

834805

Meyers, Chas W.
What Catholics
ADU 3308

What Catholics Have Done For American Civilization.



By CHAS. W. MEYERS, B. D.

Author of

“A MINISTER’S SURRENDER”

“THROUGH MAN TO GOD”

Etc.

“Go little booke—God give thee good passage.”—Chaucer

OUR SUNDAY VISITOR PRESS, HUNTINGTON, INDIANA





CONTENTS

Introductory Note	1
CHAPTER I—Catholics In America Before Columbus.....	2
CHAPTER II—America Discovered by Columbus.....	10
CHAPTER III—Catholic Explorers and Missionaries.....	12
CHAPTER IV—Who Were the Founders of Civil and Religious Liberty in America?	21
CHAPTER V—Catholics in the War for American Independence.....	34
CHAPTER VI—Catholics in the Formation of the American Republic.....	45
CHAPTER VII—Catholics in the Preservation of the Union.....	49
CHAPTER VIII—Catholics in the World War.....	54
CHAPTER IX—How Catholic Patriotism Has Been Appreciated and Rewarded in America—A Chapter in American Persecution	63
CHAPTER X—Does the Church Teach That Catholics Owe Civil Alle- giance to Rome?.....	71



INTRODUCTORY NOTE.

The matter of this booklet was first published in OUR SUNDAY VISITOR in serial form, at irregular intervals, during 1922-1923; and while the articles were coming out, repeated calls were received from both clergy and laity, requesting that the entire series be published in the form of a pamphlet. This has been arranged for with the OUR SUNDAY VISITOR PRESS.

The special purpose for which these articles were written is to counteract the everlasting howl that Catholics cannot be loyal citizens of our civil government, because they "owe civil allegiance to the Pope of Rome"! To contradict this false charge effectively, the author has presented here, in historic order, the incontrovertible evidence of Catholic patriotism, by giving the actual record of the part they took in the foundation of our government, and in the development of our American civilization.

These concrete facts are far more important in settling this question than any amount of political theorizing about the relation of Church and State.

The author has put his whole heart and strength into this work; and by the most strenuous historic research he has gathered together in condensed form the "cream" of all the best Catholic and Protestant authorities on this subject. The same amount of information on this question cannot be found anywhere else in the same space and in the same convenient form. Though the author's health has been wrecked by this strenuous work, yet he feels happy in the thought that this booklet may be the means of subduing the bitter and relentless opposition of the Church's enemies, by bringing them face to face with the incontrovertible facts of American history.

Ever since the author has had the happy privilege of being a Catholic, his chief aspiration and aim has been to put Catholic truth into non-Catholic minds; and though he may never be able, physically, to write another booklet for the benefit of his non-Catholic friends, his most earnest desire is that this little book may go into every nook and corner of our beloved America, and may continue to carry its unique message of civil and religious toleration into the heart and home of every American citizen.

The author has put his life-blood into this little work, and his most ardent hope is, that it may continue its blessed mission of peace long after the author's pen has dropped from his nerveless hand.

C. W. M.

CHAPTER I.

Catholics In America Before Columbus.

It is often said that Catholics are "foreigners," and have the foreign spirit, and consequently cannot be good American citizens. It would be well for those who say this to remember that Catholics were the first white people that ever came to America, and were the first to introduce Christian civilization into our country and to develop a genuine American spirit; and through all the years of American history Catholics have been in the very forefront, among the propagators and protectors of our American civilization. In this pamphlet it is our purpose, first, to examine briefly the influence of Catholicity in the past history of our country, in general, and then to conclude with a more minute examination of Catholic influence in the United States at the present time.

The first thing Catholics did for this western Continent was to find it, and name it, and let the world know about it. This was no small achievement, and it required centuries to accomplish it. Now to begin in the beginning, we want to study first

CATHOLIC AMERICA IN THE MIDDLE AGES.

Although this sounds like an anachronism, yet it is true that Catholic explorers visited this Western World, not only in the Middle Ages, but even in the early part of the Christian Era. We have about seventy-five authors, who have given accounts of the pre-Columbus history of America and among these accounts we have conclusive evidence that the very first discovery of this continent by civilized people was made as early as the sixth century by the famous Irish monk, St. Brendan. Prof. O'Curry, in his "Lectures on Manuscript Materials of Irish History," tells us that "St. Brendan's first voyage westward was made about the year 560," and was followed by other voyages extending through seven years. It is said that the point on the Emerald Isle from which he sailed is still known as "Brendan's Hill."

From another account we learn also that St. Brendan, with seventy-five monks, landed on a "far away shore" west of Europe and explored a "most beautiful land in which there was a great river." This land is supposed by some authors to be the country around Chesapeake Bay. A poet has glorified this discovery by singing:

"O Brendan! God unto thine eyes
Hath granted sight of Paradise."

These long perilous voyages of St. Brendan have been called the "Irish Odyssey," and were known and accredited by European

geographers even in the time of Columbus. It is a remarkable fact that on the map which the learned Paulo Toscanelli prepared for Columbus, just before his voyage across the Atlantic, there is a space marked far out in the Atlantic ocean, and named "St. Brendan's Land." From the Life of Columbus, written by his son, Ferdinand, we learn that Columbus had this very map in his hands on his way to America.

This St. Brendan was not a mythical character, for we are told by several writers of Irish history that after he returned to Ireland from these distant voyages he founded the renowned monastery of Clonfert, one of the great schools of ancient Erin. The importance of this story is also proved by the fact that it is treasured up in the principal languages of Europe in the Middle Ages. The authorities cited in support of these statements are "Usher's Antiquities of the British Churches," "McGee's Irish Settlers in America," Humbolt's "Cosmos," and others. If these authorities are trustworthy, then we are obliged to admit that nearly fourteen hundred years ago this Continent was discovered by an Irish Catholic monk, and the first name given to it was in honor of a Catholic Saint.

Just here it may be remarked, in passing, that Ireland's position and influence in the Christian civilization of the world has been unique and marvelous. According to Montalembert, in his "Monks of the West," it was from Ireland, in the early ages, that the "light of faith flashed out and illumined the dark regions of Britain, France, Germany, Belgium, Norway and Iceland." Germany honors 156 Irish saints, three of whom were martyred on German soil. France has an honor roll of forty-five Irish saints; Belgium honors thirty Irish saints, and Norway and Iceland claim eight, all of whom were martyred. That the little Isle of Erin should be the source of Christian civilization for so large a part of the world is truly wonderful. No doubt it was Archbishop Lynch's appreciation of this fact that led him to say: "Ireland has a divine mission."

It was Catholic Ireland's influence in Norway and Iceland which opened the way, later on, for the early discoveries in America by the Norsemen. It was through the Scandinavians that Christian influence continued to come from Ireland to America. Iceland, especially, was the chief stepping stone between the Old World and the New, and it was to this "Ultima Thule," (as the Greeks called it even before the time of Christ) that the devoted and heroic Irish monks came and planted the Cross of Christ in A. D. 829. This "jumping-off-place," as we Americans would call it, was not too far away for these faithful Irish missionaries to find it. Iceland was evangelized before Norway was, and it is sad to relate that in 860 A. D. the pagan Norwegians visited the

island, drove out the Christians, and then a few years later, founded a Norse colony there. Thus was the light of faith extinguished in Iceland, and then, for more than one hundred years, Iceland, Norway and Sweden continued to be wrapped in heathen darkness.

In this period of pagan gloom, from 860 to 985, a very remarkable event occurred, as related in the Icelandic sagas. According to this account, a wind-tossed vessel from Iceland was thrown upon the shore of a far western land which was called "Irland-it-Mikla"—Greater Ireland—and here the leader of the voyagers was "baptized." Even the voyager's name is given in the following sentence quoted from these Icelandic records: "In 983 Are Marson, of Iceland, was driven by storms to a far-off land called Irland-it-Mikla—Greater Ireland—where he was baptized." If this be true, then the Christians in America who baptized this pagan Icelander must have been the descendants of Christians who reached this Continent long before the Christian Norsemen came to our shores. Where could these Christians have come from, who were found on this Continent in 983 A. D.? The only satisfactory answer would seem to be that they were the descendants of the Christian colony established here in 560 A. D. by St. Brendan. It is truly remarkable and significant that the same country which ancient Irish records called "St. Brendan's Land" should be called in the Icelandic records "Irland-it-Mikla"—Greater Ireland.

In 985 A. D. Greenland was discovered by pagan navigators from Iceland; and soon after this, the untiring Irish Catholic missionaries evangelized Norway, Sweden and Greenland, and re-Christianized Iceland. Immediately after this Leif, Son of Erik, discovered **America**; and then, for four hundred years there was continuous inter-communication between Ireland, Norway, Sweden, Iceland, Greenland and America.

It was chiefly through Leif Ericson's influence that Greenland was evangelized. Near the close of the tenth century Leif made a visit back to Norway, and found that the King and people there embraced Christianity under the preaching of the Irish missionaries, and he was so impressed by this fact he, too, promptly became a Christian, and on his return to Greenland he took with him a Christian missionary under whose ministry all Greenland soon became Christian.

So freely did the Norsemen now receive the gospel that by the year 1000 both Iceland and Greenland were entirely Catholic; and a half century later, two episcopal sees were established—one at Skalholt, Iceland, and the other at Garda, Greenland.

A Danish chronicle records the fact that in the "golden age" of the Greenland colonies, there were 280 settlements, four monas-

teries, and 100 parishes in the diocese; and that the diocese was ruled successively by seventeen bishops during the period between 1120 A. D. and 1408 A. D.

Soon after Leif Ericson introduced Christianity into Greenland, he discovered America and brought the light of faith to our eastern shores. The Icelandic records tell us that the first land he reached was barren and rocky, and Leif called it Helluland (Stone Land). This is thought to be New Foundland. A little further south they discovered a level woodland, which they called Markland (Woodland). This is supposed to be Nova Scotia. After two more days' sailing, they landed and explored a country where there was a river. Here they found the wild grapes which caused them to name the country Vinland (Wineland). This is now generally thought to be the country around Narragansett Bay.

Soon after this, three Norse Catholics—Thorwald, Thorstein and Thorfinn—visited Vinland and gradually formed a settlement. In 1003 Thorwald was killed by the natives, and his kinsmen buried him on a headland near where Boston now stands. A cross was placed at his grave, and this point of land was long known as the "Promontory of the Cross." "Thus," says Dr. John O. Murry, "was the Catholic sign of redemption erected on the coast of Massachusetts nearly six hundred years before the Puritan set foot on Plymouth Rock." Thorfinn lived in Vinland until 1007, when he returned to Greenland, but the colony continued to flourish for a number of years.

In 1059 Vinland was visited by Bishop John, of Ireland, but soon after he came he was killed by savages. Thus, over 800 years ago the soil of New England was sanctified by the martyr blood of an Irish Catholic Bishop. About 1121 A. D. Erik Upsi, Bishop of Garda, Greenland, came to Vinland, which was by that time included in his episcopal see. He and his zealous missionaries revived the Church there, and there, we are told, he continued to live until his death. Dr. Vetromile, in his "Abnaki and Their History," says: "The Catholic Church was properly established on this Continent in 1121;" and Rev. W. F. Clarke, S. J., in his "Lives of the Deceased Bishops of the United States," calls Bishop Erik "the first American Bishop."

The account we have given, so far, of the discovery and evangelization of this Western Continent by the Irish and Norse Christians, is based chiefly on the ancient historic records known as the Icelandic sagas. These have been carefully examined by eminent scholars who have collected them into a great work under the title, "Antiquitates Americanae," which has been published under the auspices of the Royal Society of Northern Antiquarians. It is written in Icelandic and Danish, with a Latin translation, and is regarded as being decidedly the highest authority on this subject

in existence. The distinguished Von Humboldt, in his "Cosmos," (Vol. II, pp. 269-72), gives his estimate of these ancient records as follows: "We are here on historic ground.—The sagas and other documents concerning the expeditions of the Norsemen to Helluland, to Markland, and to Vinland in Massachusetts have been published and satisfactorily commented upon—the discovery of North America by the Norsemen cannot be disputed."

Professor Rafn, the noted Danish archaeologist, states, as the result of many years' research, that "America was repeatedly visited by the Icelanders in the 11th, 12th and 13th centuries; and that everywhere they introduced Christian civilization among the natives."

The Icelandic sagas are also corroborated by two remarkable documents known as the "Flatey Book" and the "Hauks Book," which are preserved in the Royal Library at Copenhagen. Both of these contain matter gathered from the sagas relative to America, in which Vinland is distinctly mentioned. It has been my privilege to examine copies of both of these books.

The saga documents are corroborated, further, by another most valuable work, known as the "Vatican Manuscript." This was discovered in the Vatican Library at Rome in 1902. Photographic copies of this Manuscript are preserved in many libraries in America, and I found by examination that it consists of a number of letters written by several Popes at different times to the different Bishops and Archbishops who had control of the Churches in Norway, Iceland, Greenland and Vinland. The earliest of these letters is that of Pope Innocent III, written February 13, 1206, to the Archbishop of Nidros, Norway, whose jurisdiction extended to Iceland, Greenland and Vinland. We have already seen that Vinland was included in the See of Greenland, by the fact that Bishop Erik Upsi came from Greenland to look after the welfare of the Church at Vinland. In harmony with all this, Rev. W. F. Clarke, S. J., says: "Centuries before Christopher Columbus opened the way through mid-ocean from Europe to America, Catholic priests and bishops, by the authority of the Roman Pontiffs, had landed on the shores of more than one of the thirteen States, had preached the faith, administered the sacraments, and died martyrs to their zeal for our religion."

In addition to these literary documents, we have here in America many remarkable ruins, bearing significant inscriptions, among which are several which certainly throw some light on the Norse discoveries in this country.

At Newport, R. I., there is an old "Stone Tower," which, 200 years ago, was called the old "Stone Mill." From the "Antiquitates Americanae" we learn that "this ancient *tholus* in Newport, which was erected about the time of Bishop Erik (1121), belonged

to an old Scandinavian church or monastery, where in alternation with Latin Masses, the old Danish tongue was heard over seven hundred years ago." Many of our modern historians and antiquarians have been greatly puzzled as to the origin of this strange old monument. The Danish scholar, Prof. Rafn, believed this tower to have been built by the Norsemen, and that it was "erected certainly not later than the twelfth century."

In 1912, while touring in New England, I visited this strange old structure and photographed it. As I stood in the presence of this mysterious monument I felt disappointed that it did not have one informing word inscribed upon it. There it stood in solemn silence, mocking us with its muteness. But though it has no tongue to speak, its silent presence is eloquent. Our own beloved Longfellow recognized its meaning, and in his "Skeleton in Armor" he associates this Tower with the famous armored skeleton which was dug up in Fall River, Mass. Longfellow makes the skeleton give the following account of himself:

"I was a Viking old,
 My deeds though manifold,
 No skald in song has told,
 No sage taught thee!
 Take heed that in thy verse,
 Thou dost the tale rehearse,
 Else dread a dead man's curse;
 For this I sought thee.

"Three weeks we westward bore,
 And when the storm was o'er,
 Cloud-like, we saw the shore,
 Stretching to the leeward.
 There for my ladys' bower,
 Built I this lofty Tower,
 Which to this very hour,
 Stands looking seaward!"

Just a few years ago there was discovered near Kensington, Minn., a stone covered with Scandinavian runic inscriptions which were examined by Prof. H. R. Haland, a Swedish scholar of Chicago, and which he translated as follows: "Eight Swedes and twenty-two Norwegians on a journey of discovery from Vinland westward. We had camp by two rocks, one day's journey north from this stone. We were out fishing one day. When we returned (to camp) we found 10 men red with blood and dead. AVM. (Ave Maria), save us from evil! We have 10 men by the sea to look after our vessel, 41 day's journey from this place, year 1362."

Prof. Haland tells us that the peculiar form of the runic characters on this stone is in perfect harmony with the date of this inscription, 1362. These are just like the runes on other inscriptions which are known to belong to the fourteenth century, and which are now preserved in the Library at Stockholm. As this form of runes is very rare, (only a very few inscriptions being preserved), it is practically impossible for the inscription on this stone to have been written by any *modern* Scandinavian scholar. The circumstances of its discovery, also, favor this conclusion. It was dug up in a swamp where it was found buried and entwined in the roots of a full-grown tree, where it had evidently been lying for several centuries. These considerations make it practically certain that this inscription was written by a Scandinavian explorer in the *fourteenth century*.

Now, with these evidences of its genuineness, the next question that interests us is, what do we learn from it? Briefly stated, this inscription brings to us the message that 130 years before Columbus discovered America, thirty Catholic Scandinavian explorers started out from Vinland and penetrated the country to the sources of the Mississippi River. Here some of the party go fishing, leaving 10 men to guard the camp. When they return they discover that their 10 comrades have been cruelly killed and scalped by savages. In their horror they cry out to the Virgin Mary to save them from the same fate. And then, in anticipation of such a possible fate, they write a brief account of their perilous journey on this imperishable stone, to be found and read by future generations. The two most significant facts we learn from this "Kensington Rune Stone" are, that these explorers came from Catholic Vinland, and that in their distress they prayed to the Blessed Virgin Mary for help. I have among my papers an interesting picture of this stone, showing the runic characters very plainly; and on a separate sheet I have a fac simile of the inscription, with Prof. Haland's interlinear translation.

Thus we have traced briefly the historic evidences that show that in the Middle Ages, not only before the Reformation, but before Martin Luther was born, Catholic explorers repeatedly visited America and founded Christian colonies on our shores. So, without fear of being thought unhistorical, we may indulge our poetic sentiment and sing with the poet:

"O, who has not heard of the Northmen of yore,
 Who flew, like the sea-birds, their sails from the shore;
 How westward they strayed not till breasting the brine,
 They hailed Narragansett, the land of the Vine."

That the labors of these Christian explorers seem to have

come to naught is a sad reflection. But it might be well to remind ourselves that while their material work may have fallen into ruins, their spiritual influence is undying, and continues to this day to be a helpful inspiration to every devout Catholic. Besides this, we may also rest assured that God's divine benediction is ever upon the martyr spirit of the Christian missionary. Not only is the divine blessing upon the missionary himself, but it also rests upon his labors. We may be assured that God will never forsake the land whose soil has been hallowed by the blood of Christian martyrs. As it was in the days of the Holy Apostles and Fathers, so also in these days, we venture to hope that "the blood of the martyrs shall be the seed of the Church."

We have the confidence that on these ruins there is being built today a glorious Christian civilization whose triumph will most certainly be consummated in the days to come. For this, let us never cease to pray and labor.

REFERENCES:

"The Geographical Knowledge of the Ancients in Relation to the Discovery of America."—Tillinghast.

"America Not Discovered by Columbus," 3rd edition 1883.—Anderson.

"Pre-Columbian Discovery of America by the Northmen."—Decosta.

"Antiquates Americanae."—Rafn.

"Lives of Deceased Bishops of the United States."—W. J. Clarke, S. J.; also "Centennial Discourse," by same author.

"Monks of the West."—Montalembert.

"Cosmos."—Humbolt. (Vol. II, pp. 269-72).

"The Vatican Manuscript" (Discovered in Vatican Library in 1902. Contains letter of Pope Innocent III to Archbishop of Norway, February 13, 1206).

"The Flatey Book" and "The Hanks Book," both prepared in the Royal Library, Copenhagen.

"The Skeleton in Armor."—Longfellow.

CHAPTER II.

 America Discovered by Columbus.

There is a remarkable passage written by Seneca in the first century which would seem to be a clear prediction of the discovery of this Western Continent. The passage is found in Seneca's *Medea* 376, and reads as follows, in the Latin:

“Venient annis saecula seris Quibus Oceanus vincula rerum
Laxet, et ingens pateat tellus Tethysque novos detegat orbes, Nec
sit terris ultima Thule.”

Prof. John Fiske translates this as follows:

“There will come a time (cycle) in later years, when Ocean shall loosen the bands of things by which we have been confined, and an immense land shall be revealed, and Tethys shall disclose new worlds; neither shall Thule be the ultimate limit of the lands.”

A more popular translation reads thus:

“For, at a distant date, this ancient world
Will westward stretch its bounds, and then disclose
Beyond the Main a vast new continent
With realms of wealth and might.”

Prof. Fiske, in his “Discovery of America,” says of this remarkable prediction: “This is certainly one of the most notable instances of prophecy on record.”

So suggestive was this strange poetic prediction that Christopher Columbus treasured it, and often repeated it as a favorite stanza. While it was partially fulfilled in the discoveries made by the Irish and Scandinavians in the Middle Ages, yet its *complete fulfillment* was realized by Columbus in the fifteenth century.

Besides this remarkable prediction, Columbus was also acquainted with the work of ancient geographers, and with works of Mandeville and Marco Tolo, and Toscanelli, all of which inspired him to undertake his colossal and hazardous enterprise.

When the Western Continent was discovered in 1492, Martin Luther was only nine years old, still busy studying his Catholic Catechism. Protestantism was not yet born, and practically all Christiandom was still Catholic, hence the discovery of the New

World was pre-eminently a Catholic enterprise. It was conceived in the mind of a Catholic mariner, encouraged by a Catholic monk, advocated before the Spanish throne by a Catholic Cardinal, fitted out with a fleet by a Catholic King, and aided by a Catholic Queen who pledged her royal jewels in the interests of the mighty enterprise.

It was undertaken, too, with a most devout trust in God, and a most earnest appeal for divine guidance and protection. The first words in the Admiral's diary of this memorable voyage were these: "*In Nomine Domini Nostri Jesu Christi.*" On the eve of his departure, Columbus made his confession to Padre Perez, and at the head of his crew of 120 men attended Mass and received Holy Communion.. When they had boarded their tiny vessels he reverently committed the little fleet to the benign care of the Blessed Virgin Mary. His own ship was named Santa Maria. Every evening during the voyage he and his crew reverently prayed "Salva Regina, Mater misericordiae, vita, dulcedo, et spes nostra, salve!" and followed this prayer by singing the "Ave Maris Stella." The fitness of this Latin Hymn for such a sea voyage is seen in the following translation:

"Bright Mother of our Maker, Hail!
Thou Virgin ever blest,
The Ocean's Star by which we sail
And gain the port of rest!"

At the first sight of the new land the Admiral and his crew fell upon their knees and chanted the Gloria in Excelsis. When they had landed, he bowed down thrice to the earth and kissed the soil of the newly found land. While kneeling he reverently prayed: "Eternal and Almighty God! who by Thy sacred word hast created the heavens, the earth, and the seas, may Thy name be blessed and glorified in all places. May Thy Majesty be exalted, who hast deigned to permit that by Thy humble servant, Thy sacred name should be made known and preached in this new world, Amen." In his religious zeal he named the new country "San Salvador," and the first Christian service that graced the New World was the sacrifice of the Mass, which for more than 100 years was the only form of Christian worship on the Western Continent.

Thus was the mightiest human enterprise in all history inspired by the Holy Catholic Church; and if *original discovery* secures the *highest right* to the occupation of a country, then Catholics have the *first right* to live on American soil.

Perhaps no more appropriate language could be chosen with which to close this brief account of "Columbus' discovery of Amer-

ica," than the following by Prof. Fiske: "The first voyage of Columbus to this continent is a unique event in the history of mankind. Nothing like this was ever done before, and nothing like it will ever be done again. No more worlds are left for any future Columbus to discover. The era of which this great Italian mariner was the most illustrious representative, has closed forever."

(See Fiske's "Discovery of America by Columbus" Vols. I and II, page 446, and "Life of Columbus," by his son, Fernando Columbus).

The author will never forget the emotions which thrilled his heart, as he stood once in the great Cathedral in Havana, Cuba, and looked upon the spot where the reputed remains of this colossal character had been sacredly kept for more than 100 years.

REFERENCES:

Seneca's "Medea."

X

CHAPTER III.

Catholic Explorers and Missionaries.

Now it must not be forgotten that these Catholic pioneer explorers were accompanied, through all their explorations, by the Catholic missionaries, whose chief object and effort was to evangelize and civilize the natives. Thus did civilization go hand in hand with exploration, resulting in the conversion of millions of American Indians. On his second voyage to America Columbus brought with him the first band of Christian missionaries consisting of twelve priests and a vicar-apostolic. Their first work was to build and consecrate a chapel at Isabella, in Hayti. This brought with him the first band of Christian missionaries considered as the historic beginning of the Catholic Religion in America. The work of evangelizing the Indians was especially encouraged by Queen Isabella. Washington Irving says:

"She ordered that great care should be taken in the religious instruction of the Indians; that they should be treated with the greatest kindness; and that signal punishment should be inflicted on all Spaniards who should be guilty of outrage or injustice towards them." The Christian spirit and attitude of the Spanish Government toward the Indians is still more clearly shown by the special stipulations made in the grant given by the King of Spain to a Spanish colonizer. In 1523 the King made a grant to Vas-

quez de Ayllon, one of the judges of San Domingo, in which we find the following significant statement concerning the treatment of the Indians: "Whereas our principal intent in the discovery of new lands is that the inhabitants and natives, who are without the knowledge of faith, may be brought to understand the truths of our holy Catholic faith and become Christians; (and this is the chief motive you are to bear and hold in this affair, and to this end it is proper that religious persons should accompany you); therefore, I empower you by these presents, to carry with you the religious whom you may judge necessary for divine worship." This shows, notwithstanding the fact that some Spanish conquistadores were cruel to the natives, that the Spanish Government had the most benign and unselfish sympathy for them. Prof. Chas. F. Lummis declares: "There could be no more useful reading than the laws of Spain as to the aborigines of America. They contain the highest minded, most complete and most noble Indian policy ever framed by man."

Among the first missionaries of the West Indies and Mexico, the most illustrious name is that of the venerable and courageous Dominican, Las Casas. Beginning in 1502, he labored zealously for more than 60 years, spreading the light of the Gospel among the natives, and pleading for their protection against the injustice and cruelty of the Spanish soldiers and adventurers. Las Casas crossed the ocean 16 times in order to plead the cause of the Indians at the court and before the throne of Spain. He even appealed to Pope Paul III, and secured from him the Magna Charta in the Brief of 1537 which decreed that "no Indian should be enslaved." Fiske calls Las Casas "the most beautiful and sublime character in all the annals of Christian history since the Apostles." So rapid was the evangelization of Mexico that by the year 1550, 30 years after the conquest by Cortez, there were several millions of Christian Indians in Mexico. Father Toribio puts the number at 9,000,000—nearly the whole population. The first place in our Southland to receive the Gospel was Florida. Immediately after its discovery in 1512, Florida was visited by a rapid succession of missionaries; and in 1528 the Rt. Rev. John Jaurez was appointed by the Holy See, Bishop of Florida. It is sad, however, to relate that within one year after the founding of this mission, the Bishop and his missionaries were cruelly murdered by the savages, and the settlement destroyed. Thus, within 36 years after the discovery of America by Columbus, our soil was baptized with the blood of Catholic martyrs. Later on, after the founding of St. Augustine in 1565, the monastery of St. Helena was established there; and from this radiant center the light of the Gospel flashed out successfully among the Florida Indians, and Cherokees in the territory north of Florida. The first Indian

school in America was founded and supported by this colony.

But the Spanish missions in the South had a more deadly enemy to deal with, later on, than the Indians were. About the year 1700 England began a vigorous system of Protestant colonization along the Atlantic coast; and being the bitter enemy of both Indians and Catholics she lost no opportunity to destroy the Spanish Indian missions. This was continued with cruel persistency until 1763, when by the Treaty of Paris, Spain ceded Florida to England. "This," says the author, J. G. Shea, "Was the death blow to the Spanish missions in the South—The missions were destroyed, the Indians dispersed, and St. Helena the Convent whence Christianity had radiated over the peninsula, had become a *barrack*." Another author tells us that "the forsaken Florida Indians, wandering in the pathless everglades, took the name of *Seminoles*, which in their own language means *Wanderers*. By the time of the Revolutionary War, not a single Indian mission in the South and East had escaped the destroying progress of England."

The first missionary to visit the country now called Texas was Father De Olmos, who went there in 1544; but the first permanent missions in this territory were founded by 14 Franciscans in 1688. Then for over 100 years, these missions made encouraging progress.

In 1542 Coronado led an expedition up through the territory now called New Mexico, accompanied by two Franciscans, Father Padilla and Brother John of the Cross. These two zealous missionaries began their noble work, but were soon put to death by the natives. Nearly 40 years later (1581), three devoted Franciscans erected a new mission there, but were also martyred soon after. The next year (1582) Espejo, a Spanish nobleman, explored the head of the Rio Grande, named the country New Mexico, and founded the mission of Santa Fe. After many missionaries had sacrificed their lives in this mission field the savages finally yielded to their patient and persistent preaching; and so rapid was the progress of the work that by 1608 there were 50 missions in New Mexico, numbering in all about 800 converts. Ten years later (1618) Father Salmeron founded a mission in this territory, and within 8 years baptized 6,500 converts. According to the account given by Bancroft, there were in this entire mission field in 1630 about 25 missions, served by 50 missionaries, and numbering 35,000 Christian Indians, which was practically the entire population. Although the Apaches and Navajos did much, later on, to destroy these missions, yet the Catholic Indians are still numerous in New Mexico.

In what is now Arizona the Jesuits founded the mission of St. Francis del Bac, in 1692. It fell into decay but was renewed

by the Franciscans in 1763, when it included Tucson as one of the outlying stations. Its early progress was slow, for in 1772 it had a population of only 270, and the Church was poorly furnished. But later on, it became very prosperous. The fine present structure was completed in 1797, and today it is one of the most prosperous and attractive missions in all the southwest. It is the oldest active mission in the United States.

When the expedition of Viscaino reached Monterey in 1602, a writer tells us that there was with him a band of Carmelite priests who "celebrated the first Mass on the Pacific coast on a rustic altar under the spreading branches of a venerable live-oak.—This may be considered the natal day of the California missions." The remains of this distinguished old oak may still be seen just behind the parish Church in Monterey. Here, also, these dear old Carmelites set up a Cross, and named the spot *Carmelo*. But no missions were actually founded on the Pacific coast until the Jesuits erected them at La Paz on the peninsula of Lower California in 1697, and it was from this point, about 70 years later, that Father Junipero Serra started on the famous missionary expedition which brought him to San Diego in 1769. Here he founded the Mission de Alcalá in 1769—227 years after Cabrillo had touched this coast in 1542, and 7 years before the signing of the Declaration of Independence. This was the beginning of a long line of 21 missions rapidly established near the California coast for a distance of 700 miles from San Diego to Sonoma, north of San Francisco. These missions were arranged about 30 to 40 miles apart along a trail known as the El Camino Real—the Royal Highway. Along this holy highway the sandaled feet of the saintly Padres trod their way through heat and dust to bring the message of salvation to the dusky natives. When Father Serra died at Monterey in 1784, he had founded 8 of these missions himself, and had made nearly 6,000 converts. The rest of the 21 missions were all built by the year 1823, and it has been estimated that by this time the total number of converts gained by all the missions were not fewer than 30,000. It is sad to relate, however, that when in 1833 the Mexican Government became independent of Spain, the missions were confiscated and began to fall into decay. The Franciscans were scattered, the Indians were dispersed, and the mission buildings were plundered and despoiled. Only one of these—the Mission at Santa Barbara—has never been allowed to fall into decay.

And why did Mexico secularize these missions? Simply because the dear old Padres had been loyal to Spain, just as all good Catholics are loyal to the rightful government under which they live. Most pathetic indeed is the appeal which these old mission ruins make to us; but their sacred influence is not dead. They

still have tongues with which to sing their former glory and to bewail their present desolation. Let us uncover our heads, then, and listen to their plaintive plea as they make their mute appeal to us from their lonely towers.

“Is then the old faith dead,”
They say, “and in its stead
Is some new faith proclaimed,
That we are forced to remain
Naked to the sun and rain,
Unsheltered and ashamed?”

“Once in our towers aloof
We rang o’er wall and roof
Our warnings and our complaints;
And round about us there
The white doves filled the air,
Like the white souls of the saints.

“The Saints! Ah, have they grown
Forgetful of their own,
Are they asleep or dead,
That open to the sky
Their ruined Missions lie
No longer tenanted?”

“Oh, bring us back once more
The vanished days of yore,
When the world with faith was filled;
Bring back the fervid zeal,
The hearts of fire and steel
The hands that believe and build!”

Professor Bolton, of the California State University, says: “One of the marvels in the history of the modern world is the way in which that little Iberian nation, Spain, when most of her blood and treasure were absorbed in European wars, with only a handful of men, took possession of the Carribbean archipelago, and by rapid yet steady advance, lasting to the end of the 18th century, spread her rule, her religion, her laws and her language over two-thirds of the two Americas. . . . As viewed by the Spanish Government, the work of the missionaries was to Christianize the natives and extend Spanish rule among them. But the primary work of the missionaries, first, last and all the time, was to *spread the faith*. . . . Discipline and the elements of civilization were imparted at the missions through religious instruction, through industrial routine, and even, in some instances,

through instruction in arts and letters. . . . Each fully developed mission was a great industrial school conducted on principles which, three centuries later, were adopted by the United States Government."

While the Spanish missionaries were laboring in the Southwest, the Catholic, English, and French missionaries were busy carrying the Gospel to the Indians in the East and North. On March 25, 1634, the *Catholic Pilgrim Fathers*, under Lord Baltimore landed on the shores of the Potomac and planted the colony of St. Mary's. Here, after celebrating the Mass and erecting a Cross, they laid the *first* foundation of *civil* and *religious liberty in America*. From the very beginning, these Christian colonists secured the confidence and friendship of the Indians, which was never lost afterwards. McSherry says, "Maryland was almost the only State whose early settlement was never stained with the blood of the natives." In this benign policy they were imitated, later on, in 1683 by Wm. Penn. Not only was Penn benign towards the Indians, but he was also tolerant toward the Catholics who were among his colonists. But as soon as William of Orange ascended the English throne, the infernal "penal laws" were enforced in the English colonies, and Penn was severely censured for his liberality toward Catholics. In 1708 William of Orange sent the following message to Gov. Logan, at Philadelphia: "It has become a reproach to me here, and to the officers of the Crown, that you have suffered the *scandal of the Mass* to be publicly celebrated."

Before John Eliot began to preach to the Indians in Massachusetts in 1646, the French missionaries had evangelized the Abnakis in Maine, and Micmacs and Montagais in Canada. In 1609 eleven years before the Puritans came to the New World, the French Jesuits founded a mission station and built a chapel on the Scoodic river in Maine. Finding this location unsuitable, they erected another mission in 1612 at the mouth of the Penobscot. Here they began a noble work in Christianizing the Abnakis; but like many other Indian missions, this, too, was fated to be destroyed by English bigotry. The infamous Argall attacked the settlement, killed one of the priests, and carried the other priests and colonists away. "Thus," says Dr. John O. Murray, "was the Abnaki mission destroyed by the English, a nation whose only words of peace for the Indian has ever been the sound of the rifle." Not until 40 years later was another French mission established among the Abnakis; and this, too, was destined to be destroyed by the British, later on, when the French were driven out of the country. In 1713, after the settlement had been reduced to ashes, Gov. Dudley, of Boston, proposed to rebuild the Abnaki chapel, if

they would only accept an English Protestant minister, instead of a Catholic "blackrobe." In response to this, the noble Chief stood up erect, and in a few withering words rejected the contemptible proposition with dignified scorn. These Abnakis have the distinction of being the *first* native Americans who *all* received the Catholic faith *in a body*.

In 1605 French Catholics settled among the Micmacs in Canada in the same country which was afterward called Acadia,—the land which our own dear Longfellow has made famous in his immortal *Evangeline*. The name comes from the Micmac word *Akade*, which means *Abundance*. After persistently persecuting the missionaries and natives, the climax finally came in 1755, when 7000 innocent Acadians were carried into exile by the British and scattered promiscuously among the colonies on the Atlantic coast. But so complete was the evangelization of the Micmacs, that there are even today 4000 Catholic Micmacs in the French provinces of Canada, who are supporting their own schools and churches.

At a very early date the French Jesuits founded missions among the Great Lakes at Sault Ste. Marie, Mackinaw, Green Bay and other points, which by the year 1665 numbered several thousand converts. Every schoolboy is familiar with the names of the Jesuit Fathers, Hennepin, Joliet, Marquette and others, who evangelized the Indians around the Great Lakes, in the Mississippi Valley, and in the far Northwest. The work of the "Black-robés" among the Dakotas is beautifully described in Longfellow's *Hiawatha*:

"From the farthest realms of morning
 Came the Black-robe chief, the Prophet,
 He the Priest of prayer, the Pale-face
 With the cross upon his bosom,
 Speaking words yet unfamiliar:
 Peace be with you, Hiawatha;
 Peace be with you, and your people,
 Peace of prayer and peace of pardon,
 Peace of Christ and joy of Mary."

While many ignorant bigots do not seem to know that Catholics have ever done any good in America, or anywhere else, it is gratifying to find some prominent non-Catholics, here and there, who are intelligent enough to appreciate, and honest enough to acknowledge, the noble work done by devoted Catholic missionaries in evangelizing the aborigines of America. Among these we are glad to find some ministers, statesmen and historians who are not afraid to tell the truth. The distinguished Protestant Episcopal Bishop, Rt. Rev. Austin Scriven, says: "The story of

the heroism of the Jesuit priests who, at the risk of their lives, brought the Gospel to the heathen tribes of North America, enduring tortures and martyrdom for the faith, forms one of the noblest and most thrilling chapters in our national history. To them belongs the honor of being the *pioneers* of Christianity to the natives of this country; and I never read the accounts which have come down to us of these early days, without thanking God for the splendid example of those saintly lives." Still more emphatic is the language of Senator Vest, of Missouri: "I am a Protestant. My father was an elder in the old Scotch Presbyterian church, and my earliest impressions were that the Jesuits had horns and hoofs and tails, and that there was a faint odor of sulphur in the air when one of them crossed your path. Some years ago I was assigned by the senate to duty upon a committee to examine the Indian schools in Wyoming and Montana. I visited every one of them. I wish to say now, what I have said before in the Senate, that I did not see in all my journey a single school that was doing any educational work, worth while, except those under the control of the Jesuits. . . . The Jesuits have elevated the Indian wherever they have been allowed to do so, without interference by bigotry and fanaticism, and the cowardice of politicians who are afraid of the A. P. A. They have made the Indian a Christian, and also a self-supporting workman. Go to the Flat-head Reservation in Montana and see what Father De Smet and his associates began, and were carrying on successfully, until the A. P. A. and the cowards who are afraid of them, struck down the appropriation. These Jesuits are not there, as one of them told me, for the love of the Indian only. Old Father Ravaille told me, lying on his back in his narrow cell, with the Crucifix above him: 'I am here not for the love of the Indian simply, but for the love of Christ.' The Jesuit has no thought except to do his duty, as God has given him to see it. I am not afraid to say this, because I speak from personal observation, and no man ever went among these Indians with more intense prejudice against the Jesuits than I did when I left the city of Washington."

No European nation treated the Indians with such uniform kindness as did the French. Catholic France was ever seeking to elevate them. Bancroft says: "It was neither commercial enterprise nor royal ambition, which carried France into the heart of our Continent. Her motive was religion. Religious enthusiasm founded Montreal, made a conquest of the wilderness, of the upper lakes, and of the Mississippi Valley. The Catholic Church created for Canada its altars, its hospitals, and its seminaries." But with the suppression of the Jesuits and the triumph of the British over the French, came the final overthrow of all the Catholic missions from the Gulf of St. Lawrence and the Great Lakes, on the North,

to the Gulf of Mexico on the South. Thus did the ascendancy of Protestant England prevent the United States from becoming a Catholic nation. The distinguished Protestant author, Thomas Wentworth Higginson, has well said: "If the control of the New World had depended solely on the power to obtain the friendship of its native tribes, North America today would have been French and Roman Catholic."

From 1663 to 1832 there were 152 of these heroic pioneer missionaries, who gave their hearts and lives to the work of Christianizing and civilizing the North American Indians, and among these devoted men there were 30 martyrs who sanctified American soil with their precious blood. But their labors and sufferings were not in vain; for we have today, not only the inspiration that comes from their noble example, but the visible fruits of their strenuous labors. It is an encouraging thought that out of the 270,000 Indians in the United States today 106,000 are devoted Catholics. And let us not forget too, that this wonderful success of the Latin missionaries in civilizing the Indians, lies chiefly in the fact that they were *Christian* civilizers, and not simply brutal conquerers and exterminators, as most of the Anglo-Saxons have been. It is a fact that the Puritans of New England utterly exterminated whole tribes of Indians. Under their heartless cruelty and cold-blooded policy, these tribes all vanished at the approach of these English saints and civilizers! Their slogan was "The only good Indian is a dead Indian"; and with grim zeal they put into practice what they preached. On one notable occasion, when they were attacking the Pequods, the English commander cried out, "We must *burn* them!" and Bancroft tells us that "most of them—men, women and children,—perished in the hideous conflagration." Here we have a striking instance of their *burning* zeal for the welfare of the poor pagans! Among the famous "Blue Laws" of Massachusetts, the following was passed in 1675: "Ordered by the Court that whosoever shall shoot off a gun on any unnecessary occasion, or att any game, except att an Indian or att a wolfe, shall forfeit five shillings for every such shott." Of course, there were honorable exceptions to this kind of spirit and conduct, but it must be admitted that this was the prevailing spirit among the Puritans.

But fire and fire-arms cannot hush the voice of the past. The accusing accents of exterminated Indians and Christian martyrs will rise up from their graves and resound, in ominous tones, in the ear of history. Their blood still cries out from the soil, and thoughtful Christian men today are beginning to appreciate the exalted virtues and noble deeds of these once forgotten and outraged saints and heroes. They have left their visible impress in every nook and corner of our country. Hundreds of thousands of

our rivers, lakes, valleys, mountains, cities and towns still bear the beautiful names with which these saintly missionaries christened them; and these stand today as perpetual reminders and imperishable monuments of the labors and sacrifices of the consecrated Catholic missionaries. Not only do these *visible* marks remain, but the *spirit*, too, that inspired these men of God, still survives. We are glad to believe that the spirit of noble Christian service and sacrifice is still warm in the hearts of many devoted Christians.

REFERENCES:

"Missions of the Southwest."—Adolph Bandelier.

"California Missions."—Rev. Z. Englehardt.

"History of Catholic Missions in America," "History of Catholic Missions Among the Indian Tribes of the United States," "Discoverers and Explorers of the Mississippi Valley" and "The Catholic Church in Colonial Days."—By John G. Shea.

"The Colonial Period."—George T. Fisher.

"LaSalle and the Discovery of the Great West," "The Pioneers of France in the New World," and "The Jesuits of North America."—By Francis Parkman.

"The Abnaki and Their History."—Rev. Dr. Ventromile.

X

CHAPTER IV.

Who Were the Founders of Civil and Religious Liberty In America?

I.

I. WHO WERE NOT THE FOUNDERS?

Again and again and again we have been told that the first great exponents of our American principles of Civil and Religious liberty were the Pilgrim Fathers of New England.

Through all the years of our country's history this boastful claim has been persistently dinned into our ears, both in song and oratory, until we are made to feel that it is almost sacrilegious to question the truth of it. So often have we been spell-bound by the music of these patriotic eulogies that our enraptured souls have become so hypnotized that we have almost lost the power to think. We are so bewildered by this extravagant glorification of these "Fathers" that we hardly know the difference between sound and sense. Some of us, however, have been fortunate enough to be aroused from this insane infatuation and are beginning to open our eyes to the plain truth; and we venture now to assert positive-

ly, and without fear of contradiction, that the Pilgrim Fathers of New England were not the founders of civil and religious liberty in America

The famous "Mayflower Compact" has been persistently glorified as the Original Charter of our American liberties; but only a slight examination of this document should convince anyone that it was not an American document, at all. On the other hand, it was simply a British document, drawn up by British subjects, expressing their formal avowal of loyalty to the British Crown and to the English Church.

It does not contain the slightest reference to any American principle, whatever. It was in no sense, a "Declaration of Independence," but simply a Compact swearing allegiance to a foreign civil and ecclesiastical government, which was simply a Union of Church and State. Furthermore, these same Pilgrim Fathers evidently did not intend to keep this "Compact," for they immediately began to violate it.

In the preamble of this "Compact" they called themselves the "*loyal subjects of our dread sovereigne Lord, King James, Defender of ye Faith;*" and they also declared that the object of their voyage to America was the "*advancement of ye Christian Faith and Honour of our King and Countrie.*" Then they proceeded to combine themselves together into a "*Civil Body Politick.*" After declaring themselves to be the "*loyal subjects*" of Great Britain, and proposing, also, to stand for the "*advancement of ye Christian Faith and Honour of King and Countrie,*" they formed themselves into a "*Civil Body Politick*" which immediately began to enact laws that were directly contrary to the principles of this "Compact." This celebrated "Body Politick" was not loyal either to the English Government or to the English church. On this point, Mr. Shea, in his admirable paper in the American Catholic Quarterly Review of July, 1877, pertinently remarks: "*The Connecticut and Massachusetts colonists ignored and evaded the English laws and acted in direct violation of the patents under which they settled. No man can read the authentic documents without admitting that they were designed to establish a system in utter disregard of the English law, and in many points in direct opposition to it, forbidding men to do what was their absolute right, as British subjects, to do, and compelling them to do what no English law required.. The claim that they acted for the 'advancement' of human freedom, though put forward so persistently, is so utterly absurd that, while repetition has made many think it to be undoubtedly true, thoughtful men really 'laugh in their sleeves' when they put forward this fine phrase to tickle the ears of the multitude.*"

The best Protestant scholarship of today gives the lie to

the ridiculous claim that the Pilgrim and Puritan fathers were the founders of civil and religious liberty. The well-known author, John Fiske, in his *"Beginnings of New England,"* says: "*In March, 1629, a royal charter was granted, creating a corporation, under the legal style of the 'Massachusetts Bay Company.' Nothing was said in this charter about religious liberty, for two reasons: the Crown would not have granted it, and it was not what the grantees wanted. Such a provision would have hampered them in carrying out their scheme. They preferred to keep in their own hands the question of how much or how little liberty they would allow.*" Now the extent to which they would allow religious liberty is indicated in the following stanza of a poem written by Thomas Dudley, first deputy governor, who came over in 1630:

"Let men of God in courts and churches watch
O'er such as do a Toleration hatch,
Lest that ill egg bring forth a cockatrice
To poison all with heresy and vice."

On this poem Mr. Fiske remarks: "Such was the spirit of most of the Puritans of that day." We do not wonder that a recent thoughtful writer in the *Watchman Magazine* felt obliged to say, reluctantly, "*It can hardly be shown that the civil and religious liberty we enjoy today is directly traceable to the Separatists that came over in the Mayflower.*"

The Pilgrims did not believe in the separation of Church and State. They believed in the domination of the State by the Church. This is plainly asserted by Protestant writers. John Orr Corliss in a late issue of the *Watchman Magazine*, says: "*Almost the first thing the Pilgrims did upon landing on American soil was to establish a Church-State. The State thus formed was simply the offspring of the Church, and consequently its hand-maid. In other words, the State was but the Church acting in secular and civil affairs. This was the very form of government sought by John Winthrop. As history records, he insisted on a 'due form of government both civil and ecclesiastical.' This was a theocracy in very deed;— and in it we find the secret of New England's merciless persecution of Mrs. Hutchinson, Roger Williams and the hapless Quakers.*" This union of Church and State is clearly indicated also in the following literal form: "*All lands, cattell, and other estates, of any kind, w'tsovr, shall be liable to be rated to all common charges w'tsoevr, eith'r for ye church, towne, or common weale.*" (Rec. Mass. Vol. 2, P. 210: 1647).

Mr. Wm. Elliot Griffis, of Ithaca, N. Y., said in a recent issue of the *Homiletic Review*: "It is an utterly false estimate and a misplacement of emphasis to make so much of the *Mayflower* and her very mixed company. On this ship were some scamps, and

some others of colorless character, who furnished the first murderers and the initial duelists in New England. We are every year discarding the less lovely traits of the Puritans who united State and Church, and thus, by an inexorable logic, became persecutors."

The "Bibliotheca Sacra," of October, 1920, contained an article entitled "Our Democracy's Foundation," which gave an account of the recent meeting in Boston of the "International Congregational Council." In this paper reference is made to Bradford's "Compact" as the "foundation of modern democracy;" and then further on, under the sub-title—"The Contribution of Congregationalism to Civil and Religious Liberty," we find this concluding sentence: "Congregationalism is essentially not democratic, but Christocratic." Here we see a beautiful inconsistency. If the "Compact" was the foundation of democracy, and Congregationalism is "not democratic," then, Congregationalism is not founded on the "Compact." If it is a "Christocratic Theocracy, how can it also be a democracy!

The most convincing evidence, however, that the Pilgrim Fathers did not believe in civil and religious liberty, is to be found in some of their famous "Blue Laws." The writer has made a personal examination of a number of these benign enactments, and offers the following as fair samples of the entire code:

No. 13. *"No Quaker or Dissenter from the established worship of this Dominion shall be allowed to give a vote for the election of any officer."* This law is really a corollary of No. 10, which required every voter to be a converted church member. Here we have neither civil nor religious liberty. These enactments were in force, both in Massachusetts and in Connecticut; and continued to grow more and more restrictive until 1663, when no one who "refused to attend church" was allowed to vote. (See Rec. of New Haven Jurisdiction (1653-1664); and Mass. Colon. Records (1635-6). On this law No. 13, Mr. J. G. Shea remarks: *"This law was not a dead letter; it was constantly enforced. Nearly a century after its enactment we read that Episcopal people in 1740 were hauled to jail for refusing to attend Congregational meetings."*

No. 14, puts a heavy fine on "anyone who would give food or lodging to a Quaker, Adamite, or other heretick."

No. 15. *"If any person turns Quaker, he shall be banished and not suffered to return, but upon pain of death."* This famous law was passed in Massachusetts Oct. 9, 1658, according to Mass. Colonial Records, Vol. 4 p. 345. In New Haven the penalty of death was not attached, but instead of this, the offender had one ear cut off for the first offense, the other ear for the second offense, and for the third offense he had his tongue bored through with a red hot iron; and all expenses for these courtesies were to be paid

by the recipient. (See exact wording of this law in Archbishop Spalding's "Miscellanea," p. 374). This fine practice of religious toleration is also recorded in "Revised Statutes of Conn." (1673); "Mass Colonial Records," Vol. IV., p. 308 (1657); "Plymouth Records," Vol. 3; and "Session Laws," (1607).

No. 16. *"No priest shall abide in the Dominion; he shall be banished, and suffer death on his return. Priests may be seized by anyone without a warrant."* The Massachusetts law against priests was first passed May 26, 1647, and became more and more cruel until 1700. (Senn "Gen. Laws of Mass. Bay Colony," 1672; "Acts and Resolves of Mass.," Vol. 1, p. 424; and "Neal's Appendix," p. 346). Also in "Rec. of Mass." Vol. III, p. 112, we find this enactment in its original literary form, as follows: *"No Jesuit or ecclesiastical person ordayned by ye authoritie of ye pope, shall henceforth come within our jurisdiction; and if any such person, having been once banished shall be taken the second time within this jurisdiction, he shall, upon lawful trial and conviction, be put to death."* Here again we have union of Church and State.

Here we cannot resist the temptation to introduce a somewhat lengthy quotation from the able article by Mr. Shea. In concluding his paper, Mr. Shea delivers this trenchant criticism: "The claim that these colonies did aught for civil freedom is utterly untenable; and the claim that they established, or ever dreamed of establishing, religious freedom is equally so. The freedom which these men sought was freedom to do their own will,—and to enforce their own will on their fellow-subjects, or expel them, if they refused to submit. It was simply the freedom of a robber-band. How can any sensible man pretend that they established freedom! They made their whole system an oligarchy by restricting the right of freemen (the franchise) only to those who were admitted as members of the church which they themselves had established. Religious liberty was never established in any New England Colony.

"Yet there are actually men outside of lunatic asylums who persistently talk of the freedom established in New England. Their legislation as a whole, even at its best, was narrow, exclusive, tyrannical, and based on no sound views of human nature or Christian principles. New England has become what she is, not by such laws, but in spite of them, by the assertion of the real manhood of her people."

Yes, we may add, by the manhood of the later generations, whose more generous character led them to renounce the false principles of their Calvinistic ancestors. The best type of character that ever graced New England was not that of the Pilgrim Fathers, but that of the more sane and humane men who came

after them. It was such noble men as Garrison, Wendell Phillips, Peabody, the Adamses, the Websters, Bancroft, Greely, Sumner, Bryant, Hawthorne, Lowell, Emerson, Whittier, Longfellow and others, who gave New England the proud position she holds today. These are the men to whom New England is indebted for the glory of her civil and intellectual achievements.

Several years ago the writer made a summer tour through all the New England States and, of course, visited all the leading historic landmarks. He saw the instruments of torture still standing on the green at Yale, in New Haven; he saw the spot among the elms in Boston Common where Quakers were hanged; he sat on Plymouth Rock on which the Pilgrims trod, just before they began to trample on the rights of their fellow men; he walked over the summit of Witch Hill at Salem where poor witches were decorated with hemp neckties just before they started for the other world; and then, as a relief from the sad reflections that oppressed his spirit, he visited the soul-cheering spots associated with Whittier, Longfellow and other benign characters who had sought to brighten human life with a bit of sunshine. As he strolled through Concord and gazed on the "Old Manse," he thought, "Here is the place where the brilliant young Emerson choked on the cast-iron theology of his Calvinistic ancestry;" and as he looked upon the modest tomb of Longfellow in Mt. Auburn cemetery at Cambridge, he thought, "Here sleeps the dust of one of the sweetest spirits that ever graced the land of the Pilgrims."

What a contrast between the persecuting Pilgrim and the peaceful poet. If Longfellow had lived among the Pilgrims and Puritans, it is certain that he never would have written *Evangeline* or *Hiawatha*. If he had, he would have enjoyed the delightful experience of being kicked out of the community. Like Roger Williams, he too would have had to find an asylum among the more merciful savages.

How often have we been told that these Pilgrims brought the open Bible to these shores! Nothing could be farther from the truth. They never brought an open Bible to anybody. The only kind of Bible they knew anything about was a Calvinistic Bible, —a Bible as interpreted by their Calvinistic preachers. The man who could not accept the interpretations of the Bible given by these Calvinists was a heretic, who had to be banished, as Roger Williams was. If the Pilgrims really believed in an open Bible, and in the Protestant principles of "private interpretation," as the right of each individual, why did they banish Roger Williams and hang innocent Quakers? Mr. Shea very justly remarks: "*Logically, the Quakers, acting on their own private judgment, had the same right to hang Puritans that the Puritans had to hang Quakers.*" Why not, if the Bible was open equally to all. No

statement could be more utterly false than the assertion that the Pilgrims brought an "open Bible" to America.

We have also been repeatedly reminded that we are indebted to these "fathers," not only for the "open Bible," but also for our national Thanksgiving holiday. Here is a ridiculous statement recently made in the Homiletic Review: "*In view of the fact that our nation was founded by men seeking religious freedom, who brought with them the open Bible, it seems that the Thanksgiving period, which is a national institution, is an appropriate time to give thanks also for the Christian Scriptures!*" The Pilgrim fathers knew as little about a national Thanksgiving as they did about an "open Bible." The only kind of Thanksgiving they knew was simply a local affair confined to New England. If such a thing as a national union Thanksgiving, such as we celebrate today, had been proposed to them, their saintly souls would have been sorely vexed with righteous indignation. To participate in any kind of union services with other denominations would have been regarded by them as a disgraceful compromise. Let us not forget that we did not begin to have a strictly national Thanksgiving, until most of these New England fathers had gone to heaven. Imagine these exclusive Separatists joining in an interdenominational Thanksgiving service with Baptists, Methodists, Episcopalians, Quakers and other "Hereticks!"

No; the Pilgrim and Puritan fathers did not believe in civil and religious liberty, at all. They were exclusive and intolerant in both politics and religion. Their cruelties kindle our indignation and their eccentricities excite our humor. Rev. Dr. Nevin almost swears that "*their treacherous wars upon the Indians for purposes purely mercenary, and their whippings, imprisoning and killing Quakers and Baptists for their conscientious opinions, will mark their government through all time as one of the cruelest and meanest that ever existed.*"

Washington Irving, in his History of New York (Vol. I, p. 76), justly ridiculed their grim inconsistencies in characteristic style:

"Having served a regular apprenticeship in the school of persecution, it behooves them to show their proficiency in the art. Accordingly they employed their leisure hours in banishing, scourging or hanging divers heretical Papists, Quakers and Anabaptists for daring to abuse the liberty of conscience, which they now clearly proved to imply nothing more than that every man should think as he pleased in matters of religion, provided he thought right; for otherwise it would be giving a latitude to damnable heresies. Now as they (the majority) were perfectly convinced that they alone thought right, it consequently followed that whoever thought wrong, and obstinately persisted in not being

convinced and converted, was a flagrant violator of inestimable liberty of conscience, and a corrupt and infectious member of the 'Body Politick,' and deserved to be lopped off and cast into the fire."

Now then, from the foregoing evidences, we know that the New England Fathers were not the originators of our American principles of civil and religious freedom; but instead of this, these famous "Fathers" were really the most vehement enemies of these principles that ever trod on American soil. This brings us now to the second general division of our subject

II. WHO WERE THE FOUNDERS OF CIVIL AND RELIGIOUS LIBERTY IN AMERICA?

We answer promptly, and without fear of contradiction, that this high honor belongs to Lord Baltimore, the Catholic founder of the Colony of Maryland; and to prove this, we invite you to examine with us some of the historic documents connected with the early history of our country. It is well known that the greatest bulwark of civil liberty in the world is the famous Magna Charta. It was the foundation, not only of British, but also of American constitutional freedom. Who were the framers of this memorable document? Archbishop Langton of Canterbury, and the Catholic barons of England. On the plains of Runnymede, in 1215, they compelled King John to sign that paper which was the death-blow to his arbitrary power, and the corner-stone of constitutional government. It is significant that the *only one* of the early American colonies that put the principles of this charter strictly into practice, was the Colony of Maryland, on the Chesapeake.

It is a remarkable fact that all the earlier writers of American history uniformly recognize Lord Baltimore as the first great exponent of civil and religious liberty in America. General B. T. Johnson, in his "*Foundations of Maryland*," (p. 12,) says: "*Calvert adopted the principle of religious liberty, as covered by, and included in, the guarantees of the 'Great Charter'.*" It is not too much to say that this colony was the cradle of civil and religious liberty in the United States. It is also significant that Maryland was the only one of the colonies settled by Catholics; and it is a notable fact that here the banner of liberty of conscience was held aloft, and the oppressed of other colonies were invited to seek protection and liberty under its shadow. On this point, Cardinal Gibbons, in his excellent discussion of civil and religious liberty, quotes from Bancroft's History of the United States. From this history, whose author was a New England Protestant clergyman, we gather the following facts, about the government of the Maryland colony: "*The Catholics took quiet possession of the little*

place, and religious liberty obtained a home—its only home in the wide world—at the humble village which bore the name of St. Mary. The foundation of the Colony of Maryland was peacefully and happily laid. Within six months it had advanced more than Virginia had done in many years. * * * But far more memorable was the character of the Maryland institutions. Every other country in the world had persecuting laws; but through the benign administration of the government of that province, no person professing to believe in Christ was permitted to be molested on account of religion. * * * The Roman Catholics, who were oppressed by the laws of England, were sure to find a peaceful asylum in the quiet arbors of the Chesapeake; and there, too, Protestants were sheltered against Protestant intolerance. Such were the beautiful auspices under which Maryland started into being. * * * Its history is the history of benevolence, gratitude and toleration. Maryland was the abode of happiness and liberty. Conscience was without restraint. A mild and liberal proprietary conceded every measure which the welfare of the colony required. * * * Ever intent on advancing the interests of his colony, Lord Baltimore invited the Puritans of Massachusetts to emigrate to Maryland, offering them lands and privileges and free liberty of religion.”

Here Cardinal Gibbons gives us the exact words of an act passed April 2, 1649, by the general assembly of Maryland, an act which will reflect unfading glory on that state as long as liberty is cherished in the hearts of men: “Whereas, the enforcement of conscience in matters of religion hath frequently fallen out to be of dangerous consequence in those commonwealths where it has been practiced; and for the more quiet and peaceable government of this province; and the better to preserve mutual love and unity among the inhabitants; no person whatsoever, within this province, professing to believe in Jesus Christ, shall from henceforth be in any way troubled or molested for his or her religion, nor in the free exercise thereof, nor in any way compelled to the belief or exercise of any other religion against his or her consent.” Upon this noble statute, Bancroft makes the following candid and judicious comment: “The design of the law of Maryland was to protect freedom of conscience; and some years after it had been confirmed, the apologists of Lord Baltimore could assert that his government had never given disturbance to any person in Maryland, for matter of religion; that the colonists enjoyed freedom of conscience, not less than freedom of person and estate, as amply as ever any people in any place of the world. The disfranchised friends of prelacy from Massachusetts and the Puritans from Virginia were welcome to equal liberty of conscience and political rights in the Roman Catholic province of Maryland.”

Cardinal Gibbons then continues the study of this subject by presenting a quotation from a work by Wm. Hand Browne, a distinguished Protestant scholar. Mr. Browne was a graduate of the University of Maryland, and was for several years editor of "*The Maryland Archives*" and president of The Maryland Historical Society and professor of English literature in Johns Hopkins university. Speaking of Calvert, the proprietary of the Maryland colony, Mr. Browne remarks: "*While as yet there was no spot in Christendom where religious belief was free, and when even the Commons of England had openly declared against toleration, Calvert founded a community wherein no man was to be molested for his faith. At a time when absolutism had struck down representative government in England, and it was doubtful if a Parliament of freedom would ever meet again, he founded a community in which no laws were to be made without the consent of the freemen.*"

In his *History of the United States*, Vol. I, p. 244, Bancroft makes the still more marvelous statement that "*Calvert deserves to be ranked among the wisest and most benevolent lawgivers of all ages. He was the first in the history of the Christian world to seek for religious security and liberty of conscience. In a remote corner of the world the mild forbearance of this proprietary adopted religious freedom as the basis of the State.*" (See Bancroft's *History U. S.*, Vol. I, Chap. 7, et seq.)

Thus while the New England Fathers were grimly tramping on the rights of their fellowmen, these Catholic Fathers of Maryland were building up a colony founded on the principle of civil and religious liberty; and this was nearly 150 years before Thomas Jefferson and his colleagues incorporated the same principle in our American Constitution.

On this point, Cardinal Gibbons makes the following significant remark: "*It is worthy of note that when the members of the Constitutional Convention declared in 1787 that 'Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof,' they were echoing the sentiments and even repeating the language of the Maryland Assembly of 1649, which declared that 'No person whatsoever within this province, professing to believe in Christ shall henceforth be in any way molested for his or her religion, nor in the free exercise thereof.'*" (See Cardinal Gibbons' masterly discussion of this whole question in "*The Faith of Our Fathers*," Chap 17).

Mr. Jos. W. Thomas, a distinguished member of the Maryland Historical Society, pays the following glorious tribute to the Catholic Legislators of Maryland who enacted this memorable statute: "*Higher than all titles and badges of honor, and more exalted than royal nobility, is the imperishable distinction which*

the passage of this broad and liberal act won for Maryland and for the members of that never-to-be-forgotten session. May the sacred spot which gave it birth be forever hallowed!"

Now let us see how some of the Protestants of that day appreciated these mild and generous laws of toleration. We are told that five years later, when the Puritans gained the ascendancy in Maryland, they were guilty of the infamous ingratitude of disfranchising the very Catholic settlers by whom they had been so hospitably treated. Bancroft says: "*They had neither the gratitude to respect the rights of the government by which they had been received and fostered, nor the magnanimity to continue the toleration to which alone they were indebted for their residence in the colony. An 'Act Concerning Religion' forbade liberty of conscience to be extended to 'Popery, Prelacy, or licentiousness of opinions'.*" Bancroft says, further: "*These new commissioners issued writs of election to a general assembly—writs of a tenor hitherto unknown in Maryland. No man of the Roman Catholic faith could be elected as a burgess, or even cast a vote. It repealed the Toleration Act of 1649, and created a new one, more to its mind, which also bore the title, 'An Act Concerning Religion,' but it was toleration with a difference. It provided that none who professed the Popish religion should be protected in the province, but were to be restrained from the exercise thereof.*"

Cardinal Gibbons informs us further that "*After the overthrow of the Puritan authority, and the advent to power of the members of the Church of England, the second act of the assembly was to make the Protestant Episcopal Church the established church of the province.*" In 1702, it was re-enacted, with a toleration clause, as follows: "*Protestant dissenters and Quakers were exempted from penalties and disabilities, and might have separate meeting houses, provided they paid their forty pounds per poll to support the Established Church. As for the 'Papists,' it is needless to say that there was no exemption or license for them.*"

In 1704 a law was passed *prohibiting the increase of popery* in the Maryland colony. The celebration of the Mass was declared to be an offense, and Catholics were *taxed double* the amount required of the Dissenters. They were also forbidden to approach the State House nearer than 150 yards. Lastly, to finish off their work of intolerance, they *prohibited Catholics from teaching or promulgating their doctrine* in any part of the colony. Thus came the tragic end of the benign Catholic government of Maryland, the only spot in all the land where men might worship God according to the dictates of conscience. Thus was crushed under the iron heel of intolerance, the benign Catholic rule of the only colony that gave complete religious liberty to its people, and invited the religious fugitives from other intolerant colonies to come and practice

their proscribed beliefs in the "Land of the Sanctuary." (See Woodrow Wilson's "History of the American People," Vol. I, pp. 130-31; and Bancroft's U. S. History, Vol. I, p. 438).

These penal laws continued to oppress the Catholics of Maryland until 1774.

In the New England colonies, as we have already seen, intolerance was rampant, both toward Catholics and toward certain Protestant sects. Here persecution was more cruel and unrelenting than in any of the other colonies. In Massachusetts, for instance, a favorite pastime with the pious Pilgrims was cutting off Quaker's ears and boring their tongues through with hot irons, and hanging "papists." In this they showed more mercy, however, toward the Catholics than toward the Quakers; for while they tortured the Quakers with *repeated* mutilation by the use of sharp knives and red-hot irons, they were kind enough to relieve Catholics of *all future trouble* by promptly *hanging them*.

Now, as we contrast, for a moment, this intolerance and brutality of the Pilgrim Fathers with the beautiful benignity and clemency of the Catholic Fathers of Maryland, let us lay aside our blind bigotry, and be honest enough with ourselves and fair enough toward our Catholic fellow-citizens to render to them the honor that is due them. Let us exhibit the same spirit of fairness toward them that is shown them by our best and most intelligent class of Protestants. The learned Protestant historian, Mr. Davis, in his "Day-Star of American Freedom," pays the following high tribute to the illustrious founders of the Maryland colony: "*Let not the Protestant historian of America give grudgingly. Let him testify with a warm heart, and pay with gladness the tribute so richly due to the memory of our early (Catholic) forefathers. Let their deeds be enshrined in our hearts and their names repeated in our households. Let them be canonized in the grateful regard of all Americans, and their names handed down through the lips of a living tradition. In an age of credulity, like true men with heroic hearts, they fought the first battle of religious liberty; and their fame, without reference to their faith, is now the inheritance not only of Maryland, but of all America.*"

Thus has it been established, beyond all question, that civil and religious liberty was first instituted in America by Lord Baltimore in the Catholic Colony of Maryland; and although this benign rule in Maryland was finally crushed by intolerant Protestant bigots, yet the precious seeds of Christian liberty were not sown in vain; for in the next century they sprang forth again into perennial life, never to be crushed again. Evil when pushed too far, always suffers a disastrous rebound; and in this case, thoughtful, fair-minded men, like Jefferson, Madison and others who had keenly observed the cruel trend of bigotry among the colonies,

determined to overthrow its controlling influence in civil and ecclesiastical affairs. Thomas Jefferson was the first to rise up and urge an unrelenting warfare against the intolerable civil and religious oppression of that day. He had been a close student of public affairs, and he knew all about the cruel intolerance that had been shown toward Quakers, Catholics and others, by Puritan and Anglican bigots. Jefferson did his first work in his own state. After much persistent opposition from the Established Church in Virginia, he finally succeeded in procuring the passage of the Virginia "Statute for Religious Freedom," which has served, ever since, as the model of similar legislation in all the other states. Jefferson in his "Autobiography" gives his reasons for taking such a strong stand against religious intolerance. He shows how the Puritan and Episcopal bigots had "*built up by law a despotic monopoly of religious worship, taxing and robbing the whole public to maintain their own ecclesiastical institution, persecuting and proscribing all other faiths and forms of worship, and gradually establishing over the minds and consciences of men an odious system of spiritual tyranny.*"

By the vigorous help of James Madison and other Virginia statesmen the famous "Virginia Bill of Rights" was also pushed through the Assembly in 1785; and the next year Madison was asked to draft the Federal Constitution of the United States.

Madison, like Jefferson, cordially hated religious intolerance and persecution, and two years before the Virginia Convention he wrote these caustic words: "*That diabolical, hell-conceived principle of persecution is raging among us. * * * I have neither patience to hear, talk or think of anything relative to this matter; for I have squabbled and scolded, abused and ridiculed so long about it to little purpose, that I am without common patience.*"

Thus, we have found that the *principles* of civil and religious liberty which were first instituted by Lord Baltimore in the Maryland Colony in 1649, were revived again over 100 years later, by Thomas Jefferson and his compatriots, first in the Constitutional enactments of Virginia, and immediately afterward in the formation of our Federal Constitution.

When the Federal Constitution was first formed, it did not contain, in clear terms, any definite guarantee for religious freedom, but this was finally secured through the persistent efforts of Jefferson and his colleagues, in the enactment of the *first amendment* to the Constitution, which declares that, "*Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.*" (This famous Amendment was ratified in 1791.)

Here we feel that no more appropriate words could be chosen,

with which to close this article, than those of Cardinal Gibbons, as found on page 239 of his *"Faith of Our Fathers"*:

"We may therefore affirm that Lord Baltimore's Toleration Act of 1649 was the bright dawn that ushered in the noonday sun of freedom in 1787. And we have every reason to believe that the Proprietary's charter of liberty with its attendant blessings served as an example, an incentive and an inspiration to some at least of the framers of the Constitution, to extend over the new Republic, the precious boon of civil and religious liberty."

REFERENCES:

- "History of the United States."—Bancroft.
- "History of Maryland."—Bozman.
- "Church Life in Colonial Maryland."—Gambrell.
- "Historical View of the Government of Maryland."—McMahon.
- "Loyalty to Church and State."—Satolli.
- "The Faith of Our Fathers."—Cardinal Gibbons.

—X—

CHAPTER V.

Catholics in the War For American Independence.

Not only were Catholics the first to establish the principles of civil and religious liberty, but they were among the very first to defend these principles in the forum and on the battlefield. We assert, without fear of contradiction, that from the very beginning of our country's history down to the present day, Catholics in America have invariably proved their loyalty to the Government by rallying to the colors in every time of national peril, and giving their energies, their means and their lives to the cause of civil and religious freedom.

This, too, in spite of continued persecution. As we have already shown, legal restrictions against Catholics continued to be in force, not only in the Colonial period, but for many years afterward. This, of course, was the natural result of the Reformation. The Colonial period of America came in soon after Protestantism was established in England; and as the American colonies were all under British rule for over 150 years previous to the Revolution, the same Penal Laws that oppressed Catholics in England also oppressed them in America. If England persecuted Catholics at home, she would most naturally do the same thing in her dependencies.

The distinguished Protestant jurist, Hon. Dudley G. Wooten, frankly declares: "Protestantism, transplanted to America in the

seventeenth century, began the same course, in its conduct in the older countries. Among the original thirteen colonies only three—Maryland, Pennsylvania and Rhode Island—permitted the slightest liberty of conscience or freedom of belief in religion. Maryland was a Catholic colony, founded by the Calverts as a refuge for the faithful driven to the New World by British bigotry and brutality; and by them and the Carrolls it was ever maintained as the home of absolute equality, toleration and freedom in matters of faith and devotion. Pennsylvania was settled mainly by Quakers and Irish immigrants, and they were compelled in self-defense to adopt and enforce a large measure of religious freedom. Rhode Island was the child of Puritan proscription against the Baptists, and the exiled Roger Williams proclaimed spiritual liberty as his declaration of independence from the narrow and cruel bigotry of the New England fanatics. But Maryland alone, and from the beginning, was *always* religiously free, despite the repeated efforts of the Virginia Episcopalians to stamp out her liberties."

In the very beginning of our country's history it was emphatically proclaimed by the dominant Protestant element that "this is a Protestant nation; that popery and papists have no place in the civil and religious scheme of American institutions; that Catholicism is hostile to civil and religious freedom, and that Catholics should be barred from participation in the activities of our national life."

But as the menace of the impending Revolution became more and more apparent, the British government, from pure policy, felt obliged to assume a more tolerant attitude toward her Catholic subjects in America, in order, if possible, to retain their loyalty to the mother country in the approaching conflict. In this she was successful with her Canadian subjects, but not with the Catholics in the 13 colonies. The reason for this is apparent. When France, in 1763, ceded Canada to England, one of the terms of the treaty was that civil and religious liberty should be granted to Catholics; and this was constitutionally sanctioned and extended by the "Quebec Act," passed by the British parliament in 1774.

But it is noteworthy that this very act of toleration toward Canadian Catholics caused a certain class of Protestant fanatics in the 13 colonies to reproach the mother country for her toleration, and also to renew their persecution of Catholics in the colonies.

Thus did the fanatical John Jay lift up his voice and cry out against the "Quebec Act":

"We think the legislature of Great Britain is not authorized by the Constitution to establish a religion fraught with sanguinary and impious tenets, and to erect an arbitrary form of govern-

ment in any part of the globe. By this the Dominion of Canada is so extended, modeled and governed as that, being disunited from us, detached from our interest by civil as well as religious prejudices, by their numbers daily swelling with Catholic immigrants from Europe, they might become formidable to us, and on occasion, be fit instruments in the hands of power to reduce *the ancient free* Protestant colonies to the same state of slavery with themselves."

It is truly remarkable that such a resolution as this should have been "engineered" through the Continental Congress, *immediately after* that Congress had recommended that "all former differences about religion or politics should cease and be forever buried in oblivion."

So deep and strong was the anti-Catholic spirit that still lingered in the Colonies, that whenever any tolerant measure was proposed, there was always some bigoted fanatic ready to oppose it. In 1777, after the war had already begun, the New York Colony held a sort of State Convention for the purpose of forming a State Constitution. In this Constitution was incorporated the following article: "The free toleration of religious profession and worship shall forever hereafter be allowed to all mankind." To this, the famous John Jay felt religiously inspired to offer the following amendment: "*except* the professors of the religion of the Church of Rome, who ought not to hold lands, or be admitted to a participation in the civil rights enjoyed by the members of this state, *until* such time as said professors shall appear in the Supreme Court of the State and there most solemnly swear that they verily believe in their conscience that no pope, priest, or foreign authority on earth hath power to absolve the subjects of this State from their allegiance to the same." Mr. Jay had evidently been reading some spurious history of the Middle Ages. It is gratifying, however, to know that his motion to amend this article in the State Convention was *lost*.

Two years before this, when Washington went to Cambridge to take command of the Continental Army, he found the fanatics in the army still determined to celebrate "Pope's Day," as usual, on Nov. 5, by burning the pope in effigy. But Washington was too generous as a Churchman, and too wise as a Statesman to allow any such wicked nonsense; and promptly rebuked it in the following severe terms: 'As the Commander-in-Chief has been appraised of a design formed for the observance of that ridiculous and childish custom of burning the effigy of the Pope, he cannot help expressing his surprise that there should be officers and soldiers in this army so devoid of common sense as not to see the *impropriety* of such a step. It is so monstrous as not to be suffered or excused. Indeed, instead of offering the most remote insult, it is our

duty to address public thanks to our Catholic brethren, as to them we are indebted for every late success over the common enemy in Canada."

Yet, in spite of the delicacy of the political situation, and in direct opposition to Christian charity, the 13 colonies continued to have various kinds of legal restrictions of the rights of Catholics. Nine of the colonies had *religious test-oaths*, and the other four had discriminating laws against Catholics; and these continued to be more or less in force until the close of the Revolution. Not until the adoption of the National Constitution in 1787 was complete civil and religious liberty legally granted to Catholics; and even after this, their legal rights were repeatedly ignored in many instances.

But notwithstanding all these serious disabilities by which Catholics were so unjustly hampered, it is to their everlasting credit that with superb magnanimity they drew the veil of charity over all past grievances and threw themselves unreservedly and heroically into the glorious struggle for American Independence. The distinguished Catholic historian, Dr. John O. Murray, in his "Popular History of the Catholic Church in the U. S.," (p. 161), gives us a few startling facts as to the disorganized condition of the Catholic Church in America at the time of the Revolution:

"At the beginning of the Revolution, the Catholic Church, as a completely organized body, had no existence in the 13 colonies. In most of them the Catholic was an outlaw, the priest a felon. Even Maryland had only private chapels, and Baltimore was only a station, visited once a month. The rites of the Church were nowhere *publicly* celebrated, except in Philadelphia."

There was no episcopal see in the colonies until after the Revolution, when John Carroll was made Bishop of Baltimore in 1789.

Another Catholic writer in the *North American Review* of January, 1876, informs us that in 1776 there were not more than fifty Catholic congregations with about twenty-five priests, while the Congregational church, which was then the largest and most influential religious body in the country, had about 700 churches, with nearly as many ministers

These facts will prepare us now to appreciate the relative proportion of Catholics in the Colonial Army.

And here we encounter a miracle. According to good authority, the whole population of all the colonies in 1776 was estimated to be about 3,000,000, of which not more than 30,000 were Catholics, at the very highest. According to this, the Catholic population was not more than one one-hundredth of the entire population, which, if they had enlisted in the army in the *same propor-*

tion as non-Catholics did, would have made the per cent of Catholic soldiers in the colonial army exceedingly small and insignificant. But according to several different concurring accounts, the number of Irish soldiers alone amounted to *one-half* of the entire fighting force! In 1776 the House of Lords appointed a committee to inquire into the strength of Washington's army with the result that Joseph Gallaway, a Royalist of high rank, testified before this committee that "*one-half* of the American troops were Irish, one-fourth English and Scotch, and the other fourth native Americans." Now how could there be so many Irish in the American army, when the Catholic population in the colonies was relatively so small? The only possible answer seems to be, that either the majority were not Catholics, or they lived too remote from church to be known as Catholics.

We are informed by good authority that from 1619—one year before the Pilgrims landed at Plymouth Rock—down to the Revolution, Irish immigrants fairly swarmed into most of the American colonies. In 1729, 5,000 arrived and settled in Philadelphia; and James Logan, secretary to William Penn, in the same year, declared that it looked as if all Ireland were coming to Pennsylvania. One writer in South Carolina declared that it seemed that every Irish ship was headed for Charleston. These statements are corroborated by the numerous Irish family names and place-names to be found in practically all of the Atlantic States. And this Irish immigration to America continued with increasing rapidity up to the time of the Revolution, and even during the Revolution.

Anthony Marmion tells us that from 1771 to 1773 not less than 25,000 Irish emigrated from Belfast, Derry and Newry to America; and Spencer, in his "History of the United States," says that in the years 1771 and 1772, 17,350 Irish emigrants arrived in America; and Michael J. O'Brien, in his great work, "Hidden Phases of American History," (p. 389), tells us that documentary evidence proves that between 1767 and 1774 not fewer than 63,360 Irish immigrants came to America. This was a critical period in our history, and these Irish who were being driven out of their homeland by England's infernal "Penal Laws," were a God-send to us. Of course, the condition of the Irish Catholics was not very much better here than in Ireland, so long as the colonies were under British rule; and therefore the Irish Americans were all the more ready to help the colonists throw off the British yoke. So intense was the zeal of the Irish for the cause of American freedom, that even the Irish in Catholic France raised troops and sent them to America.

In 1779 Count Arthur Dillon, the son of an Irish nobleman in the service of Louis XVI, addressed to the French War Office,

a petition on behalf of all the Irish soldiers in France craving that they be allowed to go to fight for American freedom. The petition being granted, he sailed from Brest with 2,300 Irish troops. In conformity with the American plan of campaign, Dillon was directed to attack British strongholds in the West Indies. He and the other Irishmen, the very van of the forces sent from France, soon paralyzed British power in the West Indies and captured there, bases of British activity against America.

And here, in this *continual influx* of Irish into America during the Revolution we have a suggestive fact that gives us additional information as to the *actual proportion* of Irish in the colonial army. With this constant increase during the war, the number of Irish in the American army at the close of the Revolution was *far more* than *one-half* of the whole army. Carl Solliday, in a recent issue of the Catholic World, gives some striking figures as to the immense accumulation of Irish soldiers in Washington's army by the end of the Revolution. In this enlightening article we find the following remarkable statement: "Joseph Galloway said in the House of Lords that *one-half* of the American army was Irish; but more accurate investigation has shown that practically *one-half* of the *regular soldiers* of the colonies were *born in Ireland*, while a *third more* of Washington's troops were of *Irish ancestry*." This raises the proportion of Irish soldiers in the American army to *five-sixths* of the whole number. No wonder George Park Custis said, in his day, that in the Revolution: "Ireland furnishd 100 men to every single man furnished by any other foreign country."

Now, just a word about the lapsed Irish Catholics in Washington's army. When we call to mind the cruel and incessant persecution of Catholics in the American colonies during more than 150 years of British rule, we should not be surprised that large numbers of them fell away from the Church. The Catholic author of "The Question of the Hour," says:

"As there was no room in New England or Virginia for the Catholic religion, the Irish settlers in those colonies were *bound* to fall away from the mother church, and many of them did so."

But we venture to say just here, by way of digression, that a lapsed Catholic does not mean a true Protestant, except perhaps in very rare instances. A lapsed Catholic is usually an *infidel*, who in many instances comes back to the mother church before he dies. The Catholicity in the average Irish bosom is deep-seated and practically invincible; and it takes more hellish persecution to drive it out of an Irishman than out of anybody else. An Irishman's faith, like the Irish race, is well nigh indestructible; and about the only way to destroy it is to kill the Irishman. And this,

too, is almost impossible, for a race that can endure 700 years of crushing oppression, and *still live* is practically immortal.

No doubt, most of these lapsed Irish in Washington's army were still Catholic at heart, and finally came back to the Mother Church, and made a good confession before they went to their death.

As is usual in case of approaching war, there must be a lot of interminable parleying done before the fighting begins; and in this instance, America not only parleyed with England but negotiated with Ireland. This, of course, was a very hazardous business for both Ireland and America, but especially for Ireland, as she lay at the very threshold of the mother country. For these people who had been subject to England for centuries to aid a people who were in rebellion against England, would naturally be interpreted by the British as treason; but after all, there was no more treason in it, than there was in Patrick Henry's memorable speech, when he told the vociferous Tories to "make the most of it!" As a matter of fact, Ireland and America were "in the same box." England had her heel on both of them, and of course, they sympathized with each other as *fellow-rebels*. To fight for freedom was their only hope; and America would never have broken the shackles of British tyranny without the help of the Irish. It is noteworthy that Hon. Luther Gardiner, in a speech in the House of Commons, on April 2, 1784, declared: "I am assured that it was the valor of the Irish that detached America from England."

Both Ireland and America were chafing under the same English yoke, and therefore the American colonists did not think it improper or treasonable to negotiate with their Irish fellow-sufferers in the great cause of freedom. Hence, the sagacious Franklin was sent over to Ireland in 1771 to secure the co-operation of the Irish. Franklin held out the inducement to them that "by joining their interests with ours a more equitable treatment from England might be obtained for themselves, as well as for us. (Franklin's Works, Vol. VII., pp. 557-558). This, of course, interested the Irish and readily brought them to our aid. The response of the Irish was so unanimous in favor of America that Pitt declared: "Ireland is with America to a man." Our appeal to the Irish incited in them such a zealous interest in the cause of American freedom, that in spite of all kinds of threats and concessions, Lord North and his colleagues could not win them from us.

So eager were the Irish to help win civil liberty for both Ireland and America, that they could not even wait for any "Declaration of Independence." While the Americans were still parleying with England, the rampant Irish proceeded at once to put up a different sort of argument out in the open field. A year before

Washington took command of the army, the valiant General Sullivan struck the first blow on Dec. 11, 1774, by seizing Fort William and Mary at New Castle, New Hampshire, and capturing 15 cannons and 100 barrels of powder, which was used with good effect, later on, by the 258 Irish heroes at Bunker Hill.

The next military stroke came on May 11, 1775, when Jeremiah O'Brien made the first victorious naval attack on the British off Machias on the coast of Maine. J. Fenimore Cooper was pleased to call this battle the "Lexington of the Seas."

Here we could give a long list of the names of the Irish heroes who helped us win our independence; but for want of space, we can give only a few of the most prominent.

The intrepid Commodore "Jack Barry" has the distinction of being the "Father of our American Navy;" and it is to his everlasting honor that he scorned a high British position and a bribe of \$80,000 offered him by Lord Howe, and remained with his little flag-ship, the "Effingham."

Washington was so keenly appreciative of Irish honor and heroism that he selected the following Irishmen as members of his Body Guard to stand near him through the perilous vicissitudes of the war: Chas. Dougherty, Jas. Hughes, Wm. Hennessy, Denis Moriarty, Jeremiah Driscoll, S. Daly, Jno. Finch and Thos. Gillen.

The famous Irish General, Stephen Moylan, was Washington's most trusted and efficient aide-de-camp; and Washington's Secretary through the entire war was the valiant Col. John Fitzgerald.

Dr. Richard H. Clarke, in his book "The Father of His Country," says: "Washington had no more devoted friend or one whom he esteemed more highly, than Colonel John Fitzgerald, of Alexandria. It was Col. Fitzgerald who, in 1774, introduced Stephen Moylan to Washington at Mt. Vernon, where they both were always welcome guests. As an aide-de-camp to Washington, Fitzgerald served him gallantly to the end. He was the intermediary and medium of communication between the General in the field and Martha Washington at Mt. Vernon, and was thus the confidential friend of Washington."

Among the prominent Irishmen who gave financial aid to the Revolution were Charles Carroll, regarded as the wealthiest man in the colonies; and the four noted Catholics of Philadelphia—Shea, Delaney and the Smith brothers—donated to Robert Morris, the Financier of the Revolution, \$55,000 for food and clothing for Washington's suffering troops. It is also noteworthy that the Irish organization in Philadelphia, known as "The Friendly Sons of St. Patrick," contributed \$517,000 in 1780 to feed Washington's army. Washington showed his apprecia-

tion of their loyalty by attending their special celebration of St. Patrick's Day, on which occasion the hall was decorated with the Irish colors, combined with "Old Glory."

Among the prominent men who were powerful factors in moulding public sentiment in favor of American independence, were such Irishmen as Chas. and Daniel Carroll, Matthew Lyons, William Thompson, John and Edward Rutledge, James Duane, Thadeus McCarthy, John Sullivan, Wm. Bryan, Wm. Tennet and others.

Twenty Irishmen were members of the Continental Congress from its first session in 1774 to 1787. The names of all of these could be given here, if space would permit.

We also have the names of nine Irish governors from 1700 to 1788 in the following Colonies:

Carolina—James Moore, 1700.
 North Carolina—Arthur Dobbs, 1754.
 North Carolina—Matt. Rowan, 1764.
 South Carolina—John Rutledge, 1776.
 South Carolina—Thos. Burke, 1781.
 South Carolina—Ed. Rutledge, 1788.
 Delaware—John McKinley, 1776.
 Pennsylvania—Geo. Bryan, 1788.

The Secretary of the Congress that issued the Declaration of Independence was Chas. Thompson, of Derry, Ireland; and among those who signed this immortal document were the following, who were either Irish born or of Irish descent: Charles Carroll, Jas. Smith, Geo. Taylor, John Rudledge, Matt. Thornton, Thos. McKean, Geo. Read, Thos. Lynch and Robert Paine; Hancock and Whipple were of Irish descent on the maternal side.

Among all the signers of the Declaration of Independence there was no one more truly devoted to civil and religious liberty than the peerless Charles Carroll, of Carrollton. This is strikingly exhibited in a letter he wrote to Washington's foster-son, Geo. W. P. Custis, on Feb. 20, 1829, when he was far advanced in age. In this letter he said: "When I signed the Declaration of Independence, I had in view not only our independence of England, but also the toleration of all sects professing the Christian religion, and communicating to them all, equal rights—Believing, as you must, in the disabilities and proscription of the Roman Catholics in Maryland, you will not be surprised that I had this grand design much at heart, founded on mutual charity, the basis of our holy religion."

Well might George Washington Parke Custis say to his coun-

trymen later on: "This Shamrock should be entwined with the laurels of the Revolution. Americans, recall to your minds the recollections of this heroic time when Irishmen were your friends, and when in the whole world we had not a friend beside. The rank grass had grown over the grave of many a poor Irishman who had died for America ere the Flag of the Lillies floated in the field beside the Star Spangled Banner."

Yes the Irish came to our rescue long before the French began to take an interest in us. Archbishop Spalding in his *Miscellanea*, exclaims: "Can America ever forget that the Irish were the first people in Europe to sympathize with us; and can we forget that it was this generous sympathy and aid given us by the Irish that was alleged by the British to be the *reason* why the petitions of Ireland for political enfranchisement were rejected."

Yes if St. Brenden was indeed the first to discover this western land, in the distant past, then America is really the *New Erin*, where every down-trodden refugee from the "Emerald Isle" may find a home, and where the Shamrock may forever be entwined with the "*Red, White and Blue.*"

Now, in order to be more fair, let us admit that even three-fourths of the Irish in Washington's army were Protestants or lapsed Catholics, we are still obliged to take into account the other Catholics in the colonies who were not Irish. These, together with the Catholics from France, Spain, Poland and other foreign countries, would abundantly make up for all these non-Catholic Irish, and will give us a Catholic majority in the Colonial army. So, after all the deductions that can fairly be made, we still have before us the amazing spectacle of an American continental army that was *mostly Catholic!* This would, indeed, seem miraculous, if it were not for the fact that among the 3,000,000 people in the colonies, there were thousands and thousands of Tories, who, of course, did not join Washington's army; and every one knows that nearly all of those Tories were Protestants.

With all these facts before us, we feel safe in saying that the greater number of patriots in the struggle for American Independence were Catholics. Catholic Spain gave us 1,000,000 francs, 3,000 barrels of powder, blankets for nearly 10,000 soldiers, and opened the port of Havana for our Navy. At the same time, Spain drew the other European nations into an armed neutrality, which held England in check.

Catholic Poland gave us Kosciusko and Pulaski; and Catholic France! What would we have done if the French *fleur-de-lis* had not followed the *Irish Shamrock* to our shores? Besides furnish-

ing us with over \$3,000,000, France fitted out and sent to us the most powerful navy since the days of the "Invincible Armada," and furnished us with the great commanders, La Fayette, De Grasse, Rochambeau, Count D'Estaing, and others. It was De Grasse and LaFayette who bottled up Cornwallis at Yorktown; and with the co-operation of a land force of about 6,000 French and American soldiers under Rochambeau and Washington, Cornwallis was forced to surrender, which practically ended the war. And here again, (let us not forget it) there stood close beside Washington the two valiant Irish generals, Moylan and Fitzgerald.

But the glory of the Irish record in the war was not yet completed; for just as the treaty acknowledging American independence was being ratified, the gallant Barry, off the coast of Florida won a most brilliant naval victory. Indeed, it was Captain Barry's succession of brilliant victories during the entire war that caused Washington, a few years later, to appoint him to organize and command the American navy that was to maintain the honor of the new Republic.

In closing this account of the participation of Catholic France in our struggle for independence, we feel that it is due to France to say that we could not have gained our independence without her. This is generally admitted by American historians; and the great Washington was generous enough to say: "In the midst of a war, the nature of difficulties of which were peculiar and uncommon, I cannot flatter myself in any way to recompense the sacrifices France has made. To call her brave were to pronounce but common praise. Wonderful Nation! The ages to come will read with astonishment the history of your brilliant exploits."

When the war was ended a *Te Deum* was sung in St. Joseph's in Philadelphia, which was attended by Washington and La Fayette.

REFERENCES:

"Life of Jay."—Tellew.

"History of the United States."—Bancroft.

"Jay's Treaty."—Bemis.

"Franklin's Works," Vol. VII, pp. 557, 558.

"The Father of His Country."—Richard H. Clarke.

"History of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States."—Thomas O'Gorman (pp. 250-258).

"Hidden Phases of American History."—Michael J. O'Brien.

"Catholic Builders of the Nation."—Published by Continental Press, Boston, Mass.

CHAPTER VI.

Catholics In the Formation of the American Republic.

In the Revolution, the common cause of liberty the common danger, and the unflinching loyalty and valor of the Catholics, tended to subdue the intense anti-Catholic spirit which was so prevalent at the beginning of the war; and this caused Catholics to be admitted freely into the deliberative councils of the young Republic. Fair-minded and sagacious statesmen, like Madison, Jefferson, Washington and others, had become thoroughly displeased with the civil and religious intolerance which the different sects and factions had shown toward one another, and especially with the unjust discriminations made against Catholics.

First of all, the combined efforts of Madison and Jefferson secured the passage of the "Bill of Rights" in the Virginia Assembly, by which the state threw off the shackles of ecclesiastical oppression and completely succeeded in divorcing Church and State. They were thoroughly tired of the domination of "the Established Anglican Church," which had built up, by law and governmental support, a despotic monopoly of religious worship, taxing the entire population to maintain the Anglican Church, and persecuting and proscribing all other faiths and forms of worship, and gradually establishing over the minds and consciences of men an odious system of "spiritual tyranny." Jefferson himself, in his "Autobiography," gives these as the main reasons that impelled him, with untiring effort, against bitter opposition, finally to secure the passage of the Virginia "*Statute for Religious Freedom.*" So well did he succeed in his relentless warfare against ecclesiastical dominion that today his standard of religious freedom is the accepted standard of every American state.

But while Madison and Jefferson were the first to institute civil and religious liberty in the young American Nation, let us not forget that Lord Baltimore had instituted the same thing in the Catholic colony of Maryland more than one hundred years before. Jefferson, of course, could not have been ignorant of this, and consequently he and his colleagues must have derived their inspiration from this noble, Catholic precedent. There is a remarkable similarity between the Virginia "*Statute for Religious Freedom*" and the "*Toleration Act,*" of Catholic Maryland; and it is not true, as some up-to-date rationalists would have us believe, that free-thinking Thomas Jefferson "was the originator of all our American principles of freedom."

Soon after the establishment of civil and religious liberty in

Virginia, the law-makers of the new Nation wisely began to consider the formation of a federal constitution as the basis of all future legislation. It is remarkable that while at this very time there were still a number of misguided Protestant fanatics who vehemently proclaimed that "this is a *Protestant* nation in which there is no place for papists and popery," there was a truly patriotic and influential class of Catholics who were actively interested in the *formation* of the *national constitution*. Their loyalty and competency were so well appreciated by the better class of Protestants that they were officially honored with the privilege of participating in the founding and building of the nation. Consequently we find that among the framers of the Constitution there were seven Irishmen, some of whom we know were Catholics; and it was an Irishman who first printed that document, and an Irishman who first read it publicly. Here are the names of the seven Irishmen who were members of this Constitutional Convention: Charles Carroll, Daniel Carroll, Thomas Fitzsimmons, John Rutledge, James McHenry, Pierce Butler, and George Read.

The first draft of the Constitution did not contain, in very clear form, any guarantee for *religious* freedom; and it has been reported that it was the distinguished Catholic Daniel Carroll, of Maryland, who drew up a memorial to Congress urging the necessity of a constitutional provision for the protection and maintenance of *civil* and *religious freedom*.

When this memorial was presented to the Convention, it was favorably received, and resulted finally in the enactment of the *first Amendment* to the *Constitution*, which declares that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." This Amendment was ratified in 1791.

When the members of the Constitutional Convention inserted this Amendment in the Constitution, Cardinal Gibbons says, "they were echoing the sentiments and even repeating the language of the Maryland Assembly, which in 1649 declared that 'No person whatsoever within this Province, professing to believe in Jesus Christ, shall from henceforth be in any way molested for his or her religion, nor in the free exercise thereof.' We may, therefore, affirm that Lord Baltimore's 'Act of Toleration' in 1649 was the bright *dawn* that preceded the *noonday* sun of freedom in 1787; and we have every reason to believe that the Proprietary's Charter of liberty, with its attendant blessings, served as an *example*, an *incentive*, and an *inspiration* to the framers of the Constitution, to extend over the New Republic the precious boon of civil and religious liberty."

And yet, despite all these historic evidences, we have been reminded, again and again, that our American freedom is to be attributed to the influence of the liberty-loving Pilgrim Fathers of New England.

Religious freedom was thus secured for the original thirteen states, but as yet, there was no provision for its extension into any other territory of ours. It was necessary therefore, to enact a *similar statute* to secure civil and religious freedom in the "Northwest Territory," which we acquired at the close of the Revolution; hence, our statesmen passed the famous "Ordinance of 1787," which took that territory out of hands of the Virginia colony and made it a part of the national domain of the young Republic.

But how did we acquire this "Northwest Territory?"

It should be noted that our conflicts in the Northwest Territory were practically contemporaneous with our struggles with England in the Revolution proper; and hence, we had a double conflict, with the uncivilized Indians on one side of us and the British on the other. We have already noted the reason why the Canadians did not join the colonists in their revolt against England; but neither did they, as a people, fight against the colonists. There is no record of any Canadian regiment, or even company, being enlisted under the British banner. As a body, the Canadians were *neutral*; but as *individuals*, quite a number of them came over into our territory and joined us in our struggle for freedom. It is a matter of record that two regiments of Canadian volunteers joined the Americans, and were known as "Congress's Own," on account of their valuable services. With them we may group the Catholic Indians of the North and Northwest, who, under the celebrated Chief Orono, guided by Father Gibault of Vincennes, rendered valiant aid to the struggling colonists. Orono bore a Continental Commission giving him authority to lead his tribesmen to the field of battle. In Judge Cauthorn's History of Vincennes, (pp. 79, 80), we find the very names of the 150 men who marched through Vincennes under Col. George Rogers Clark; and 89 of these, (nearly two-thirds), were names of Irishmen, most of whom were undoubtedly Catholics. It is to the everlasting credit and honor of Father Gibault, the patriotic priest of Vincennes, that he, in company with Francis Vigo, a Spanish merchant, rendered valuable aid to General Clark, and thus helped to raise the American Flag over the stations of the Northwest, which gained for us a vast territory out of which we have carved several powerful states. Thus by the aid rendered to General Clark by Father Gibault, a whole empire of sovereign states was finally added to our young Republic in the very beginning of its existence. This patriotic priest led the Catholic Indians, as well as Catholic white men, into the cause of the American colonists, and later on, in

1780, Washington's own state, Virginia, recognized his services by a public resolution of its legislature. Thus did we acquire the great Northwest Territory by the help of Catholics, led by a patriotic priest.

When we consider these significant facts, we do not wonder that the great "Father of his Country" cheerfully expressed his gratitude publicly to the Catholics who helped us gain our national independence.

In New York, on March 3, 1789, while Washington was preparing for his inauguration as the first President of the New Republic, an address of congratulation was read to him in behalf of the Catholics of America. It was signed by the three illustrious Carrols—Charles, Daniel and John—the last of whom became the Bishop of Baltimore in this same year; and by Thomas Fitzsimons of Philadelphia, and Dominic Lynch of New York. In response to this courtesy, Washington, later on, (March 12, 1790), addressed an open letter "*To the Roman Catholics in the United States,*" in which we find this significant paragraph: "I hope ever to see America among the foremost nations in examples of justice and liberality; and I presume that your Protestant fellow citizens will not forget the patriotic part you took in the accomplishment of the Revoultion and the establishment of the Government, or the important assistance which they received from a nation in which the Roman Catholic faith is professed."

Humanly speaking, it is not too much to say that we should have had no United States at all, had it not been for the unflinching patriotism of Catholics. So admirable was the loyalty of the Catholics, and so influential had they become by their high character and potriotism, that at the close of the Revolution (1783) the Church gained one of its most distinguished converts—Rev. John Thayer, a scholarly Congregational minister of New England, and this too, in the midst of strong anti-Catholic intolerance.

So much for Catholic loyalty in the struggle for American freedom and the founding of the Nation.

REFERENCES:

"Jefferson's Autobiography."

"Statute for Religious Freedom," of Virginia.

"History of Vincennes."—Cauthorn. (pp. 79, 80.)

"Life and Times of Archbishop Carroll."—Shea (p. 348).

"Elliott's Debates,"—Vol. II, pp. 120-148, Vol. IV., p. 242.

"Madison's Journal."

CHAPTER VII.

Catholics in the Preservation of the Union.

Soon after the establishment of the young Republic, our forefathers began to cast about for a home for our national officials—a capitol city which should be the center of our government. Congress, therefore, appointed a committee of three to examine proposed sites for a federal city. These three men were Doctor David Stuart, physician to the president, Chief Justice Johnson of Maryland, and Daniel Carroll, of the famous Catholic Carroll family. They selected a site covering part of the Carroll estate; so that our great Capitol at Washington today stands on a site given to our Nation by a Catholic, and within the identical territory in which Lord Baltimore and the Maryland statesmen in 1649 first unfurled the banner of religious liberty. It is also worthy of note that it was the Catholic Major General Charles L'Enfant who laid out the Capitol City, and the Catholic Francis Pope who owned the White House Grounds and the Catholic John Hoban who drew the plans for the White House, and the Catholic Robert Brent who was the first Mayor of the Capitol City, which office he held for ten years.

Then, later on, when the "Father of His Country" had passed on to his eternal reward, the Catholic Bishop Carroll preached a notable panegyric on Washington in St. Peter's, Baltimore, on Feb. 22, 1800.

The failure of the "Irish Rebellion" in 1798 increased the Irish emigration to America so rapidly that, according to good authority, not fewer than 6,000 of these "Exiles of Erin" landed on our shores between 1798 and 1812. They were here just in time to participate in our second conflict with England—the "War of 1812"—and of course, we know which side they would take in the conflict.

We must also note that in 1806 the "Louisiana Purchase" more than doubled our territory, and also helped to double our population; and this also increased the number of Catholics in the United States by bringing in large accessions of French Catholics in the far West and Southwest.

From this time down to the present day the Catholic population of our country has grown far more rapidly than our general population has; and in every national crisis thru which we have passed, our Catholic people have invariably come to the front in defense of what they believed to be the true principles of civil and religious liberty. In the "War of 1812" thousands of Catholics were found among the officers and in the "rank and file" of the

American Army. It was by the valiant assistance of French Catholics that General Jackson's "Mountaineers" won their great victory over the British in the famous "Battle of New Orleans." It is noteworthy, too, that when General Jackson and his army marched into New Orleans, after this signal victory, the whole Catholic populace came out to greet him, while a *Te Deum* was sung in the Catholic Cathedral, near which Jackson's statue stands today.

Later on, in our war with Mexico, a country which was predominantly Catholic, our American Catholics proved their loyalty to the United States. When our victorious army entered the City of Mexico, the first American flag borne into the city was carried by a regiment under the command of the Catholic General, James Shields. Here we see a practical refutation of the false claim, so often made, that all Catholics are a unit in their civil allegiance to the Pope; and that our American Catholics constitute a "Political Machine" under papal control.

The same absurdity is apparent, also, in the conduct of Catholics in our "Civil War." As American Catholics had fought against Mexican Catholics, so in our Civil War Southern Catholics fought against Northern Catholics. The former were as loyal to the Southern Confederacy as the latter were loyal to the Union. Beauregard and other Confederate officers were Catholic, while on the Union side there was a brilliant galaxy of Catholic officers—Sheridan, Meagher, Corcoran, Shields, O'Brien, McMahan, and many others too numerous to mention. While it is not the purpose of this paper to discuss the *causes* of the Civil War, it is enough to say, in passing, that the whole contest was not a matter of *loyalty against disloyalty*, but simply a difference of opinion as to the proper interpretation of the Constitution in regard to the true relation of the *sovereign states* to the *federal government*. The Confederates were not a lawless mob, but simply an organized body of "rebels," just as the colonists were, at the time of the Revolution. They were all loyal to what they believed to be the just principles of civil authority. While the writer himself is a Unionist, thru and thru, and deeply deplores the Confederacy as a serious and fatal mistake, yet he would be far from charging the Confederates with deliberate lawlessness.

Who can listen to the music of that Southern Marseillaise—"My Maryland! My Maryland!"—written by that Catholic Southerner, James R. Randall, without feeling a thrill of deep emotion; and who can read that pathetic apotheosis to the Confederate cause—"The Conquered Banner"—written by the poet-priest, Father Ryan, without being filled with reverence and admiration for the sincere devotion that may be given to a "Lost Cause"?

It is an established fact that the ruling classes in England

were thoroughly in sympathy with the Southern Confederacy, as is evidenced by the fact that she permitted swift sailing vessels and steamers to be fitted out from her ports laden with munitions of war to aid the Confederacy. The British government issued a proclamation of *professed neutrality*, which of course, was a virtual recognition of the independent national integrity of the Confederate States. Her *main reason* for thus putting the Confederacy on the same footing with the United States was her desire to perpetuate slavery. This attitude of England toward slavery was severely rebuked, not only by American statesmen, but it was formally condemned by a body of Protestant ministers in France. (See Jackman's "History of the American Nation," Vol. IV., p. 892; and Vol. V., p. 990.)

It is well known that Jefferson's original draft of the Declaration of Independence was pretty thoroughly altered and revised by the Continental Congress before it was finally completed and adopted and published in its present form. It was the privilege of the Author, while in Washington several years ago, to see the old, faded, interlined copy of this precious document, as it appeared just before a "fair copy" of it was written out in full for publication. Most of the alterations were slight, and were incorporated into the document by brief interlinear additions and eliminations; but aside from all these smaller alterations, there was one large paragraph, which Jefferson had written in the original draft, which was entirely left out through the influence of, and in deference to, a number of "hyphenated" characters who were not yet "100 per cent Americans." This paragraph as Jefferson had written it, was especially objectionable to these "hyphenates," because they regarded it as entirely too radical, in its open, undisguised, condemnation of King George for introducing and operating in the American Colonies, a most disgraceful and degrading slave traffic! Here is the paragraph in which Jefferson arraigned King George for permitting this hellish traffic of buying and selling human beings:

"He has waged cruel war against human nature itself, violating its most sacred rights of life and liberty, in the persons of a distant people who never offended him, capturing and carrying them into slavery in another hemisphere, or to incur miserable death in their transportation thither. This piratical warfare, the opprobrium of infidel powers, is the warfare of the Christian King of Great Britain! Determined to keep open a market where men should be bought and sold, he prostituted his negative by suppressing every legislative attempt to restrain this execrable commerce. And that this assemblage of horrors might want no fact of distinguished dye, he is now exciting those very people, (negroes) to rise up in arms against us and procure that liberty,

of which he deprived them, by murdering the people upon whom he obtruded them; thus paying off former crimes committed against the liberties of one people by crimes which he is urging them to commit against the lives of another (people)."

In this remarkable passage, Jefferson dealt a few stunning blows at King George and his Parliament, in true characteristic Jeffersonian style; and, like Washington and other genuine American patriots, he felt that, on account of England's treacherous dealings with the American Colonies, we should cut loose from all dependent relations with Great Britain, and declare ourselves absolutely independent. He felt that the time had come for complete separation from the mother country, and he had no patience with any so-called American who was still content to cringe at the feet of any English Sovereign.

Jefferson was greatly pained over the expurgation of this paragraph from his original draft of this document, and complained of it in a letter to his friend, Mrs. Wells, written as late as 1819, in the following contemptuous terms: "The pusillanimous idea that we had friends in England worth keeping terms with, still haunted the minds of many; and for this reason those passages (of the Declaration of Independence) which conveyed censure on England, were struck out, lest they should give offense."

It is remarkable that this passage, in which the slave traffic was so bitterly condemned, was written by a staunch Southern Democrat and a Virginian!

It may not be too much to say, that Thomas Jefferson was one of the most conspicuous examples of a true "100 per cent American" that ever breathed on American soil; yet, he was more, in his heroic defence of Civil and Religious Liberty, he was the very incarnation of Americanism!

Just recently, (April 18, 1921) Lloyd George made the following remarkable statement: "At the outbreak of the American struggle (Civil War) nearly every one in these islands sympathized with the South. Wm. Gladstone took this view, and only John Bright, (the famous English statesman), did not waver in his adherence to Lincoln's cause." Now, this very fact, aside from any other, would be sufficient to put the Irish, as a class, against the Confederacy and in favor of the Union; and that is just what happened. The thousands of Irish that had immigrated to our shores since their unsuccessful "Rebellion" in 1798, were only too ready to antagonize anything that might be in favor of England. When the "first gun of Sumter" was fired there were already many Irish Catholics in the garrison under Major Anderson; and when Lincoln made his first call for troops in 1861, among the *very first* to respond, was the famous Irish 69th New York regiment under the command of Col. Michael Corcoran.

So freely did the Irish and other Catholics respond to the military call, that good authority declares that "in the Civil War, the proportion of Catholics in the Union Army was *double* the proportion that Catholics bore to the whole population; and a whole host of Catholic generals served in the federal army to preserve the Union."

Here again, we feel obliged, for want of space, to omit the long list of names of the Catholic generals in the Union Army.

On April 23, 1861, the celebrated 69th New York regiment marched out of the city with flying colors, amid the wild cheers of the populace. At the head of the column was a decorated vehicle bearing the flaming inscription "*Sixty-Ninth—Remember Fontenoy!*" This reference to Fontenoy carries us back to the European historic back-ground of this famous regiment. Capt. D. P. Conyngham, one of the Irish officers associated with the gallant Irish General Meagher, in the Civil War, gives us a fine account of this in his book, "*The Famous Irish Brigade.*" From his very interesting account of the exploits of the Irish who had enlisted in France long ago under the *Fleur-de-Lis*, we quote the following:

"There are few battle-fields in Europe and America where the Irish soldier has not left his footprints. . . . The exploits of the Irish at Ramilles and Fontenoy, are proudly chronicled in French history. The latter, especially, was as decisive for the French as Waterloo was for the English. . . . Even King George uttered this memorable imprecation against England's Penal Code: 'Cursed be the laws that deprive me of such subjects!'"

This explains the reference to "Fontenoy" in the parade of the 69th regiment in New York. They simply reminded themselves that their famous regiment had a *history*.

And Fontenoy, famed Fontenoy,
had been a Waterloo;
Were not these exiles ready
then, fresh, vehement and true?"

Just here we may be permitted to extend this digression a little further by repeating the fine eulogy which the Duke of Wellington passed on the extraordinary valor of the Irish Catholics in his army. In a speech in the House of Lords he said: "It is well known that of the troops which have been entrusted to my command at various times, . . . at least *one-half were Roman Catholics*. . . . Your Lordships are well aware for what length of time and under what difficult circumstances they maintained the empire, . . . and how they kept alive the only spark of freedom which was left unextinguished in all Europe. . . . My Lords, it is mainly to the Irish Catholics that we owe our proud predominance in military achievement. . . . We must confess, my Lords,

that *without Catholic blood and Catholic valor* no victory could ever have been obtained."

Has England forgotten all this?

What was known as the "Irish Brigade" in the Civil War, consisted chiefly of the 69th N. Y. V., the 63rd N. Y. V., the 88th N. Y. V., and the 9th Massachusetts. These regiments comprised at the beginning of the war, about 3,000 soldiers; and this famous 69th regiment consisted of nine companies, with a total of more than 1,000 men. This entire "Irish Brigade" has the distinction of being engaged in more than 25 of the leading battles of the Civil War.

But in addition to this "Brigade" there were thousands and thousands of Irish soldiers amalgamated with various other commands throughout the Union Army, making a total of nearly 1,000,000 loyal Irishmen, who fought to preserve the Union. Governor Phillips of Wisconsin, while commending the loyalty of Catholics in the "World War," also refers to their loyalty in the "Civil War" by saying: "The Catholics are made of the sort of stuff that built up a strong Union Army."

REFERENCES:

- "The Catholic Foundation of Our National Capitol."—Downing.
- "History of the National Capitol."—W. B. Bryan. Macmillan, 1914.
- "History of the American Nation."—Jackman.
- "Life and Times of Lincoln."—Lamon.
- "The Irish Brigade."—D. T. Conyngnam.
- "Numbers and Losses in the Civil War."—Thomas L. Livermore.

X

CHAPTER VIII.

Catholics in the World War.

As to Catholic loyalty in the recent "World War," it is already so well known and so fully appreciated by our American people, that it is hardly necessary to add another word now to their glorious record. It will be enough simply to relate a few of the official declarations of several Catholic institutions, and how heartily these expressions of loyalty were appreciated by President Wilson and other non-Catholic officials of high rank; and then close by mentioning a few of the special outstanding military achievements of Catholics during the war. As soon as war was declared, President Wilson received the following "*Letter of the Catholic Archbishops to the President of the United States*":

"Mr. President: Standing firmly upon solid Catholic tradition

and history from the very foundation of this nation, we reaffirm in this hour of stress and trial our most sacred and sincere loyalty and patriotism toward our country, our government, and our flag.

"Moved to the very depths of our hearts by the stirring appeal of the President of the United States and by the action of our national congress, we accept whole-heartedly and unreservedly the decree of that legislative authority proclaiming this country to be in a state of war.

"We have prayed that we might be spared the dire necessity of entering the conflict. But now that war has been declared we bow in obedience to the summons to bear our part in it, with fidelity, with courage and with the spirit of sacrifice, which as loyal citizens we are bound to manifest for the defense of the most sacred rights and the welfare of the whole nation.

"Acknowledging gladly the gratitude we have always felt for the protection of our spiritual liberty and the freedom our Catholic institutions under the flag, we pledge our devotion and our strength to the maintenance of our country's glorious leadership in those possessions and principles which have been America's proudest boast.

"Inspired neither by hate nor fear, but by the holy sentiments of truest patriotic fervor and zeal, we stand ready, we and all the flock committed to our keeping, to co-operate in every way possible with our President and our national government, to the end that the great and holy cause of liberty may triumph, and that our beloved country may emerge from this hour of test stronger and nobler than ever.

"Our people now, as ever, will rise as one man to serve the nation. Our priests and consecrated women will once again, as in every former trial of our country, win, by their bravery, their heroism and their service, new admiration and approval.

"We are all true Americans, ready as our age, our ability and our condition permit, to do whatever is in us to do, for the preservation, the progress and the triumph of our beloved country.

"May God direct and guide our President and our government, that out of this trying crisis in our national life may at length come a closer union among all the citizens of America, and that an enduring and blessed peace may crown the sacrifices which war inevitably entails.

"James Cardinal Gibbons, Archbishop of Baltimore.

"William Cardinal O'Connell, Archbishop of Boston.

"John Ireland, Archbishop of St. Paul.

"John J. Glennon, Archbishop of St. Louis.

"Sebastian G. Messmer, Archbishop of Milwaukee.

"Henry Moeller, Archbishop of Cincinnati.

"Edward J. Hanna, Archbishop of San Francisco.

"George W. Mundelein, Archbishop of Chicago."

No wonder the President's heart was thrilled and warmed by this expression of loyalty! We are not surprised that the grateful President expressed his appreciation of this so heartily in the following note to Cardinal Gibbons:

"The very remarkable resolutions unanimously adopted by the Archbishops of the United States at their annual meeting in the Catholic University on April 18, last, a copy of which you were kind enough to send me, warms my heart and makes me very proud indeed that men of such large influence should act in so large a sense of patriotism and so admirable a spirit of devotion to our common country."

Not only President Wilson, but other high officials expressed their appreciation of this declaration of loyalty. A. Mitchell Palmer, Attorney General of the United States, said:

"I have read with deep interest the Pastoral Letter of the Archbishops and Bishops to their clergy and people of the Catholic Church in the United States, the first that has been issued in the past thirty-five years, and was impressed with its profound thought and lofty tone.

"The greeting from the dignitaries of the church is addressed to their people, not only as members of the Catholic Church, but as citizens of the Republic.

"I am glad that the Catholic Church in the United States, as exemplified by the Pastoral Letter, is showing such splendid and progressive spirit."

In perfect harmony with this was the declaration of loyalty made by the "American Federation of Catholic Societies." In their Convention in Kansas City, Mo., this organization declared:

"We renew assurances of fidelity already offered to the President of the nation by the Catholic Archbishops, and we pledge without reservation our blood and our treasure for the defense and the perpetuation of our beloved country which offers the fullest measure of religious, political and economic liberty, not only to its own people, but to the oppressed of every land.

"Whether the war be long or short, we pledge the undeviating loyalty of 3,000,000 Catholic men and women united in federation."

In regard to the patriotic spirit of this "Federation," the Editor of the "*Davenport, (Ia.) Democrat,*" had this to say, in the issue of Aug. 28, 1917:

"That is the sentiment that permeates the meeting, and which has been evident not only in the words but the acts of the Catholic societies ever since America entered the war. The loyalty of

American Catholics is beyond question, and they stand as a body in earnest support of their government to the end of the war, and for principles of democracy which must govern the peace that shall follow the war."

The "Catholic Educational Convention" also passed the following resolutions:

"The Association gives its whole-hearted support to the Chief Executive of our country, President Wilson, in this supreme moment of trial. It pledges unswerving fidelity and devotion to him in the prosecution of the war for the complete attainment of the high and moral ideals set forth by him.

"In a spirit of humility and gratitude we give thanks to God for the splendid patriotism displayed in this crisis by the graduates of Catholic colleges, who have rallied to the colors in surprisingly large numbers in a spirit of entire devotion."

Here also is the official record of the Georgetown Catholic University, at Washington, D. C., giving the enrollments of its students in the service of the United States:

Of the sons of the great Catholic University 2620 were enrolled in the service list. Of these 54 sacrificed their lives and 28 were decorated for their achievements. The detailed list indicates the following ranks and numbers for the Georgetown men in the army: Generals, 3; colonels, 18; majors, 9; captains, 148; lieutenants, 649; candidates, 181; noncoms, 227; privates, 811. In the navy: Admirals, 1; lieutenants, 37; ensigns, 129; P. O., 96; seamen, 175. In the marines: Majors, 7; captains, 5; lieutenants, 25; candidates, 7; noncoms, 11; privates, 31. The total number for the army was 2096; for the navy, 438, and for the marines, 86.

Here are the utterances of some of the individual members of the Hierarchy.

In a memorable discourse delivered from the pulpit of his Cathedral in Baltimore, the Sunday after Congress had declared that our country was in a state of war, Cardinal Gibbons uttered these patriotic words:

"The primary duty of a citizen is loyalty to country exhibited by an absolute and unreserved obedience to his country's call manifested by solemn service, not by empty declamation. . . . In the present emergency it behooves every American citizen to do his duty, to uphold the hands of the President and the Congress in the solemn obligations that confront us, to pray that the Lord of Hosts may inspire them to such measures as will redound to the glory of our country, to righteousness of aim and conduct and to the future permanent peace of the world."

On the same solemn day Cardinal Farley, from the pulpit of his See, declared:

“Our President and our national Representatives having spoken, our response to the voice of authority which they embody will be to rally around our flag with complete fullness of devotion, with loyal hearts and sturdiest arms, to place all that we have and all that we are, at the service of our country. We will not shrink from any sacrifice in her behalf. We will render to her what our Catholic faith and teaching both sanction and sanctify. No demand on our citizenship will go unanswered or find us other than true Americans, true children of the Church, which never was found wanting in any crisis of our country.”

And Father Dromgoole, representing Archbishop Prendergast, delivered this clear-cut declaration of loyalty:

“Every faculty of the Church, manhood, womanhood, priesthood, sisterhood, churches, schools and hospitals are lined solidly behind the nation and the President. Spiritually, intellectually and materially the Catholic Church is behind the President.”

Many more similar expressions of loyalty came from the lips of other members of the Hierarchy, and from the rank and file of the clergy all over the land. Large numbers of the priests voluntarily left their parishes, for the time being, and enlisted as chap-pains in the army. So freely did the Catholics respond to the call of the Nation, that Secretary Baker, in a statement issued on Sept. 22, 1917, declared that Catholics constituted 35 per cent of the new army. It was found, later on, that at least 40 per cent of the army and navy were Catholics. To appreciate the full significance of this we need to bear in mind that Catholics constituted only about 16 per cent of the entire population of the United States.

A writer in the *Extension Magazine* said: “Not only have Catholics furnished 40 per cent of the fighting force on land and sea and in the air, but they have bought Liberty Bonds, Thrift Stamps, and have enrolled in the Red Cross and in the League of Conservation, and other organized means of winning the war. But all this was to be *expected*; for every *Catholic School*, is a *nursery of patriotism*, and every *Catholic pulpit* a *gospel of loyalty*, and every *Catholic altar* a *plea for sacrifice*.”

Not only did Catholic men show their loyalty to the country, but the dear Catholic Sisterhoods all over the land sent up their prayers to God and offered their services as nurses of the sick and the dying, both in the hospitals and on the battlefields. As a matter of fact, *thousands* of these dear “angels of mercy” went to the scene of war, and many of them lost their precious lives in seeking to save the lives of others. This was not only true in the recent gigantic war; but it has always been true in all the wars through which our nation has ever passed. A recent writer gives

us the following brief account of the noble work of the nuns in our Civil War:

"There were 250,000 Catholic soldiers in the Union Army. Excepting Louisiana and Maryland, there were more Catholic Sisters nursing the Union soldiers than there were Catholics in the entire Confederate Army. Every Order of Catholic Sisters in the country sent every available Sister to nurse the sick, wounded and dying in field and hospital. They served without pay throughout the long, dark struggle. Their charm, grace, efficiency and skill at all times under the superb management of Sister Anthony and Mothers Catharine Spaulding and Columbo Caroll, won and received the eternal gratitude of the entire nation. What these noble women proved themselves to be in those troublesome times, so too are such today. The crawling, sneaking, human viper who dares to slander them deserves and should receive the withering and everlasting curse of humankind."

Just here we beg to give the Immortal Lincoln's eulogy on the heroic labors of the Catholic Sisters on the battlefields of the Civil War. From the great heart of this Great Man came these warm words of appreciation:

"Of all the forms of charity and benevolence seen in the crowded wards of the hospitals, those of some Catholic Sisters were among the most efficient. I never knew whence they came or what the name of their order. More lovely than anything I have ever seen in art, so long devoted to illustrations of love, mercy and charity, are the pictures that remain of those modest Sisters going on their errands of mercy among the suffering and the dying, gentle and womanly, yet with the courage of soldiers leading a forlorn hope, to sustain them in contact with such horrors. As they went from cot to cot distributing the medicines prescribed, or administering the cooling, strengthening draughts as directed, they were veritable angels of mercy. Their words were suited to every sufferer. One they incited and encouraged, another they calmed and soothed. With every soldier they conversed about his home, his wife, his children, all the loved ones he was soon to see again if he was obedient and patient. How many times have I seen them exorcise pain by their presence or their words. How often has the hot forehead of the soldier grown cool as one of these Sisters bathed it. How often has he been refreshed, encouraged and assisted along the road to convalescence, when he would otherwise have fallen by the way, by the home memories with which these unpaid nurses filled his heart!"

These words will be inscribed on the monument which will soon be erected in Washington as a memorial to the nuns of the battlefield. Let bigots of every stripe, peruse them and learn from

a mind that was immeasurably superior to theirs how to appreciate some of the work of our Sisterhoods.

But among all the achievements of Catholics in the World War, none has been more active and heroic than those of the Knights of Columbus. To state these in detail would require a volume; and for want of space, we shall simply summarize their activities as briefly as possible.

In the very beginning of the war, the Knights assured President Wilson of their loyalty; and the President showed his confidence in their word by the following note through his Secretary, Mr. Tumulty:

“My Dear Mr. Flaherty:

“The President genuinely appreciates the heartening assurances that you give him in your telegram of August 7 in the name of the Knights of Columbus of the United States. Such messages do much to keep him in heart and he asks me to convey to you one and all an expression of his cordial thanks.”

Not only did the Knights *promise* their loyalty, but, later on, they proved it by “making good.”

On March 15, 1918, the President wrote to the K. of C.:

“Gentlemen: As Commander-in-Chief of the Army and Navy, I heartily approve your plan to accumulate a fund to be spent for the spiritual and material welfare of our soldiers and sailors, and I am very much gratified to note that your effort, while born of the charitable impulse of a *single Church*, is *non-sectarian* in its scope and purpose and intended to confer a fundamental benefit on all those whose mental, moral and physical health is our solemn concern. Sincerely yours, Woodrow Wilson.”

Here is a summary of some of the things which the Knights of Columbus did during the war and since:

They erected 500 buildings at the cantonments, army and navy posts in this country.

They established many recreational and provisional centers in France, Belgium, England, Italy, Germany.

They supported 2000 Secretaries here and abroad (there was sufficient work for double this number of Secretaries).

They gave away not only stationery, but candies, chewing gum, tobacco, pipes, cigarettes, coffee, doughnuts, all kinds of athletic goods, etc.,—absolutely free of charge.

Every form of entertainment was free to the soldiers; these entertainments included not only movies, but high class theatricals, boxing matches, lectures, and a real three-ring circus; they carried their provisions in auto trucks, aeroplanes, and on the

backs of their Secretaries far up into the fighting lines in the Argonne, Chateau Thierry and other battlefields.

They took photographs of the graves of the American boys buried in France and sent the pictures to the relatives of the fallen.

They were the first to accompany the Army of Occupation into Germany and the last to leave there; after the signing of the Armistice all their attention centered on preparing wholesome recreation for the soldiers for the promotion of contentment until such time as the boys could get back home. Athletic goods by the ton were then supplied to the boys, and creature comforts were given out lavishly.

As soon as the soldiers began to return, the Knights established Employment Bureaus in every large city and had their members go about from factory to factory, from merchant to merchant, to find jobs for the boys.

The Knights never inquired whether the soldier had any religious affiliations or not, whether he was Catholic or not. When the soldier filled out the card for employment or for any other attention, there was no query about his religion to be answered.

One writer tells us that during one year the Knights spent \$2,748,206 for the educational and hospital assistance of nearly 100,000 veterans. Every cent of the money contributed for the soldier is being used in his behalf, and there is no Catholic religion tag on anything. The soldier may go to any school he wishes, and he may be in any one of 362 hospitals, in which disabled soldiers are being treated. There is no question asked about the religious affiliation of the soldier, no discrimination shown no matter what his race or nationality be.

Then the same writer concludes: "These and many other kinds of service, too numerous to mention, were the unselfish, patriotic contributions of the K. of C. to relieve the awful after-effects of the War."

Of their splendid work overseas, *General Pershing* said:

"I wish to express to the Knights of Columbus my appreciation and that of the officers and men under my command for the valuable services rendered by your organization to the American Expeditionary Forces.

"The active work of your organization in France begun early in 1918, was well under way by the Spring of that year, and has been increasing in scope ever since."

Not only as fighters, but as benefactors, the Knights have elicited the highest praise. Secretary Hoover said:

"The 800,000 members of the Knights of Columbus are known to be united against anarchy and disorder, but you could not possibly have taken a better step towards giving your splendid support to the European Relief Council. I express to you the gratitude of the 3,500,000 children we have been able to save through the efforts of the Knights of Columbus and the other organizations united with you in the European Relief Council."

As to the unflinching loyalty of the Knights, Governor Hammond of Minneapolis declared: "I believe thoroughly that no order of citizens in this country is more patriotic and more devoted to America today than the Knights of Columbus."

Now out of the numerous eulogies passed on the Knights by non-Catholics of high standing we will close this point by quoting the following fine compliment made during the war by the *Dayton (Ohio) Journal*:

"One of the great Orders in America is the Catholic Knights of Columbus. It is American clear through. It is doing a mighty work in the cantonments and on the fields of battle. It is working side by side with the Y. M. C. A. and is doing equal, if not greater service than this famed organization of Christian young men. The work of the Knights of Columbus is practical. To their halls are invited all soldiers, irrespective of creed or faith. They have realized that loneliness and homesickness come to the lads who have been gathered to defend the sacred principles upon which civilization is founded. They are the disciples of cheer, the apostles of joy.

We have all heard much spluttering in these latter days by the K.K.K. about what constitutes a "100 per cent American." Someone has humorously remarked that the Klan's conception of a "100 per cent patriot" is "one who was *born* in America, who *lives* in America, and who *stays* in America, when there is fighting to do abroad." The "Caseys," instead of wasting time spluttering about *definitions* have simply got busy and *shown* us what it is to be a "100 per cent American."

REFERENCES:

"Letter of the Catholic Archbishops to the President of the United States."

"Resolutions of the American Federation of Catholic Societies."

After all the foregoing historic evidence of Catholic Patriotism, extending through all the decades of our country's history, one would naturally suppose that the spirit and attitude toward Catholics in America would be one of peace and amity and frater-

nalism. But here we encounter a most disheartening disappointment. Instead of peace and good-will, we find the most bitter hatred, suspicion and persecution.

CHAPTER IX.

How Catholic Patriotism Has Been Appreciated and Rewarded in America.

A CHAPTER IN AMERICAN PERSECUTION.

Beginning with the old English "Penal Laws" in force during the Colonial days, there has been carried on, under different forms of organization, a succession of outrages against Catholic citizens, that has extended down through all the decades of our country's history. Though the *forms* of persecution have varied at different times, yet the *spirit* has been always the same. All these outrages have been animated by the same old false assumption that Catholics owe *civil allegiance* to Rome; and hence, cannot be loyal citizens of any state government. This has been the dominant note with all these anti-Catholic persecutors through all the years; and on this one note they are still continuing to harp.

First there came in 1831 the "American Protestant Society" which soon resulted in a severe outbreak. Dr. Husslein, the distinguished editor of "*America*," tells us that "the bigotry incited by press and pulpit, and stimulated by public placards, found its complete expression in the destruction of the Ursuline Convent at Charlestown, Mass., in 1834. Not only was the Blessed Sacrament dishonored, but everything within the building was destroyed, and then it was burned to the ground. The charges that had been made against the Sisters of this Convent were disproved by a Protestant committee, but it was too late; the harm had already been done. Such was the first result of this campaign of slanderous accusations against Catholic institutions. In Boston, the Pope was shot in effigy by the "Washington artillery."

During these outrages the Massachusetts State Legislature asserted that "Catholics owed temporal allegiance to a foreign potentate," which shows what the *real motive* was behind all this persecution; and hence, in 1834 the Catholic archbishops and bishops of the United States, assembled in the Third Provincial Council of Baltimore, published the following declaration: "We owe civil and political allegiance to the several States in which we live and also to our general government. When we acknowledge the spiritual and ecclesiastical supremacy of the Chief Bishop of our Universal Church, the Pope, we do not thereby detract from the allegiance to which our temporal governments are plainly en-

titled, and which we cheerfully give; nor do we acknowledge any civil or political supremacy, or power, over us in any foreign potentate; even the Chief Pastor of our Church."

The next organization against the Catholic Church arose in 1844, known as the "*Native American Party*." Here is an account of the kind of work done by this "*Native American Party*" during the first five months of its existence, as given by the Rev. M. Fithian, a Protestant minister: "Two Catholic churches burned; one thrice fired and desecrated; a Catholic seminary and retreat consumed by the torches of an incendiary mob; two rectories and a valuable library destroyed; forty dwellings in ruins; about forty human lives sacrificed; and sixty of our fellow-citizens wounded; riot, rebellion and treason rampant; the laws boldly set at defiance, and peace and order prostrated by ruffian violence."

Later on, in 1852, came the notorious "Know Nothing" agitation, which was simply a development of the "*Native American Party*." The first protective act of these fanatics was an attack on a convent of helpless and inoffensive nuns in Providence, R. I. Next followed outbreak of civic hatred from press and platform in the cities of Boston, Baltimore, Wheeling, Pittsburg, and many other places. The agitation reached its climax in the mob attack upon the Cathedral in Cincinnati, resulting in the loss of several lives. This "patriotic" violence now continued with the bloody riots of St. Louis; with the tarring and feathering of a Jesuit priest at Ellsworth, Me.; with the attempted destruction of churches in Newark, N. J., Williamsburg, N. Y., and Manchester, N. H.; and with the successful burning and wrecking by gunpowder of Catholic churches in Bath, Me., Dorchester, Mass., and Sydney and Massillon, Ohio. The supreme triumph of this movement finally came, on what is known as "Bloody Monday," in Louisville, Ky., August 6, 1855. Bishop Spalding gives the following lurid account of it: "We have just passed through a reign of terror surpassed only by the Philadelphia riots. Nearly a hundred poor Irish and Germans have been butchered or burned, and some twenty houses have been fired and burned to the ground. The city authorities, all 'Know-Nothings,' looked calmly on, and they are now endeavoring to lay the blame on the Catholics."

This last incident, indeed, was a refinement worthy of Nero himself; and caused the Catholic Hierarchy again to repeat the Catholic principle of patriotic allegiance to *civil authority*.

To counteract these uncalled-for outrages the Catholic archbishops and bishops of our country assembled in the First Plenary Council of Baltimore, and in their pastoral letter addressed these words to the Catholics of our country: "Attachment to the *civil institutions* under which you live *has ever marked your conduct as citizens*. We cannot, however, deem it altogether unnecessary

to exhort you ever to discharge your *civil duties* from the higher motives which *religion* suggests. Obey the public authorities, not only for wrath, but also for *conscience* sake. Show your attachment to the institutions of our beloved country by prompt compliance with all their requirements, and by the cautious jealousy with which you guard against the least deviation from the rules which they prescribe for the maintenance of public order and private rights." This episcopal appeal to the Catholic people shows the true attitude of the Church toward civil authority.

Just here it is interesting to note that it was during this period of anti-Catholic fanaticism that Abraham Lincoln wrote the following to his old friend, Joshua F. Speed, in 1855: "You inquire *where I now stand*. That is a *disputed point*. I think I am a Whig; but others say there are no Whigs, and that I am an Abolitionist. I am *not a Know-Nothing*, that is certain. How could I be? How can any one who abhors the oppression of negroes be in favor of degrading classes of white people? Our progress in degeneracy appears to me to be pretty rapid. As a nation we began by declaring that '*All men are created equal*.' We now practically read it: '*All men are created equal, except negroes*.' When the *Know-Nothings* get control it will read: '*All men are created equal, except negroes, and foreigners, and Catholics*.' When it comes to this, I should prefer emigrating to some country where they make *no pretense of loving liberty*—where despotism can be taken pure, and without the base alloy of hypocrisy."—"Recollections of Abraham Lincoln."—Lamon).

Here also, in this period of "Know-Nothing" agitation, we hear another courageous voice of rebuke. Hon. Henry A. Wise, Governor of Virginia, had the manhood to say in the "*Richmond (Va.) Inquirer*," of November, 1855: "I am a native Virginian, '*intus et in cute*' a Virginian; my ancestors on both sides for two hundred years were citizens of this country and this state. I am a Protestant by birth, by baptism, by education, and by adoption. I am an American; yet in every character, in every relation, in every sense, with all my head, and all my heart, and with all my might, I protest against this secret organization of native Americans and of Protestants, to proscribe Roman Catholics and naturalized citizens."

A little later on, about 1880, the notorious "A. P. A.," of which we have all heard so much, arose and began its famous *American Protective* asinine performances. So bitter and sweeping was their "patriotic" program against Catholicism that they proposed, not only to drive all Catholics out of America, but out of the *whole world*! This sweeping threat of the A. P. A. against Catholic citizens was noticed and rebuked by Mr. Brann, the famous editor of the "*Iconoclast*," in an issue of that paper pub-

lished about 1895. Brann quotes the following paragraph from an address delivered in Milwaukee at that time by the president of the Supreme Council of the A. P. A.: "If coming generations are to be secure in the enjoyment of their liberties, we must drive the enemy, not from the United States *only*, not from the New World to the Old; but we must drive them *off the face of the earth!* We must destroy the devil's brood, root and branch, by the power of A. P. A.-ism!"

Again Mr. Brann, after remarking that the A. P. A. were "preaching war,—a war of *extermination*," quotes the following sentence from their official organ, published then in San Francisco: "In Rochester, N. Y., a *bad* A. P. A. man shot and killed a *good* Catholic. The chief regret is that he did not have a *magazine gun*, instead of a *single shooter*."

Then Brann remarks, in his characteristic style: "I am not much in favor of a press censorship nor the abridgment of the right of free speech; but I do think that men who persist in a deliberate attempt to precipitate a *civil war* should be *hanged for treason*. My bump of veneration is not so abnormal that it wears holes in the steeple crown of my Mexican hat; still I hold that the orator or editor who flagrantly defames and systematically vilifies any religious cult considered sacred by millions of law-abiding men is a *blasphemous brute*, and that it would be entirely consistent with the American idea of liberty to clap a cast-iron muzzle on him and lose the key." See "Brann's Defense Against the Enemies of Catholicity," pp. 120-144.

This whole tragic record of the persecution of Catholics in America is thus briefly summed up, in a sentence or two, by Cardinal Gibbons: "In more than one instance in our nation's history have our churches been desecrated and burned to the ground, our convents invaded and destroyed, and our clergy exposed to insult and violence. These injuries have been inflicted on us by incendiary mobs animated by hatred of Catholicism. Yet, in spite of these provocations, our Catholic citizens, though wielding an immense *numerical* influence in the localities where they suffered, have *never retaliated*. It is in a spirit of just pride that we can affirm that hitherto in the United States *no Protestant house of worship or educational institution has ever been destroyed by those who profess the Catholic faith*." This is truly a wonderful account of the marvelous patience and meekness of our American Catholics. With these facts before us, we do not wonder that the generous and distinguished Protestant minister, Dr. Washington Gladden of Columbus, Ohio, felt justified in saying: "We Protestants should remember and confess that the most grievous cases of religious persecution which have occurred *during our generation* were not the persecutions of Protestants by Roman Catholics,

but of Roman Catholics by Protestants." (See "*Faith of Our Fathers*," by Cardinal Gibbons).

But while the persecution of Catholics in America today has become less violent in *action*, it is still none the less bitter and unrelenting in *spirit*. It is still based on the same old false assumption of *papal domination* over civil and political affairs. This is still the *prevailing note* of all the anti-Catholic agencies, and it is their continual harping on this *one note* that has made it necessary for the Church repeatedly to assert her loyalty to all legitimate civil authority.

So, again in 1884, the Catholic archbishops and bishops of our country, assembled in the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, made this declaration: "We repudiate the assertion that we need to lay aside any of our devotedness to our Church to be true Americans; that we need to abate any of our love for our country's principles and institutions to be faithful Catholics. We believe that our country's heroes were the instruments of God in establishing this home of freedom; to both the Almighty and to His instruments in the work, we look with grateful reverence; and to maintain the inheritance of freedom which they have left us, should it ever be imperiled, our Catholic citizens will be found to stand forward as one man ready to pledge anew 'their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor.'"

Yet, in spite of these repeated authoritative declarations of the Church, and in spite of all the patriotic service which Catholics have invariably rendered to our country in every national crisis, the *same old song* of "papal domination" continues to be sung.

These "calamity howlers" have even gone so far as to declare boldly that the Knights of Columbus are the Pope's military "right arm," and are storing away arms and ammunition with which to fight the Pope's battles. One of these venomous anti-Catholic papers on February 5, 1914, displayed the following startling headline: "Three Hundred Thousand Catholic Knights Armed to the Teeth, Awaiting the Orders of Their Vicar General!" Just think of it! The Pope has an armed militia, in these United States, as large as our standing army! This would be truly amazing and alarming if it were not known to be a *Colossal Lie*. These false and vicious charges have been disproved again and again and yet they continue to be flaunted before the public with an infernal persistence that only incarnate demons could exercise.

While it is to be regretted that many good people are deceived and misled by these false alarms, it is gratifying, on the other hand, to note how severely these falsehoods are condemned by many of our most prominent non-Catholic friends. One of the

most scathing denunciations of these misrepresentations comes from Dr. Washington Gladden of Columbus, Ohio. This distinguished divine said: "It is sickening to note the morbid eagerness to make public feeling against Catholics; to search out and magnify all that is discreditable in them; to put the worst construction on all that they say or do; never, by any inadvertence to note a point in their favor; and sometimes, alas, to give currency to the most fiendish fabrications and forgeries, attributing to them crimes and atrocities of the most diabolical character. Nothing more infernal than that alleged "oath" of the Knights of Columbus has ever been produced by human malignity. It has been proven again and again, in courts, to be a *forgery*, and the publishers of it have been condemned and punished for *libel*; but it is still in circulation! It is simply amazing that anybody should expect any credit to be given to a concoction so monstrous; but it is more astonishing to know that it has been accepted as a genuine document by hundreds of thousands of church members. Oh, fellowmen, isn't there honor and decency and manliness enough among our Protestant Christians to put an end to such hellish calumnies!"

The recent movement of the Ku Klux Klan is but a rebirth of anti-Catholic movements of other days. True the Jew and the Negro share with the Catholic in the vilification so freely uttered, yet there is no gainsaying the real motive. Against these false premises and uncharitable charges of the hooded Knights, Dr. Wilbur E. Crafts, Supt. of the International Reform Bureau, has this to say: "As no Negro, Jew, or Catholic is eligible to membership, manifestly it is the *Protestant Americans* who are guilty of the folly and sin of this profiteering in hate and bigotry, and therefore, intelligent Protestant Americans through their pulpits and religious papers should take the lead in unveiling and breaking up this conspiracy against democracy and public peace. The last country in the world that can safely afford to tolerate racial or religious hate and bigotry is the United States. Practically every nationality in the world is represented in our population, while the number of religious beliefs among us is almost without number. This being true, the only way we can get along in peace and harmony is through the free exercise of broad *toleration* and true *democracy*. The only sure way there is of having our own rights respected is to respect the rights of others. Americanism is not so much a matter of birth or religion as it is of *spirit*. He is a true American who believes in and practices the American ideals. Bigotry, hate, intolerance and fanaticism are not American traits or ideals. Men and women of many creeds and nationalities founded this country and established its independence; the same is true of those who have preserved and defended it. And if we

are to fulfill our destiny we must remain true to the ideals and traditions under which we have grown great and powerful."— (Pennsylvania Grange News, October, 1921).

Thomas Dixon, the well-known author of the "Klansman," also condemns this modern K. K. K. and declares that it has "stolen the livery of the *original order*," and that its assault on Jews, Negroes, and Catholics is the "acme of stupidity and inhumanity," and is sure to lead to "riot, anarchy and bloodshed."

Hon. Benjamin Loring Young, of Massachusetts, is still more severe and declares that "the klan has *already* left behind it a trail of *passion, hatred, violence, bloodshed and murder*." He then adds further: "The Klan is false to the Declaration of Independence, and false to the Constitution of the United States. Nothing can justify political movements based on *race or religion*. The Klan should be fought, not only by *Catholics, Jews and Negroes*, but by every decent white Gentile and Protestant in America."

There are other anti-Catholic movements, however, which we have more reason to take into serious account. They are well organized and their *personnel* is of a higher rank and influence.

Among these more refined anti-Catholic organizations the two most potent and influential are "*The Evangelical Protestant Society*" and "*The National Patriotic Council*"; and these two organizations propose to *co-operate*, and to carry on a *nation-wide* crusade against the Catholic Church. What these two well-equipped forces propose to do for the Catholics of the United States is truly amazing. Perhaps the best account of the *purpose* and *scope* of their proposed work is the following by Mr. William E. Brigham, as published in the "*Boston Transcript*," July 19, 1911. By way of *caution* and *warning*, Mr. Brigham says:

"Religious blocs have not yet appeared in Congress, but they might prove a natural sequence, if Congress is to reflect all the organized forces which are attempting to play upon legislation throughout the country. Not since the Civil War, possibly, has so general an effort been made to revive the old spirit of *Know-Nothingism* which exerted such a subtle yet powerful influence upon elections following the organization of the Know-Nothing Party about 1852. No less than three separate, distinct organizations of *national scope*, formed for the expressed purpose of attacking the Catholic Church or preventing Catholics from attaining public office, are *now in the field*,—two of them of very recent origin. One is the *Ku Klux Klan*, another the *Evangelical Protestant Society*, with headquarters in New York, and the third the *National Patriotic Council*, which met in Washington a few days ago and hopes to work with the Evangelical Protestant Society. The *Evangelical Protestant Society* is an organization which aims

to include in its membership the *one hundred and twenty thousand Protestant clergymen* of the United States and many times that number of the laity. Its particular purpose is to fight the Papacy as a *political organization*, while the *National Patriotic Council* evidently intends to specialize in keeping Catholics out of *public office*."

All this continued organized activity against the Catholics of the United States only shows how *deep-seated* and *bitter* has been the anti-Catholic bigotry that began with the "Penal Laws," transmitted by Protestant England into our American Colonies; and which has repeatedly shown itself in the most outrageous form of *persecution* through all the years of our country's history. This, too, in spite of the most faithful loyalty of Catholics to our government in every time of national emergency. And now, while the *modes* of attack are, in general, less crude and cruel than in earlier days, yet the *spirit* of our enemies is no less bitter and unrelenting. We are still *hated* with an intensity that is almost diabolical. And all this, under the false and ridiculous pretense that the Church is antagonistic to the State, and hence, Catholics cannot be loyal to civil authority. The Pope, they say, claims our *civil allegiance*, as well as our religious devotion; and we Catholics must submit to it, even though it should *conflict* with the civil authority of the State. This ridiculous "*Catholiphobia*," as some one has called it, has been the *one note* on which our enemies have harped through all our country's history. To justify this furtive plea of "*papal domination*," they point to the occasional conflicts between the Popes and the Princes of the "Middle Ages," and insist that they prove that the Church was determined to rule the State. As a matter of fact, however, the very opposite was true. These Princes were determined to dominate the Church, even in *spiritual* matters, and the Popes were obliged to resist them, in defense of their own *spiritual prerogatives*.

REFERENCES:

"U. S. Catholic Historical Records and Studies," Vols. II, III, IV, V.

"Catholic Encyclopedia," Vol. VIII, pp. 677-689.

"History of the United States," Schouler, Vol. V, p. 305.

"Life of Lincoln," Nicholay and Hay, Vol. II, p. 357.

"The Murders of Mer Rouge," By John Rogers, of St. Louis, Mo. Rogers is a 32nd Degree Mason.

—X—

This brings us to our next question—

CHAPTER X.

Does the Church Teach That Catholics Owe Civil Allegiance to Rome?

The answer to this question has already been anticipated, in part, but now in order to answer it more fully and logically, and with the best effect, we will consider, in a few brief paragraphs, what the highest authority in the Church has always taught on the proper relation of Church and State, as exhibited in the "Middle Ages." To begin with, it is important to keep in mind the fact that at that time, both Church and State were Catholic, and therefore, the *civil rulers* were also the *spiritual subjects* of the Pope; and yet in many instances these Catholic princes were corrupt, and sought to *over-ride* the Pope by ignoring his *spiritual* prerogatives. In other words, they insisted on carrying out personal and political schemes that were contrary to the laws of God; and when they did this, they invaded the spiritual sphere and subjected themselves, as Catholics, to the legitimate censure of the Pope. The truth is, the Church has never attempted to dominate the civil power. She has invariably kept herself within her own spiritual realm, and never clashed with the civil power, except when her spiritual functions obliged her to defend her own spiritual rights, or the moral and religious rights of the people. At times, she was obliged to exercise her legitimate spiritual authority in order to withstand the wicked Catholic rulers who sought to oppress the innocent, or to carry out other corrupt and wicked designs. In all these instances, the Church was the faithful protector of the weak and the innocent against the oppression of the strong and the vile. Ancellon, though unfriendly to the Pope, says: "In the Middle Ages, it was the power and influence of the Popes that stayed and prevented the despotism of the emperors;" and a Protestant minister, in the American Encyclopedia, says: "The papal power was for ages the great bulwark of order in Europe." On this point the following words from Cardinal Gibbons are pertinent: "In all the ages, the Church has not only respected the conscience of the people in embracing the religion of their choice, but she has also defended their civil rights and liberties against the encroachments of temporal sovereigns. One of the popular errors that has taken possession of some minds in our times is that in former days the Church was leagued with princes for the oppression of the people. This is a base calumny which a slight acquaintance with ecclesiastical history would soon dispel. It is a remarkable fact that the most unrelenting enemies

of the Church have been the princes of this world, and so-called Christian princes, too. . . . The Church has always felt it to be her duty in every age to raise her voice against the despotic, arbitrary measures of princes. Many of them chafed under the salutary discipline of the Church. They desired to be governed by no law except the law of their own licentious passions and boundless ambitions. A Protestant American reviewer has well said: 'It was a blessing of Providence that there was a spiritual power on earth that could stand like a stone wall against the tyranny of earthly sovereigns.' " It must be said to the everlasting honor of the Popes that their uncompromising resistance to despotic princes, and their unflinching defense of the rights of the poor and the oppressed, is the most glorious chapter in the Church's history.

But it has also been repeatedly urged that these frequent clashes between the Church and the State in an earlier day indicate that the spirit of the Church is autocratic, and that she aspired to dominate the civil power. This is a hasty conclusion, resulting from careless study of the Church's history, and also from ignorance of the Church's teaching on the true relation of Church and State. Now, what is the Church's attitude toward politics? This is clearly answered by the distinguished Catholic author and editor, Rev. Joseph Husslein, S. J., in the following words: "The Church can never entertain political ambition. She, clearly and without hesitation, acknowledges the sovereignty of the State in temporal matters, reserving to herself the spiritual sovereignty in things of the soul. To all the accusations against her she has but one answer to make,—the answer of Christ when He was accused in the same manner, viz: 'My kingdom is not of this world.' "

In his Encyclical "Immortale Dei," on the "Christian Constitution of States," Pope Leo XIII wrote: "The Almighty has apportioned the charge of the human race between *two powers*: the ecclesiastical and the civil; the one being set over *divine*, and the other over *human* things. Each in its kind is supreme. Each has fixed limits within which it is contained. . . . Whatever is of sacred character, whatever belongs to the salvation of souls, or to the worship of God, is subject to the power and judgment of the Church; and whatever is to be ranged under the civil and political order is rightly subject to civil authority." On this declaration of Pope Leo, Dr. Husslein remarks: "The Church, therefore, according to the institution of her Divine Founder and the declaration of her sovereign pontiffs, is not concerned with purely civil and political matters, so long as there is no violation of the laws of God, and no infringement of her own sacred rights."

But while the Church can have no political ambitions, she is

obliged to safeguard the spiritual rights of her children against any violation of these rights by the State. This truth is clearly expressed by Victor Cathrein, S. J., in his "Moralphilosophie," in the following words: "The Church has the right to provide that her subjects be not seduced to commit sin, or suffer detriment to their spiritual welfare, through the ordinations of secular authority. It would be very wrong to call this *indirect power* over temporal matter a *secular power*. It is, and remains, a *spiritual power*; because it extends to temporal matters only in so far as *spiritual* interests are concerned. Its final object is *spiritual*." Here, again, we quote the clear statements of Dr. Husslein: "Should any political party, or should the State itself, propose what is unjust and sinful, it is evident that the voice of the Church must be heeded. The Church must always protest against crime, the enemy of the State. Of two things, however, both Catholics and non-Catholics may rest assured: The *first* is, that the Church will never interfere with any man's economic or political views, unless those views are spiritually pernicious or sinful. Against sin, she is always obliged to cry out. The *second* is, that loyalty to the Church will never stand in the way of genuine patriotic interest. *A true Catholic must of necessity be a true patriot.*"

It is this spiritual function of the Church also that constitutes her truly *democratic* character. Being a great spiritual democracy, the Church can flourish under *any form* of civil government that is not unjust and oppressive. The Church has no preference for one form of government over another; empire, monarchy or republic, all meet with her approval, so long as they keep in view the common good for which social authority is constituted. Pope Leo XIII has thus defined the attitude of the Church: "Catholics, like all other citizens, are free to prefer one form of government to another, precisely because no one of these social forms is, *in itself*, opposed to the principles of sound reason or the maxims of Christian doctrine." At another time in his Encyclical "Sapientiae Christianae," on the "Chief Duties of Christians as Citizens," the same Pontiff writes: "The Church holds that it is not her province to decide what is the *best* among many *diverse forms* of government and civil institutions of the Christian states. Amid the *various kinds* of state rule she does not disapprove of any, provided the respect due to religion, and the observance of good morals, be upheld."

On the *democratic* character of the Church it is interesting to note, just here, what that brilliant student of American Democracy, de Tocqueville, said on this point nearly one hundred years ago. In his masterly work he states that the Catholic religion has been erroneously looked upon as the natural enemy of *democracy*; and then, on the contrary, he declares his conviction that Roman

Catholicism is decidedly *favorable* to the *democratic* doctrine of *equality*. On page 281, (*Ed. 1838*), he plainly asserts that "the Catholics constitute the *most democratic* class of citizens in the United States." (See Dr. C. B. Wilmer's article in "*Atlanta Journal*," October 3, 1920).

Woodrow Wilson, also, in his "New Freedom," (page 85), said of the Church's democratic character, both in the *Middle Ages* and at *present*: "The Roman Catholic Church was *then*, as *now*, a great democracy. There was no peasant so humble that he might not become a priest and no priest so obscure that he might not become a Pope."

While the Hierarchy, in itself, is not a *democratic form of government*, yet there is in it the *democratic spirit of equality*, based on personal *merit* and *effort*, and not on the mere *accident of birth* or *social position*.

From the foregoing, it is perfectly clear that the *spiritual* sphere of the *Church* and the *civil* sphere of the *State* are *entirely distinct*, and yet essentially harmonious. The function of the one is *religious*, while that of the other is *civil*; and instead of being essentially antagonistic, they are *reciprocal and co-operative*. This question being settled, it is easy now for us to answer the main *question* of this paper, namely: *Do Catholics owe civil allegiance to the Pope?* If the Church's function is purely religious and spiritual, and not civil, then it follows, as a *matter of course*, that no Catholic owes civil allegiance to the Pope. This is so clear and conclusive that it would seem that any reasonable mind would be *bound to see it*; and yet, for the benefit of the persistent doubter, we will emphasize this truth still further, by some corroborative statements from prominent Catholic and Protestant sources. Cardinal Gibbons says: "In his spiritual affairs, every Roman Catholic owes allegiance to the Pope; but in matters concerning his civil welfare, or that of his country, every Roman Catholic is as *free* as any *other American citizen* to act as his wisdom and conscience dictate." "*The Chicago Inter-Ocean*" (Prot.) says: "The Catholic owes a certain allegiance to the Pope, and yet he can be a good citizen; for that allegiance is a *spiritual matter*, about which the government does not concern itself. The Catholic takes his *religion* from Rome, but he supplies his *own politics*. His conscience is no more liable to lead him into conflict with the State than is the conscience of any other religious man. In this respect he is in the same position as the Protestant who takes his religion from the Bible." The same thought is emphasized by Bishop England, of Charleston, S. C.: "Let the Pope and Cardinals and all the powers of the Catholic world make the least encroachment on our Constitution, and we will protect it with our lives; yet we are most *obedient Papists*." Rt. Rev. B. J.

Keiley, of Savannah, Ga., declares: "Catholics in civil matters owe and pay allegiance and loyal support to no person, or power, or authority, save the United States; the *Pope has no civil authority over us*; and no Catholic recognizes in him any right, or title, to have or demand civil allegiance." Rev. K. A. Bray (Episcopal) of New York, says: "To those who are forever harping on the power of the Pope, meaning not his spiritual, but his *temporal* power, the problem set by this World War must be a hard nut to crack. When Roman Catholic fights his brother, each owing allegiance to the same *spiritual head*, yet each with his life protesting allegiance to different and opposing *temporal rulers*."

The American Bishops, assembled in the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, spoke the mind of the Church when they said: "We claim to be acquainted with the laws, constitutions and spirit of the Catholic Church and with the laws, constitutions and spirit of our country, and we emphatically declare that there is *no antagonism between them*." Thus does devotion to the Church only intensify our loyalty to the State.

Now, in addition to the preceding authoritative declarations of the Hierarchy on the principles of Catholic loyalty and patriotism, we beg to present here a few of the numerous high-class Protestant testimonies to the same unswerving patriotism and heroic service of our American Catholic citizens. All fair-minded non-Catholics admit, without hesitation, that the influence which the Catholic Church exerts on the general welfare of the United States, is beyond computation. So great and benign is her influence that many of our best non-Catholic citizens do not hesitate to declare that her presence is *absolutely necessary* to our safe existence. She is not only a defense in time of war, but she is at all times a most efficient protection against lawlessness, anarchy, Bolshevism, and other kindred evils that imperil our nation. On this point, the "*Outlook*" had this to say: "America today stands in peculiar need of that contribution which the Roman Catholic Church is peculiarly fitted to furnish. The chief peril of America is from *dis-organizing forces* and a *lawless spirit*. One of the chief lessons Americans need to learn is reverence for constituted authority and willing obedience to law."

The "*Los Angeles Times*" declares: "The Catholic Church in America stands like a stone wall against *anarchy* and *socialism* and the *divorce* evil; and it always upholds *law and order*. For these reasons alone, no right-minded American can find cause for alarm in the growth of the Catholic Church in this country."

The Texas "*Democrat*" said, April 14, 1914: "To the average American Catholic, the Stars and Stripes—the American flag—is next in sacredness to the Cross of Christ. If American institutions were as sacred in the hands of those who in books and news-

papers seek to arouse Protestant prejudice against Catholicism, as they are in the hands of the American Catholic, but little harm would befall the most sacred safeguards which our fathers threw around the religious and political liberties which we enjoy."

"*The Federation Review*" (A Hebrew organ) says: "As regards the Catholics, moreover, let us not forget that they wellnigh constitute the backbone of our fighting forces on sea and land, and the upholders of law and order in our cities and villages. It is an open truth that the Catholics furnish the largest proportion of blue-coats, blue-jackets, and boys in khaki."

In an editorial in the "*Oakland (Cal.) Inquirer*," May 31, 1915, we read: "It is beyond cavil that the *especial concern* of Catholics is to *exalt patriotism*, to inculcate *obedience* to established *political authority*, and to instill reverential *regard* for the *nation*, its *laws* and its *flag*."

Dr. C. B. Wilmer, in an article in the "*Atlanta (Ga.) Journal*," October 3, 1920, gives us his very encouraging estimate of Catholic loyalty both in peace and in war, and warns us seriously against all anti-Catholic misrepresentations of Catholic patriotism. He fearlessly declares: "I feel perfectly sure that if it ever comes to a showdown between the forces of righteousness, law and order, on one side, and the hell-spawned forces of anarchy on the other, that our Roman Catholic friends will be found fighting side by side with all lovers of God and humanity; I therefore deplore all misrepresentations of them, all denial of their political rights. That there is anything inconsistent between the allegiance of Roman Catholics in this country to the Pope across the seas and loyalty to American government is indignantly denied by men whose characters we are bound to respect.

"I feel, for one, that we can trust the Roman Catholic Church and the American Republic in fellowship with each other, and my appeal is this: let us all, Roman Catholics, Anglicans, and Protestants alike, nay, Jews and Gentiles—march together, shoulder to shoulder, for the safety of the Republic and the moral and political leadership of the world."

Not only the Catholic Church in general, but the Knights of Columbus in particular have always shown their superb patriotism, especially in the recent war. Indeed, the *principles* of true Catholic loyalty are contained in their *ritual*. After a careful examination of this ritual, a committee of Masons in Los Angeles, Calif., made the following generous statement: "The ceremonial of the Order teaches a *high* and *noble patriotism*, instills a *love of country*, inculcates a *reverence for law and order*, urges the conscientious and unselfish performance of *civic duty* and holds up the *Constitution* of our country as the richest and most precious possession of a Knight of the Order."

Like the great Church, of which this noble Order of Knights is a part, their *civic loyalty* is simply a *part* of their *religion*.

As an unmistakable proof of their loyalty to our country in the recent war, our Supreme Board of Directors, on the 14th day of April, meeting to provide for the emergency created by the declaration of war, passed the following resolution, which our Supreme Knight transmitted to the President and to the Congress:

"The Supreme Board of Directors of the Knights of Columbus, at a called meeting held this 14th day of April, 1917, in the city of Washington, realizing that the crisis confronting our country calls for the active co-operation and patriotic zeal of every true citizen, hereby reaffirms the devotion of 400,000 members of the Order in this country to our Republic and its laws, and pledges their continued and unconditional support to the President and Congress of the Nation in their determination to protect its honor and its ideals of humanity and right."

As to the attitude of our Knights of Columbus toward Socialism, Bolshevism, Anarchy, etc., our Supreme Council in 1919 passed the following resolution: "Pledging the Order to fight Bolshevism and all that it means and threatens against law and order, we pledge our manhood, our mentality and, if need be, our brawn, to protect the Constitution, to safeguard true democracy, to preserve respect for the law and all duly constituted civil authority. This we are in *conscience* bound to do by the teachings of the *Church*,—it is a *bounden duty*, not fancy, or pleasure, or mere lip-service."

No truer devotion to civil authority and civic welfare can be found anywhere than is expressed in this superb pledge. Not only is the K. of C. Order perfectly loyal to all civil authority, but the Order, as such, is never a "political machine," as has often been charged by anti-Catholics. While the Order is always perfectly *patriotic*, yet it is never *partisan*. Every individual Knight is absolutely free and unhampered in his *politics*. He is perfectly free to vote either for or against any partisan measure which may be proposed in the politics of his state or nation, regardless of the views of *any other Knight* of the Order. This free *democratic* character of the Order is clearly indicated in the following serious charge given to the Order by the Hon. Joseph E. Randall, a U. S. Senator from Louisiana, and himself a Knight of the Order. In a letter published in the "*Columbiad*," July, 1914, he said: "Permit me to remind you, my brothers, that Knights of Columbus are forbidden to use this *Society* in any way in *politics*. You can not, without violating both the *letter* and the *spirit* of our rules, meddle in elections or participate in *organized effort* to advance the political fortunes of any man, or set of men. We have no right,

as a *Society*, to interfere with politics, and should let it alone. *Each individual Knight* must have *entire freedom* of action in all political matters. This wise rule should be strictly followed."

Here we have a fine expression of the truly *democratic* spirit. Here is a beautiful combination of *Law* and *Liberty*, each balancing the other and holding it steady. The Order cannot trample on the civil rights of the individual, and no fanatical individual can dictate the principles and policy of the Order. Neither the Knights of Columbus nor the Great Church, of which it is a part, can ever be degraded into a mere "Political Machine."

Now, as to the superb loyalty of American Catholics, in general, and also the special fitness of the Church in the work of *Americanizing* our foreign population, and saving them from Bolshevistic contamination, we have the following enlightening and suggestive appeal from the pen of the Rev. Dr. Lloyd C. Douglas, Pastor of the First Congregational Church in Akron, Ohio. Dr. Douglas declares frankly and fearlessly: "The Roman Catholic Church has, during the last twenty-five years, rendered America a service that is utterly beyond the estimation of the ordinary citizen.

"The strong material influence exercised by Roman Catholicism over our unassimilable foreign population, which has been coming into this country by the millions in the last twenty years, has *protected this country* from the general attitude of revolt and disaffection against institutions, organizations and government which is so strongly marked in a great deal of our European immigration.

"One of the *strongest forces* at work in this country today to hold an attempted Socialism to *restraint*, and reduce to a minimum the sporadic efforts to encourage Bolshevism in this country has been the Roman Catholic Church; and whatever may be the difference of opinion between Catholics and Protestants as matters of doctrine, Protestantism should be unprejudiced enough to admit the high-grade service rendered to this country by Roman Catholicism in its dealings with a large class of people for whom Protestantism has no message."

Now, from all the foregoing evidences, it is perfectly clear that *Catholics do not owe civil allegiance to the Pope of Rome.*

Instead of there being anything in the Catholic religion which would interfere with the patriotism and loyalty of any Catholic citizen, the *Catholic religion* is decidedly favorable to the most ardent *love of country* and *patriotic service*. It has been observed, again and again, that the most devoted Catholics are the most loyal citizens in time of peace, and the best fighters on the battlefield. On this point, let us listen to the wise counsel given to our Catholic soldiers by one of the highest dignitaries of the

Church: "Recent history shows, says John Cardinal Bonzano, former Papal Delegate to the United States, "that all your aspirations, even your patriotism, may be *suspected* because of your *religion*. But do not be afraid to stand up and say that your *religion* is its own defense; that in the *principles* of your Catholic religion lies the *very strength* and vigor of your *loyalty* and *devotion* to your *country*; that a Catholic's *fidelity* to his *religion* is the *measure of his citizenship*; that the American Constitution is sacred to you, and second only to the Constitution of God as outlined in the Gospels; and that, while you bow respectfully to the authority that guides the destinies of your immortal souls, you thereby *all the more* submissively bow to the authority that directs your material welfare."

Now, in the face of all the evidences presented in the foregoing articles on "*What Catholics Have Done for American Civilization*," is it possible for any intelligent, fair-minded American to regard the Catholic Church as a "*Menace*" to our American institutions? If the Church is really a "*Menace*," to anything in this country, it is to the gigantic political and social evils which imperil our civilization. Yes; to Bolshevism, Anarchy, the Divorce Evil, Atheism, Rationalism, and other dangerous influences which threaten the integrity and welfare of our Christian Civilization, we admit that the Holy Catholic Church is, indeed, a most formidable "*menace*." Indeed, in regard to some of the above named evils, she is almost the *only really effective* "*menace*." Against this foul, filthy Divorce Evil which threatens to *rot* the very heart out of our American family life, she stands *almost alone*. Not only today, but through all the decades of our American history, she has always been our mightiest bulwark against all the evil forces that have ever threatened to sap the foundations of our beloved Nation. She has always stood staunch and immovable for law and order, and for all that is highest and best in our American Civilization; and without her presence and influence our beloved Nation would crumble into ruins. Let us thank God that we have her here to save us from social disintegration and destruction.

And now, in concluding this booklet, we can think of no more appropriate words than are to be found in the following eloquent speech delivered by Hon. Martin H. Glynn, Ex-Governor of New York, on Memorial Day in 1917, in Washington. This gifted orator said of "Catholic Patriotism":

"The patriotism of the Catholics of the United States is a self-evident proposition; it needs no demonstration; no substantiating evidence; no mathematical proof. It is written on every page of our country's history and no man's hand can blot it out. Catholic

patriotism plowed the Atlantic with Columbus, and with Balboa it looked upon the Pacific from the peak of Darien. With DeSoto and Marquette it discovered the Mississippi, with Cartier it sailed the picturesque St. Lawrence; and with Ponce de Leon it sought the fountain of everlasting youth in the 'Land of Flowers.' With its early missionaries it blazed the trails of our primeval forests, with the Cross of Christ in one hand and the Banner of Civilization in the other. The discovery of America, my friends, was the most momentous contribution to the cause of democracy since the advent of Christ. For the discovery of this New World, where democracy could grow and spread around the globe, a Catholic monk gave his eloquence, a Catholic king his treasures, a Catholic queen her jewels; and a Catholic navigator gave his brains and energy. In peace-time and in war-time, we Catholics have furnished this country with our quota of the men and women who stand out on the pages of the Nation's history, like towering mountains on the plain. Today, we Catholics love to tell the names of our own on the Nation's Roll of Honor, as we love to tell the beads of our rosaries. We like to remember how the Magna Charta, the inspiration of our own Declaration of Independence, the foundation-stone of the Constitution of the United States, was wrested from old King John by Cardinal Langton and the Catholic Barons of England. We like to remember how, years and years before the Colonies began their fight for independence in 1776, Lord Baltimore had written into the Charter of Catholic Maryland the inspirational principle of 'no taxation without representation.' We like to remember how George Calvert, of Maryland, gave this country its *first example of freedom in religious worship*. From these sentiments, we do not hesitate to assert that we believe that the Declaration of Independence is the greatest political exposition of a freeman's rights ever penned by the hand of man, and that the Constitution of the United States is the most luminous chart by which a nation ever steered the Ship of State, and that the Star-Spangled Banner, with all that it symbolizes and all that it actualizes, is the most glorious flag in the history of mankind. My friends, let it never be forgotten that the patriotism of the Catholics of this country began in 1492 and will last '*Whiist the earth bears a plant and the sea rolls a wave.*'"

REFERENCES:

"Faith of Our Fathers."—Cardinal Gibbons.

"The Church and Politics," and "Loyalty of Catholics."—Husslein.

"Is the Catholic Church a Menace?"—Dudley G. Wooten.

"Union of Church and State."—Dudley G. Wooten.

Instructive and Interesting

PAMPHLETS

ON SUBJECTS FREQUENTLY MISUNDERSTOOD
BY NON-CATHOLICS.

	Single Copies	Five or more of one kind or assorted, Per Copy
The Catholic Answer	10c	5c
What Catholics Do Not Believe.....	10c	5c
Catholic Church Not In Politics.....	10c	5c
How America Goes to Church and Where.....	10c	8c
Bible An Authority Only in Catholic Hands.....	10c	5c
Converts to the Catholic Church.....	15c	10c
Notes On Ingersoll	15c	10c
The Catholic Church and the Jews.....	10c	5c
Adventists and Russellites	10c	5c
Explanations for a Stranger Attending Catholic Services.....	10c	5c
Why Do Catholics Honor Mary?.....	10c	5c
Misrepresentations of History.....	10c	5c
Infallibility Defended by Protestants.....	10c	5c
Do Catholics Owe Civil Allegiance to Rome?.....	10c	5c
Catholics Always Loyal	10c	5c
Socialism Unmasked	10c	5c
When Informed Ministers Speak.....	10c	5c
Capital and Labor	10c	5c
Jones and Smith Discuss Socialism.....	15c	10c
The Anti-Catholic Motive	15c	10c
Jones Instructed on Confession.....	15c	10c
Inside Facts About the Catholic Church.....	15c	10c
A Minister's Surrender	15c	10c
From Unbelief to Belief.....	20c	15c
What Is A Catholic?.....	20c	15c
Defamers of the Church	20c	15c
Father Smith Instructs Jackson	35c	25c
The Fairest Argument	35c	25c
Question Box	40c	35c
Faith of Our Fathers	35c	30c

THE HOLY BIBLE.

180 A Black Satin Cloth, blind cross.....	\$1.75
181 DK Keratol, limp, gold title.....	\$3.25
181 D French seal, gold title.....	\$4.25
181 YK Keratol, yapp, round corners, gold title.....	\$3.75
181 Y French morocco, yapp	\$5.00

Above prices include postage.

Write for special prices on quantities of above pamphlets.

Address All Orders to

OUR SUNDAY VISITOR, HUNTINGTON, INDIANA

Book Department

PRICES OF THIS PAMPHLET

Single Copies, 25 Cents, postpaid

Six Copies, \$1.00, postpaid

One Hundred Copies, \$9.00, plus postage

One Thousand Copies, \$75.00 plus transportation.