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By the end of the fourth century Christianity had achieved its first great victory. It had triumphed over pagan and skeptical Rome. As early as A.D. 313 Constantine had proclaimed it the favored religion of the Empire; and from that time Christianity made slow but constant progress, and by the opening of the fourteenth century almost all Europe was claimed by Christianity.

The Christian Church was at first a simple democratic society, which was gradually changed into a great monarchy, with the Bishop of Rome as its head. In organizing itself the Church followed the model of the Empire, the ecclesiastical division conforming to those of the civil administration. There were at first four regular patriarchates, that is, districts superintended by patriarchs. These centered in the great cities of Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria and Antioch. It is maintained by some that the patriarchs at first had equal and coordinate powers; but others claim that the Bishops of Rome, from the very first, was regarded as above the others in dignity and authority, and as the divinely appointed head of the visible church on earth. However this may be, the Pontiffs of Rome began very early to claim supremacy over all the Bishops and Patriarchs. The claim of the Roman Pontiffs was based on several grounds, the chief of which was that the church at Rome had been founded by St Peter himself, the first Bishop of that capital, to whom Christ had given the keys of heaven and hell.

This authority and preeminence conferred by the great Head of Church upon Peter was held to be transmitted to his successors in
the holy office. The Bishops of Rome put forth a double claim, namely that they were the supreme head of the church, and also the rightful divinely appointed suzerain of all temporal princes. Their claim to supremacy in all spiritual matters was very generally acknowledged as early as the sixth century, while that as to the supremacy in temporal affairs was not established before the eleventh or twelfth century.

It is known that the "Papal Party" maintained the absolute supremacy of the spiritual over the temporal power. They would effect a perfect union of the Church and State, not on the basis of mutual cooperation, but on that of complete subordination of the state to the church. The Papacy had virtually gained this at the beginning of the thirteenth century. The beginning of this period of Papal splendor is marked by the accession to the pontifical throne of Innocent III. Under him was very nearly made good the claim that all earthly sovereigns were merely vassals of the Roman Pontiff.

In looking over the early history of the different nations of Europe, we find that there has been a constant rivalry between the two powers. We find that Papacy had virtually gained supremacy over spiritual and temporal affairs during the thirteenth century; but fortunately for the people of today, did not retain it. Their temporal power was shattered by the revolt of the kings and princes of Europe in the fourteenth century; and their spiritual authority was destroyed in the countries of northern Europe by the revolt of the people in the sixteenth century—by that great popular movement
known as the Reformation, which separated one half of Christendom from the communion of the Roman Catholic Church. Thus the Papacy, though its temporal power has been entirely taken from it and its spiritual authority repudiated by one half of Christendom still remains as Macaulay says, "not in decay, not a mere antique, but full of life and youthful vigor." And she still may exist in undiminished vigor, when some succeeding generation may stand on these broad plains of America and sketch the ruins of their freedom, religion and civil institutions.

One hundred years ago there were very few Roman Catholics in the United States, compared with the bulk of the population. It is otherwise now; today they constitute probably more than a fifth. This rapid increase in the Roman Catholic part of our population renders it an important inquiry, whether or not there is anything in the demands and teachings of the papacy which requires that so large a body of the citizens of this country shall put themselves, either now or hereafter, in opposition to the principles we are endeavoring as a nation to perpetuate by our civil institutions. The bulk of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States, while shielded and protected by free institutions, seem so trained in their passive and slavish schools, that they do not yet realize how surely and inevitably its tendency is to make them the mere tools of an imperious and exacting hierarchy, whose professions of moderation are both delusive and insincere. They seem either incompetent or unwilling to understand how completely their manhood is forfeited by a compli-
ance with the requirements of the ecclesiastical system: while in oth-
other respects they exhibit commendable intelligence and some of the
best qualities of citizenship.

The decree of papal infallibility was a severe blow at the
cause of personal as well as political freedom; and by now consent-
ing to make it their chief cornerstone of their ecclesiastical pol-
ity, they avow their readiness beforehand, to acquiesce in whatsoever
shall be demanded of them, now matter how enormous it may be and to
what degree of humiliation it may reduce them. It is wonderful that
such men do not profit more by that experience which comes from the
intercourse with the world; that they do not realize that multitudes
of their brethren, who once supported the cause of papacy, have aband-
oned it on account of the very things to which they submit; and the
governments hitherto most obedient to the pope have passed out of
his hands and from under his control. How can it be possible for
them to shut their eyes so completely as they seem to do to the
movements of the modern nations? Germany, England, France, Spain and
even Italy have snatched the scepter of temporal dominion from the
hands of the pope, invited protestant churches and schools to be o-
pened in every part of their nations, confiscated the property of
the rich monastic orders and appropriated it to the state. There is
not left in all the earth a single government with either the in-
clination or the power to defend the papacy, nor a single square
mile of territory over which its temporal scepter can be wielded.
And while all these are consummated facts in history, and others of
kindred import are rapidly presenting themselves; while these Roman Catholic populations of Europe are beginning to breathe more like free men, and are preparing for higher degrees of progress than they have yet attained, the followers of the papacy in the United States, with few exceptions, are concentrating their exertions in order to reforge the discarded fetters of papal tyranny. These events teach a lesson which it becomes the American people to understand.

We must remember that there is a distinction, which undoubtedly exists, between the hierarchy and laity. Among the latter there are, beyond all question, a large number of pious and sincere Christians, who follow the teaching of their church with honest and pure intentions and who are equally honest and sincere in their support of our republican and popular institutions, because they think, they see nothing in either incompatible with the other. During the late rebellion many of these went into the national armies, willingly and promptly, and were as brave and zealous as any others in defending the nation's life, and the integrity of the union. But it can not be honestly denied that the direct tendency, during the same crisis, of all that came from Rome was to give aid and comfort to those who were endeavoring to overthrow the government. And it is equally true that the open avowals of the pope, in so far as they were designed, to have political influence, had also the same effect. All their ecclesiastical training is so conducted as to prepare them for opposition to a popular form of government, and for giving preference to monarchial principles.
They show abundant proof of this at all times when collisions occur between the people and their monarchs who profess to govern by divine right, always opposing the former and taking sides with the latter. They could not pay obedience to the pope in any other way. Nor would he consider their obedience to him complete, such as their ecclesiastical obligations impose upon them, unless they were always and everywhere ready to go to this extent. He measures their fidelity to him by the readiness with which they adopt and promulgate these sentiments.

The hierarchs have been false to every people who trusted them, and they must be abandoned in order to save the people from being sacrificed. The pope no doubt has a strong desire for monarchy therefore he would destroy every constitution or law which gives the people the right to frame their own institutions, and would require the whole world to recognize and adopt the doctrine of the "divine rights of kings" to govern all the nations in obedience to the pontifical mandates. He demands of his hierarchy and all the officers of the Roman Catholic Church, in every country and under all conditions, not merely that they shall maintain these sentiments themselves, but shall carefully instruct all their friends to do the same; conceding to them only such a degree of discretion as allows them to regulate their utterances by expediency. From both classes, hierarchs and laymen, the pope exacts implicit obedience, without inquiry or any appeal to their own reason.

Now if this obedience is yielded by the Roman Catholic popula-
tion of the United States; and if it is really the design, that the papal exaction shall be carried to the extent of interfering with their obligation as citizens, there is no difficulty in seeing that they may be ultimately led into an attitude of antagonism to our form of government. At this point lies the danger most seriously to be apprehended by the people of the United States. While we may not now know the precise time or form of its coming, we should not be unprepared to guard against it, and to meet it, if by any possibility it shall be hereafter precipitated upon us.

By our form of government all the laws have their source, both theoretically and practically in the will of the people; and are therefore of human origin. The constitution was ordained and established by the people. Its objects include everything which is necessary to the happiness, prosperity and elevation of a nation, and with the supreme and sovereign authority of the American people to preserve them for over a century, they have, thus far, proved to be much more conducive to bring about the ends for which our government was established, than any other form of government. Considering what a grand government we have to live under; it seems strange that any people or class of people, having an ordinary mind, should attempt to overthrow, or belong to any organization whose tendency is to overthrow, our popular form of government. Nevertheless there are those who are opposed to this civil power. We meet them in every part of the United States. Look at the Anarchists; they come from foreign lands, where they havent onehalf the privileges which our
government grants them, but still they are not satisfied, they desire anarchy and misrule. So it is with the popes and their following. It seems to me that they should be glad to live under our civil power, but notwithstanding, they cling to the teachings of the pope, and are finally led from the true principles of American government.

Papacy wants absolute power, and absolute power wherever it may exist, whatsoever name it may bear, and for whatever object it may be exercised, is most dangerous to any nation. To make our country the greatest and the best we must keep it free from absolute power; and to keep it so depends entirely upon its citizens. It is argued that our constitution provides that every man is allowed to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience, that is right so long as their religious opinions do not interfere with the laws of our country, but they go beyond that degree of worship, and try to make our land one of monarchy and misrule; they have trampled upon the laws of our country and should be put down, even at the expense of their own lives.

There seems to be an idea prevalent in the mind of the pope and his following in this country, namely, to make their churches and schools free and independent of the state. This cannot be denied for we have only to look back a few months and we can surely see, that it is true. When the compulsory education law was passed and enforced, the pope, priests and their following became very much excited and thought the people were infringing upon their liberty, by dictating to them to which school they should send their children,
and what they should teach them. Indeed the law did dictate, but what of that; it was purely American and was enacted for the welfare of every would be American citizen. Does this show citizenship, to object to the laws of the state? Does it show they are in sympathy with the pope and priests or in sympathy with the civil institutions of our country? No American citizen should ever lend a hand to make the home or school "free, inviolate and independent of the state". It is true our homes are sacred, but they are not independent of the state. Our persons are sacred also, but they are sometimes at the mercy of the laws and the officers who execute them; and our schools as the training ground for our citizens must exist under precisely the same conditions. The state must be supreme. We allow churches greater privileges. Unlike our homes they are not taxed, and any attempt to make this a Catholic land or to give to ecclesiasticism any enlarged scope or reserve power, should find resistance at the hands of all liberty loving people.

It is true religion is a necessity. Society could not exist without an inequality of fortunes and an inequality of fortunes without religion. How suddenly the whole social fabric would quake, and with what a fearful crash it would sink into hopeless ruin, were the idea of a Supreme Being erased from the human mind. We must have a religion for it is the only basis of society; but we don't want the Catholic when we have such favorable opportunity of getting a better. Protestants no less than Catholic Christians assign to the spiritual and temporal powers a common foundation in the order and
appointment of God. But they differ from them essentially in the application of this general principle to the civil affairs of government.

The papal theory of government, taking this principle as the starting point, reaches the following results; that the church and state, having this common origin, are bound to extend mutual aid to each other; that the church, belonging to the spiritual, is bound to see that both the state and individuals conform in their laws and conduct to the law of God.

The Protestant system of government draws a marked line of distinction between religion and civil policy, between the church and the state; and while recognizing also their common foundation in the order and appointment of God, it so separates them neither shall trench upon the jurisdiction of the other. It leaves religion to its influence upon the hearts of individuals, so as to form good dispositions within each one, in order that society may be influenced by love of justice and right.

We see that these two theories of government are in direct antagonism. There is a distinct boundary line. The civil power condemns a criminal to death; the priests give him absolution and offer him paradise. In relation to this act both powers operate publicly in a reverse sense on the same individual, one with the guillotine and the other with a pardon. We have seen each of these systems tried and I think there is no question in the minds of American citizens which is the most conducive to our happiness and welfare. The pope
wishes to suppress all "liberty of conscience"; and would like to carry the world back to the middle ages, with himself as the independent and infallible sovereign of a grand "Holy Empire".

The doctrines of the Syllabus were put forth by the pope expressly as a judgment against all the progressive nations, against all existing civil and religious institutions not in harmony with the papacy. Roman Catholicism and Christianity with the pope means the same thing. Institutions not Roman Catholic are not Christian; and in his belief all people who are not Roman Catholics are heretics. This sentiment is arrived at in his official paper, The Papal manifesto. Considering this manifesto, there is no wonder why the people revolted from papal power. As a Protestant people we built our civil institutions upon the popular plan, because that is the most direct road to political and religious freedom. As a Roman Catholic prince the pope designed to strike directly at this plan, wheresoever it may exist and understanding well that the "divine right of kings" to govern must be maintained or the papacy would fall. We call ourselves a Christian people and in so doing include both Protestants and Roman Catholics. We have a Christian government also; but the pope does not concede this. All the christains we have in this country according to him are Roman Catholics. We are classed by him and his hierarchy along with the infidels, socialists and communists of Europe. And because Protestantism, under Luther and other reformers of the sixteenth century, divided the Roman Catholic church, and because the adverse influences then excited are still at
work, mostly from the effect of our example, and whenever they lead to a new form of government, the people become the source of all the civil laws. The pope recognized this full well and the Syllabus was aimed as an exterminating blow at Protestantism and Government of the United States. There is no escape for its advocates from this conclusion.

It urges them to plot together for the destruction of the great principles for which our fathers sacrificed so much, and which we have prized more highly than our lives. Here are two systems of government, one of papacy and the other of civil power; and the question now remains whether we will resolve to continue to be the guardians of our own civil rights or shall we leave them to the guardianship of an army of papal hierarchs, irresponsible to all human authority and above all human laws.