

# THE AMERICAN PAPACY

A. T. JONES. APRIL 15, 1889

“Have not the Popes publicly and repeatedly anathematized the sacred principle of Liberty of Conscience? Have they not boldly said, in the teeth of the nations of Europe, that Liberty of Conscience must be destroyed—killed at any cost? Has not the whole world heard the sentence of death to liberty coming from the lips of the old man of the Vatican?”

— Father Charles Chiniquy, “The Priest, the Woman, and the Confessional,” 1880, p. 170.

Since the year 1856, a book entitled “Our Country” has been largely circulated, and it has excited a great deal of attention throughout the United States. The book was written for the American Home Missionary Society, its object being to present “facts and arguments showing the imperative need of home missionary work for the evangelization of the land.” In a startling, as well as splendid array of facts, it presents the growth, the size, the resources, and the perils of our country.

Among the perils to our country, the author rightly places Romanism, and by many excellent quotations proves that it is indeed a peril. We quote a passage or two:—

“There are many who are disposed to attribute any fear of Roman Catholicism in the United States to bigotry or childishness. Such see nothing in the character and attitude of Romanism that is hostile to our free institutions, or find nothing portentous in its growth. Let us, then, first compare some of the fundamental principles of our Government with those of the Catholic Church.”

“The Constitution of the United States guarantees liberty of conscience. Nothing is clearer or more fundamental. Pope Pius IX, in his Encyclical Letter of August 15, 1854, said: ‘The absurd and erroneous doctrines or ravings in defense of liberty of conscience, are a pestilential error—a pest, of all others, most to be dreaded in a State.’ The same pope, in his Encyclical Letter of December 8, 1864, anathematizes ‘those who assert the liberty of conscience and of religious worship,’ also ‘all such as maintain that the church may not employ force.’”

“The pacific tone of Rome in the United States does not imply a change of heart. She is tolerant where she is helpless. Says Bishop O’Connor: ‘Religious liberty is merely endured until the opposite can be carried into effect without peril to the Catholic world.’... The Archbishop of St. Louis once said: ‘Heresy and unbelief are crimes; and in Christian countries, as in Italy and Spain, for instance, where all the people are Catholics, and where the Catholic religion is an essential part of the law of the land, they are punished as other crimes.’”

“Every cardinal, archbishop, and bishop in the Catholic Church takes an oath of allegiance to the Pope, in which occur the following words: ‘Heretics, schismatics, and rebels to our said Lord (the Pope), or his aforesaid successors, I will to my utmost persecute and oppose.’”

“Cardinal Manning advises Romanists throughout the world to enter politics as Romanists, and to do this especially in England and the United States. In our large cities the priests are already in politics, and to some purpose. ... We are told that the native Catholics of Arizona and New Mexico are not energetic as the Protestants who are pushing into these Territories. True, but they are energetic enough to be counted. The most wretched members of society count as much at the polls as the best, and too often much more.”

All this and much more is true of Romanism. And although there is just cause for fear that the principles of Romanism will be legalized by the laws of this nation, we are certain that it will never accomplish this of itself nor in its own name. We are perfectly assured that if ever Romanism gains such power in this Government, it will be through the mediumship and by the instrumentalities of the National Reform party;<sup>1</sup> for, as crafty, as crud, as bitterly opposed to our free institutions as Rome is, as this book shows she is, and as men know that she is, yet the National Reformers are willing and even anxious to join hands with her, and enlist her in the promotion of their scheme of so-called reform.

In saying that the National Reformers are willing, and even anxious, to join hands with Romanism in America, we only state the sober truth, as proved by the following statement from an editorial in the *Christian Statesman* of December 11, 1884:—

“Whenever they [the Roman Catholics] are willing to co-operate in resisting the progress of political atheism, we will gladly join hands with them.”

What the *Statesman* designates as “political atheism,” is nothing more nor less than the present form of government and the present Constitution of the United States. To oppose National Reform is to them sheer atheism; and to

oppose the kind of government, which they indorse is political atheism. That no religious test shall be required of a civil ruler, is declared by Rev. M. A. Gault to be “the infidel theory of government” (*Statesman, December 24, 1885*). The theory of government taught in our national Constitution is declared by Rev. A. M. Milligan to be “the infidel theory” (*Speech in the New York Convention*).

The Statesman of December 1, 1884, further says:—

“We cordially, gladly, recognize the fact that in South American republics, and in France and other European countries, the Roman Catholics are the recognized advocates of national Christianity, and stand opposed to all the proposals of secularism. . . . In a world’s conference for the promotion of national Christianity, many countries could be represented only by Roman Catholics.”

It is beyond question, therefore, that what the Statesman means is, that whenever the Roman Catholics are willing to co-operate with the National Reformers in the scheme for the establishment of national Christianity in the United States, the National Reformers “will gladly join hands with them.” But the Roman Catholics are always ready to co-operate in that thing. That is one of Rome’s clearest characteristics. Rome hates our present form of government and our present Constitution as heartily as do the National Reformers. Rome, too, would readily enough brand our present system of government as “political atheism,” if the National Reformers had not already done it for her. And every body may rest assured that the National Reformers will have the pleasure of “gladly” joining hands with Rome, just as soon as they shall have gained a position of sufficient importance to make it to the interest of Rome to join hands with them. In fact, this is exactly what Roman Catholics are commanded to do. In his Encyclical Letter published in 1885, Pope Leo XIII says:—

“All Catholics should do all in their power to cause the constitutions of States, and legislation, to be modeled on the principles of the true church, and all Catholic writers and journalists should never lose sight, for an instant, from the above prescriptions.”

From the foregoing quotations from the Statesman, it is seen, that in European and South American countries the Roman Catholics are the recognized advocates of national Christianity; National Christianity is the object of the National Reform movement; our Constitution and legislation have to be remodeled before this national Christianity can be established; to remodel our Constitution and legislation in the aim of National Reform; but this is exactly what “all Catholics” are by the Pope *ex cathedra* commanded to do, all, and not to lose sight of it, for an instant. Therefore, what the National Reformers propose to do with our Constitution and legislation is precisely what the Roman Catholics in this country are commanded by the Pope to do. Therefore the aim of National Reform and the aim of Rome are identical; and why should they not “gladly join hands”?

But that the National Reformers will gladly join hands with Rome, is not all of the story—not near all. They actually and deliberately propose to make overtures to Rome for co-operation. They actually propose to make advances, and repeated advances, and even to suffer rebuffs, to gain the help of Rome in their Romish scheme of “National Christianity.” Proof of this is in the Christian Statesman of August 31, 1881, where Rev. Sylvester F. Scovel, a leading National Reformer, says:—

“This common interest [“of all religious people in the Sabbath”—Sunday] ought both to strengthen our determination to work, and our readiness to co-operate in every way with our Roman Catholic fellow-citizens. We may be subjected to some rebuffs in our first proffers, and the time is not yet come when the Roman Church will consent to strike hands with other churches—as such; but the time has come to make repeated advances, and gladly to accept co-operation in any form in which they may be willing to exhibit it. It is one of the *necessities* of the situation.”

Notice, the advances are all on the side of the National Reformers. They are not only willing to make advances, but are willing to be subjected to “rebuffs,” and, being rebuffed, to make “repeated advances,” to overcome the coquetry and gain the treacherous favor of “the mistress of witchcrafts.” And why this willingness? Because “it is one of the *necessities* of the situation”—and the italics are his. Shades of Wycliffe, and Luther, and Zwingle, and Milton, and Wesley, and of all the martyrs! was there ever in the world a more humiliating, a more contemptible surrender to the papacy? How many of the American people are ready to join in it? But know of a surety that every one who joins in the National Reform movement thereby joins in a scheme for the delivery of this free land into the hand of the Papacy. Just here, please read again the quotations from Dr. Strong’s book, at the beginning of this article, and see whether the National Reformers, in joining hands with Rome, do not equally with Rome show themselves the enemies of the United States Government, and of American institutions—the enemies of human right and human liberty.

It is true, as Mr. Scovel says, the National Reformers now receive somewhat cool treatment, and perhaps sense rebuffs. The Catholic Church does not to any considerable extent directly aid in the National Reform movement. She is too crafty for that. She knows, as well as they, that “it is one of the necessities of the situation,” and she is determined to have the surrender come from them. We personally know a gentleman, who, riding in the railroad not long since, fell into conversation with a Catholic priest, and finally said to him, “What is your church going to do with the Religious Amendment movement? are you going to help it forward? are you going to vote for it?” “Oh,” said the priest, “we have nothing to do with that. We leave that to the Protestants, we let them do all that. They are coming to us, and we only have to wait.”

And when in December, 1855, the demand for a national Sunday law reached the point at which it was supported by six millions of petitioners, Cardinal Gibbons came out with a letter to Dr. Wilbur F. Crafts, the leader of the Protestant side, heartily endorsing the national Sunday bill, and gladly adding his name to the number of petitioners. And on the strength of the Cardinal's letter, Dr. Crafts and the W. C. T. U. added seven million two hundred thousand Catholics to the six million names already obtained.

Such is the attitude of the Catholic Church at present; and as the National Reformers find themselves more in need of help, and when, by repeated advances, and in spite of repeated "rebuffs," they have come to her and made the proper surrender, she will let her power and influence be felt. Let the Reformers do the work, as they are doing, and bring the matter to the point of being voted upon, then there will be found at the polls every Catholic voter its the United States whom the political priests can rule, casting his ballot for the Religious Amendment, which, in the words of the Pope, will "cause the Constitution of" the United "States, and legislation, to be modeled on the principles of the true Church," and by which, as the Archbishop of St. Louis says, "heresy and unbelief" will become "crimes," and will be "punished as crimes," as in the Christian countries" of Italy and Spain.

It may be of interest to inquire, What was the subject which drew from Mr. Scovel this expression of willingness, if not anxiety, to gain the co-operation of Rome? He was writing of a movement of the Catholic Church in Europe, for the strict observance of Sunday; and it is to compel everybody to keep Sunday that the National Reformers want the Constitutional Amendment, and legislation under it. Now as the Catholics in Europe are earnestly engaged in it, the question occurs to the National Reformers: "Why shall we not join hands with the Catholics in America, so that we can win? True it is, we may be subjected to some rebuffs in our first proffers, for time has not come when the Roman Church will strike hands with other churches—as such; but the time has come for us to make repeated advances and gladly accept co-operation in any form in which they may be willing to exhibit it. It is one of the necessities of the situation. For without the help of Rome, we cannot compel people to keep Sunday. But if we can enlist with us the powerful hand, and the masterly organization, of Rome, our success is assured." That is the sum and substance of this proposition of the National Reformers.

### **SOLD INTO THE HANDS OF ROME**

Then, when the time comes for the enforcement of the laws which they now demand, what is to hinder the Catholics from assisting in the work, and that, too, is the Catholic way? Every priest in the United States is sworn to root out heresy. And Monsignor Capel, in our cities and at our very doors, defends the "Holy Inquisition." And when, by Constitutional Amendment, the refusal to observe Sunday becomes heresy that can be reached by the law, what then is to hinder the Catholics from acting a prominent part in rooting out the heresy? Certainly when the National Reformers shall

have been compelled by the necessity of the situation to call on the Catholics for help to make the laws, it would not be in their power, even were it in their disposition, to repeal the laws independent of the Catholics; so there would then be nothing left but the enforcement of the laws—by Catholics, if by nobody else. This view of the case alone ought to be sufficient to arouse every Protestant, and every American, to the most uncompromising opposition to the National Reform party.

It is of no use for the National Reformers to say that they will not allow the Catholics to do these things. For when the National Reformers, to gain the ends which they have in view, are compelled by "the necessities of the situation" to unite with Rome, having, by the help of Rome, gained those ends, it will be impossible, without the help of Rome, to make them effective, or to reverse them, or to hinder Rome from making them effective in her own way. When the thing is done, it will be too late to talk of not allowing this or that. The whole thing will then be sold into the hands of Rome, and there will be no remedy.

In a resolution at a meeting in Glasgow, Scotland, October 5, 1875, Dr. Joseph. P. Thompson well declared that "the papacy, as exemplified in the Vatican Decrees, is the most perfected of all existing forms of tyranny" (*Our Country*, page 50). And Lord Macaulay made no mistake when he wrote the following:—

"It is impossible to deny that the polity of the church of Rome is the very masterpiece of human wisdom. ... The experience of twelve hundred eventful years, the ingenuity and patient care of forty generations of statesmen, have improved that polity to such perfection that, among the contrivances which have been devised for deceiving and oppressing mankind, it occupies the highest place."— *Essays*, Von Ranke.

And it is into the power of this "most perfected of all existing forms of tyranny;" it is into the hands of this mistress of human deception and oppression, that the National Reformers deliberately propose to surrender the United States Government and the American people. But just as surely as the American people allow the National Reform party, or anything else, out of seeming friendship for Christianity, or for any other reason, to do this thing, they are undone.

Many people think that those who are directing attention to the dangers of religious legislation, are exerting themselves to no purpose, some claiming that there is no possibility of the success of National Reform, and others declaring that there is no danger if it does succeed. But as the National Reform party is allied with Rome, there is danger. Then put with this the almost universal demand for more rigorous laws, more vigorously enforced, for the stricter religious observance of Sunday, the very thing above all others at which the National Reform movement aims—and the danger is increased, and is imminent. In view of these facts, there is great danger that through the sophistry of the National Reform arguments, thousands upon thousands of people who favor

Sunday laws will be induced, with ill-informed zeal, to support the National Reform movement, and so they and the whole nation be delivered into the hands of Rome. There is danger in the National Reform movement. We know it; and by the evidences we here give in their own words, it is high time that the American people began to realize it.

If the National Reformers and the Catholics, or any others, want to keep Sunday, let them do it. If they have not religion enough to lead them to do it without the aid of civil laws to compel themselves to do it, then let them have laws to compel themselves to do it. But Heaven forbid that they

shall ever succeed in securing the laws that they ask, by which they will compel others to do it. And we do most devoutly pray, God forbid, that they shall ever succeed in their scheme of putting into the hands of Rome the power to enforce religious laws and to correct heresy. God forbid that they shall ever succeed in making free America a slave to Rome.

The success of the National Reform movement will be the success of Rome. Therefore, to support the National Reform movement, is to support Rome. How many of the American people are ready to enter into the National Reform scheme?

A. T. JONES, April 15, 1889

<sup>1</sup> The Nation Reform Party has been known by many names and still exists today under the name of “The National Reform Association,” and can be found at [www.nationalreformassociation.weebly.com/](http://www.nationalreformassociation.weebly.com/)

The following description of this association is from Wikipedia:

“**The National Reform Association** (NRA), formerly known as the **National Association to Secure the Religious Amendment of the United States Constitution**, is an organization that seeks to introduce a Christian amendment to the U.S. Constitution in order to make the United States a Christian state. Founded in 1864, the National Reform Association included representatives from eleven Christian denominations as well as the official support of a number of Churches. It publishes a magazine called *The Christian Statesman*.”

You can find their modern articles archived at the Internet Archive, at the following link:

<https://web.archive.org/web/20050205031353/http://www.natreformassn.org/index.html>

It is interesting to note to what extent the present form of American government is a reaction to the abuses of the papacy of years gone by:

- The U.S. has a constitution that protects the rights of the minority:
- Its government is of the people, by the people, and for the people:
- All public offices are filled through either free elections or appointment by duly elected officials:
- Its government has a separation of powers, so that a single person or entity is not the absolute executive, legislative, and judicial ruler:
- The laws of the U.S. include impeachment proceedings for officials gone awry.

Have the principles of the papacy changed? Does it now have a constitution that protects the minority? Does its system of government now have a separation of powers, impeachment proceedings, and free elections? If not, if there have been no changes and no reforms, what impediment exists to prevent a revival of the abuses of the past? Just a promise? Can it really be so that in this modern era of civil and religious freedoms that the head of Vatican City is still an absolute dictator for life, accountable to no one, unelected by the people?

The very fact that after so many centuries there are still no safeguards in place to prevent the abuses of the past from occurring again gives us no assurance...

—*The above excerpt was taken from [www.ellenwhite.info/rome\\_world\\_dominion\\_4.htm](http://www.ellenwhite.info/rome_world_dominion_4.htm)*