

"Was Sherman Correctly Quoted?"

THAT IS WHAT Priest Foley, editor of *The Western Catholic*, wants to know. We had been expecting an explosion somewhere in the precincts of priestcraft; and here it is as it appeared in Foley's fulminator of June 13:

One of our readers has sent to us a clipping from the Decatur Herald in which Senator Sherman is quoted as follows:

"The vatican has never acquiesced in the separation of church and state. From the earliest pope to the present one the papal power has always insisted on the property of exercising civil authority. A majority of the Christian races in the league are Roman Catholic. The papal power is very active in promoting the league. The delegates sitting in the assembly or the council will be of that religious faith. It is an excessive distribution of power to one ecclesiastical body."

If Sherman wrote these words, he is either ignorant or bigoted! The popes have time and time again praised conditions in America where we have a separation of church and state. Cardinal Gibbons is at least as good an American as Senator Sherman and he is delighted with conditions here in America. When Sherman says that the delegates sitting in the assembly or the council will be Catholic, he is making a fool of himself. We are writing to Mr. Sherman to find out if he was correctly quoted.

The quotation credited to Senator Sherman purports to be copied from a letter written to the faculty of a Decatur college; so there is little likelihood of such mistakes or inaccuracy as sometimes result from a verbal interview.

But—"If Sherman wrote these words, he is either ignorant or bigoted," bawls the blatant blatherskite who divides his Hibernian talent and columns between promotion of Irish secession, and attacks upon decent Americans and desirable legislation.

One may wonder what Foley's opinion can be of that Jesuit who declared in the Jesuit magazine, *America*, of May 24, "That the popes still claim their temporal power, a power of which they are hypocritically and unjustly deprived, is true."

Fundamentally, the statement made by Senator Sherman, and that made by Jesuit Reville, are identical. The popes still claim, as they have so long claimed, both civil authority and temporal power. Senator Sherman says it in pertinent connection with discussion of public policies, and the Jesuit admits it in an article contributed to the leading magazine of his order.

And one of these is a bigot or an ignoramus because he says it! If so, what is the other? But the chief interest lies not so much in the bigotry or orthodoxy of the senator as in the question whether what he says is true.

Foley declares that "the popes have time and time again praised conditions in America where we have a separation of church and state." Yes, they have praised certain conditions as might be expected, but when and where has one or any of them been caught in the act of praising that separation?

The papal attitude on that subject can be better trusted to what a recent pope has written about it. Pope Leo XIII, in his encyclical on "Catholicity in the United States," dated January 6, 1895, and published on page 323 of his *Great Encyclicals* by Benziger Bros., declares: "It would be very erroneous to draw the conclusion that in America is to be sought the type of the most desirable status of the (Roman Catholic) church, or that it would be universally lawful or expedient for state and church to be, as in America, dissevered and divorced."

We could fill this paper with directly quoted declarations denunciatory of such separation of church and state as exists in the United States—declarations of popes and prelates as heated as they are hostile. That of the late Pius X concerning such separation in the republic of Portugal is typical of papal soreness on the subject.

Senator Sherman is not ignorant of the facts or mistaken in his examinations of history when he writes that the vatican has never acquiesced in the separation of church and state. He may be a bigot for writing it; but that is a matter of papal theology and Jesuit terminology in which such fanatics as Foley are expert beyond the possibility of correction.

Senator Sherman may accept the intended reproach as an exquisite compliment both because of its source and because of what inspires it.

As to the foleyism that "Cardinal Gibbons is at least as good an American as Senator Sherman," we must dissent, for Gibbons' recent conduct as abettor of war on Mexico and Great Britain proves him alien to this country in affections, connections, allegiance, associations, and in everyday practice.

Americans, worthy of the name, do not busy themselves with fomenting trouble with friendly nations and co-belligerents. Moreover, Americans do not serve as satraps of a foreign crowned and enthroned monarch, and as director of that monarch's local emissaries. There is a radical difference between an American citizen and the pope's prelate whose chief care and interest is in politics and propaganda inimical to this country.

There is enough sturdy Americanism in Senator Sherman for him to utter a truth with teeth in it, even if such frank declarations draw the wrath of popery's agents. He would rather declare a fact, the knowledge of which is essential to the common welfare, even though called a bigot, than to truckle to popes and priests who rely on epithets and anathemas to silence unwelcome revelations.

It is to be hoped that the senator has been correctly quoted, for the quotation is true and it is time that all should know it. It is also to be hoped that patriots generally may commend the senator by letter for his frank statement. Foley and his kind are already busy with their usual bulldozing tactics in the effort to force retraction or silence repetition of what is an affront to their papal monarch.

The truth about popery and its political designs is what its agents are busily trying above all things to suppress. Senator Sherman has dared to tell some of it, and the occasion is opportune for every sincere American to express his satisfaction.

Established April 15, 1911

# THE MENACE

Aurora, Missouri June 26, 1919

This is Number 426

## ROME WOULD REFORM TO SAVE THE POPE'S WANING AUTHORITY

### Like Mohammed, Who Could Not Make the Mountain Come to Him, Benedict is Daring Enough to Advocate Changes in Dogma to Preserve His Power

Special Correspondence to New York World of June 15.

ROME, May 16.—Never since the wars of the middle ages has the Holy See been so nervous about to-morrow as now, on the eve of peace. The war and its results have shaken its very foundations. Austria, the greatest Catholic power for many centuries, has crumbled into dust. The house of Hapsburg, ever the Holy See's staunchest friend and protector, is dethroned and in exile; and the countries which have risen in its place are in rebellion against the authority and teaching of the Holy See.

Belgium, once the most generous contributor of Peter's Pence, is so poor and devastated that it now ranks last among the givers of tribute. The Greek Catholics are demanding autonomy; Mgr. Valfre di Bonzo, Papal Nuncio at Vienna, has just sent an alarming report about the attitude of Catholics in Bohemia, Hungary and Jugoslavia to Holy See discipline. The Bohemian government demands the right to nominate bishops and archbishops, thus threatening one of the pope's most ancient authorities. The Catholics of Hungary demand not only expropriation of church lands, but marriage of priests, and such divorce facilities for the laity as to make the vatican shudder.

#### A Papal Admonition

The Pope has sent a severe letter to the "rebels" through his Nuncio, but the Bohemian press declares it cares nothing for such admonition.

In Turkey and Palestine the attitude of the British government toward Arab and Jewish claims has filled the pope with such alarm that he has appealed to a French prelate, Mgr. Baudrillart, for help and protection of Holy See interests in these countries.

In fact, events all round threaten the papal authority and teachings as they have not been threatened for many centuries.

Not the least alarming is the progress made by the American movement for the union of Christian churches. In the past few weeks the Holy See's attitude toward it has undergone a great change. Since Mgr. Cerretti arrived from New York with a report of the committee's plans to send emissaries all over Christendom, news of rebellion in the Catholic communities just mentioned causes the pope to fear that these "rebels" will join with the Americans and break away from Rome's authority altogether.

The American committee's delegation to the vatican will soon arrive, and one of its tasks is to invite the pope to send representatives to the Pan-Christian congress. This again puts the Holy See in a dilemma, for if it refuses it will be isolated from what looks like one of the biggest church movements of history; if it accepts, the pope compromises his prestige by consenting to merely send representatives where, as head of the Catholic church, he should initiate and preside, giving orders and not following them. This is the vatican's viewpoint of the American movement.

#### Might Give Up Some Dogmas

Some daring spirits there—and the pope is said to be of them—have put forward a scheme whereby leadership would revert to Rome, as in the middle ages. Its most salient feature is the convocation by the pope of a vatican council, inviting representatives from all Christian churches. And as this would not be successful unless the Holy See saw fit to renounce a certain part of its dogmas, these would first come under revision, so as to make it possible for Protestant churches to join the union.

A few personalities at the vatican have such modern ideas: Cardinal Gasparri is credited with being one of them. With a view to keeping pace with the times, which, he says, is the only way to preserve the Holy See's authority and teaching, he has sent experts into all Christian countries to study and report on present conditions. His experts are priests with wide views and fully alive to the enormous changes war has brought about. They report that the Catholic bishops and archbishops in the various countries are far more conservative and timid than anybody at the vatican itself. And Mgr. Gasparri's task is now being further enlarged by the need of converting bishops and archbishops to the Holy See's latest viewpoint. Both Pope Benedict and Mgr. Gasparri are working hard to prevent the ruin which threatens the Holy See, and there is no doubt there that they will soon proclaim to the world the plans they are now forming.

THIS IS unquestionably the most momentous of all messages from the seat of Roman Catholic power since war swept the world into disorganized confusion. The papal system is shaken to its foundations because everything else has suffered a like upheaval. Fate plays no favorites under the conditions that have developed since those fateful days in the summer of 1914.

Prussian kaiserism has been tested and repudiated; and the mightiest of war lords

is an exile from the land he ruled with "divine right" and military might. The human race has suffered as never before in its successful effort to repudiate autocracy.

And now the disorganized world is trying to re-organize itself in a peace that must be sound and sane if it is to be permanent. Change is the order of the day; and the demand for readjustment comes from every imaginable source. It is not within the province or power of a few crowned heads to dispose of the ex-kaiser and the vast problems his activities have raised.

Reform, with the alternative of revolution, stare statesmen in the face with an insistence that cannot be evaded; but Roman kaiserism, popery, the papal system, the alleged church of Rome, still asserts its divine right to persist unchanged until this moment. *Roma semper eadem* is sick of the prevailing fever. Rome always the same has become an impossibility. Rome must change or die. Even the senile pope, of reactionary traditions, hastens to make peace with the inevitable.

The way Benedict goes about this compromise with a world he is no longer able to bluff is as interesting as the situation which makes such extraordinary change of tactics necessary.

Even he has quit prattling about attacks upon Christianity. That bogie has been worn threadbare. Christianity is rising from the ruins of war to serve mankind with a closer union of its sincere champions. The danger is not to Christian religion; but that the Christian religion may get away from papal domination. It is not Socialism or Bolshevism or syndicalism or any of the turbulent isms that challenge Rome to prove its fitness for the coming time; but it is world-wide democratic sentiment, calm and determined, that questions popery as boldly and as unsympathetically as it has challenged kaiserism.

Christianity is not in danger. It is the pope's authority that is in danger. You will notice in the message from Rome that the pope is prepared to give up some of his dogmas to prevent Catholic communities rebelling and joining the great international religious movement which seems about to move on and leave the papacy alone with its dead past and decayed notions.

Pope Benedict first admonished the rebel Modernists whom his predecessor had quieted by that means in the piping times of peace; but the effect in Bohemia is probably duplicated in other Catholic strongholds. There is too much excitement over realities to heed such vaporings; and they fall flat with peoples who are dead in earnest concerning matters of pressing importance.

Then the spirit of the pope became daring enough to evolve something new whereby leadership of the international religious movement would revert to Rome as in the middle ages. His first care is to save the leadership to himself. Dogmas not essential to his leadership and authority can be sacrificed in order to preserve his power as a religious dictator. This is more than interesting.

His effort is not so much to save the faith in its pristine purity as to save the power, perquisites, authority and position of his papal self. He places his new departure not in the hands of his theologians but in the hands of his expert politician and diplomat, Cardinal Gasparri, papal secretary of state.

It is not to save Rome's theology and traditional faith; but to save or preserve the political ascendancy of its pope. Politics demands that if anything papal is to be saved from the wreck of war, Rome must become more in harmony with the times. It

## Judge Nations Visits Aurora

JUDGE GILBERT O. NATIONS, President of the Free Press Defense League, who has recently received the Doctor's Degree in Philosophy from the American University at Washington, D. C., has been a welcome visitor at the home of THE MENACE; and, on the evening of June 15, delivered his lecture, "Pope, Italy and the Peace Conference," to a large and intensely interested audience at the Aurora Christian church.

Limited space forbids publication at length or an adequate review of the discourse which held the close attention of his auditors for more than an hour. Perhaps no other speaker is so well equipped with the scholarship, presence, and delivery requisite to a clear and forceful presentation of facts bearing on that timely subject.

Three years university residence and studious application to international and canon law, together with exhaustive examination of church history, have enabled the League's president to collect and connect much related material which is as surprisingly entertaining as it is voluminous.

It is hoped that Judge Nations can perfect arrangements whereby he may devote some of his time and talent to the lecture platform where capable men are so much needed. His services are already in demand by patriotic and fraternal organizations; and patriotic societies which may arrange for one or more of his lectures will do so with pleasure and profit.

## How the Patriots Voted for President

IN RESPONSE to the suggestion made in these columns a few weeks ago a great volume of letters came to THE MENACE giving the preference of the writers for the next president of the United States. These letters continue to come, but at the time when this issue of the paper went to press the foremost ten favorites had received the following percentages of the total vote as expressed in the letters:

Gilbert O. Nations	36 per cent
Eugene V. Debs	11 per cent
General Leonard Wood	6 per cent
Thomas E. Watson	6 per cent
Charles E. Hughes	4 per cent
Sidney J. Catts	3 per cent
Hiram W. Johnson	3 per cent
Woodrow Wilson	2 per cent
General John J. Pershing	2 per cent
Jacob I. Sheppard	2 per cent
Arthur Capper	2 per cent
Scattering	23 per cent

The conviction seems to grow constantly stronger among the people that our national and local politics must have a new birth. Letters from every section of the country demonstrate the deep and widespread disgust with politicians and public officials who secretly intrigue with the Roman hierarchy or cringe before its impudence and vengeance. The people have ample power to nominate and elect men who can be trusted. They can place any man they please in the White House and in every state house from Augusta to Sacramento. Will they do it?

This paper will welcome other letters on this important subject till every patriot between the oceans has been heard. WHO IS YOUR CHOICE FOR PRESIDENT?

## Sinn Fein Vote in the Senate

PASSAGE RECENTLY by the United States senate of the Borah resolution demanding the admission of Sinn Fein delegates from the Roman Catholic Irish rebels to the peace conference is full of significance. Only the solitary vote of Senator Williams of Mississippi opposed this cringing senatorial bid for the papal-Irish vote in this country.

Let no senator deceive himself as to the present temper of the American people. They have had more than enough of the politics represented by Jeremiah A. O'Leary, Joseph McGerrity, John P. Keating and Daniel F. Cohalan. Last November the voters expressed their nausea at the favors and preferment accorded to Irish Knights of Columbus by the national administration.

If one or more of the states composing our country should revolt against the United States government and send a rebel delegation to Versailles, that delegation would have the same legal right to admission that the Sinn Fein rebels have. It would likely have infinitely greater moral right because the Sinn Fein traitors demand the right to enslave and papalize their unwilling neighbors in Ulster. Our senators know this.

Our representatives in the lower house of congress knew it when they passed a similar resolution without a roll call near the close of the fifty-fifth congress last March. The motive is perfectly clear. It was the same in both cases. Senators and representatives alike ask that patriotic Ulster with a million population be sold to the papal autocracy that has ruined Ireland, Spain, Portugal, Austria Hungary, Mexico and South America.

They ask this because the papal-Irish in this country have about 800,000 votes and care vastly more for popery in Ireland than for America at home. It was a Democratic house and a Republican senate that passed these un-American resolutions, but the vote was virtually unanimous in both cases. Which of the parties so ready to defile themselves at the cesspool of Roman Catholic intrigue shall we elect to congress and to the presidency next year? American politics must be born again.

According to Cardinal O'Connell's diocesan organ, *The Pilot*, of Boston, it took fifteen priests speaking six languages to hear the Easter season confessions of Roman Catholics confined in the Massachusetts state prison at Charlestown for Massachusetts' good.