

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION.

THE conclusion of the whole matter is a very clear one. Englishmen are very human. The voters there are often ignorant and careless about their votes, as in every country where the suffrage is a broad one. Often the voters are men who have few high aims, but who have low, selfish appetites that they like to satisfy. The candidates and their agents like to win, and for the sake of winning they will do as the voters wish in many cases, if they dare. They appeal to the higher motives first and most strongly; then to prejudice; then, if need be, at times, to the lowest motives of greed and appetite.

The law, however, is most rigid, and, on the whole, public opinion is behind it. The risk from corruption is so great that warnings not to violate the law are put forward most prominently by all parties, and the dangers of so doing are fully explained. Without the risk involved in corruption, there would be much more of it. There are still a very little bribery; a little personation; more, but still not very much, treating; some coercion by employers, some by priests; a good deal of trickery and misrepresentation that is mean but very natural, and which often comes from sincere but narrow prejudice; and a good deal of indirect and, on the whole, I think, very insidious and evil, though not always illegal, corruption committed while "nursing the constituencies." This evil is hardly so much political as social.

From all that I can learn, what corrupt practices exist are to be found mostly in the parliamentary elections. Those for the county councils, and those more strictly local, are, as might be expected perhaps, more free even than the parliamentary from corrupt practices of all kinds. On the whole, speaking broadly and comparatively, the elections of England are pure—probably, on the whole, better than those of France or Germany, far better than those of the United States. I think that one may say that they are purer than in any other of

the great states where the political interest is so powerful. There is probably no more bribery or treating or personation in Germany, no more coercion by employers; but the government sometimes has made its coercive power felt more there, and the same thing holds true, in a somewhat different way, in France and Italy.

England, from a state of the worst corruption, has reached a very enviable condition, and this in good part as the result of her law-making. I have shown, I think, the very worst that can be said, and I have in a great measure left unsaid the good; but the relative weakness of the bad side brings out the strength of the good.

The experience of England seems to point out the next step for us to take, for we must not assume that any legislation on that subject will be final.

There were more petitions to unseat members after the election of 1892 in England than after that of 1885. Presumably the politicians found the law more terrifying when it was new, and were therefore unwilling to take so many risks in evading it. This is often the case with such a law. After a time it can be more or less successfully evaded, and it must then be amended to meet the new tricks. So we shall in the future, perhaps, need much legislation to keep the suffrage pure: civil service reform; some limiting qualifications of the suffrage for immigrants, perhaps, or for the ignorant and corrupt—possibly the proportional system of representation that works so strongly for purity in Switzerland. But, for the immediate future, we can most wisely look to corrupt practices acts, framed in the main on the English model, with, of course, due adaptation to our forms of government and of party organization. Seven of our States have already framed such laws, though most of them will probably need to be made more stringent and detailed. But such laws, with the Australian ballot to aid, and a favoring public opinion to enforce them, can, for the present at least, give us within measurable distance a pure ballot.

Jeremiah W. Jenks.

THE ANTI-CATHOLIC CRUSADE.



THE year of the Parliament of Religions witnessed a most discouraging outbreak of religious rancor in the United States. It is the ancient feud of Protestant and Romanist, and the new form which it has taken is worse than the old Know-nothingism. The animus of that party

was ostensibly its opposition to foreigners; the present movement is directed solely against Roman Catholics.

The time seems inopportune for such an outbreak. The occupant of the papal throne is perhaps the most enlightened and the most progressive pontiff who has ever occupied that

throne: the whole policy of the Church under his administration has been tending toward a reconciliation with modern civilization, thus in effect reversing the tendencies of the preceding reign; the right of the people to govern themselves under republican forms has been distinctly affirmed by Pope Leo XIII.; his deliverances upon the social question have manifested a large intelligence and quick human sympathy; and we are told by those who ought to know that the Pope is not alone in this liberalism—that he is heartily supported by the whole Curia, and by public sentiment at Rome. This is the administration which the anti-Catholic zealots have chosen to attack; it is in the presence of these hopeful movements of the Roman ecclesiasticism that they are seeking to uncover the smoldering embers of religious animosity.

Several secret orders are taking part in this crusade. Just now they are very strong in Ohio and in Michigan, and in all the States farther West. I learn that many of the local governments in eastern Michigan are in their possession; in some portions of Ohio they have been able to control municipal elections. In my own county, at the last election, every man but one upon the county ticket of one of the parties was reputed to be a member of one of these orders. It was also said, during the campaign, that a large proportion of the legislative candidates of one of the parties belonged to this order.

The methods employed by these orders in gathering their adherents seem to be tolerably uniform. The campaign opens with the furtive circulation of certain documents. The first of these is generally a paper entitled, "Instructions to Catholics." It is printed in the form of a leaflet, and handed from one to another. The first copy which was placed in my hands was supposed by my informant to be a veritable letter of instructions issued by the Roman Catholic authorities, a copy of which had by some secret means been obtained. In the newspapers of the order this document is also kept standing. The headlines under which it commonly appears are such as these: "Instructions to the Catholics. Platform of the Papal Party as Laid Down by the Pope. Pecci's Hands Busy in American Affairs." After a preamble addressed "To Our Beloved Children in the Faith," these hierarchs are made to say, "We here announce and publish the following platform of principles, or orders, from the Holy See." The document bears *the official signature of eight archbishops*, with the counter-signature and confirmation of Cardinal Gibbons. It is said to have been "decreed and ordered by the provincial council at their session, August 5, 1890." Those in whose hands this document is placed are thus expected to regard it

as a veritable official utterance of the highest Roman Catholic authorities in this country. Here, now, are a few of the counsels which Cardinal Gibbons and Archbishop Ireland, and their compeers, are represented as giving to American Catholics:

We view with alarm the rapid spread of educated intelligence, knowing well that wherever the people are intelligent, the priest and prince can not hope to live on the labor of the masses whose brains have been fertilized with our holy catechism. That in order to restore the order of things that made the reign of Gregory VII., of holy memory, so glorious, the people must not think; that is a privilege that belongs only to the pope, who by divine right is the only person appointed by God to do the political and religious thinking of this world.

We view with alarm the rapid diffusion of the English language. It stands before the world as the tongue which has for 300 years ever been opposed to our holy church, and those who speak it have been foremost in assailing the holy see.

We are opposed to any system of schools that teaches the youth more than Roman catechism, or that teaches the young to think—it is unnecessary, a waste of time and money, when the holy father has been appointed by God, especially at the Vatican council in 1870, to do the thinking of this world. Therefore, we call upon our subjects to do all they can to break down and destroy the free public schools of this protestant nation, which has compelled us to set up and maintain at great expense parochial schools to defend our faith, thus lessening the incomes of the clergy.

In order to find employment for the many thousands of the faithful who are coming daily to swell the ranks of our catholic army, which will in due time possess this land, we must secure control of all the cities, railways, manufactories, mines, steam and sailing vessels—above all the press—in fact, every enterprise requiring labor, in order to furnish our newcomers employment; this will render it necessary to remove or crowd out the American heretics who are now employed. You need not hesitate; it is your duty to do so. You must not stop at anything to accomplish this end. There are many ways to consult your father confessor, but "be careful to do nothing that will create scandal."

American Protestants, the graduates of our public schools, are expected to believe that Roman Catholic prelates are in the habit of talking in this way to the people of their charge. The men who forged this precious manifesto, and put the Pope's name at the head of it, and the signatures of nine of their fellow-citizens at the foot of it, seem to have had no misgiving that those to whom it was shown would laugh in their faces. And the melancholy fact is that they were justified in their confidence. The forgery has been taken seriously by tens of

thousands of American voters. No man can intimate a doubt of its genuineness without being denounced as a Jesuit in disguise or an ally of the Pope. It is published week after week in scores of journals with large circulation. There are great masses of our people to whom it does not seem improbable that the Roman Catholic archbishops would publish such a document as this. We might have thought it an easy task to convince this multitude that these prelates were great knaves, but who could have imagined that credence would be given to a document which represents them as preposterous fools?

Another document of a still more astonishing nature has also been freely employed. This is a pseudo-encyclical of Pope Leo XIII. addressed "to the Jesuits, patriarchs, primates, archbishops, and other ordinaries," and "given at St. Peter's, Rome, on December 25, 1891, the fifteenth year of our Pontificate." In this the Pope is made to declare that this continent, discovered by Columbus, belongs to him: that he has long forborne to take forcible possession of it, but that the time has now come. He therefore is made to fulminate as follows:

We proclaim the people of the United States to have forfeited all right to rule said republic, and also all dominion, dignity, and privileges appertaining to it. We likewise declare that all subjects of every rank and condition in the United States, and every individual who has taken any oath of loyalty to the United States in any way whatever, may be absolved from said oath, as also from all duty, fidelity, or obedience, on or about Sept. 5, 1893, when the Roman Catholic Congress shall convene at Chicago, Ill., as we shall exonerate them from all engagements: and on or about the feast of Ignatius Loyola, in the year of our Lord 1893, *it will be the duty of the faithful to exterminate all heretics found within the jurisdiction of the United States.*

This document has been published in many of the anti-Catholic newspapers; in some of them it has been kept standing week by week for months at a time; in leaflets and hand-bills of every form it has been distributed throughout the whole country.¹

These are the two principal documents which have been employed in working up the anti-papal fury. It is difficult for intelligent men to believe that literature of this description can be intended to be taken seriously. It reads like the fabrication of a very clumsy humorist.

¹ "The Christian Advocate" of New York, which will not be suspected of undue friendliness to Roman Catholics, says of this document: "We do not know of a more transparent fraud. We are astonished that any human being acquainted with the methods of the Roman Catholic Church could have believed either the Pope or his advisers such dull idiots as this document

But one who is as familiar as I have been constrained to be, through the constant attentions of members of this order, with the newspapers, leaflets, circulars, and manifestos by which it carries on its propaganda knows that they are all of a piece. The most extravagant humorist could not invent anything more absurd than that which they publish weekly as current history. And whatever may have been the origin of these documents, it cannot be denied that they have been used as campaign literature all over the land, in all manner of publications, and that their genuineness has been editorially asserted and defended in the organs of the order. With these documents have been combined a variety of alleged oaths of papal leaders and garbled extracts of Roman Catholic writings. In every community oral tales of the same tenor are diligently passed from lip to lip. "A consignment of arms has come to Father So-and-So!" "They are drilling every night in the basements of their churches!" You are met on the street by excited persons who ask you what you think about these Catholics drilling in all their churches, and getting ready for war. If you demand definite information as to the precise church where this drilling is going on, as to the name of the priest who has received these arms, the reply is apt to be evasive. In some cases, however, names and places have been given, and investigations have followed, resulting in no discoveries. These identical stories have been told, I suppose, in hundreds of communities, and they have not, so far as I have been able to hear, been verified in a single instance. Several churches have been freely open to their search, but not one single firearm has been discovered in any Roman Catholic church in the United States; not a particle of evidence of such warlike preparation has ever been produced. The stories are, however, still circulating just as freely as ever.

When the ground has been well prepared by the dissemination of such dreadful documents and such harrowing tales, the work of organization proceeds. The meeting-places of these orders are intended to be secret; all their operations are carried on in the most stealthy manner. It will be readily seen, however, that a class of persons who could accept as genuine the documents which I have described would not be likely to preserve such secrets, and the existence and the main purpose of these orders speedily transpire.

would prove them to be." It is the work, the "Advocate" says, of some one "whose mendacity has intoxicated his own mind to such a degree that, though he obviously wanted to lie, he could not do it shrewdly." This phrase aptly describes the state of mind in which the greater part of this literature was begotten.

Chief among these anti-Catholic secret orders is the American Protective Association, better known by its initials. The platform of principles which this order publishes in the newspapers sounds well; most platforms do. It is not, however, always easy to find in its platform the animus of a political party; much less safe is it to accept those statements of its designs which a secret political society publishes in the newspapers. If its real purposes could be published in the newspapers, there would appear to be no reason for secrecy.

The platform of the A. P. A. makes these declarations:

We attack no man's religion so long as he does not attempt to make his religion an element of political power.

We are in favor of preserving constitutional liberty and maintaining the government of the United States.

We regard all religio-political organizations as the enemies of civil and religious liberty.

This is the exoteric doctrine. The esoteric differs widely, as may be seen by comparing these statements with the oath taken at their initiation by all members of the order. This oath has been published in several places, having been derived, apparently, from independent sources. Some verbal differences appear in these versions, but their substantial identity is conclusive evidence of their essential genuineness. The cardinal obligations of this oath are two: (1) A promise never to favor or aid the nomination, election, or appointment of a Roman Catholic to any political office. (2) A promise never to employ a Roman Catholic in any capacity if the services of a Protestant can be obtained. The evidence that the oath of the order contains these two obligations is abundant and conclusive. Sane and reputable men, members of the order, in controversy with me upon the subject, have acknowledged this; and the challenge to men of known veracity to come forward and deny it has not been accepted. If the oath is not substantially as published, such a denial would violate no obligation.

In the light of this oath, which every member of the A. P. A. takes with his hand upon his heart, we must interpret those outgivings printed in the newspapers. When he says that he attacks no man's religion so long as he does not intrude it into politics, we explain his saying as well as we can, in view of his oath that he will not employ a Roman Catholic in any capacity if he can obtain the services of a Protestant, and that he will never countenance or aid the nomination, election, or appointment to public office of any Roman Catholic. Not

a word is said in this oath about any distinction between Roman Catholics who attempt to make their religion an element of political power and Roman Catholics who do not; Roman Catholics, as such, are sweepingly proscribed. And when the champion of this order tells us in the newspapers that he is "in favor of preserving constitutional liberty," we must bear in mind that he has sworn to violate the first principle of American constitutional liberty, which forbids discrimination against men on account of their religious belief. The Constitution of the United States declares that "no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States." All the State constitutions embody the same principle. The oath of the A. P. A. binds its members to apply a religious test to every candidate for office—to give political office to none but Protestants. This is what they mean when they say that they are "in favor of preserving constitutional liberty."

What may be done by secret conclaves of men, bound together by such an oath as this, meeting at night in concealed places, and carefully hiding all their operations from the public eye, any man is at liberty to conjecture. It is evident that these assemblies will be hotbeds of malicious rumor. The men who have accepted as genuine the "Instructions to Catholics" and the pseudo-encyclical are prepared to believe anything. The most preposterous lies can be started in these conclaves, for there is no one there to challenge them; and thence they can pass from mouth to mouth until they have filled the whole community with their malarious influence. A system of espionage falls in with this scheme, and spies are detailed to attend Catholic churches to watch the priests and the bishops, and to dog the footsteps of those who are supposed to be friendly to the Roman Catholics. Suspicions and fears are thus plentifully engendered, and many communities have been filled with terror. A Protestant minister of Columbus, Ohio, stated not long ago in an ecclesiastical assembly that he had purchased a Winchester rifle to defend himself against the Romanists. The following extract from a letter written by a physician in one of the smaller towns in Ohio describes a state of things which is not uncommon in Western communities:

We have been, and still are, having an excitement in our usually quiet town, in regard to the Catholic question. There is not a Catholic in the entire township; but a large number of our people are intensely stirred up, some almost prostrated with fear, afraid that the Catholics are about making a wholesale attack upon Protestants, killing and plundering, and destroying our schools and churches. Of course it obtains the strongest foothold among the ignorant and un-

thinking, yet it seems to cause great uneasiness and fear among many of the more intelligent.

One of my neighbors, a justice of the Supreme Court, having some acquaintance with this community, and feeling curious to know whether this report was correct, wrote, and satisfied himself of its substantial accuracy. If the documents on which the A. P. A. is making its campaign are genuine, this is precisely the state of feeling which ought to exist. "There is not a Catholic in the entire township," says my correspondent. In such communities the terror is much more easily excited. The people of these rural neighborhoods are told the most lurid tales of what is going on in the cities. My correspondent had heard that a year ago all the public-school teachers in Columbus were Roman Catholics; the fact was that out of 349 teachers not more than 12 were Roman Catholics. The most blood-curdling reports had also reached that hamlet of the preparations for war which the Catholics in Columbus were making. Thus the secret propaganda is able to work very effectively in the rural districts. A large proportion of these councils are found in country places.

But credulity is not confined to the country. A minister of the gospel in Columbus told me that *all* our county officers were Roman Catholics, and that 95 per cent. of the police of our city were Catholics. The fact was that at that time 5 out of 20 county officials were of that faith, and 45 out of 112 policemen.

That in this year of grace a secret political society, built on such foundations of forgery, and bound together with such an oath, should be sweeping over the land like the Russian epidemic, is certainly a fact for patriots and Christians to ponder. The depth and density of that popular ignorance which permits the use of such documents as I have cited is certainly appalling.

Are we expected to believe that educated men do not know these documents to be forgeries? Why have they not demanded their suppression? I asked a clergyman if he regarded the "Instructions to Catholics" as genuine. He said, with some embarrassment, that he supposed those who prepared it thought "that was about what the Catholic authorities would say if they expressed their real convictions." Some such casuistry as this is contained in the following note sometimes appended to the "Instructions": "The essence of this document is to be found in the writings of so-called American Romish bishops and the letters of the Pope to them." This note is itself the clearest evidence of the fraudulent character of the writing to which it is attached. For every paragraph of that document is put into the first per-

son plural. It purports to be, not the essence, but the very words of the men whose names are signed to it: if it is only the essence of what they have said,—extracted by somebody else, or what somebody has imagined they would say if they told the truth,—then what shall we say of the morality of those who publish it as their very words, and forge their signatures to it?

The silence of the pulpit in many instances is explained by the fact that members of the church are members of the order, and the pastor is unwilling to alienate any of his supporters. There are few churches, I suppose, in the Western cities in which members of this order are not found. But a more influential reason for this silence is a feeling which is shared by the great majority of Protestant ministers, that Roman Catholics, as such, are a very dangerous class of persons, and that any kind of opposition to them is therefore to be welcomed. The extermination or repression of the Roman Catholic Church seems to these pious men a desirable end, and they are therefore inclined to argue that any means to that end are justifiable.

The common excuse for these methods offered by men who are capable of reasoning about them is that they are simply retaliatory; that Roman Catholics have been practising similar outrages, and that Protestants are only trying to get even with them. One of the apologists of the A. P. A., in a letter to me, says, "It is a question of organization and methods against organization and methods, and Catholics have had more than a quarter of a century the start." The implication seems to be that Protestants must push the worst methods of the Romanists with all the greater diligence now that they have taken them up.

Let us assume that the Roman Catholic people of this country are our enemies. Have we who are Christians any rule about the treatment of enemies? Are the methods of the A. P. A. founded on this rule? Let us admit for the sake of argument that the aims and practices of the Roman Catholics are wholly evil. What is the Christian way of overcoming evil? Does any man imagine that Roman Catholics will be turned from their evil ways, and converted from enmity to friendship, by boycotting them, and proscribing them politically, and telling outrageous lies about them?

Let us concede that a grave conflict between Protestants and Roman Catholics is impending, and that there is danger of encroachments by them upon our liberties, which it will be our duty sternly to resist. Shall we best prepare ourselves for that conflict by such a regimen as that which the A. P. A. commends to us? Will the knowledge that we have been doing

our best to deprive them of their dearest rights — to disfranchise and impoverish and dishonor them — add strength to our arms in that day of battle? If any such collisions are probable, is it not the dictate of ordinary prudence that we keep ourselves clear of everything that savors of injustice or oppression? that we yield to them every right that belongs to them? that we give them no just cause for resentment, and leave in their memory no wrongs to be revenged?

For one, I confess that I cannot look with complacency upon the attitude of some of the Roman Catholic leaders toward the public schools; and their attempts, in cities where they have the power, to use the municipal machinery for their own purposes are not reassuring. So far as the schools are concerned, the encouraging fact is that multitudes of the Roman Catholic laymen, and not a few priests, are loyal supporters of our system of public education. Firm and reasonable treatment of the subject will strengthen this element. But a policy like that of the A. P. A. must drive the entire Roman Catholic population into complete alienism. Could any rational Protestant expect Roman Catholics to send their children to schools under the control of men who have sworn these oaths and disseminated these forgeries?

The oath of the A. P. A. does not lack apologists. Those who defend it are the best witnesses to its genuineness. They are in the habit of excusing its boycotting feature by saying that it expresses only our natural choice of friends to strangers as associates in business. Methodists, they say, are more apt to employ Methodists, and Catholics to trade with Catholics; and this, they add, is perfectly lawful, and the oath means no more than this. The oath means a great deal more than this. It is quite true that religious sectarianism does invade the industrial and commercial realm; men do discriminate in behalf of their own coreligionists: but it is a kind of clannishness which they do not defend. If a Methodist should openly say, "I will have no business dealings with any but Methodists," he would make himself contemptible. But even that would be a very different thing from entering into a combination with other sectarians, all of whom should bind themselves by an oath never to employ or deal with those holding a certain religious belief.

But we are referred by these apologists to the qualifying clause, that they will not employ a Roman Catholic in any capacity *if they can obtain the services of a Protestant.*

This is the refinement of meanness. It signifies that these heroic defenders of the faith do not intend to expose themselves to any serious inconvenience in this warfare. "What does it mean but this," says the Rev. Alexander Milne, "that in case I cannot find any one else to

do some work I desire, I will employ a Roman Catholic? It would be foolishness for me to go without food because I could get no Protestant cook. It would be foolishness to cause myself suffering or inconvenience in any case for the same reason. Of course, then, I will have a Roman Catholic rather than go without anything. I will not injure myself. I am not a fool." Stated briefly, it means this: "I will do all the hurt I can to Roman Catholics unless it involves hurting myself."

The political proscription of Roman Catholics which the oath requires is justified on the plea that Roman Catholics are not and cannot be loyal Americans; that their doctrine of the papal supremacy puts them completely under the power of a foreign potentate. Roman Catholic scholars dispute this interpretation of their allegiance, and insist that they owe no obedience to the Pope which can interfere with their duty to their country. I will not argue this question. Let us admit for the sake of the argument that the logic of the papal theory would require the Roman Catholic to disobey, at the Pope's command, the laws of his country. But is it true that we all follow our theories to their logical results? The logic of his doctrine requires every Presbyterian to believe in infant damnation: do Presbyterians generally believe in infant damnation? The logic of his theory requires the Baptist to unchurch all other Christians. Does the Baptist follow his logic? "That good dose of inconsistency which," as Cousin says, "common sense often prescribes for philosophy" is all that saves a good many of us from being fanatics or fools. That good dose of inconsistency has been well shaken and taken by millions of Roman Catholics. They are not really any more consistent than the rest of us, and the attempt to include them in the condemnation of alienism and treason is not a sane procedure. Roman Catholics have proved their loyalty to this nation on many a bloody battle-field; and those who imagine that the Pope's orders always find them tame, spiritless subjects of his will should read of his attempted interference with the recent "Plan of Campaign" in Ireland.

The relation of the oath of this order to the oath of office taken by all high officials under our Government demands consideration. It is evident that the contradiction between the two is absolute. The oath of office promises obedience to the constitution of the State and of the nation, and these constitutions forbid any distinction or preference among men on account of their religious belief. The oath of the order binds a man to make precisely these distinctions. What the member of the A. P. A. swears, in his council, that he will do, he swears, on the threshold of his office, that he will not

do. So, if he joins the order after he is inducted into office, his initiation oath is the flat repudiation of his official oath.¹

Let us suppose that he is a judge upon the bench. It would seem that the proof of having taken this oath should subject a judge to impeachment; but the lawyers declare that there is probably no law by which this punishment could be inflicted. Great authorities say that while the oath of the order is in clear opposition to the official oath, yet it would be assumed that in the oath of office the official had renounced the oath of the order. *If he should govern himself while in office by the oath of his order he would, say these authorities, be liable to impeachment.* Those voters who have helped to elevate to the bench members of this organization must find this reflection somewhat discomforting. False to one or the other of these oaths their candidate must be; they may find some exercise for their ethical judgment in determining on which side he is forsworn. The astounding thing is that a man who has entered into a conspiracy to deprive a large class of his fellow-citizens of their dearest rights should have the effrontery to preside over any court of justice.

Suppose that the official raised to office by his brethren of the A. P. A. is one whose duty it is to appoint subordinate officials. His oath of office binds him to support the Constitution, and the Constitution forbids him to apply religious tests to candidates for office. But the oath of his order obliges him to impose such tests, and makes him promise that he will never appoint to office any man who is not a Protestant. It is certain that one of these oaths must be broken. The question as to which he shall break is sometimes embarrassing. The present mayor of Denver, who through misrepresentation, as he alleges, had taken the oath of the order, signalized his renunciation of it by appointing, on the first day of his term of office, a Roman Catholic chief of police.

The A. P. A. at once demanded the chief's removal, which was refused, whereupon the society denounced the mayor, and in flaming resolutions ordered that his photograph, draped in black, and inscribed, "Perjurer and Traitor,"² be hung in the council chamber; "that all communication with said traitor and perjurer do now forever cease"; and that "whenever his carcass repose in the arms of mother earth, in whatsoever land, an unknown committee, duly appointed, shall perform its last rite in the name of this council, by marking the place, that all may know, 'Here lies a traitor.'" This is thrilling; but these warm-hearted Christians do not seem to have reflected that if he had kept their oath he would most certainly have been a "traitor and perjurer" through the violation of his oath of office. In Rockford, Ill., the mayor essayed to keep his A. P. A. oath by removing a very popular subordinate official who was a Roman Catholic. In this case several Protestant councilmen made it quite unpleasant for the mayor by declaring in his presence that the mayor had frequently borne the most unqualified testimony to the fidelity and efficiency of the officer whom he now sought to remove; and by charging him with sacrificing the interests of the city to the oath of his order.

That the prevalence of this insanity will be brief is certain; but it may spread widely enough and last long enough to do incalculable mischief. May I not venture to call upon all intelligent Protestants, and especially upon Protestant clergymen, to consider well their responsibilities in relation to this epidemic? Can we afford, as Protestants, to approve, by our silence, such methods of warfare against Roman Catholics as this society is employing? For the honor of Protestantism, is it not high time to separate ourselves from this class of "patriots?" In any large town, if the leading Protestant clergymen will speak out clearly, the plague will be stayed or abated.

Washington Gladden.

¹ In what appears to be a later recension of these oaths, the candidate is made to swear that he will support and defend the Constitution. In the next phrase, however, he declares his purpose of keeping "all Roman Catholics out of office." Which of these contradictory statements expresses his real intention, we may easily determine. The mental and moral obfuscation which is exhibited by one who utters these two sentiments in the same breath is verily phenomenal.

² This action of the Denver Council was official. Mayor Van Horn writes to me that he was visited by a committee of three members of the order, who served this notice upon him, informing him that the same would be sent to "every supreme council, supreme lodge,

supreme camp, and grand commandery within the jurisdiction of the United States." The only offense charged against Mayor Van Horn was that he had appointed a Roman Catholic to office. This act made him a "perjurer." Such is the official announcement. Is it not rather silly, after this, for an A. P. A. member to deny that the oath of his order requires the political proscription of Roman Catholics? A letter just received from a champion, and presumably a member, of the A. P. A., says of Mayor Van Horn, "His obligation as an A. P. A. denied him the right to appoint any Romanist to office, when the services of an efficient Protestant could be secured."