

THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

VOL. XIII.

JANUARY, 1909.

No. 1.

“JERUSALEM, ROME, AND WASHINGTON.”

An Italian gentleman of pleasing address, his clean-shaven face beaming happiness and his piercing eyes kindling with the enthusiasm of hope and bright prospects, stood “before a highly distinguished audience” on the 30th of January, 1893. From the windows of the room in which he had come to speak the suave gentleman could have looked out, had he cared to do so, upon many an object dear to the hearts of citizens of the North American Republic. He might have been said to be standing in the shadow of the dome of the Capitol of the United States, and almost within harking distance of the Presidential Mansion. All around him could be observed the material evidences of the activities of a great government. The gentleman was fully conscious of his surroundings. He was pleased to know that he was exactly where he was. He loved and admired the beautiful American city on the Potomac. But his love was hardly that of the patriot, and his admiration differed from that of the tourist. He loved and admired the city, and the country which had made the city the seat of its government, not so much for what they were at the time of his address, but for what they would be, and what he ardently hoped to be instrumental in making them, within a measurable space of time.

The gentleman was a person of authority, but he was not independent. At the moment of which we are speaking he was representing a higher authority far away, and his remarks were inspired by that higher authority. In fact, he had been careful

CHURCH AND STATE.

MATT. 22, 21.

President Roosevelt, in a letter of November 8, 1908, says it is "narrow bigotry" to vote against a Roman Catholic for President; to say that a considerable number of men would do so, is to "fouly slander" them; that it is against the "first principles of his government;" "if you once enter on such a career, there is absolutely no limit at which you can legitimately stop."

We wish to deny these four statements of the President of the United States.

1. The limit is where a man's religion makes his politics subject to a foreign ruler. This is the case in the Roman Catholic religion.

2. If this be true, it is against the first principles of our government to vote for a Roman Catholic for President.

3. Therefore it is not narrow bigotry but enlightened patriotism to vote against a Roman Catholic for President.

4. As a matter of fact, a considerable number of American citizens are influenced by these considerations, and so the statement is the sober truth and not a foul slander.

Christ says, "My kingdom is not of this world," John 18, 36. The Pope says in effect, "My kingdom is of this world." Christ said to Peter, "Put up thy sword!" The Pope often drew the sword. Christ said, "Render unto Caesar the things

which are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's," Matt. 22, 21. The Pope renders neither to Caesar the things which are Caesar's, nor to God the things that are God's.

Lord Derby said Catholicism is "religiously corrupt and politically dangerous." (Acton, *Hist. of Freedom*, p. 189.) As Lutheran Christians we deal with the "religiously corrupt" Catholicism; as American citizens we deal with the "politically dangerous" Catholicism.

The Canon Law has been summarized by the Roman Catholic Professor von Schulte of Bonn; here are a few statements: "The Pope has the right to give countries and nations which are non-Catholic to Catholic regents, who can reduce them to slavery. — The Pope has the right to annul state laws, traditions, constitutions; and to absolve from obedience thereto, as soon as they seem detrimental to the rights of the Church, or those of the clergy." (*Die Geschichte der Quellen und Literatur des canonischen Rechts von Gratian bis auf Papst Gregor IX.* Stuttgart, 1875—80. 3 vols. Quoted in "Words of Help," Am. Tract Society, p. 258.)

The Jesuit Schrader in his *De Unitate Romana* says: "All papal measures, as regards their truth, belong to the order of faith, or morals, or law. All decrees, whatever their subject, always contain a true doctrine, whether speculative, moral, or juridical. But the Pope is infallible in the order of truth and doctrine, and therefore in all his decrees." (Quirinus, p. 124.)

It is a maxim of the Decretals that no oath against the interests of the Church is binding. But what is for the benefit of the Church the infallible Pope determines. (Quirinus, p. 51.)

"It belongeth to the Bishop of Rome to allow or disallow the Emperor after he is elected; and he may translate the empire from one region to another." (E. G. Man, p. 20.)

The Church has the right to use fines, fasts, prison, and blows against those that refuse obedience. (*Civiltà Cattolica* VII, 603; VIII, 42. 279—282. Hoensbroech, *Syllabus*, p. 97.)

Pope Paul IV (1555—1559) says: "All princes leaving the Catholic church at once lose their right as rulers and are

to be strangled or burned to death as heretics." (Hoensbroech, *Rom u. d. Zentrum*, p. 12.)

Francis Suarez, the greatest Jesuit theologian, says: "The papal power over kings includes the power to depose them. This is as certain as that the Church cannot err in matters of faith and morals." (Hoensbroech, *Syllabus*, p. 68.)

St. Thomas Aquinas would have made the papacy control all Christian governments. (Acton, *Hist. of Freedom*, p. 37.) Pope Leo XIII held up Thomas as an example for all Catholic scholars to study and follow.

Gregory VII began the disparagement of civil authorities by saying that they are the work of the devil. (Acton, *Hist. of Freedom*, p. 36.)

Gregory VII, who deposed princes and absolved their subjects from their oath of fealty, was actually of the opinion that princes had come into existence at the instigation of the devil, in order that from motives of blind greed and insufferable presumption they might aim at holding sway over those who were men like themselves. (*Epp.* VII, 21. Hase 2, 503.)

Pope Gregory VII, 1073: "We wish to show the world that we can take away from anyone and give to anyone kingdoms, duchies, counties, in short, the possessions of all men, for—we can bind and loose. Why should not he judge the world to whom is given the power to lock and unlock heaven?"

The same: "Without the Pope's ratification no civil and no canonical law is valid. The Pope alone has the right to use the imperial insignia; to him alone the secular princes owe it to kiss his feet; to him alone belongs the right to dethrone emperors and kings and to release their subjects from the oath of allegiance."

Pope Boniface VIII in November, 1302, in his notorious Decretal, the so-called Bull, *Unam Sanctam*, says: It is fitting that the temporal authority should be subject to the spiritual power, that is, that the Pope rule the king. "We define that every human creature is subject to the Roman Pontiff, and we pronounce this to be altogether necessary for salvation."

Bishop Fessler admits this is binding because the word "define" is used in it. (Littledale, p. 13; Hoensbroech, *Syllabus*.)

The Catholic Guggenberger's *General History of the Christian Era*, p. 431, says the doctrine of the *Unam Sanctam* had been maintained before Boniface VIII by Gregory VII, Alexander III, and Innocent III. The new *Catholic Encyclopedia* says Boniface VIII attempted to exercise his supreme authority in temporal affairs.

Pope Sixtus V, in 1590, placed the chief work of the Jesuit Cardinal Bellarmine on the Index of Prohibited Books because he denied that the Pope is the *direct* lord of the whole world. "Every acre or vineyard, or whatever is owned by anyone, is his property only through the Church."—"The Pope has the highest power to dispose of the worldly goods of all Christians." (Hoensbroech, *Syllabus*, pp. 51. 69. 71. 76.)

Pope Gregory IX said: "The Pope owns and rules every person and everything in the universe."

Pope Pius VII wrote: "The Church has decreed as punishment of a heretic confiscation of his property."—"Heretic monarchs are to be deprived of their principalities, and their subjects must be ordered to break their oath of allegiance." (B. Willard-Archer, *Characteristics of the Roman Church*.)

These were not idle claims. Gregory VII was the first pope to dethrone an emperor and to release the subjects from their oath of allegiance. He excommunicated Emperor Henry IV of Germany, and this hapless ruler had to travel over the Alps in winter to Canossa and in January stand barefooted and bareheaded, fasting three days from morning till evening, begging for mercy from the Pope, who enjoyed the sight from the palace windows and at last raised the ban. Later on Henry was banned once more and his people released from their oath of allegiance.

Since Pope Gregory VII (1073—1085) the popes have claimed authority over the whole world, also in all political matters.

Until the end of the sixteenth century the Pope claimed to be the "direct" lord of the whole world, of states, governments, princes, and nations. In a work dedicated to Pope John XXII and later to Pope Gregory XIII, Augustinus Triumphus says: "The Emperor is the servant of the Pope. Therefore he can be nominated and deposed by the Pope. The laws of the Emperors are not valid unless approved by the Pope." Aegidius Romanus teaches the same doctrine. (Hoensbroech, *Rom u. d. Zentrum*, p. 10.)

Pope John XXII repeatedly excommunicated Emperor Louis of Bavaria and declared him dethroned and his goods forfeited; his loyal lands were punished with the Interdict.

At the time of the Reformation Cardinal Bellarmine counted eighteen popes who had dethroned secular rulers, and seventeen emperors or kings whose crowns the popes would have robbed. As late as the nineteenth century Pius VII hurled the curse of his ban at Napoleon I.

Pope Gregory XIII offered a high place in heaven to any who would murder the Prince of Orange; and the poor wretch, Balthazar Gerard, who did the infamous deed, actually told his judges "that he would soon be a saint in heaven, and would have the first place there next to God," whilst his family received a patent of nobility and the estates of the Prince in the Franche Comté—rewards promised for the crime by Cardinal Granvella.

Pope Nicholas V in 1452 wrote to King Alfonso of Portugal: "We give to you, in the fullness of our apostolic power, free and limitless permission to attack and subdue Saracens, infidels, and enemies of Christ, to seize their principalities, territories, and possessions, and to reduce them to perpetual slavery."

These powers were confirmed by Calixtus III (1455—58) and Sixtus IV (1471—84). (B. W-A., p. 262.)

Pope Alexander VI, in 1493, in his infallible Bull *Inter Cetera*, as the Vicar of Christ, gave to Ferdinand and Isabella of Spain all of America, all islands and continents, discovered

and undiscovered, situated one hundred miles west and one hundred miles south of a certain line drawn from the North Pole to the South Pole, "to overthrow and subject all the inhabitants of those lands." The Spaniards killed and worked to death so many natives that Columbus fourteen years after his discovery computed that six-sevenths of the population had perished. (Hoensbroech, *Rom u. d. Zentrum*, p. 11. Quirinus, p. 506. B. W-A., p. 262.)

Pope Adrian IV gave Ireland to King Henry II of England. (Quirinus, p. 539.)

Pope Innocent III, in 1209, annulled Magna Charta, ordered Langton to excommunicate the recalcitrant barons, and on his refusal suspended Langton permanently from his office, excommunicated the barons himself, and laid the city of London under an Interdict. (Lingard's *History of England; Forefathers*, p. 240.) By such means King John of England lost his land, and therefore is known to history as John Lackland.

Up till 1533 the Pope treated England as his property. He called on King Henry VIII to appear and answer for his contumacy. On the King's refusal the Pope excommunicated him, declaring he had forfeited his throne and the allegiance of his subjects, and calling upon those subjects to rebel against him.

Pope Paul III arranged for the murder of King Henry and for the invasion of England, promising indulgences and other favors to any who would kill the English heretic. The Pope wrote to Henry: "It is in our power to dispose of thy sword and scepter to whom we please." (Robertson, pp. 134. 135; E. G. Man, p. 22.)

When Elizabeth became Queen of England, the fiery Pope Pius V in his Bull, *Regnans in excelsis*, on February 25, 1570, declared it was great boldness on her part to assume the crown without his consent, and we "do deprive the same Elizabeth of her pretended title to the kingdom . . . and we do command all and every . . . that they do presume not to obey her, and those who shall do the contrary, we do involve in the same sentence of anathema." John Felton was hanged as a traitor for

placing this bull on the gate of the palace of the Bishop of London. Pope Leo XIII selected this traitor as a martyr to beatify him in the jubilee year of Queen Victoria. According to Bishop Mandell Creighton, the result of this bull was that "the position of the English Romanist during the reign of Elizabeth was a perpetual choice between loyalty to the Queen and obedience to the Pope. . . . The recognition of the papal supremacy in things spiritual involved a political duty to deny the legitimacy of their Queen, and to disobey the law of their country."

The Roman Catholic Lord Acton, in a letter to the *London Times* on November 9, 1874, says that "a Pope who is famous in history as the author of the first crusade, decided that it is no murder to kill excommunicated persons," and that "this rule was incorporated in the Canon Law." "It has been for seven hundred years, and continues to be, a part of the ecclesiastical law." "The greatest legislator of the Mediaeval Church laid down this proposition—that allegiance must not be kept with heretical princes. . . . Pius V, the only Pope who has been proclaimed a saint for many centuries, having deprived Elizabeth, commissioned an assassin to take her life." (*Words of Help*, pp. 254—7. See also Hoensbroech, *Papsttum*, vol. I, p. 64.)

The Pope instigated the Ridolfi conspiracy for a Spanish invasion, having as his chief helper the Duke of Norfolk, who received a dispensation to pretend he was a Protestant, the better to further the infamous design. (Robertson, p. 135.)

As late as 1855 Bishop Raes of Strassburg harked back to this bull and called on Queen Victoria to take off her crown and give it to the rightful owner, the Pope in Rome. (Hoensbroech, *Rom u. d. Zentrum*, pp. 12. 13.)

Pope Pius V offered, as Froude tells us, "remission of sin to them and their heirs, with annuities, honors, and promotions, to any cook, brewer, baker, vintner, physician, grocer, surgeon, or others," who would make away with Queen Elizabeth.

In 1584 Pope Gregory XIII promised riches here and

heaven hereafter to any one who would make away with the heretical Queen. - (Robertson, p. 135.)

The Catholic Lord Acton wrote to Miss Mary Gladstone: "I will show you what Ultramontanism makes of good men by an example very near home. St. Charles Borromeo, when he was the Pope's nephew and Minister, wrote a letter requiring Protestants to be murdered, and complaining that no heretical heads were forwarded to Rome, in spite of the reward that was offered for them. His editor, with perfect consistency, publishes the letter with a note of approval. Cardinal Manning not only holds up to the general veneration of mankind the authority that canonized the murderer, but makes him in a special manner his own patron, joins the congregation of Oblates of St. Charles, and devotes himself to the study of his acts and the propagation of his renown."

In Lord Acton's eyes no defense was possible of the purport of the papal bull excommunicating Queen Elizabeth, or of the warm papal approval of the Massacr e of St. Bartholomew's Eve.

The writer of Lord Acton's obituary in *The Times* states that he had proved to a demonstration that Pius V specially employed an agent to assassinate Queen Elizabeth. (Sidney, pp. 261. 262.)

Cardinal Manning, in his *Unity of the Church*, p. 361, writes: "If any man will look down along the line of early English history, he will see a standing contest between the rulers of this land and the bishops of Rome. The Crown and the Church of England, with a steady opposition, resisted the entrance and encroachment of the secularized power of the Pope in England." (E. G. Man, p. 289.)

The temper of Innocent III and Boniface VIII is still the leading influence in the policy of the church, and the opportunity alone is wanting for it to revive in the nineteenth century the all-pervading tyranny which it exercised in the thirteenth. Even the separation of Church and State is condemned as heresy, and as the State is denied the privilege of defining

the limits of its own authority, and as the right of the Church to use force is asserted, it would be difficult to set bounds to the empire which is its rightful heritage, and of which it is deprived by the irreligious tendencies of the age. (Lea, *Celib.*, p. 639.)

The Jesuit commentator Cathrein calls attention to the similarity between the *Unam Sanctam* of Pope Boniface VIII and the *Immortale Dei* of November 1, 1885, of Pope Leo XIII. (Hoensbroech, *Rom u. d. Zentrum*, p. 36.)

The power claimed in an earlier day is claimed to-day; formerly they called it the "direct" power, now they call it the "indirect" power. It is another name; but what's in a name? The thing is the same.

Pope Pius IX in the *Syllabus* of December 8, 1864, says in the 24th Sentence, put positively: "The Church has the power to use external force and a temporal direct or indirect power." In Sentence 55 separation of Church and State is condemned. Sentence 77 condemns: "In our times it is no longer good to regard the Catholic religion as the only State religion and to exclude all other religions." Sentence 78 condemns: "It was well done legally to guarantee immigrants in certain Catholic countries the free exercise of their religion." (Hoensbroech, *Syllabus*, pp. 15—26.)

This *Syllabus* is absolutely binding on the conscience of every Catholic and must be obeyed under all circumstances. This doctrine of the *Syllabus* became a dogma of the Vatican Council of 1870, July 18, when the Pope was declared infallible in faith and morals. "Morals" includes the whole field of human actions, of individuals or nations, according to Antonelli, Papal Secretary of State. (Hoensbroech, *Rom u. d. Zentrum*, pp. 16. 17. 21.)

Pope Pius IX told a group of bishops he wished of course that Catholicism should have the benefit of toleration in England, and Russia, but the principle must be repudiated by a Church holding the doctrine of exclusive salvation. It seems he would have been satisfied with a decree confirming the

twenty-third article of the *Syllabus*, and declaring that no Pope has ever exceeded the just bounds of his authority in faith, in politics, or in morals. (Acton, *Hist. of Freedom*, p. 520.)

The bishops at the Vatican Council, "in requiring submission to papal decrees on matters not articles of faith, . . . were investing with new authority the existing bulls, and giving unqualified sanction to the Inquisition and the Index, to the murder of heretics and the deposing of kings." (Acton, *Hist. of Freedom*, p. 544.) The minority affirmed the Infallibility would drive devout men out of the Catholic Church and make Catholicism indefensible in controversy, that it would give governments apparent reason to doubt the fidelity of Catholics, and would give new authority to the theory of persecution and of the deposing power, that it was unknown in many parts of the Church, and was denied by the Fathers. (*Ibid.*, p. 546.) They declared it an absurd contradiction, founded on ignoble deceit. (*Ibid.*, p. 546.) When Bishop Strossmayer had spoken against the Infallibility, Ginault said to him, "You terrify me with your pitiless logic." (*Ibid.*, p. 536.)

In an address to the Literary Society of Rome, Pope Pius IX on July 20, 1870, claimed the right in view of his authority as Pope to depose kings and to absolve nations from their oath of allegiance to their rulers.

Pope Leo XIII in his Encyclical of June 29, 1881, teaches the same doctrine; so does Pope Pius X in his Encyclical of October 4, 1903, and in his Allocution of November 9, 1903. (Hoensbroech, *Syllabus*, pp. 105—108.)

Pope Pius X agrees with Boniface VIII, Pius IX, and Leo XIII. In his inaugural Encyclical of October 4, 1903, he refers to himself the words of Jer. 1, 10: "I have this day set thee over the nations and over the kingdoms, to root out, and to pull down, and to destroy, and to throw down, to build, and to plant." Boniface VIII in his *Unam Sanctam* referred this passage to himself, and the Catholic Bishop von Hefele in his *History of the Councils* (VI, p. 299) comments: "Whoever has the right to order, pull up, plant is the real ruler." In his

Allocution of November 9, 1903, Pius X says, "It is our duty to direct every individual, also the rulers, also in public, in social and in political matters. The Roman Pope cannot separate politics from his teaching office." (Hoensbroech, *Rom u. d. Zentrum*, p. 40.) In his *Motu Proprio* of 1903, Pope Pius X claims jurisdiction over the politics of Catholics. (*Ibid.*, pp. 41—74.)

Pope Pius IX, the dethroned Pope-King, robbed all Italian Catholics of the right to vote and to be voted for in his Decree *Non Expedit*. Leo XIII and Pius X confirmed it.

The theologian Molitor of Speyer defends the Pope's right to depose princes. "Gregory VII deposed King Boleslaus of Poland. His successors, Victor III, Urban II, Paschalis II, Gelasius II, Calixtus II, confirmed his deposition of Henry IV. Alexander III deposed Frederick Barbarossa; Innocent III, King John of England and Otto IV of Germany; Innocent IV, Emperor Frederick II; Clement VI, Louis the Bavarian; Paul II, King George of Bohemia; Pius V, Queen Elizabeth of England—confirmed by Gregory XIII; Sixtus V and Gregory XIV, King Henry of Navarre." (Hoensbroech, *Syllabus*, p. 109.)

The advocate of Bishop Rudiger of Linz, acting on instructions from Rome, declared in court that "A Catholic is bound by his very nature to be continually at variance with the laws of the State." (Hase II, p. 501.)

According to Doellinger, the rule of the Pope "imposes upon those who accept it the solemn obligation to violate civil law, to set themselves in opposition to the ordinances of Government whenever the Pope shall pronounce his infallible judgment against any one of those ordinances upon moral or religious grounds." Cardinal Manning has distinctly stated that the Pope's power, growing out of his infallibility, must be absolute "inasmuch as it can be circumscribed by no human or ecclesiastical law." (H. C. Pedder, *Shadow of Rome*, p. 63.)

The third *Schema* of the Vatican Council, "On the Church and the Pope," may be thus summed up: "The Christian world

consists simply of masters and slaves; the masters are the Italians, the Pope, and his Court, and the slaves are all bishops (including the Italians themselves), all priests, and all the laity. . . . Church and State are immutably connected, but in the sense that the Church's laws always hold good before and against the civil law; and therefore every Papal ordinance that is opposed to the Constitution and law of the land binds the faithful, under mortal sin, to disobedience to the Constitution and law of their country." (Quirinus, pp. 203. 204.)

The Cardinal Archbishop Rauscher of Vienna led a large number of bishops in an address to the Pope on April 20, 1870, opposing this dogma just because it contained the doctrine of Pope Boniface VIII in his Bull *Unam Sanctam* in which the Pope claims the God-given authority over all things in the world.

Pope Leo XIII (1878—1903) agrees with Pius IX and says in his Encyclical of January 10, 1890, the Pope is to be obeyed as God, and it is a moral duty to obey the Pope in political matters. (Hoensbroech, *Rom u. d. Zentrum*, pp. 21. 28. 29.)

The American bishops at the Vatican Council in 1870 ask how they are to live under the free Constitution of their Republic, and maintain their position of equality with their (Protestant) fellow-citizens, after committing themselves to the principles attested by Papal Infallibility, such as religious persecution and the coercive power of the Church, the claim of Catholicism to exclusive mastery in the State, the Pope's rights to dispense from oaths, the subjection of the civil power to his supreme dominion, etc. (Quirinus, p. 108.)

Cardinal Gibbons says: The Roman Catholic "Church is not susceptible of being reformed in her doctrine . . . it is perfect . . . incapable of reform." (*Faith of Our Fathers*, p. 91; quoted in Stearns's *Faith of Our Forefathers*, p. 51.)

What we have been, we shall be; what we have done, we shall do. Therefore we say with Stahl of Berlin: "The attitude of Protestantism towards Rome is that of the Borghese gladiator." (Doellinger, in Acton's *Hist. of Freedom*, p. 352.)

Mr. Ruskin's father said: "I take my stand on this, against all agitators in existence, that the Roman religion is totally incompatible with the British Constitution." (Robertson, p. VIII.)

The great English statesman William Pitt declared: "My unaltered opinion is, that so long as human nature and the Popish religion continue to be what I know they are, a conscientious Roman ecclesiastic never will become an attached subject to a Protestant State, and that the Popish clergy have a commanding influence on every member of that community." (*Life of W. Pitt*, by Lord Ashbourne, p. 296.)

In the *Vatican Decrees* Gladstone says that no man can become "a convert to Rome without renouncing his moral and mental freedom, and placing his civil loyalty and duty at the mercy of another;" and of such a man he says, he "intends, in case of any conflict between the Queen and the Pope, to follow the Pope, and let the Queen shift for herself." (pp. 6. 28. Murray, 1874.)

The Roman Catholic Prince Hohenlohe pointed out that the doctrine of infallibility of the Pope involved all those claims which cause collisions between Church and State, and threaten the liberty and security of governments. The *Syllabus* is in part directed against maxims of State. (Acton, *Hist. of Freedom*, p. 503. The ultramontanes drove Hohenlohe from office. (p. 505.)

On April 9, 1869, the Catholic Prince Hohenlohe, then prime minister of Bavaria and later Chancellor of the German Empire, sent a note to all governments, in which he says: "The sentences of the *Syllabus* are directed against the principles which are the basis of the public life as developed among civilized peoples." On June 30, 1871, Prince Bismarck said: "The *Syllabus* contains teachings, the carrying out of which on the part of the Catholic Church must necessarily lead to the shaking up of all worldly political power." (Hoensbroech, *Syllabus*, p. 122.)

Emperor William I of Germany, on February 18, 1874, said: "The rule of the Papacy has been compatible with the peace and prosperity of the people of no country of the world." (Hoensbroech, *Rom u. d. Zentrum*, p. 5.)

The Italian statesman Signor Crispi wrote in 1892: "To be a sincere Catholic, and a friend of Italy, is to the Italians a contradiction."

Graf Paul von Hoensbroech writes: "Jesuitism suppresses and even tends to annihilate all proper national feeling and true patriotism." It was partly for this reason that the Count quitted the Jesuit Order and the Catholic Church.

The King of Siam was one day driving with King Humbert in Rome, when a college of priests and their students passed, none of whom took off their hats, and the visitor asked for an explanation. When General Appellius explained the enmity of the Church to the State, the Siamese broke out: "But have you not here in Rome gibbets on which to hang them all? If they were in my country, I would soon clear them out. And it is said the Pope wants to recommend to my care his missionaries!" (Robertson, p. 146.)

Pope Leo XIII: "Why is it that Roman Catholic priests are hated by the Chinese?" "It is because of their assumption of political power," answered Sir Rutherford Alcock, on his way to China as a representative of England. (Robertson, p. 137.)

Not long ago Mr. F. A. Mackenzie, correspondent of the London *Daily Mail*, in writing about Protestant and Catholic successes in China, said that "the Catholic missionary largely employs political methods. He is an official, and uses all his influence as such, in the courts, in favor of his converts, and, if necessary, he encroaches upon magisterial functions. The interference by Catholic priests in Chinese courts has been responsible for infinite quarrels, misunderstandings, and extortions." Playing politics and meddling with public affairs are regular practices on the part of Roman priests and bishops. (*Converted Catholic*, June, 1908.)

The Roman Catholic Robert Dell, editor of an English magazine, says in the Paris *Grande Revue*, quoted in *The Literary Digest*, May 2, 1908: "The development of Catholicism in England is and ever has been chiefly hindered by the fact that, while Englishmen do not find any difficulty in accepting the Catholic dogmas, they dread the Vatican's interference in their national politics, or in any sphere that lies outside the domain of religion pure and simple. The people of England would probably have been quite ready to embrace the Catholic ideal and to submit to the authority of the Pope if they had been convinced that this authority would confine itself to purely spiritual matters, and would not be exerted excepting in a purely religious sphere."—"The policy pursued by Pius X in the affairs of France appears to England to be a resurrection of the claims of Boniface VIII, which constituted a perpetual menace to the autonomy of the civil power. It is thought in England that the Pope some day or other might excite English, Irish, and Canadian Catholics to a revolt against the British Government, just as Pius X has roused French Catholics to revolt against the Republic. What is going on in France recalls to us certain incidents in our own history which we had almost forgotten. Without doubt the French Republic has maintained a more dignified and tolerant attitude than did the English Queen. It nevertheless remains that the policy of Pius X is, on all essential points, identical with that of Pius V, which lost England to the papacy."

Why did Archbishop Ireland in St. Louis, on October 18, hope for a *Catholic* President of the United States? Why did Mr. M. A. Fanning of Cleveland at the Catholic Congress at Chicago on November 18 hope for a *Catholic* majority in the United States? Other churches never talk that way; why not? As citizens we have nothing against any man's *religion*; as citizens we are opposed to the part *politics* plays in the Roman Catholic religion.

Milwaukee, Wis.

W. DALLMANN.