

court, receiving its authority from the church and liable to have its decrees reversed on appeal,' and that 'in the case of conflicting laws between the two powers, the laws of the church must prevail over the state. While the state has rights, she has them only in virtue and by permission of the superior authority, and that authority can only be expressed through the church.'"

Cardinal Manning is quoted in *Donahoe's Magazine* for December, 1888, as saying: "It is an obligation to obey the civil ruler, but if the civil ruler shall make a law hostile to faith, we must then be Catholics first and citizens afterward." Following its declaration of the doctrine of the Catholic Church and its citations of authorities for its position the pamphlet then goes on to take the radical ground of proposing disfranchisement of Catholics who acknowledge their first allegiance to be to their church rather than to their country. This proposition is remarkable because in the committee of 100 are some of the leading citizens of Boston, and it cannot be presumed that they would permit this document to go out without their careful consideration. The pamphlet says:

"We have no hesitation in affirming that the oath of allegiance to our government taken by Romanists and by which they have obtained the rights of the ballot, citizenship, and office amounts to nothing if they are good Romanists, and has no binding obligation where the interests of the church or the pontiff require it to be disregarded. Peter having thus spoken and the position of Romanists in this country being clearly established, what is to be done? If the American people do not propose to surrender to the papal church their sovereignty, their honor, and their rights, and undo what their fathers secured through the sacrifices of the revolution, then something will have to be done and that speedily. We do not hesitate to say as a measure for the nation's protection that no man who professes allegiance to the pontiff should be allowed to participate as a citizen in either holding an office or casting a ballot. The United States Supreme Court has decided that the law of one of our States disfranchising Mormons is constitutional, on the theory that the man who takes the oath the Mormons are required to take cannot be a good citizen. Why should not this principle be applied to those who confess allegiance to the papal hierarchy? How much longer will this flagrant violation of citizenship be permitted in America? Is it not high time for the nation to decide which is supreme, the church or the State, to which citizens owe allegiance? How long would the nation allow one-eighth of her population to enjoy all the rights and privileges of American citizenship while owing allegiance to any other foreign power, say Austria or Russia? Why permit this to be done with those who own allegiance to the pontiff of Rome? Why should the privileges of citizenship be extended to

men who not only not uphold American institutions, but who endeavor to drive those who uphold them away from such allegiance through fear of eternal damnation? \* \* \*

Let Romanists who would become citizens of the United States be required not only to take the oath of allegiance to the government but to take an oath also renouncing all allegiance to the pope of Rome. This is not a question of religious intolerance, nor is it one of antagonism to foreigners who are willing to homologate with us in accord with the spirit of our institutions. We would not cut down by a single span the splendid proportions of national freedom; we would not abridge the liberty of party, or individual. But this is a question of self-protection and self-preservation, and the law of self-preservation is supreme in all social and political organizations. We would guard and preserve our liberty from the hands of hate and the assaults of foes.

"Romanism is a political system. It is a political power. As a political power it must be met, as a political force it must be treated when viewed in its relation to our institutions. It does not make any difference whether the political power that assails our institutions is on the shores of the Baltic, on the shores of the British channel, or on the shores of the Tiber. It must be met. We can have no divided citizenship. No man should be allowed to participate in the political affairs of this country who is the subject or ally of a foreign power that is at war with her national institutions. No ballot for the man who takes his politics from the vatican."

"There is more of the same sort of appeal. The committee will have 100,000 copies of the pamphlet printed and will give it a wide circulation, for which they have ample means. — *Chicago Times*, March 25th.

#### OUR CHICAGO LETTER.

A few moments ago I read an editorial from the London (England) *Daily Telegraph* on the Utah question. Before me now lies an editorial from the *Irish World* of New York, on the same subject. Here are two papers wide apart as the poles on religion, politics and economics, yet harmonious on the subject of "Mormonism." The *Telegraph* article is one characteristic of the London daily. It is ponderous, prosaic and platitudenarian. Sentence after sentence is moulded as if cut out by a steam hammer. It contains nothing new, simply a rehash of what has been said these thirty years back. The editor and owner of this paper is a Jew, but far be it from me to malign the whole race because one of its members is a recreant, a knave, a snob, a mercenary creature who would speak thus of his own people if paid for it.

Nor would it be good taste to regard the London *Telegraph* as a fair type of English journalism and of English political thought. It is true

the *Telegraph* professes to be a liberal, yet it opposes Gladstone, Labouchere and Morley. That is enough, political turpitude can go no lower than by calling Gladstone a knave.

The *Irish World* is edited and owned by an Irishman named Pat Ford. It used to be the organ of dynamite advocates. It kept a column specially for instruction in the use of dynamite. I said Pat Ford was or is an Irishman. This statement requires an explanation. He is a native of Mayo County in Ireland. This county forms a large section of the province of Connaught. This province is exclusively composed of the worst and most degraded elements of the old Irish clans. The bravest and boldest of the other provinces fell fighting or were exiled to other countries. The weak and cowardly sought the mountains and recesses of Connaught, and particularly Mayo. In famine times Mayo sent shiploads of people to this country, and even here these Mayo people would not amalgamate with the people from other provinces of Ireland. This one Irish county has furnished nine-tenths of the criminals in this country denominated Irish. It was this county that furnished nearly every person connected with the murder of Dr. Cronin. Camp 20 was with a few exceptions formed of County Mayo people or the sons of such. So in classing Pat Ford as an Irishman I am guilty of a libel on the Irish of Leinster, Munster and Ulster. I will class him as Mayo and as an affinity of the Cronin murderers, so that in one sense Pat Ford of the *Irish World* and Levi Lawson of the London *Telegraph* are agents which Americans ought to be ashamed of as instructors and teachers.

The fact that Mormonism should be opposed by such heterogeneous elements and by almost all existing races and creeds, set me thinking seriously of Christianity in general. Pat Ford's paper is full of fulsome adulation of Cardinal Gibbons and Cardinal Manning, and claims for these prelates direct succession from the Apostles. Levi's paper has the same tune about the Bishops of London and Canterbury. The truth is, there is no more connection between the Christianity of Gibbons and Manning and that of the Apostles than there is between chemistry and astronomy. The same might be said of the other alleged Christians. The departure from Apostolic Christianity is so far back that its inception can hardly be set definitely. But that such a departure has taken place no unbiased reader can deny. In 1857 the Rev. J. J. Blunt, a professor of divinity in the University of Cambridge published a history of primitive Christianity. Three are better works on this subject published, but Mr. Blunt shows such a knowledge of the early Church and its principal writers, that a consideration of his writings is well worth expending a little time on.

In discussing the attitude of Hadrian the Roman Emperor towards the Christians, Mr. Blunt dwells particularly on the Church