

No. 4, Vol. 2.

April, 1890.

Committee of One Hundred Series.

Price 2 Cents.

Per 1000, \$10.00

THE POPE'S LAST VETO  
IN  
AMERICAN POLITICS.

WILL THE PEOPLE SUSTAIN IT ?

*Being a review of the Pope's last Encyclical, in which Roman Catholics are enjoined in politics, always to serve first the interests of Catholicism, to submit themselves in obedience to the will of the Pontiff as TO GOD HIMSELF, and that the civil laws are binding on them only so long as they are conformable to the Roman Catholic Religion.*

BY REV. JAMES B. DUNN, D. D.,

Secy. of Committee.

Published by the Committee of One Hundred.

OFFICE: ROOM 22, CONGREGATIONAL HOUSE,  
BEACON STREET, BOSTON, MASS.

Entered at the Post Office, Boston, as Second Class Matter.

Cath. Ch. in U.S.A. (F.2) BX  
1403  
D. B. (Name) 1000144

## IMPORTANT.

THE COMMITTEE OF ONE HUNDRED was organized in Boston in the summer of 1888, its aim being to protect and to preserve inviolate from all sectarian influence the American Public School, to promote such public interest in it as will secure its continual development as the true primary educator of the people in the duties of citizenship, and to assist by all moral and political means in preventing encroachment by ecclesiastical organizations on the rights, functions and possessions of the State or the appropriation by federal, state, or municipal authorities, of any public money or public property to any sectarian school or institution whatever.

Since its organization two city elections have been held, in both of which the influence of the Committee was manifested in such a positive and helpful way as to create a wide-spread interest all over the land. Having thus shown itself to be a potent factor in preserving our public schools and defending American institutions, its counsels and aid are being sought by those friendly to its objects in various parts of the country.

That the work may be placed on a more solid and permanent foundation, and its national as well as local work continued, and that it may also meet the rapidly increasing demand for its valuable monthly documents, (5,000,000 pages of which have already been circulated), it asks all who are in sympathy with its objects, and who desire to aid in its work, to more thoroughly identify themselves with it, and this they can do in either of the following ways:

(1.) By becoming Associate, Honorary, or Life Members — \$1.00 a year constitutes an Associate Member; \$10.00 a year an Honorary Member; and the payment of \$100.00 a Life Member. The series of monthly publications will be regularly sent to all such.

(2.) By enlisting for it the active co-operation of their friends and acquaintances, and by securing from among them additional memberships.

(3.) By sending to the Secretary of the Committee the addresses of persons whom they know to be friendly to the cause and likely to aid it, or to whom it is desired publications should be sent.

(4.) By securing signatures of individuals, organizations and churches to a petition praying Congress to pass an amendment to the National Constitution prohibiting all sectarian appropriations of public funds. Copies of this petition may be had on application to the Secretary, Rev. DR. JAMES B. DUNN, 22 Congregational House, Boston, Mass.

Declassified

No. 4. Vol. 2.

April, 1890.

... ~~~~~ ...  
**Committee of One Hundred Series.**  
... ~~~~~ ...

Price 2 Cents.

Per 1000, \$10.00



**THE POPE'S LAST VETO**  
IN  
**AMERICAN POLITICS.**

**WILL THE PEOPLE SUSTAIN IT ?**

*Being a review of the Pope's last Encyclical, in which Roman Catholics are enjoined in politics, always to serve first the interests of Catholicism, to submit themselves in obedience to the will of the Pontiff as TO GOD HIMSELF, and that the civil laws are binding on them only so long as they are conformable to the Roman Catholic Religion.*

BY REV. JAMES B. DUNN, D. D.,  
Secy. of Committee.

Published by the Committee of One Hundred.

OFFICE: ROOM 22, CONGREGATIONAL HOUSE,  
BEACON STREET, BOSTON, MASS.

*Entered at the Post Office, Boston, as Second Class Matter.*

## The Pope's Last Veto in American Politics.

---

In the first document issued by the Boston Committee of One Hundred — “ An Open Letter ” — after citing numerous quotations from high Roman Catholic authorities, going to show that the Church claimed supremacy over the State, and that Roman Catholics owed their first allegiance to the Church, the question was asked, “ In view of such declarations and teachings, is it possible for a consistent Roman Catholic to be at the same time a loyal American citizen ? ”

According to the latest encyclical of Pope Leo XIII., — whose word is law and infallible, — the question must be answered in the negative. The encyclical was issued at Rome, January 10, 1890, and published in New York Catholic papers of February 12, and the *Pilot*, of Boston, February 15, 1890.

The encyclical is on the subject of Church and State, and defines the position of the good Romanist toward his religion and his country. Now while the American people care no more for the Pope of Rome than for the King of the Cannibal Islands, and while they have no respect for the absurd claims of this man to infallibility, and we know of no language with which to fitly characterize the audacity of the claim he sets up in the encyclical, such a claim being absurd, nonsensical, foolish ; nevertheless, as it is made seriously, and because it is binding on the soul of every Romanist in whatever land he may dwell, as it is

his duty to obey the voice of the vicegerent of God in preference to the commands of earthly rulers; and as much of the encyclical seems intended for the instruction and guidance of members of the Papal Church on questions and issues now absorbing a great deal of attention in the United States, it is important that Americans should understand the true relation of that Church and its members to these very vital questions, especially as this encyclical requires the Church to be first in the thoughts of its members, and where the Church and State differ in their requirements, the Church, and not the State is to be followed. But let the Pope speak for himself as he proceeds:—

“to describe more *exactly* the duties of the Catholics, . . . to restore the principles and practices of Christianity in private life and in *all parts of the social organism.*”

Having thus stated his object, he takes the ground:—

“That in actual life, the duties of Catholics are more numerous and greater than the duties of those who have not a proper grasp of the Catholic faith or are altogether devoid of it,—the Catholic religion, which is the *only true* religion.”

Coming to the State, he says:—

“that cases happen in which the State demands one thing from the citizen, and religion the opposite from Christians, and this undoubtedly *for no other reason* than that the heads of the State pay no regard to the sacred power of the Church, or desire to make it subject to them. No one, however, can doubt which is to receive their preference.”

Since

“It is an impious deed to break the laws of Jesus Christ for the purpose of obeying the magistrates, or *to transgress the laws of the Church* under the pretext of observing the civil law.”

Vicar General Byrne, of the Boston Diocese, in a sermon preached in that city, March 16, 1890, while explaining this encyclical of Leo XIII. and claiming for Romanists loyalty to government, said:—

“No doubt there are times when the State demands of us a line of conduct manifestly contrary to the dictates of our religion. This only



happens when the civil rulers for the time being overstep their true sphere, or seek to make the sacred power of the Church subservient to their own ends. The good citizen will refuse to obey an immoral command of the State, and peacefully accept the penalty."

The Church declares, in the language of Bishop McQuaid, in Boston, Feb. 13, 1876, that:—

"The State has no right to educate, and when the State undertakes the work of education it is usurping the powers of the Church."

Hence the conflict that is now being waged all over the land. Is the Church or the State supreme in the education of the child?

After having thus elevated the laws of the Church to an equality with the teachings of God, and above the laws of the land, the Pope proceeds:—

"But if the laws of the State are in open contradiction with the Divine law, if they command anything *prejudicial to the Church*, or are hostile to the duties imposed by religion, or violate *in the person* of the Supreme Pontiff the authority of Jesus Christ, then indeed it is a duty to *resist* them and a *crime* to obey them—a crime fraught with injury to the State itself."

This means in plain Anglo-Saxon that when any *law* is passed, or any action taken by any government which the proper Romanist authority deems "*prejudicial*" to the interest of the Church, or affecting "the person of the Supreme Pontiff," *resistance* becomes a *duty*, *obedience* a *crime*. And this, mark you, is not the teachings of Hildebrand and of the middle ages, but of Leo the XIIIth, and the 19th century. And what Leo here indicates as possible, has happened. Popes have declared the laws of nations null and void, and absolved Romanists from allegiance to such governments. Our readers cannot have forgotten how the Pontiff took upon himself in 1863, to declare null and void the laws of New Granada; also, in 1856 the laws of Mexico; as in 1855 the laws of Sardinia; in the same year the laws of Spain, and the laws of Piedmont; in 1862 the laws of Austria;—and in every



case, the laws which he pronounced null, are essential parts of the American Constitution, and of our common law. Shortly after the present Pontiff's recovery from his illness in 1886, after establishing all the privileges and immunities of the Jesuits, he issued a Papal degree in which occurs this sentence:—

“The judicial functionaries must refuse obedience to the State and to the laws of the country which are in contradiction with Roman Catholic precepts.”

What is this but preaching downright rebellion, not only in Italy, where it means civil war, but in every country where Roman Catholics hold any judicial function?

There is required

“Perfect submission and obedience of will to the Church and the Sovereign Pontiff, *as to God himself*. In fixing the limits of obedience, let no one think that it is due to the authority of Bishops, and especially the Roman Pontiff, merely in matters of dogma.”

Oh, no; this perfect submission and obedience is all-sweeping—covering the private and public life and acts of the individual, his civil, political and religious duties,—and the claim of the Pope to perfect submission and obedience on the part of the members, is recognized and acknowledged by Roman Catholic leaders in this country.

Father Bodfish, a Roman Catholic priest, at a hearing at the State House, Boston, last winter, said

“Roman Catholics were bound to receive, believe and disseminate the instruction received from the Pope as the Vicar of Christ.” To ex-Gov. Long's question, “You said you are bound to receive, believe and disseminate the word of the Pope, am I right?” Answer, “Yes, sir.”

Vicar General Preston, of New York, while on the witness stand in one of the courts in that city a little over a year ago, when asked if Roman Catholics must obey their Bishops, whether right or wrong, replied “Yes.” This excited amazement in the court, and the question was repeated, and again Monsignor Preston answered, “They *must* obey, right or wrong.” In

this the Vicar General spoke the truth. It is "obedience," first, last, and all the time.

This same Vicar General Preston, in a sermon preached in New York, January 1st, 1888, gave utterance to these significant words:—

"Every word 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 only jurisdiction 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 true Catholic. The Church teaches that the supreme Pontiff *must be obeyed*, because he is the vicar of the Lord, Christ speaks through him."

And this is all in keeping with the claims of the Pontiff, who is to be obeyed in all matters of faith and morals. Cardinal Manning, in Vol. III. of Ecclesiastical Sermons, page 83, says:—

"Why should the Holy Father touch any matter in politics at all? For this plain reason, *because politics are a part of morals . . . Politics are morals on the widest scale.*"

In his encyclical the Pope proceeds to deny the rights of private judgment in civil matters, or indeed, any.

"It must be considered a duty by Christians to be ruled and guided by the authority and leadership of the Bishops, and especially of the Apostolic See. Man's duties, what he ought to believe and what he ought to do, is by divine right laid down by the Church and in the Church by the Supreme Pontiff. Hence it is that the Pontiff ought to judge with authority what is contained in revelation, what is consonant, and what disagrees with it; and for the same reason it is incumbent on him to point out what is moral and what immoral; what is necessary to do and what to avoid, in order to attain salvation."

"The finger of the Pope, like the needle in the compass, invariably points to the pole of eternal truth; and the mind of the Sovereign Pontiff is as certain to reflect the mind and will of God, as a mirror at one end of a submarine cable to indicate the electric signal made at the other. (*Catholic World*, July, 1870, page 436).



Cardinal Manning, in one of his Sermons on Ecclesiastical subjects, in speaking of the Pope's claims to Independence and Supremacy, says :

"I acknowledge no civil superior; I am the subject of no prince: and I claim more than this. I claim to be the supreme judge on earth, and director of the consciences of men; of the peasant that tills the field, and the prince that sits on the throne; of the household that lives in the shade of privacy, and the legislature that makes laws for kingdoms. I am the sole last supreme judge on earth of what is right and wrong."

That there may be unity of action, Leo XIII. announces of Christians (Roman Catholics) that

"They receive from the Church the rule of their faith; they know with certainty that in obeying its authority and allowing themselves to be guided by it, they will be placed in possession of the truth..... We must receive entirely and with the same assent all things and everything ascertained to have been revealed by God.

The integrity of the Church would suffer if a doubt were entertained that the Church alone has been invested with this power of governing souls to the absolute exclusion of the civil authority; for it was not to Caesar, but to Peter that Jesus Christ gave the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven. From this doctrine with regard to the relations between politics and religion follow important consequences."

Its application to politics is made in the following terms :

"Furthermore, in politics, which are inseparably bound up with the laws of morality and religious duties, men ought *always* and in the *first place to serve*, as *far as possible*, the *interests of Catholicism*. As soon as they are seen to be in danger, all differences should cease between Catholics. Since the fate of States depends principally on the disposition of those who are at the head of the government, the Church cannot grant its patronage or favor to men whom it knows to be hostile to it, who openly refuse to respect its rights; who seek to break the alliance established by the nature of things between religious interests and the interests of the civil order. On the contrary its duty is to favor those, who, *having sound ideas as to the relations between Church and State*, wish to make them both harmonize for the common good. These principles contain the rule according to which every Catholic *ought to model his public life*."

This is but a reiteration of what Pope Leo said in an

encyclical letter of November 7, 1885, reported by cable to the *New York Herald*: —

“Every Catholic should rigidly adhere to the teachings of the Roman Pontiff, especially in the matter of modern liberty, which, already under the semblance of honesty of purpose, leads to destruction. We exhort all Catholics to devote careful attention to public matters, and take part in all municipal affairs and elections, and all public services, meetings and gatherings. All Catholics must make themselves felt as active elements in daily political life in countries where they live. *All Catholics should exert their power to cause the constitutions of States to be modeled on the principles of the true Church.*”

The treatment of this subject is very full, and cannot be misunderstood. In every case it means no personal freedom, but direct rule from Rome. He says:—

“The civil prudence of individuals seems wholly to consist in faithfully executing the precepts of legitimate authority.”

This is fully set forth as the authority of the priests, Bishops and Pontiff, who says of himself that

“In effect he has to order and regulate the actions of Christian citizens in view of the realization of their eternal salvation. It will be thus seen how indispensable it is that besides the perfect concord which ought to reign in their thoughts and actions, the faithful should always religiously take as the rule of their conduct the *political wisdom* of the ecclesiastical authority.”

This therefore follows:

“Now the Roman Pontiff is the supreme ruler of the Church. The union of minds then requires perfect submission of will to the Church and the Sovereign Pontiff AS TO GOD HIMSELF.....Should any of the Bishops lay himself open to criticism either in his conduct or in the opinions he maintains.

It does not belong to any individual to arrogate to himself in his own regard the office of judge confided by our Lord Jesus Christ to the sole pastor whom He has set over His lambs and sheep.”

Silent acquiescence in the decisions of the Pope and his representatives is enjoined, and it is taught that —

“The actions of superiors ought not to be struck at with the sword of speech, even when they appear to merit a censure.”

“Peter having thus spoken”—to use the words of the Irish Bishops — “through Leo, the question is settled.”

It is the duty of every good Romanist in whatever land he may dwell, to obey the voice of the Pope as pretended viceroy of God, in preference to the commands of earthly rulers. The oath embodied in the profession of faith does not differ greatly in the material point of allegiance from that taken in the Mormon Endowment House, which the courts have recently decided renders those who take it incapable of naturalization. Here it is, as decided by the Romish Council at Baltimore, in 1885 :

"I acknowledge the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Roman Church as the mother and mistress of all Churches; and I pledge and swear true obedience to the Roman Pontiff, vicar of Jesus Christ and successor of the blessed Peter, prince of the apostles." (Acta et Decreta Concilii Baltimorensis III., page 53, Baltimore, 1886.)

There is nothing reserved; no exception is made of allegiance to the government under which the person who has taken this oath may live, and in the wide field of conflicting sovereignty the duty to obey the Pope is imperative and absolute over the duty to obey the laws. This doctrine of supreme jurisdiction over all earthly powers and laws is a doctrine the Papal Church in America has always taught as it holds :

"The State to be only an inferior court, receiving its authority from the Church, and liable to have its decrees reversed on appeal, (Brownson's *Essays*, p. 282), 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.—*Catholic World*, page 439, July, 1870."

This is the doctrine taught in the Pope's *Syllabus* of 1864; and in the Pastoral Letter issued by the Second National Council of the Roman Catholic Church, held at Baltimore in 1866, we are told that,

"in prescribing anything contrary to the divine law" (as interpreted by the Pope) "the civil power transcends its authority, and has no claim on the obedience of the citizen," as the civil power is never absolute or independent, but subject to the Church.

On page 278 of a book prepared for the use of the Roman Catholic colleges and schools, by the Rev. F. X. Schouppe of the Society of the Jesuits, and bearing the imprimatur of Cardinal Manning, we are told that—  
 “The civil laws are *binding* on the conscience *only so long as they are conformable to the rights of the Catholic Church.*”

And on page 279 that

“Human laws are susceptible of dispensation. The power to dispense belongs to the sovereign Pontif.”

This is plain language. It cannot be misunderstood. Civil laws are *not binding* when they conflict with the decrees of the Pope. Thus the *Catholic World* of August, 1868, says that *the Pope*,

“as the head and mouthpiece of the Catholic Church, administers its discipline and issues orders to which every Catholic under pain of sin must yield obedience.”

Is it possible, it may be asked, that the Roman Catholic clergy and laity realize the full extent of what is involved in these principles as laid down by the infallible head of their Church? It is to be hoped that they do not; but that their leaders do is unquestioned. Bishop Gilmour, in his lenten pastoral 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.”

The *Catholic World*, for August, 1871, one of the ablest and most influential of Roman Catholic journals in this country, boldly affirms :

“Each individual must receive his faith and laws from the Church in which he is a member by baptism, with unquestioning submission and obedience of the intellect and will: we have *no right to ask reasons of the Church* (the Pope) any more than of Almighty God as a preliminary to submission.”

Again, read the following in the light of the encyclical :

“A Catholic must not only believe what the Church now proposes to his belief, but be ready to believe whatever she may hereafter propose: he must therefore be ready to give up any or all of his previous

opinions as soon as they are condemned and proscribed by competent authority."

This same journal very tersely and very clearly defines its position, as follows :

"We are purely and simply Catholic, and profess an unreserved allegiance to the Church, which takes precedence of, and gives rule to, our allegiance to the State."

This sort of loyalty is scarcely what the enthusiastic American looks for.

Cardinal Manning, in *Donahoe's Magazine* of December, 1888, says :

"It is an obligation to obey the civil ruler; but if the civil ruler shall make a law hostile to faith (Rome) we must then be Catholics *first*, and citizens afterwards."

In view of such declarations and teachings, we ask, Can a good Romanist be at the same time a loyal American citizen?

Many Romanists, no doubt, mean to be loyal citizens of the Republic, and honestly think they are; yea, we are quite willing to believe that the great body of them have no wish to interfere with the liberties and institutions of America, and that if called upon to choose between serving our government and the power at Rome, think they would abjure Rome. But it must be remembered that they belong to a system in which free agency is impossible. As we have seen, the Vatican claims absolute and supreme authority in all things, civil as well as spiritual, and every member of that Church is bound to render to the Pontiff absolute and unquestioning obedience. This being true, is it not quite certain that whatever his private or personal opinions and feelings may be as an American citizen, he must support the Church as against the State? Yea, this position is acknowledged not only by the Roman hierarchy in this country, but by the representative Roman Catholic laymen in Congress assembled at

Baltimore a few weeks ago, who quickly responded to the summons which Archbishop Ireland gave when confronting the seething mass, he with fiery emphasis exclaimed:—

“Go to your homes with the enthusiasm that you have shown here; spread it in every State in the Union, and say there is a new departure among Catholics in the United States. Tell them there is a new mission open for laymen. The long expected day has come when Catholic Bishops, priests and laymen rise up and say, *Henceforth we will act as one man* in accordance with our religion.”

The response to this call was given by that large representative body, in these words, to be found in the last paragraph of their platform:—

“We demand in the name of humanity and justice, that this freedom (of the Holy See) be scrupulously respected by *all* secular governments. We protest against the assumption by any such government of a right to affect the interests or control the actions of our Holy Father by *any form of legislation*, or other public act to which *his full approbation* has not been previously given, and we pledge Leo XIII., the worthy Pontiff to whose hands Almighty God has committed the helm of Peter's bark amid the tempests of this stormy age, the loyal sympathy and unstinted aid of all his spiritual children in vindicating that perfect liberty which he justly claims as his sacred and inalienable right.”

For less treasonable utterances, men during the recent war, were sent to Fort Lafayette or fled the country. Now, what are we going to do about it?

In view of this un-American and treasonable declaration, and the further declaration that

“in performing their duties as citizens, electors and public officers, Romanists are always, and under all circumstances, to act simply as Catholics.” (See *Catholic World*, July, 1870.)

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 self-protection, that no man who confesses 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 authority 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 owning allegiance to any other foreign power, say Austria or Russia? Why permit this to be done with those who own allegiance to the Pontiff at Rome? Why should the privileges of citizenship be extended to men who not only do not uphold American institutions, but who endeavor to drive those who uphold them away from such allegiance through fear of eternal damnation?

Romanism elevates the Church above the State, and demands that the first allegiance of the citizen shall be to

the Church, and claims the prerogative of deciding what laws of the State shall be obeyed, and what laws disobeyed. Can any person who is loyal to Romanism be true to Republicanism? Can a Romanist be a good citizen of America?

What is the duty of the government to those who, at the bidding of an alien power, are grossly misrepresenting and maligning the nation's most cherished and valued institutions — the public schools — and pursuing a policy towards them that is expected to cripple them if not to destroy them, and who owe their first allegiance to the Pope?

Let there be required of men appointed or chosen to fill offices of trust and power an oath of allegiance to the government as strong as can be framed, permitting of no mental reservation.

The Constitution of Massachusetts, up till 1821, required the Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Councillors, Senators, Representatives, as also every person appointed or commissioned to any judicial, executive, military, or other offices of the government, before entering on the discharge of the business of his place or office, to take and subscribe the following declaration and oaths, or affirmations, viz :

[" I, A. B., do truly and sincerely acknowledge, profess, testify, and declare, that the Commonwealth of Massachusetts is and of right ought to be, a free, sovereign, and independent State; and I do swear that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the said Commonwealth; and that I will defend the same against traitorous conspiracies and all hostile attempts whatsoever; and that I do renounce and abjure all allegiance, subjection, and obedience to the king, queen, or government of Great Britain (as the case may be), and every other foreign power whatsoever; and that no foreign prince, person, prelate, state, or potentate, hath, or ought to have, any jurisdiction, superiority, pre-eminence, authority, dispensing or other power, in any matter, civil, ecclesiastical, or spiritual, within this Commonwealth, except the

authority and power which is or may be vested by their constituents in the Congress of the United States; and I do further testify and declare, that no man or body of men hath or can have any right to absolve or discharge me from the obligation of this oath, declaration, or affirmation; and that I do make this acknowledgment, profession, testimony, declaration, denial, renunciation, and abjuration, heartily and truly, according to the common meaning and acceptation of the foregoing words, without any equivocation, mental evasion, or secret reservation whatsoever. So help me, GOD." (See Chap. VI. Article I).

In 1821 the Sixth Amendment was adopted, requiring that instead of the foregoing oath of allegiance, the following only should be taken :

"I, A. B., do solemnly swear that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and will support the constitution thereof. So help me, God."

Is it not high time to return to "the faith of the fathers," and require the enactment in every State, and by Congress of some such statutes as the former?

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 accordance 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, sect 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 our National institutions. *No ballot for the man who takes his politics from the Vatican!*

As the State assumes not to control the faith of the citizen, she will not permit the Church to control the politics of the citizen. Employers are prohibited under heavy penalties from influencing the votes of employees; prevent by penalties as heavy, ecclesiastics from influencing the votes of their parishioners.

Any corporate vote, be it that of a church or railway company, is a menace to a free State, because it is an *imperium in imperio*.

In the face of these most explicitly avowed claims of the Papal hierarchy as iterated and reiterated by Popes, Councils and Bishops, who doubts that Romanism as a political system occupies the position of a deadly foe to all American institutions, and that its intriguing interference with politics is a thousand times more perilous than the ships and armaments of other enemies to American liberties? If so, what are you going to do about it?

Arrangements are now being perfected  
for the publication of a

**NEW**  
**BOSTON DAILY**  
**Newspaper,**

DEVOTED TO THE PRESERVATION  
OF OUR

**Civil, Educational and Religious**  
**LIBERTIES !**

For further particulars apply to the  
Secretary of the

**BOSTON COMMITTEE OF ONE HUNDRED,**

Post Office Box, 1345. Boston, Mass.

# PUBLICATIONS

OF THE

## BOSTON COMMITTEE OF ONE HUNDRED.

---

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE FRIENDS OF FREE SCHOOLS AND AMERICAN LIBERTIES, showing the hostility of the Papal Hierarchy to our Civil Institutions and the Public Schools. 16 pages. Per dozen, 20 cts. Per 100.....	\$1 25
IS SWINTON RIGHT? or The Truth About Indulgences. Per 100 .....	50
THE SUBSTITUTE FOR SWINTON, ROMANIZED. Per 100 .....	50
THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS MUST GO. Per 100.....	50
THE FIRST VICTORY IN BOSTON. Per 100.....	50
PUBLIC SCHOOLS <i>versus</i> PAROCHIAL (Dr. Moxom). 10 cts. Per 100 .....	5 00
THE HEARING AT THE STATE HOUSE, with the Argument of ex-Gov. Long. 96 pages. 25 cts. Per dozen, \$2.50. Per 100..	20 00
ARGUMENT OF EX-GOVERNOR JOHN D. LONG, on Behalf of the Public Schools. 5 cts. Per dozen, 50 cents. Per 100.....	3 00
CONSTITUTIONAL SAFE-GUARDS against the appropriation of public funds for sectarian purposes, by Rev. J. B. Dunn. Per dozen, 10 cts. Per 100.....	75
IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION, their evils and remedies, by Rev. J. B. Dunn. Per dozen, 10 cts. Per 100 .....	75
THE TWO SIDES OF THE SCHOOL QUESTION, papers by Cardinal Gibbons and Bishop Keane on the one hand, and Edwin D. Mead and Hon. John Jay on the other, with notable extracts from United States documents. 80 pages, 12 cts. 10 copies..	1 00
THE POPE'S LAST VETO IN AMERICAN POLITICS. Will the people sustain it? By J. B. Dunn, D. D. Per dozen, 20 cts. Per 100 .....	1 25
Soon to be issued, Second Annual Report of the Committee of One Hundred, containing valuable and interesting information, also the account of the Second Great Victory in Boston. 32 pages. Price, 5 cts. Per 100.....	2 50

☞ Friends of Free Schools and American Institutions are kindly asked to aid the Committee in widely distributing these valuable documents, by liberally contributing to its funds. If the means are provided, one million copies of THE POPE'S LAST VETO will be circulated.