

One-Man Power

BY ALONZO T. JONES.

The Spirit of Combine.

TO-DAY many remarkable things are occurring, and so openly before the eyes of all that every thoughtful person is compelled to query, What do these things mean? One, among the most remarkable of these remarkable things of to-day, may be best defined as the universal spirit of combine. Everywhere, among all classes, and in all lines of effort, there prevails this spirit of combine.

This spirit of combine is not merely *an extension* of the sound principle of cooperation or unity of action of individuals acting collectively toward a common purpose. It is not, in any sense, the principle of cooperation or unity of action of individuals acting as such, collectively toward a common purpose. It is instead the principle of *one mind*, of *one individual*, dominating all others possible, and using all these

2

to the *one purpose* of *that one mind* or individual.

This truth and this distinction are demonstrated in the universally-known fact that the first effect of this spirit is to deny, to override, and to crush out, all right and all freedom of the individual; as instanced in the trust, whether it be the Standard Oil Trust, the Steel Trust, or a fruit trust. Whatever business is may be that is comprehended in the trust, no individual is allowed to do anything in that line of trade except as the servant of the trust, and absolutely subject to the dictation of the trust. If the "combine" takes the form, not of the trust as such, but of the labor union, then no individual is allowed to work, except as the servant of the union and under the absolute dictation of the union.

The second effect of this spirit, wherever entertained, is to destroy all individuality of the individual himself; so that he can not do the simplest and easiest thing, a thing the virtue of which

consists entirely in its being individually done, unless a combine, a club, or a society, is first created, and he do that simple and easy individual thing in the name and by the power of the combine. If, for instance, a person wants to rest one day in the week, he insists that he can not rest unless everybody else rests at the same time; and so a combine must be formed, requiring everybody to rest when he wants to, so that he can rest because they do. A member of the

3

church knows that it is only plain, simple Christianity to visit and help the afflicted, the poor, and the needy; and he knows that this is what the church is for; yet he can not do this simple Christian thing as an individual Christian; but must first form within the church a combine, called a "band" or a "society," for the purpose, and then do it in the name of this combine, and because the combine requires it.

Another effect, and the direct logic of the *combine*, is a *one-man power*. This is to-day manifest on every hand; the head of the trust can dictate daily what the whole people shall pay for their sugar, their kerosene, their nails, etc; the head of the union can dictate just what the employer shall do, and how he shall conduct his business, or whether he shall conduct it at all. In the railroad strike of 1894, that reached from Buffalo to San Francisco. It occurred that two governors of sovereign states could not travel on official business within their own respective states without permission of the one-man head of the strike combine, who dominated from Chicago the greater part of the whole country of the United States.

The logic of a one-man power is always a despotism. This is certain, because of the nature of man himself. And it has proved so universally true that it is universally understood. Indeed, it was the character of the rule of the *man* who held the innocent *office* of *despot* that gave to that word its terrible meaning.

4

The logic of a one-man power is a despotism, and it is a despotism in all relations, religious as well as other. This, too, is

inevitable, because, as we have already seen, the spirit of the combine is the spirit that leads one mind to usurp the place and power of God over the minds, the rights, the persons, and the property of others, and by force compel them to his one purpose. And as it is certain that a man in the place of God will always act unlike God, it is also certain that his power will always be exerted in compelling that his power will always be exerted in compelling them to do things contrary to the righteousness of God. This has been the unvarying history of it from the mighty despotism of Nimrod, the first that arose since the Flood, to be partly but growing ones of to-day. For Nimrod was not only a mighty hunter of beasts, but of men, also. He pursued and compelled men to recognize his authority in all things; they must worship as he dictated, and his example has been invariably followed. It was followed by Pharaoh, by Nebuchadnezzar, by Darius, by the Cesars, and by the popes.

It never has failed, and it never will fail, that a one-man power develops a despotism, and a despotism in religion as well as other affairs of life. And those who disregarded the spirit of the combine and maintained their individual integrity, have always been in the right, and are the true heroes of the ages.

5

Abraham disregarded the spirit and power of the combine established by Nimrod, and maintained his individual integrity with God; and God vindicated him, called him out of it unto an eternal reward, and made him an example unto all men, "the father of all them that be of faith," and "the friend of God."

Moses did it in Egypt. God maintained his cause, delivered him and his whole people from it, made him the greatest legislator of all times, and took him to an eternal reward.

In the face of a blazing furnace of sevenfold heat the three Hebrews did it in the presence of Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon. God vindicated their course, preserved them in the midst of the fire, brought them forth unscathed, changed the king's word, and made the circumstance a lesson to all kings and all combines forever.

Daniel did it individually alone in the presence of the Medo-Persian combine and the den of hungry lions. God vindicated him, because of his "innocency" in the matter, and again made the individual an example to all men, and the circumstance a lesson to all one-man powers and combines, forever.

John the Baptist did it, Jesus Christ did it, Stephen did it, all the apostles and early Christians did it, *not in a "combine," but wholly as individuals*, each for himself alone, in disregard of the greatest one-man power, and so the greatest despotism, of all ancient times.

John Wycliffe, John Huss, and Martin Luther did it against the greatest one-man power, and

6

so the greatest despotism, of all time, ancient or modern.

These are the ones who have kept alive liberty and the rights of mankind through the ages, and have saved the world from being engulfed long ago in the vortex of unmitigated despotisms.

Self-government and the Combine.

When from Nimrod onward the despotism, the combine, of a one-man power, had afflicted the world for a long series of ages, there arose a people who renounced all that as akin to it, and established a *government of the people*. They threw off all kingship, and declared that they needed no such figment to govern them, but that they were capable of governing themselves, and so established a government of the people, by the people, and for the people—individual self-government, the republic of Rome. They were right. The principle was sound, and the government was a grand success—*while the people really governed themselves*. But the grandeur of their success brought results which caused the Roman people to lose the faculty of governing themselves; and the government fell to cliques, coteries, and combines. These presently merged in the first triumvirate—government by a special three.

And who were these three?—One of them was the chief capitalist, the head of the trusts, the combines of capital, of the

empire; another was the pride of the populace, and the combines of the unions and of the envious crowd; and the

7

third was the pride of the army;—Crassus, Cesar, and Pompey. These three men sat down together and agreed that nothing should be done in the Roman State but by their consent. This held for awhile, but Crassus was killed in a battle. Pompey was afterward killed, and Cesar alone was the government—a one-man power. But a one-man power was dreaded. Cesar was murdered to escape it. But immediately a new triumvirate was formed: Antony, Octavius, and Lepidus. Lepidus was soon shelved; Antony and Octavius fought the battle of Actium; Antony was defeated and shortly afterward committed suicide; and Octavius was the government—a one-man power which permanently remained and which became the most terrible despotism ever till then known. This one-man power, its despotism, and its empire sank in annihilating ruin by the floods of barbarians from the forests of Germany, and upon that ruin was built the one-man power of the Papacy, the completed combine and the greatest despotism ever known on earth.

The barbarians established kingdoms in Western Europe. And again there was a long series of kingships expanding into empire, with their consequent tyranny, though these tyrannies were so far overtopped by the one greatest of all tyrannies—the Papacy—that they were but slightly felt in comparison. Then after that series of ages of kingships and imperialism there arose another people who cast off all kingship and

8

established a government of the people. They declared that men are capable of governing themselves, and that, therefore, governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. Accordingly, they established a government of the people, by the people, for the people—individual self-government, the republic of the United States. These men were right. These principles are sound. The government was a grand success so long as the people governed themselves.

But how many of the people of the United States to-day are self-governing? And it must not be forgotten that the majority is, in effect, the government. In a government of the people, when a majority fail to govern themselves, the government is gone. In the world of business and traffic in the United States to-day, how many of the people are governing themselves in their own business?—The vast majority are governed by the trusts. In the world of labor to-day, how many of the people govern themselves?—The vast majority are governed by the unions. In the realm of government itself in the United States, in politics, how many of the people govern themselves?—Almost the whole body of them are governed by "the party," by "the machine," by "the boss," and according to "the state."

Then where is self-government in the United States to-day? Where is government of the people in this "government of the people" to-day—It is absolutely gone; gone to the combines—

9

to the business combines, the labor combines, and the political combines. And do not forget that the logic of the combine, of *whatever sort*, is a one-man power. And how far are we from this even now?—The condition of things in this nation to-day is such that in a crisis any day the head of the trust, the head of the unions, and the chief of the national, political machine, can form a triumvirate as quietly and as absolute as was that of Crassus, Cesar, and Pompey. And of such a triumvirate the only outcome that there can be is a one-man power.

And even for this outcome the way is already blazed. The great coal strike in the summer of 1892 brought the nation to the brink of such danger as could not possibly be risked. As a government the state of Pennsylvania failed. There was no way by which the national government could constitutionally reach the case. Then he, who is the head of the national government, intervened—*not as head of the government*, but only as "a private citizen." And when he intervened only as "a private citizen," his intervention was promptly accepted and every suggestion was respected—*not because he was a private citizen*, but *wholly because he is head of the national*

government. If he had been indeed only a private citizen, he would not then been listened to for a moment; any more than were the many other private citizens, who had offered suggestions. Therefore, here is an instance of the head of the national government,

10

in a case of a national danger, acting only as a private citizen, yet with all the prestige of the head of the government; an instance in which official and constitutional government is left behind by the head of the government, yet that same head of the government, acting as a private citizen with all the prestige of official and constitutional head of the government. This is nothing else than in principle the direct intimation of a one-man power.

This is not to say nor in any way to intimate that this has been in any way intended, nor that President Roosevelt would intentionally do such a thing to any extent. It is not in any way to criticize what he did. It is only a study of the principle that is *in* what has been done. And this is the principle. And these great strikes, with their consequent complications, are not by any means over with. Indeed, things have now only fairly begun. A victory has been gained that will be pushed to the utmost limit. Other such strikes with their perplexing complications will certainly arise. Other men will occupy the place of head of the national government. They too, will act "as private citizens," yet with the prestige of head of the government. They, too, will act "pas private citizens," yet with the prestige of head of the government, but with the important difference that over the course where President Roosevelt cautiously, and, as it were, tremblingly, felt for the way for his feet, the other man will, on horseback and in fully panoply, ride rough shod.

And what a fearful pass it is to which this

11

nation has already come, when the only escape from a ruinous danger is the taking of a course that carries in its train ruinous danger; in other words, when the only escape from ruinous danger is a *mere* temporary palliative?

The Papacy and the Combine.

As in this consequence of the coal strike there has already been blazed the way to a one-man power, so also in it there has appeared even in sight the religious despotism that attaches to the one-man power. In the choosing of the commission to settle the coal strike, it was stipulated that the commission should consist of five men, each chosen from a certain calling that would make him in a sense an expert. However, when the five had been chosen, the President went beyond this, and added a sixth member. This sixth member was added "as a commission to the strikers." And who should be he but Bishop Spaulding, of the Catholic Church, for the reason that he "should be an imminent Roman Catholic prelate, nearly all of the miners being adherents of the Catholic Church." In addition to this, the President appointed a recorder to the commission. And this recorder was a man who "freely admits his admiration for the magnificent organization of the Roman Church and his appreciation of its strong and elevating influence upon artisans and wage-earners," and who "has been for many years an active teacher in the economic department

12

of the great Catholic university at Washington." In addition to all this, the President appointed two assistant recorders, and one of the two "is professor of political economy at the Catholic university, located near Washington."

And yet even this does not exhaust the list of Catholic influences connected with the commission, so that it is safe to say that the Catholic Church held the dominating influence in connection with that commission which originally was to consist of five men chosen from specific callings. Under the circumstances, with "nearly all the miners being adherents of the Catholic Church," and they being one of the principals in the controversy; and with the large Catholic influence attached to the commission; it was in no small degree simply the Catholic Church arbitrating her own cause and settling her own case.

And when thus stands her power and her influence at the very outset, in the very nature of things her power in these things will grow as these troubles grow upon the government, and when from it all there is developed the inevitable one-man power, there will she be close beside him, the same perpetual Papacy. This is not to say that the Papacy herself will be the one-man power. It is only to say that she will be the inspiration and the directing voice of that which, apart from her personally, will be the one-man power.

Yet this power and influence which she has

13

gained and will hold in connection with the strikes, combines, and complications is only a part of the true standing of the Papacy in connection with the United States Government of to-day.

The opening of the Spanish-American War presented to the Papacy a grand opportunity, which she instantly seized, and which she has been working to the utmost at every stage of proceedings since. The entanglement of the question of the friars in the Philippines she so worked as to draw the national government one official communication with the papal government in Rome. She secured a commission from the United States Government to be sent to Rome to deal with the Papacy on her own ground in the Vatican. This commission consisted of three persons,—Governor Taft, of the Philippine Islands; Bishop O'Gorman, of the Catholic Church; and Attorney James F. Smith, a Roman Catholic and associate justice of the Supreme Court of the Philippines. That is to say, the United States Government and the Papacy are two parties to a controversy or negotiation. The United States Government sends a commission of three to represent the United States, and two of the three are themselves Papists. This, then, was nothing else than another instance in which the Papacy is professedly dealing for the United States Government simply deals with herself. For is there anybody in the world so obtuse as not to be able to dis-

14

cern that the papal two-thirds of that commission sent to deal with the Papacy would inevitably work for the interests of the Papacy

first of all? that they would represent the Papacy instead of the United State?

This two-thirds papal commission went duly to Rome, and entered upon negotiations with the Papacy; with the result that the question in controversy was relegated to Manila as the place of the further consideration of it, and Governor Taft and the papal apostolic delegate, Mgr. Guido, as the persons to conduct the further negotiations, with "the Philippine Government expressly recognizing the official character of Mgr. Guido, and has pledged itself, over Mr. Taft's signature, to treat with him as a duly-accredited representative of the Holy See." And this is but the recognition of the papal government by the United States Government in her Philippine possessions and jurisdiction.

In the negotiations Governor Taft proposed four articles as a basis of procedure and settlement. One of these articles proposed a tribunal of arbitration composed of five members, two to be appointed by the pope, two by the Philippine Government, and the fifth to be chosen by "an indifferent person, like the governor-general of India." By the Papacy these four articles were expanded to *twelve*; and this particular *one* was so changed as to have that arbitration board composed thus: "Two shall be named by the Holy See, two by the Philippine Government,

15

and the fifth by the common accord of the same four; and if such accord can not be reached, *his holiness the pope* and *the President of the United States* shall come to an understanding as to the choice of said fifth member." Negotiations were at this point abruptly broken off, so that the matter went no further. But this one item shows plainly enough how ready is the Papacy to set traps by which she shall involve the United States Government in such a way that it shall be caused to work hand in hand with the Papacy in behalf of the Papacy. If that proposition had been accepted, can anybody believe that the *four* would ever have agreed upon the fifth members, when the alternative was that the pope and the President of the United States should work together in the matter, thus becoming a union of the United States and the Papacy?

The School Question.

Another item in this papal entanglement is the school question in the Philippines. The Papacy claims the sole right of controlling and conducting education in the Philippines; and at the same time here the schools supported from the public treasury; in other words, to have the Papacy, a union of the Church and the State, supported by the United States. Governor Taft claims the right of the American principle of separation to prevail in the Philippines and not in the school matter there. The papal

16

plea is represented in the following documents:—

Cincinnati, July 10, 1902.

Rev. Dear Father: Should you be willing to do so, kindly sign your name to the enclosed memorial and return it as soon as possible to the Chancery, stating at the same time the number of Catholics under your care. The document has already been signed by the Rt. Rev. Bishop of Hartford, and the 282 priests of his diocese, and probably by many others.

Wm. Henry Elder,
Archbishop of Cincinnati.

Cincinnati, July 10, 1904.

To His Excellency, Theodore Roosevelt,
President of the United States:—

The undersigned, the clergy of the diocese of Cincinnati, in their own name, and in the name of 200,000 Catholics of the diocese, would respectfully beg to lay before your excellency the following memorial bearing upon the Philippine schools:—

Your excellency is aware that the Filipino people, in so far as they are Christians at all, are members of our communion. For three hundred years they have committed the education of their children to the care of religious teachers. To the training thus imparted the natives owe their present status as a civilized and Christian people. We respectfully submit that, in our judgment, the abrupt and complete breaking away from this system of education, and the adopting of another entirely devoid of

religious coloring, coupled with the violent disruption of venerable traditions which must necessarily ensue, would

17

be a grave hindrance to their progress in civilization, and impede unnecessarily our peaceful and successful government of the archipelago.

We respectfully submit that the clause of the Constitution which requires the absolute separation of Church and State was intended by the framers of the document to meet the conditions in the United States of America, and not those which obtain in the Orient and among a people unanimously of one form of religious belief.

And the Catholic paper from which these documents are copied, the *Church Progress*, of St. Louis, enforces the plea of the documents with the following editorial endorsement:—

While our government has been far from doing the right thing by way of recognizing American Catholics in the Philippines, we believe justice will eventually prevail. For that the demand of fifteen million American Catholics is somewhat of a guarantee. It is one which no administration dare ignore.

Against Governor Taft's holding to the American principle of separation of Church and State, the Papacy sets up the argument: "The Constitution of the United States does not apply in the Philippines." And since that is exactly what the Supreme Court has decided, who can deny the legality of the papal contention? And since the Papacy has the highest possible legal basis for her claim that the Constitution does not apply in the Philippines, she holds distinct vantage ground in her claim that the system that has prevailed there for three hundred years shall

18

continue; and that is the papal system, with the splendid addition that the authority of the United States Government is now included in the papal system. And that this shall be firmly *secured*, she proposes to swing, *in the United States itself*, the political power of "the demand of fifteen million American Catholics"—"a guarantee" "which no administration dare ignore."

In addition to "this demand of fifteen million of American Catholics," "which no administration dare ignore;" and as a further strong security that her system and conniving will and shall prevail in the Philippine school matter; is the significant fact that that Hon. James F. Smith, who was half of that two-thirds papal commission of the United States to the Vatican, was, upon his return from that commission, appointed by the President of the United States a "member of the Philippine commission and *Secretary of Public Instruction* in the Government of the Philippine Islands." And this simply puts into her hands the whole control of the school question in the Philippines. And what possible prospect can there be of Governor Taft alone stemming that papal tide in the Philippines, when that tide is so industriously fed, not only from Rome, but from Washington itself?

What Do These Things Mean?

No, that tide will surely engulf not only the Philippines, but the United States. Eleven years ago the Papacy published in the United States

19

that "what the Church has done for others, she will now do for the United States." Ten years ago she gave by Satolli her official commission to the Catholics of the United States to bring their country into immediate contact with the papal church. And by every possible means this is being done; and her success in the scheme is remarkable. And through the success of this scheme she proposes to lift herself again to supremacy in Europe and the world, and so dominate "all humanity."

And she will succeed in that world scheme so certainly as she is succeeding in her scheme to dominate the United States as the preliminary to that world scheme. And so it is written in the Scriptures: "These kings are of one mind in surrendering their power and authority to the beast." "For God put it into their minds to carry out His purpose, in carrying out their common purpose and surrendering their kingdom to the beast, until God's decrees

should be executed." Rev. 17:14, 17, Twentieth Century New Testament.

And when she gets again world power and supremacy, what will she do with it? How will she use it?—She will do with it just what she did before. She will use it just as she did before,—to compel "all humanity" to do her bidding, and whoever will not do it will incur her wrath in persecution, boycott, and inquisition, unto death. And the one thing in which has always centered her will to be conformed to by all peo-

20

ple, without distinction, is the recognition of Sunday as the day of rest for all. This she will enforce upon all the world by all the power of the world. And every movement of any sort in behalf of Sunday as the rest day is a direct play into the hands of the Papacy; it is a direct helping forward of the papal domination of the world.

And this is the religious despotism of the one-man power that is the logic and the culmination of the universal spirit of combine that prevails to-day. And when she finds herself once more at the head of the world, she exultingly congratulates herself: "I sit here a queen; no widow am I; I shall never know misery." But her exultation will be short-lived this time, thank the Lord. For the Lord's own response to her note of triumph is, "Therefore in one day shall these curses befall her—death, misery, and famine, and she shall be utterly destroyed by fire." And the kings of the earth that surrendered their power and authority to her, hoping that she should be the means of bringing to their kingdoms help and peace from the confusion and anarchy that her own elements had caused—these same kings, in their infinite disappointment and vain humiliation, "will all hate the prostitute, and cause her to become deserted and strip her bare; they will eat her very flesh and destroy her with fire."

Then, in the midst of the anarchy and destruction that is the result of all this, the Lord Jesus

21

appears in the clouds of heaven with true power and infinite glory. And in their blindness and anarchistic confusion the beast and all

the kings of the earth turn to make war even against Him. "They will fight with the Lamb, but the Lamb will conquer them, for He is Lord of lords and King of kings, and those who are on His side . . . will share His victory."

And so the meaning of the things that are ocurrent to-day, and the outcome of the combines that are prevalent everywhere, and in all things, is the religious despotism of a one-man power of the Papacy restored to a short-lived supremacy, and then hurled down to eternal destruction and perdition. While for those who, with the other heroes of the ages, in their individual integrity, *refuse all that*, and stand in their individual integrity with God in Jesus Christ, the *sure outcome* is the rising to be with God in everlasting victory and eternal glory. For "those who are on His side . . . will share His victory."