of some length concerning the late Charles Chiniquy, who was for many years a Roman Catholic priest, but who later repudiated the doctrines of the Church of Rome, and spent the remainder of his life speaking and writing against them. Throughout this article the ex-priest was severely criticized, but the climax was reached in the English version of the following paragraph:—

"Chiniquy, the apostate, could no more marry than could any priest or member of a religious community who is bound by solemn vows. Consequently, Euphemie Allard was nothing but a concubine for Chiniquy."

Suit was immediately brought against the editor of "La Croix" by the daughter of Dr. Chiniquy, who is the wife of Prof. J. L. Morin of McGill University, on the ground that the paragraph quoted above was libelous and defamatory to the memory of her father and mother, and humiliating and damaging to herself, as it virtually declared her to be an illegitimate child. The case was tried before Justice Greenshields. In behalf of the defendant it was denied that the article was calculated to insult and defame the father and mother of the plaintiff; that neither by inference nor direct statement did it charge that the plaintiff was illegitimate; that it was of a nature to cause the plaintiff no damage nor wound her honor nor blacken the memory of her parents. It was further claimed that "La Croix" was a Roman Catholic paper, which combated all ideas opposed to the Roman Catholic belief; that the article was in conformity with the ideas of the readers of the paper and was in conformity with the truth, and was written,

printed and published in good faith and in the public interest; that the article had for its object to convey to its readers the fact that the marriage of Charles Chiniquy, contracted outside of Canada, was a marriage tainted with irregularity from a Roman Catholic point of view, and from the point of view of the laws governing the Province of Quebec.

Although the laws of the United States and of Canada may differ in some respects, yet the principles involved are the same, and we, therefore feel justified in quoting at considerable length from the judge's opinion in this case, as reported in the Montreal "Daily Witness" of June 21, 1912. After giving a summary of the facts, and referring to the claims both of the plaintiff and of the defendant, the judge continued:—

"In matters purely civil, as distinguished from matters purely religious, if I may use such an expression, no church, be it the great and powerful Roman Catholic Church, or the equally great and powerful Anglican Catholic Church, possesses any authority to override the civil law. Such authority as the church has in civil matters is given to it by the law of the land, and it is subservient to and in no sense dominates the law....

"That the article in itself, on its face, and the words used in themselves, are, defamatory and libelous, I have no doubt. I shall have a further word to say on this in a moment, but consider it sufficient here to state that in unmistakable terms the article charges Charles Chiniquy and Euphemie Allard with having lived and cohabited as man and wife without marriage. In unmistakable terms it charges Euphemie Allard with being his concubine, and by irresistible inference it charges the illegitimacy of the plaintiff....

"To sum up the whole matter, so far as I am concerned, and that there may be no uncertainty as to my holding, without hesitation, and with all the emphasis and force that words can lend or give to the expression of a firm conviction, I hold

the article published by the defendant in his paper, on the eighteenth day of November, 1911, to be grossly defamatory and libelous to the memory of Charles Chiniquy and Euphemie Allard. In like manner, I declare it to be insulting, humiliating, and damaging in the extreme to their daughter, the present plaintiff.

“With like lack of hesitation, and with equal force and emphasis, I pronounce the article to have been published without excuse or justification, either in law or in fact. On the contrary, I declare it to have been published with a malicious and reckless disregard of the most sacred feelings that find their lodgment in the human breast.....

“In assessing the damages, I take into consideration the gravity of the charge made. Be well assured, I take into consideration the high position occupied by the plaintiff as the wife of Professor Morin. Be well assured that I take into consideration the fact that spoken words may be forgotten but when written, they remain. Be well assured in seeking a motive for the publication of the article, I have not forgotten the words and expressions used and the attitude assumed by the defendant before this court. I assess the damages at the sum of \$3,000. I dismiss the defendant’s plea as absolutely unfounded in law and in fact. I maintain the prayer of the plaintiff. I condemn the defendant to pay to the plaintiff the sum of \$3,000, with legal interest from this day.”

13. THE POPE AS A MONARCH AND OVER-LORD ANNULS OUR PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM.

Now let us look at another phase of this annulment of our laws and institutions

We have as a part of our system of government our Public School. But this autocrat who presumes to be our Over-Lord says he will have none of it—that it is a vile and vicious system and he orders his faithful slaves not to send their children to these Public Schools, under pain of punish-

ment here and hereafter. His idea of education is entirely different from the American idea.

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC IDEA OF EDUCATION.

Rev. Isaac J. Lansing, in his book "Romanism and the Republic" on page 234 thus refers to the Catholic idea of education:—

"The Catholic World for April 1871, gives the Roman Catholic idea of education as follows: "Education is the American hobby—regarded, as uneducated or poorly educated people usually regard it, as a sort of panacea for all ills that flesh is heir to. We ourselves, as Catholics, are as decidedly as any other class of American citizens in favor of universal education, as thorough and extensive as possible—if *its quality suits us*. We do not indeed prize as highly as some of our countrymen appear to do the ability to read, write and cipher. *Some men are born to be leaders, and the rest are born to be led.* (Who is born to be led; and who is born to be a leader? is a fair question.) "The best ordered and administered state, is that *in which the few are well educated and lead, and the many are trained to obedience, are willing to be directed, content to follow, and do not aspire to be leaders.* In extending education, and endeavoring to train all to be leaders, we have only extended presumption, pretension, conceit, indocility, and brought incapacity to the surface. *We believe that the peasantry, in old Catholic countries, two centuries ago, were better educated; although for the most part unable to read and write, than are the great body of American people to-day.*" Now you understand that this theory of education states that the few shall be educated and shall be leaders; that the many shall be educated, whether they know how to read and write or not, and shall be led. That is Roman Catholic education."

14. THE POPE AND HIS SUBORDINATES PRONOUNCE OUR
PUBLIC SCHOOLS GODLESS AND SINKS OF INIQUITY.

READ WHAT THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH SAYS OFFICIALLY
OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

(From True American Leaflets—No. 10)

IN THE ENCYCLICAL LETTERS OF POPE LEO XIII, PAGE 206,
THE POPE SAYS:

"It is then incumbent on parents to strain every nerve to ward off such an outrage, and to strive manfully to have and to hold exclusive authority to direct the education of their offspring, as is fitting, in a Christian manner; and first and foremost to keep them away from schools where there is risk of their drinking in the poison of impiety."

[Note.—All the quotations herein marked with a star thus (*) are from a Roman Catholic book, entitled "The Judges of Faith; Christian vs. Godless Schools," Which has the official endorsement of Cardinal Newman, Cardinal Gibbons, Archbishop Riordan, Bishop Hogan, Bishop Vertin and many others.]

POPE PIUS IX, IN HIS ENCYCLICAL LETTER, DECEMBER 8TH,
1849, SAID:

"It is incumbent upon you and upon ourselves, to labor with all diligence and energy, and with great firmness of purpose, and to be vigilant in everything that regards schools, and the instruction and education of children and youth of both sexes. For you well know that the modern enemies of religion and human society, with a most diabolical spirit, direct all their artifices to pervert the minds and hearts of youth from their earliest years. Wherefore, they leave nothing untried; they shrink from no attempt to withdraw schools, and every institution destined for the education of youth, from the

authority of the Church, and the vigilance of the Holy Fathers.”

THE FIRST PLENARY COUNCIL, HELD IN BALTIMORE IN 1852,
SAID:

“As it is evident that the system of public education in most of our States is calculated to serve the cause of heresies by imbuing the minds of Catholic youth with the false principles of the sects, we admonish pastors to provide for the Christian and Catholic education of Catholic children by every possible means, and to watch narrowly lest they use the Protestant version of the Scriptures, or recite prayers or hymns of sects. It will be their duty to prevent books or exercises of this kind from being introduced at the evident risk of faith and piety, by constantly and prudently resisting these attempts of the sects.”

THE SECOND PLENARY COUNCIL, HELD IN BALTIMORE IN
1886, SAID:

“The experience of every day shows more and more plainly what serious evils and great dangers are entailed upon Catholic youth by their frequentation of the public schools in this country. Such is the nature of the system of teaching therein employed, that it is not possible to prevent young Catholics from incurring through its influence danger to their faith and morals; nor can we ascribe to any other cause that destructive spirit of indifferentism which has made and is now making such rapid strides in this country, and that corruption of morals which we have to deplore in those of tender years. Familiar intercourse with those of false religion, or of no religion; the daily use of authors who assail with calumny and sarcasm our holy religion, its practices, and even its saints—these gradually impair in the minds of Catholic children the vigor and influence of the true religion.”

"Besides, the morals and examples of their fellow scholars are generally so corrupt, and so great their license in word and deed, that through continual contact with them, the modesty and piety of our children, even of those who have been best trained at home, disappear like wax before the fire." (*35.)

REV. MICHAEL MULLER, A ROMAN CATHOLIC PRIEST, IN A BOOK ENTITLED "PUBLIC SCHOOL EDUCATION," ON PAGE 199, SAYS:

"Yes, continue a little longer to educate the greater part of the community according to the present system of the public schools, and rest assured we shall soon have a hell upon earth—society will be stabbed to the heart by the ruffian assassin called Godless public school education—it will reel, stagger, and sink a bleeding victim to the ground, expiring, like the suicide, by the wound itself has inflicted. I truly believe that if Satan was presented with a blank sheet of paper, and bade to write on it the most fatal gift to man, he would simply write one word—"godless schools." He might then turn his attention from this planet; "godless public schools" would do the rest."

AGAIN THIS PRIEST SAYS, ON PAGE 346:

"The public schools are not only seminaries of infidelity, they are, moreover, in many cases hotbeds of immorality. In these schools every child is received, no matter how vicious or corrupt he or his parents may be. 'One mangy sheep,' as the homely proverb says, 'infects the whole flock.' So one corrupt child in a school is capable of corrupting and ruining all the others.... Ah, you will see, only on the Day of Judgment, how many unnatural crimes have been taught and propagated, from generation to generation, in these very hotbeds of iniquity."

IN THIS SAME BOOK IS A QUOTATION FROM THE BOSTON PILOT OF APRIL 6, 1872, WITH THIS VILE SLANDER UPON THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS, PAGE 193:

“That the devil is in the public schools, raging and rampant there among the pupils as well as among the teachers, no one can well doubt who has sent a little child into them, as guiltless of evil or unclean thoughts as a newly fallen snowflake, and had him come home, in a short time, contaminated beyond belief by the vile-ness and filth which he has seen, and heard, and learned there.”

IN ANOTHER ROMAN CATHOLIC BOOK, ENTITLED “THE RIGHTS OF OUR LITTLE ONES,” BY REV. JAMES CONWAY, PAGE 26, IS THIS STATEMENT:

“The introduction of State education has been everywhere attended by an enormous increase of crime, which can be attributed to no other cause. In our own country proportionally by far the greater share of crime is committed not by the illiterate, or by foreigners, but by those who enjoy all the blessings of a public school education, and, what is most surprising of all, as has been satisfactorily proved, the increase of crime has kept even pace with the efforts and expenditures made for public education.”

The above statement by the holy priest is an absolute falsehood. Statistics show that while the Roman Catholics have only sixteen per cent of the population, yet in the jails and penitentiaries of the whole country from forty to sixty per cent of the criminals therein are of the Roman Catholic faith. It is the Roman Catholic Church which is producing the criminals of the country and not the public schools.

After reading these official utterances of the Roman Catholic Church, what other conclusion can any thinking man come to than that the Roman Catholic Church is the enemy of the public schools and therefore the enemy of the State.

Let us look at the real facts in the case. Let us compare the products of the Public School and the Parochial School. "By their fruits shall ye know them."

THE RESULTS OF PAROCHIAL SCHOOLS.

In the Pittsburgh Observer, April 14, 1921, is this statement:

"Morals Court Report for March"

"The Morals Court report continues to show a high percentage of Catholic cases. Of the 594 males that came before the court in March, 343 or almost 58 per cent were Catholic * * * *

Of the 167 females, 73, or about 44 per cent were Catholics."

In the same paper, June 9, 1921, is this statement:

"During the month of May, 508 males were brought before the magistrate of the Morals Court. Of this number 278, or over 54 per cent were Catholics * * * *

Of the 86 females, *only* 39, or about 45 per cent were Catholics."

In the 44th annual report of the Allegheny Workhouse, for the year 1913, is a statement of the religious connections of the inmates. The total number received was 3,798, of which 2,091 were Roman Catholics.

Not many years ago the ablest and best-known of the Roman Catholic priests called "Paulist Fathers" was Walter Elliot of New York. In an article in the "Catholic World" for September, 1890, he said:

"Now comes the horrible truth. In all the cities of the Union a large proportion of the wretches are Catholics. To deny this is a great weakness; it is folly to try to conceal it. Mr. Powderly ought to know whether the working-classes are given to excessive drinking, and at the last convention of the Catholic Total Abstinence Union of America he affirmed that nine out of ten of the supporters of the saloon are working men—the very class which forms nearly the whole of our Catholic community. In many cities, big and little, we have something like a monopoly of the business of selling liquor, and in not a few something equivalent to a monopoly of getting drunk. Scarcely a Roman Catholic family among us but mourns one or other of its members as a victim of intemperance. This is lamentable. I hate to acknowledge it. Yet from Catholic domiciles—miscalled homes—in those cities and towns three-fourths of the public paupers creep annually to the almshouses, and more than half the criminals snatched away by the police to prison are by baptism and training members of our Church. Can anyone deny this? Or can anyone deny that the identity of nominal Catholicity and pauperism existing in our chief centres of population is owing to the drunkenness of Roman Catholics? And can anyone deny that this has been the horrible truth of something like thirty-five years, or ever since the Father Mathew movement began to wane? Yet no one will affirm that the cause is a lack of churches and priests, or the want of any super-natural aids of religion. This detestable vice has been a veritable beast in the vineyard of the Lord, making its lair in the precinct of the buildings containing the confessional and the altar. I will give you an example. For twenty years the clergy of the parish of St. Paul the Apostle, New York, have had a hard and uneven fight to keep saloons from the very church door, because the neighborhood of a Roman Catholic church is a good stand for the saloon business; and this is equally so in nearly every city in America. Who has not burned with shame to run the gauntlet of the saloons lining the way to the Roman Catholic cemetery? Whether it be the christening of the infant or the burial of the dead,

the attendance at the ordinary Sunday mass or celebrating of such feasts as Christmas and New Year's and St. Patrick's day, the weakness and degradation of our people has yoked religion and love of country and kindred, the two most elevated sentiments of our nature, to the chariots of the god Gambrinus and the god Bacchus, whose wheels crush down into hell a thousand fold more victims than ever perished under the wheels of Juggernaut.

"How can you expect conversions? demands Canon Murnane in his paper read to the Catholic Truth Conference at Birmingham—how can you expect conversions when a Roman Catholic prison chaplain can assert that of six or seven thousand women brought into the prison yearly, more than eighty per cent are Catholics?"

"The words written in this article will be hot words to some of my readers, but they will burn no one who reads them more painfully than they have burned me in writing them."

In 1913, Mr. Franklin Steiner of New York mailed about 75 letters to wardens of penitentiaries in the United States and Canada enquiring as to the religious affiliations of the convicts.

Twenty-one of the answers received were from various penal institutions in the United States which reported as follows:

The twenty-one prisons in as many states contained 65,772 convicts. Of these 31,513 declared themselves Roman Catholics; 30,423 claimed to be Protestants, and 3,836 were of those whose affiliation could not be positively determined.

Thus, in the institutions of 21 States, scattered well throughout the nation from California to New Hampshire and from Louisiana to North Dakota, 47.9 per cent of all convicts were Roman Catholics although the Roman Catholic population according to its own claims, did not exceed fifteen per cent of the whole.

This is the best possible indication of what Roman Catholic training does to its devotees. When 15.6 per cent of the population furnishes 47.9 per cent of a country's criminals there is something wrong with its moral quality. And when that criminal-producing class is distinguished and set to itself by its teaching and faith, there is assuredly something wrong with that teaching and faith."

In July, 1916, in the Church of St. Charles Borromeo, in Brooklyn, N. Y., Judge Cornelius T. Collins, of the Special Sessions Court said:

"In the Children's Court, 14,000 cases are brought up every year. Sixty per cent of these are Catholic children, thirty per cent, Jewish children, and the remainder of all other faiths. And this despite the fact that only one-fourth of the population of this City is Catholic. Sixty per cent of the boys in the reformatories are Catholics."

The Reports of the United States Prisons for the year ending June 30, 1919, show the following facts:

<i>Prison</i>	<i>Inmates</i>	<i>Roman Catholics</i>
Atlanta	1592	410
Leavenworth	2011	481
McNeil Island	No religious Report	
	3603	891

In the 21st Biennial Report of Minnesota State Prison 1918-1920, it is shown that 39 per cent of the inmates are Roman Catholic.

The Prison Report of the State of New York for 1919 shows that the total number of inmates admitted in the year ending June 30, 1919, in the prisons of New York, is 28,518, of which 16,184 are Roman Catholics.

In the Pittsburgh Observer of April 28, 1921, Rev. Leo Kalmer, Catholic Chaplain in the Illinois State Penitentiary, says 45 per cent of the inmates are Roman Catholic.

Rev. Isaac J. Lansing, in Romanism and the Republic on page 246, says, on this subject:—

“We have some figures concerning this that I think you can carry away with you in mind. Do you know that parochial schools in Boston have, as they claim, over 60,000 Roman Catholic children? And do you know what the effects of Roman Catholic parochial school education are? There are furnished to every 10,000 inhabitants by Roman Catholic schools 1,400 illiterates; that is to say, where there are 10,000 people whose children go to the parochial schools, there are furnished 1,400 illiterates from such population; by the public schools of 21 states 350 illiterates, only one-quarter as many; by the public schools of Massachusetts 71, while the Roman Catholic schools in the same proportion furnish 1,400. And how about paupers? Every 10,000 people sending their children to parochial schools furnish 410 paupers as the result of that form of education; by the public schools of 21 states, 170 paupers to 10,000 (compare with 410); by the public schools of Massachusetts 69 paupers to every 10,000, against 410 paupers furnished by the parochial schools. Do we want more parochial schools at that rate?

“And how about criminals? By the Roman Catholic parochial schools, to every 10,000 of the population, there are furnished 160 criminals; by the public schools of 21 states 75, not half as many; by the public schools of Massachusetts there are furnished only 11 criminals to every 10,000 inhabitants, compared with 160 criminals furnished by every 10,000 who send their children to the parochial schools. That is, the parochial schools furnish about fifteen times as many criminals as the public schools of Massachusetts. There are more children now in school than there ever were, and still an increase of crime. In France, two or three years ago, were

reported in 10,000 lay schools 5.55 crimes, 22.29 offences; in 10,000 church schools 65.10 crimes and 90.50 offences."

What is true of the criminal products of the Parochial Schools in this country is also true in other countries.

In "What Rome teaches" by M. F. Cusack, the Nun of Kenmare, on page 260, is this statement:—

"Rome sometimes, but rarely, admits that she has failed utterly as an educator and reformer. Such admissions should be well noted by Christian people, not in any spirit of vindictiveness or unchristian triumph, but in the spirit of true charity, which desires the salvation of the sinner and seeks the best way to save that which is in danger of being lost. It is sad indeed to see Christian people giving any support to the educational schemes of those who are obliged to make such admissions as those which have been made by Archbishop Ireland and by Father Nugent, whose many years' experience of the criminal classes of the Roman Catholic Church entitle his utterances to special respect.

"We copy the following from the Roman Catholic Times, April 17, 1885, of Liverpool, England:—

"The criminal returns of Her Majesty's prison at Liverpool for the year ending March 31, 1885, disclose a state of things which the Catholic public can not contemplate without feelings of sadness and humiliation; and it is hoped that our people may be roused to action that we place the figures before them. During the year 21,324 prisoners were committed to the jail—12,367 men, and 8,439 women. Of this number 13,676 were Catholics—7,237 men, and 6,439 women; while Protestants and all other denominations numbered only 7,648—5, 137 men, and 2,518 women.

It would further appear that the daily average of the prison population for the year was 633.45 Catholics against 327.52 of all other denominations. Thus our Roman Catholic people, though forming less than one-third of the population

of Liverpool, contribute nearly one-half to the total number of prisoners.”

The Catholic Times should have said “contributed more than half the number of prisoners.”

“This statement is fully confirmed by Father Nugent. In his address at Darlington, on October 18, 1886, reported in the Catholic Times, October 22, 1886, he stated “his daily duty during the past twenty two years had been within Her Majesty’s prison at Liverpool, and it had afforded him daily opportunities of studying mankind. That of the prisoners committed to that prison last year, 13,676 fell to his charge as Roman Catholic Chaplain. Again, in his address at the League Hall, Liverpool, on Thursday, November 11, 1886, reported in the Catholic Times, November 12, 1886, Father Nugent, alluding to the immorality prevailing in Liverpool, said, “Nine out of ten of the girls to be seen at night along London Road or Lime Street were Catholics; there was no use hiding it. The Sisters of Notre Dame had 15,000 girls under their charge. What became of them after they left school? Thy went into places where they got work, and instead of going home at night, went out with their companions.”

ROMAN CATHOLIC HISTORY IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

Now let me call your attention to another phase of this school question. I hold in my hand a book entitled “An Introduction to American History. European Beginnings by Alice M. Atkinson.”

This Book is a glorification of the Roman Catholic Church; perverts and distorts the real facts of history so as to show the Roman Catholic Church to be the only true religion; suppresses all crimes against humanity committed by that Church and endeavors to create in the minds of American boys and girls the belief that this Holy Church was a great factor in the creation of our civilization and of American History.

In this book on page 149 is this statement—"Pope Innocent III was one of the greatest and most powerful popes that ever occupied the papal throne. He was deeply interested not only in the religious but also in the political affairs of every European nation of the time, and had a wide influence with kings and emperors."

* * * *

Read the following pages and see what manner of man this Pope was.

From True American Leaflets—No. 11.

TRUE HISTORY OF POPE INNOCENT III WHO WAS "DEEPLY INTERESTED IN THE RELIGIOUS AFFAIRS OF EUROPE."

In a History of the Popes, written by Louis Marie De Cormenin, a Roman Catholic, on page 461, is this description of this "greatest and most powerful pope":

"In the midst of all these wars with princes and kings, Innocent did not loose sight of heresies. He had already sent the monks Rainier and Guy, to the south of France, with power to constrain the Vaudois, to abjure, and to employ for this purpose the sword, water and fire, as these good monks should judge it necessary to use one or the other, or all three together, for the greater glory of God. "Thus," says Perrin, "all Christendom was agitated by the sight of unfortunate men hung to gallows, tortured on wooden horses, or burned on funeral piles, because they placed their trust in God alone and refused to believe in the vain ceremonies invented by men." As the monks, notwithstanding their utmost endeavors, failed in their task, and did not progress sufficiently in their work, in the opinion of the pope at least, three new legates left Rome commissioned to exterminate all heretics to the last man; that is to say, four-fifths of the southern population. These three monks, who were invested with the confidence of the holy father, were called Arnaud, Pierre de Castlenau,

and Ralph, worthy monks of the order of the Citeaux. The obstinacy of the Vaudois was such that, notwithstanding preachings and persecutions, the sect increased daily, and found recruits among the great lords of the country; amongst others, Raymond the Fourth, Count of Toulouse, and Raymond Roger, Count of Foix. The executions then became more difficult for the missionaries; the executioners refused to perform their duty; the people rose and in a moment of effervescence stoned Pierre de Castlenau, who was the most cruel of the three. As soon as the Pope was informed of this murder, he resolved to avenge it terribly, so that its example might not affect the catholic provinces, and he caused a crusade to be preached against the unfortunate Vaudois. The Count of Toulouse and his subjects were excommunicated; plenary indulgences were granted to those who should arm against the heretics; and the palm of martyrdom was promised to the fanatics who should perish in this war.

The unfortunate Raymond, foreseeing the disasters which were to fall on his states, soon made his submission to the legates of the Pope and took the oath of obedience and fidelity to the Holy See. Nothing could appease the wrath of Innocent the Third; the Count himself was obliged to take the cross against his own subjects, after having submitted to an infamous punishment.

Perrin in his history of the Albigenses thus relates the humiliating ceremonial to which the Count was submitted: "The legate caused Count Raymond to be stripped of all his clothing on the threshold of the church of St. Gilles; he put a stole around his neck and caused him to make the tour of the grave of Pierre de Castlenau nine times, scourging him with rods in the presence of counts, marquises, barons, prelates, and a great concourse of people. And as Raymond protested against this penance, which was inflicted on him for a sin that he had not committed, the legate imposed silence on him by saying that he was guilty as the sin had been committed in his states. He then caused him to swear on the crucifix, the gospel, and the relics, an entire submission to

the Holy See, and named him chief of the crusade, in order that the Vaudois might see that they were lost, since their friends and protectors combated against them.”

“The crusaders could not, however, penetrate into the interior of the country until the arrival of a new legate, named Dominick, and the Count de Montfort, who brought with him an army of twenty-four thousand men. Then only did the operations of the campaign commence, and they laid siege to Beziers. This flourishing city courageously resisted the efforts of the fanatics for an entire month; at length a horrible famine constrained the inhabitants to make proposals of surrender; but as these infamous persecutors had sworn to exterminate this brave population, all offers were rejected. In vain did the Count de Beziers and the venerable prefect of the city cast themselves at the feet of St. Dominick beseeching him to spare at least the Catholics, who formed a majority of the population of Beziers—the monk was inflexible, and replied that he had received orders from the Pope to burn the city, and put all the population to the sword; and that, moreover, after the massacre God would recognize His friends.

“The siege was pushed with more vigor than before and in a last assault, the city fell into the power of the crusaders. Then commenced a butchery of which history affords no second example. The frightful Dominick, with the cross in one hand and the bull of the Pope in the other, animated the combatants and incited them to carnage, to rape, to incendiarism. He fulfilled so well the orders of the Pope that sixty thousand dead bodies of both sexes, men, women and children and old persons, were swallowed up beneath the smoking ruins of their city, reduced to ashes. Those among the unfortunate whom the soldiers spared on account of their youth, or beauty, were reserved for new scenes of horror. Young girls and young boys were led, entirely naked, before the tomb of Pierre de Castlenau—were beaten by the monks with thongs loaded with lead, and when their bodies were en-

tirely covered with blood, were abandoned to the brutality of the soldiers, then murdered, and their dead bodies horribly polluted.

“All these atrocities were not arrested at the single city of Beziers. The executioners having no more victims at hand, pursued their march and attacked the Count de Beziers, who had retired to Carcassone, well resolved to defend that place to the last. But he had not foreseen that he should have all the forces of the crusaders upon him, and he was soon obliged to propose terms. At Carcassone as at Beziers, St. Dominick was inflexible; he replied that the only condition he could offer was that the inhabitants of Carcassone, men women and children, should abandon their walls, without clothing, and should retire to a neighboring place to await their fate. The Lord of Beziers, knowing his enemies, refused to expose his subjects to the rage of these tigers, and continued his defence for a month longer. Treason finally came to the aid of the crusaders. Carcassone was delivered up to the Count de Montfort, and was treated with the same cruelty as Beziers. Toulouse, Alby, Castlenaudary, and all the cities of the south which contained Albigenses, were also devastated by this army of assassins.”

“Finally came the decisive hour in which tyrants, like other men, must go to render an account to God of their good and evil actions. This fatal day came to Innocent; at the termination of a debauch at the table, he was seized with a violent fever, which brought him to the tomb on the 16th of July, 1216.”

Matthew Paris, in his history, represents Pope Innocent as the proudest, the most ambitious, and the most avaricious of men; affirming that there was no crime which he was not capable of committing or favoring for money. This judgment is entirely justified in the life of this Pope.”

Such is the history and character of this Pope whom the boys and girls in the Public Schools of Pennsylvania are taught in this book of American History was such a great and good

man who was "deeply interested in the religious affairs of Europe."

Men and women of Pennsylvania, what do you think of such falsehoods and propoganda being taught to your children by the teachers in the Public Schools?

15. ANNULLMENT OF THE CONSTITUTION OF PENNSYLVANIA.

And now let me call your attention to another phase of this annullment of our Constitution and Laws.

Section 18 of Article 3 of the Constitution of Pennsylvania, provides as follows:—

"No appropriations except for pensions or gratuities for military services, shall be made for charitable, educational or educational purposes to any person or community, nor to any denominational or sectarian institution, corporation or association."

This is as plain as the English language can express it but that made no difference to this foreign power who claims the right to annul all constitutions and laws.

For some years after the adoption of this Constitution, which went into force on the first day of January, 1874, no such appropriations were passed, but various attempts were made to pass them and various Governors vetoed the bills. But notwithstanding these vetoes, constant efforts were made by those interested to get such appropriations through the Legislature. The first appropriation of that character which passed through without being vetoed was one to a Roman Catholic institution in Pittsburgh in the year 1881. This was the entering wedge and then the work of destroying the Constitution was on in earnest. There was a wild scramble of politicians to in this manner use the funds of the State for the purchase of votes and year after year the plunder of the Public Treasury for the benefit of Sectarian Institutions went merrily on.

The progressive character of these appropriations to Sectarian Institutions from 1874 is shown by the following table compiled from the Pamphlet Laws:—

Year	Total
1881	\$30,000
1883	
1885	10,000
1887	
1889	2,000
1891	32,000
1893	55,000
1895	62,000
1897	67,000
1899	89,000
1901	155,000
1903	381,000
1905	566,000
1907	1,093,500
1909	964,000
1911	1,299,000
1913	1,195,050
1915	1,116,000
1917	1,200,000
1919	2,120,689
	\$10,437,239

Of this total sum, about \$8,000,000 was appropriated to Roman Catholic Institutions, \$1,000,000 to Protestant Institutions, and \$1,000,000 to Jewish Institutions.

So great had this evil become that in 1918 in order to prevent this misuse of the public funds, a number of patriotic citizens of Pennsylvania organized the Anti-Sectarian-Appropriation Association.

This Association has more than 2400 contributors and is endorsed and sustained by the patriotic organizations of the

State, who through their associate membership have more than 250,000 voters supporting this movement.

On February 8, 1919, this Association sent a personal letter to every member of the Legislature calling his attention to the above provisions of the Constitution and asking him to vote against any such appropriation.

On March 8, 1919, a second letter was sent to each member of the Legislature, again calling his attention to the above provisions of the Constitution, and further calling his attention to a list of such Sectarian Appropriation Bills which had been presented to the Legislature; and again asking members of the Legislature to vote against these proposed appropriations.

But, the members of the Legislature paid no attention to these letters and requests. All the bills presented were passed.

The Association then wrote to the Governor a letter concerning the matter, quoting the Constitution as above stated, and also enclosing copies of vetoes of such appropriations by former Governors. But, while thus fully informed, the Governor signed the bills, thus violating his oath of office to "support, obey and defend the Constitution of the United States, and the Constitution of this Commonwealth."

All these means having failed to prevent these illegal appropriations the Association began action in the Courts for an injunction to prevent the State officers from paying them.

Five test cases were selected—two Protstant, two Roman Catholic and one Jewish. The defendants fought the cases at every step; but they finally reached the Supreme Court of the State and were argued on the twenty-fifth day of May, 1921; and on the first day of July, 1921, the Supreme Court handed down a unanimous decision reversing the decision of the lower Court and granting the injunction as asked by the plaintiff.

That decision is the most important ever made by any Court in the United States and settles the question of the appropriation of Public Funds to Sectarian Institutions as unconstitutional and contrary to the settled policy of the State.

FINAL APPEAL

So, as best I could I have tried to show you the responsibility which you and all good citizens bear to the government under which we live; the greatness of the government and the inestimable rights and privileges guaranteed to us by our institutions; and the efforts being made to destroy these institutions.

I trust I have been able to show you that the greatest enemy to our free institutions today is this Foreign Government which under the guise of Religion assumes to set up a Super-Government over us and dares to set aside our Constitutions and Laws.

And now, in view of all these facts and the perils to our Government and our Free Institutions, I appeal to you as American Citizens, as leaders of thought, as men of God, to become aroused to the dangers of the situation; I beg of you to go to your various congregations, present to them the facts which I have tried to give you today; urge them to perform their duties as citizens, to the end that we may place in official positions only men who are devoted to American Ideals. Let us in season and out of season work and talk and act together for the preservation of this Great Republic so that this Government "of the people, by the people and for the people" shall not perish from the face of the earth."

On the motion of Frank B. Lynch, a rising vote of thanks was given to the speaker of the morning.

(DR. LYNCH'S SPEECH)

Mr. Chairman:

Before this motion is put, I desire to say a few words concerning my friend, the speaker of the morning. I have worked side by side with Luther S. Kauffman for years and am therefore, in a position to know something of the character and work of the service he has rendered through these years to the cause of righteousness and civic betterment.

Having been a member of the Executive Committee of the Anti-Sectarian Appropriation Association through whose influence sectarian institutions were stopped from receiving aid from the public funds of the State, I am glad to acknowledge the large debt under which the Committee has been placed by the invaluable service rendered by Mr. Kauffman. To him more than to any other man, or set of men, belongs the victory won in the face of fiercest opposition. He is worthy, not only of our enthusiastic endorsement, but he should also receive our financial backing. Many times he has been compelled to pay the expenses of the Committee out of his private purse, and at all times he has given his legal services without recompense. Let us stand behind him morally and financially.

End of Book

End of Vatican Assassins CD containing
Anti-Jesuit Suppressed Documents