

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

to emphasize from the day that he set foot upon our hospitable shores that his master had sent him, and that those who heard him heard his master's voice and could know, from him, his master's mind. And Monsignor Francis Satolli's official character and mission were fully understood and heartily appreciated by his audiences, especially by the "highly distinguished audience" which had gathered at Carroll Institute, on the date above named, to honor the Pro-Delegate Apostolic with a formal reception.

The Italian gentleman said, — or rather "the erudite rector" of the young Catholic University, the Rt. Rev. Bishop Keane, interpreted him to his American audience as having just said "in his beautiful Italian," — the following:

The Papal Delegate began by saying that while he appreciates every mark of respect and esteem shown him as the legate of the Holy Father, he was particularly gratified at this reception tendered him by a society representing the Catholic gentlemen of this Capital City and bearing the name of one so distinguished in the history of the Church in America. This is an occasion, the memory of which will ever be dear to his heart, and will be a precious memory to the members and to their children, who will be the future members, and the coming generation, for it is an occasion linked with so many great events. It is a significant fact that the opening of a new chapter of the Institute should take place in the beginning of a year marked by so many great events, the sending of a Papal delegate to this country, the celebration of the quadro-centenary of the discovery of America by Christopher Columbus, and the golden jubilee of Leo XIII.

It is not strange that the Papal delegate should give his greeting in Italian, for that was the language which first sounded over the billows of the Atlantic and echoed on the shores of America, when the Italian Columbus bore across the sea the knowledge of Christ to the shores of this unknown continent. *And it is beautiful to trace the economy of Divine Providence in the history of America. The Christian religion, which was founded by our Divine Savior at Jerusalem, was, by Divine Providence, destined to become centered at Rome. Rome, the greatest city of the world, was going to destruction on account of the wickedness of its people, and it was to become the capital of the Christian world and send forth streams of light to all the nations of the world. Fittingly, then, Rome sent*

*Christianity to America, just as she received it from Jerusalem, so that the world is encircled by the great chain connecting Jerusalem, Rome, and Washington.*¹⁾

A study of the history of America, the constitutional organization of our Government, and the sentiments of its founders, as expressed in the writings of Washington, and our other great men, only confirm the impression that the life and essence of our institutions are in perfect harmony with the sentiments of our Holy Father Leo XIII on the subject of human liberty.

In the great event we are so soon to celebrate, three names will be linked together and cherished with love and veneration—the names of Columbus, Washington, and Leo XIII. The Papal delegate utters the prediction that as the years unfold and America continues on her great mission, the more closely men analyze the origin and development of her free institutions, the more clearly they will perceive that we are indebted to the teachings and inspirations of the Church of Christ for all of them.

In conclusion he spoke to this effect: May your republic, built deep in its foundations of solid rock, raise its pinnacles to the clouds, and like the Church, outlast the ages, and may they side by side, in perpetual good faith and love, teach all mankind true liberty, true brotherhood, and peace everlasting.

The account of this remarkable address which we have given is the official account, and it is complete. It has been published with the full approval of Cardinal Gibbons who has prefaced the book in which it appeared.²⁾ The address is remarkable for a number of things. In the first place, there is, or seems to be, a cordial patriotic fervor pervading the address. Americans love to hear just such things as these: our great Washington, our free institutions, our greater destiny, etc. And when a foreigner tells them these things, they feel more than commonly flattered, and the speaker has won their affections completely. In the second place, the address is remarkable for its unheard-of collocation of persons, places, and events. “Columbus, Washington, and Leo XIII,” “Jerusalem, Rome, and Washington,” the Columbian Exposition and the papal

1) Italics ours.

2) Loyalty to Church and State. The Mind of His Eminence, Francis Cardinal Satolli, Pro-Delegate Apostolic. Second, enlarged edition, Baltimore. 1895. p. 216 ff.

jubilee—what is it that these matters have in common? Columbus was a mariner of the fifteenth, Washington a soldier of the eighteenth, Leo XIII a clergyman of the nineteenth century. 'Columbus's voyage was a commercial enterprise, Washington's campaign a patriotic undertaking, Leo XIII's business was to preach. Columbus's name can be intelligently connected with the American Continent, but not with the territory occupied by the North American Republic and her institutions. What Columbus might have done—besides finding a shorter way to India—has been shown by the fate of those countries where the religion which he brought to the new continent became firmly established. On the subject of liberty Columbus and Washington could not have agreed for a minute. Nor is there any evidence of an agreement in sentiment upon this subject between the first President of the United States and the late Pope. George Washington was, in the estimate of the affable gentleman from Rome, not only a miserable and damned heretic, like the rest of us, but also an anarchist, because he championed the separation of Church and State. We are perfectly amazed to hear this stranger in our gates tell us that he is in possession of facts, from the writings of Washington, which "confirm the impression that the life and essence of our institutions are in perfect harmony with the sentiment of our Holy Father Leo XIII on the subject of human liberty." Most Americans are well acquainted with what Washington has said on that subject; quite a number of Americans know equally well what Leo XIII has said on the same subject. The claim of Monsignor Satolli, then, can be understood only when in the sentence last quoted we emphasize the words "the life and essence." And the question now arises: Did our Italian visitor *studiously avoid* saying simply "our institutions"? If the agreement between Washington and Leo XIII affects not our institutions, as they stand to-day and are accepted by Americans, but their life and essence, we require somebody to tell us what is that "life and essence." The late Pope has delivered himself in unmistakable language on this very point. On November 1,

1885, he denounced the very principles on which our political organization rests.³⁾ On June 20, 1888, he denounced the chief American “liberties,” liberty of worship, liberty of speech, liberty of the press, liberty of teaching, liberty of conscience.⁴⁾ On January 10, 1890, He felt it incumbent upon him to instruct Christians as to their duties as citizens, and told them, amongst other things, to fight, to fight vehemently, if in their particular country the Catholic Church were not allowed to “make laws and exercise every other kind of right.”⁵⁾ The “essence and life” of American institutions, in the view of the late Pope, are these: The Church exists as a distinct body; so does the State. But the State must in all its activities become subservient to the interests of the Church, meaning the Roman Church. Where did Washington express sentiments like these?

It was because Americans, who had read these papal exhortations, might draw from them certain conclusions unfavorable to the Popish Church in America, that the Pope sent his legate to this country. We were to be assured that the Pope is an ardent American patriot, — the same pope who had written the afore-mentioned encyclicals. And Monsignor Satolli had assumed the artful task of honeying the Pope’s word and making Americans swallow the Pope’s poison. Well did he accomplish his task! His diction is a masterpiece, as regards concealment. He did not cancel one syllable of the subversive utterances of his master, but he did not touch a single one of the terrible issues which had been raised by those flaming, liberty-destroying encyclicals. He smiled upon the Americans whom he met, and extolled the love of Leo XIII for America.

Strange, too, ill-boding, portentous, is the geographical chain which the bland Italian gentleman forged, a chain en-

3) See Encyclical *Immortale Dei* in “The Great Encyclical Letters of Pope Leo XIII.” Translations from approved Sources. With Preface by Rev. John J. Wynne, S. J. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers, Printers to the Holy Apostolic See. 1903. pp. 107—134.

4) See Encyclical *Libertas Praestantissimum*. l. c. pp. 135—162.

5) See Encyclical *Sapientiae Christianae*. l. c. pp. 180—207.

circling the world, to be closed and riveted at Washington. At Jerusalem our Lord preached and died, but He did not establish Jerusalem as the center of the Church. His thoughts about Jerusalem are expressed John 4, 21; Luke 19, 41 ff. It was a center when He began His career. At Jerusalem the Sanhedrin, the ancient hierarchy, had its seat. The Sanhedrin murdered Christ. "Christian Rome," *i. e.*, the papacy, cannot point to any connection with Jerusalem, except one that will make it the sequel, the successor, the heir, yea, the perfecter of that system over which Annas and Caiaphas were presiding in the days of the Lord. And to Washington this system is to be extended? Was the geographical triad which the Italian gentleman constructed the shadow that preceded the cablegram from Rome to our president-elect on the morning of November the fourth? Was the speech at the Carroll Institute to pave the way for the reception at Washington of the Papal Nuncio, who was to take his place among the ambassadors of foreign countries to America, and represent his sovereign and his sovereign's interests among us? Washington the sequel of Rome! The splendors of the White City on Lake Michigan in 1893 represented to Americans as the expression of the nation's gratitude to the Papist Columbus who is said to have brought Roman Christianity to America! The Pope's anniversary linked and blended with that of the American nation! Verily, this is brazen impudence. But it has all been said in such winning words, in such a devout spirit, with a reverent appeal to the divine Providence, that the cunning equivocations with which the address bristles are overlooked, the false setting which has been given to a mere concomitant circumstance in an historical event is not discovered, the deft manipulation by which a stubborn fact emerges ultimately as in harmony with its exact logical contrary is not recognized. Why, the very things which the Italian gentleman thanks Providence for having achieved, Providence, in the judgment of every historian of the North American Republic, has most signally averted. It is one of the great miracles of history that the American

Colonies, at a time when every condition seemed favorable to Romish ascendancy, did *not* come under the influence of Rome, as did Mexico, the Central American states, Peru, and all of South America. And it is a most significant ruling of Providence that, when in the course of human events the young Republic declared its independence and uttered the constitutional principles on which it wished to start on its course as a nation, explicitly eliminated that principle for which every occupant of the papal throne, down to the present incumbent,⁶⁾ has stubbornly fought, the union of Church and State. Monsignor Satolli merely beams upon you as you betray your inability to comprehend him, and says: Child, “analyze closely the origin and development” of your free institutions, and you will see that they were conceived in Rome and shapen in popery.

Two years pass, after the benignant gentleman from Italy has linked Washington with Rome. On the 6th of January, 1895, there is issued at Rome another Encyclical Letter, addressed directly and exclusively to the “Catholicity in the United States.”⁷⁾ The aged pope, tottering on the brink of the grave, “traverses in spirit and thought the wide expanse of ocean.” He says to his beloved sons in America: “We shall be, God willing, of some assistance to the Catholic cause among you.” Was “the Catholic cause” in danger? Had Catholics become disfranchised? Was the country entering upon an anti-Catholic campaign? Had laws been made that rendered the existence of the Catholic Church precarious? Not in the least; we shall hear that the Pope in this epistle acknowledges that the flourishing condition of the Catholic Church in our country is “due to the equity of the laws which obtain in America.” The “assistance,” then, which he wishes to render cannot be for *defensive* purposes. He goes on to say:

6) See Encyclical of Pius X, *Vehementer nos esse*, on the Separation of Church and State in France. Authorized Latin and German text, published by Herdersche Buchhandlung, St. Louis, Mo. p. 7 ff.

7) See Encyclical *Longinque Oceani* in Encyclical Letters of Leo XIII, l. c. pp. 320—335.

We highly esteem and love exceedingly the young and vigorous American nation, in which we plainly discern latent forces for the advancement alike of civilization and of Christianity.

Not long ago, when your whole nation, as was fitting, celebrated with grateful recollection and every manifestation of joy the completion of the fourth century since the discovery of America, We, too, commemorated together with you that most auspicious event, sharing in your rejoicings with equal good-will. Nor were we on that occasion content with offering prayers at a distance for your welfare and greatness. It was Our wish to be in some manner present with you in your festivities. Hence We cheerfully sent one who should represent Our person. Not without good reason did We take part in your celebration. For when America was, as yet, but a newborn babe, uttering in its cradle its first feeble cries, the Church took it to her bosom and motherly embrace. Columbus, as We have elsewhere expressly shown,⁸⁾ sought as the primary fruit of his voyages and labors, to open a pathway for the Christian faith into new lands and new seas. Keeping this thought constantly in view, his first solicitude, whereon he disembarked, was to plant upon the shore the sacred emblem of the cross. Wherefore, like as the Ark of Noe, surmounting the overflowing waters, bore the seed of Israel together with the remnants of the human race, even thus did the barks launched by Columbus upon the ocean carry into regions beyond the seas as well the germs of mighty States as the principles of the Catholic religion.

This is not the place to give a detailed account of what thereupon ensued. Very rapidly did the light of the Gospel shine upon the savage tribes discovered by the Ligurian. For it is sufficiently well known how many of the children of Francis, as well as of Dominic and of Loyola, were accustomed during the two following centuries to voyage thither for this purpose; how they cared for the colonies brought over from Europe, but primarily and chiefly, how they converted the nations from superstition to Christianity, sealing their labors in many instances with the testimony of their blood. The names newly given to so many of your towns and rivers and mountains and lakes teach and clearly witness how deeply your beginnings were marked with the footprints of the Catholic Church.

8) In the Encyclical *Abrupto Sacculo*, of July 16, 1892. This document was issued expressly in commemoration of the Columbus Tercentenary. It was from this Encyclical that Satolli took his cue for the address at the Carroll Institute. See l. c. pp. 264—270.

This agile, old pope, who possesses such a lithe memory, is blessed with a convenient forgetfulness. He forgets that the religious character of the American colonists in British territory during the periods of exploration and colonization differed most strikingly from that of the colonists in Spanish and French dependencies. He forgets that the flocking of “the children of Loyola,” etc., to America was due also to other causes besides their missionary zeal. Their overthrow in Portugal, their expulsion from France, the rise of Gallicanism, Febronianism, Josephinism, the fierce fight which European nations at that time were making upon the infamous Bull *Unigenitus* of Clement XI—all these events⁹⁾ persuaded the Society of Jesus that their ancient pastures had turned into warring camps against them, and they must find new pastures. He forgets that the superstitions of which he speaks have not been removed, but merely supplanted by a different sort of superstitions in all those parts of the New World where Rome held undisputed sway. His genial reminiscences, then, are valuable only as showing that he regards *all* of America as a papal domain, from the day that it rose out of the ocean to the eyes of Columbus.—The Pope proceeds:

Nor, perchance, did the fact which We now recall take place without some design of divine Providence. Precisely at the epoch when the American colonies, having, with Catholic aid, achieved liberty and independence, coalesced into a constitutional Republic, the ecclesiastical hierarchy was happily established amongst you; and at the very time when the popular suffrage placed the great Washington at the helm of the Republic, the first bishop was set by apostolic authority over the American Church. The well-known friendship and familiar intercourse which subsisted between these two men seems to be an evidence that the United States ought to be conjoined in concord and amity with the Catholic Church. And not without cause; for without morality the State cannot endure—a truth which that illustrious citizen of yours, whom We have just

9) See Dr. Fredrik Nielsen’s “History of the Papacy in the XIXth Century.” Translated under the direction of Arthur James Mason, D. D. 2 vols. London, 1906; a third vol. forthcoming. Chapters III and V of the first volume are especially valuable.

mentioned, with a keenness of insight worthy of his genius and statesmanship perceived and proclaimed. But the best and strongest support of morality is religion. She, by her very nature, guards and defends all the principles on which duties are founded, and, setting before us the motives most powerful to influence us, commands us to live virtuously, and forbids us to transgress. Now what is the Church other than a legitimate society, founded by the will and ordinance of Jesus Christ for the preservation of morality and the defense of religion? For this reason have We repeatedly endeavored, from the summit of the pontifical dignity, to inculcate that the Church, whilst directly and immediately aiming at the salvation of souls and the beatitude which is to be attained in heaven, is yet, even in the order of temporal things, the fountain of blessings so numerous and great that they could not have been greater or more numerous had the original purpose of her institution been the pursuit of happiness during the life which is spent on earth.

Here we observe again that dexterous grouping of heterogeneous elements which succeeds in welding Jerusalem, Rome, and Washington into a popish chain. The establishment of the North American Republic and the establishment of the Roman hierarchy in the United States coincide in point of time. Hence, they are allied causes working to achieve the same ends. That is the argument. George Washington was a personal friend of some Catholic priest. Hence, the American Congress and the Roman *Curia* must be allied. That is the argument. The State cannot endure without morality. Hence it needs the guardian care of "*the Church*," *i. e.*, the papacy. That is the argument. If this is not *baculus in angulo*-logic, what is? If the Church of England had created an American bishop at the time of the Declaration of Independence, we presume we would, as a nation, by that coincidence become "conjoined in concord" with the Episcopal Church. If George Washington had fellowshiped Henry Muehlenberg in a social way, we presume that the country would have been destined, by the irresistible force of that event, to become Lutheran. If the Presbyterians were to declare themselves "a legitimate society, founded by the will and ordinance of Jesus Christ for the preservation of morality," Congress, we anticipate, seeing that the State is in need of morality, would have to recognize that it is useful and necessary

for these free American States to be conjoined in concord and amity with the Presbyterian Church.—But we are still in search of some indication why Catholicity in the United States is in need of “assistance.” The next paragraph seems to render this task almost hopeless. It reads:

That your Republic is progressing and developing by giant strides is patent to all; and this holds good in religious matters also. For even as your cities, in the course of one century, have made a marvelous increase in wealth and power, so do we behold the Church, from scant and slender beginnings, grown with rapidity to be great and exceedingly flourishing. Now if, on the one hand, the increased riches and resources of your cities are justly attributed to the talents and active industry of the American people, on the other hand, the prosperous condition of Catholicity must be ascribed, first indeed, to the virtue, the ability, and the prudence of the bishops and clergy, but in no slight measure also to the faith and generosity of the Catholic laity. Thus, while the different classes exerted their best energies, you were enabled to erect unnumbered religious and useful institutions, sacred edifices, schools for the instruction of youth, colleges for the higher branches, homes for the poor, hospitals for the sick, and convents and monasteries. As for what more closely touches spiritual interests, which are based upon the exercise of Christian virtues, many facts have been brought to our notice, whereby we are animated with hope and filled with joy, namely, that the numbers of the secular and regular clergy are steadily augmenting, that pious sodalities and confraternities are held in esteem, that the Catholic parochial schools, the Sunday schools for imparting Christian doctrine, and summer schools are in a flourishing condition; moreover, associations for mutual aid, for the relief of the indigent, for the promotion of temperate living, add to all this the many evidences of popular piety.

After reading this paragraph which depicts American Catholicism in the present age with astonishing accuracy, one is utterly at a loss to understand why this wealthy, influential society which is very conspicuous on our avenues and elevated building sites, which is without exaggeration the largest landholder in the country, whose activities ramify in the life of Americans from border to border,—why this ubiquitous, plethoric society should be in need of “assistance” from the Pope. We make one more effort at discovering the obscure cause.

The main factor, no doubt, in bringing things into this happy state were the ordinances and decrees of your synods, especially of those which in more recent times were convened and confirmed by the authority of the Apostolic See. But, moreover (a fact which it gives pleasure to acknowledge), thanks are due to the equity of the laws which obtain in America, and to the customs of the well-ordered Republic.

We are beginning to be extremely attentive at this point.

For the Church amongst you, unopposed by the Constitution and government of your nation, fettered by no hostile legislation, protected against violence by the common laws and the impartiality of the tribunals, is free to live and act without hindrance. Yet,

We are wide awake.

though all this is true, *it would be very erroneous to draw the conclusion that in America is to be sought the type of the most desirable status of the Church, or that it would be universally lawful or expedient for State and Church to be, as in America, dissevered and divorced.*¹⁰⁾ The fact that Catholicity with you is in good condition, nay, is even enjoying a prosperous growth, is by all means to be attributed to the fecundity with which God has endowed His Church, in virtue of which, unless men or circumstances interfere, she spontaneously expands and propagates herself; but she would bring forth more abundant fruits if, in addition to liberty, she enjoyed the favor of the laws and the patronage of the public authority.

Now *we* shall have to do some juxtaposing. Here are two official statements of the sovereign Ruler of the Catholic Church as to the status of Catholicism in the United States:

a) The Pope is pleased with it, *because* the laws of the Republic protect his Church impartially, and do not oppose it.

b) The Pope is not pleased with it *because* his Church does not enjoy "the favor of the laws and the patronage of the public authority."

The Pope acknowledges that his Church is receiving common favors, and regrets that he has not—uncommon favors. What he has is good, as far as it goes, but it does not go far enough. There is one thing, one only thing in the way which keeps him from getting more: the mistaken notion that the

10) Italics ours.

separation of Church and State is expedient. HENCE, HIS ASSISTANCE IS NEEDED. This country must be led to see that what they consider “lawful and expedient” is an “erroneous conclusion.”

We remarked that the “assistance” of the Pope could not be required for defensive purposes. The Pope is not attacked, but the Pope means to attack. He means to take the offensive. We are not seeing any ghosts of armed Catholics marching through the land and shooting down Protestants. We are not dreaming of concealed arsenals in the cellars of Catholic citizens, as a gentleman in the *Pioneer Press* of St. Paul¹¹) (November 22) imagines. Merely as a matter of history we would note that St. Bartholomew’s Day of 1572, and sundry other events, afford food for reflection. When we speak of attacks at this present day, we do not mean an attack with grape and canister, but we mean those measures which Pope Leo XIII has suggested to American Catholics in his letter of January 6, 1895, the letter which we are now studying. He has suggested:

a) The enlargement of educational facilities for Catholics in the United States, the Pope himself taking the lead by founding “at Washington, your capital city,” a Catholic university (l. c. pp. 324—326);

b) Submission to the statutes of the third Plenary Council of Baltimore, the Pope himself “putting, so to speak, a proper and becoming crown upon its work” “through the due establishment by the Apostolic See of an American Legation” (pp. 326—330);

c) The general adoption by American citizens of “the Catholic teaching and the Catholic customs” regarding marriage and divorce (p. 330 f.);

d) “The virtue of temperance, the frequent use of the sacraments, and observance of the just laws and institutions of the Republic” (p. 331). (NB. In what sense and to what

11) From the *Hancock* (Mich.) *Gazette* we learn that the gentleman is Rev. P. A. Sullivan.

extent the laws and institutions of the Republic are regarded as just has been noted);

e) Shunning associations which "have been openly condemned by the judgment of the Church," and associating with Catholics (p. 331 ff.);

f) A controlling influence on the daily press (p. 333 f.);

g) Increased missionary activity among "those who dissent from us in matters of Christian faith," among the Indians and negroes.

By a gradual, silent process the Catholics are to wrest to themselves the instruments for controlling public opinion; in every possible way they are to commend themselves to the nation as a well-compacted, well-organized body; they are to impress Americans more and more with their wealth and influence. Then the day will come at length, when "the favor of the laws and the patronage of public authority" will be theirs.

To show how the spirit and letter of this papal communication was inculcated upon Catholics, we revert once more to our Italian gentleman, the forger of the chain "Jerusalem, Rome, and Washington." The scene this time lies in the Quaker City, and the occasion is the eighteenth anniversary of the Catholic Club of Philadelphia, February 14, 1895. In a hall profusely draped with the American and the Papal colors Monsignor Satolli, in response to a toast by the President of the Club, said, after a few introductory remarks:

The arms of the Catholic Club of Philadelphia appropriately express its character and its aim. In them I see the symbol of heavenly light and the sign of man's redemption by the Man-God; and I read that motto, which is a great principle of social life, "Per fidem libertas." This is a solemn declaration against the error of those who think that the sacrifice is incompatible with generous sentiments, and that a clear, well-defined religious faith is irreconcilable with liberty. . . .

Every historical epoch has its special conflicts, and from the sixteenth century down to our own time the conflict has been between liberty and authority. It is the office of religious and social truth to establish harmony between these two terms. The excess of social authority leads to oppression, and the excess of liberty leads to license

and the disorganization of the social fabric. The equilibrium of the two constitutes and maintains the life of all society. Proofs are not needed to show that it has ever been the highest glory of the Catholic Church, I do not say to have invented either social authority or social freedom, but to have maintained the equilibrium and established the harmony of the one with the other. And this harmony is what is symbolized in the arms of the Catholic Club of Philadelphia.

I need not tell you how dear to the heart of the Holy Father is the Church in America. I need not tell you the admiration he has for this great American Republic and all her institutions. His Encyclical, which we have so lately received, tells plainly enough his high regard and tender affection for this country. (*Loyalty to Church and State*, p. 211 ff.)

The author goes on to say that Catholic clubs have the special approval of, and are commended by, the Pope. Their mission he characterizes thus:

In Catholic Clubs a filial affection for the Pope should be cherished in a special manner. The Catholic Club ought to feel that it has a special mission—to teach respect for the Pope in the fullness of his dignity and authority, to sustain him on every occasion, and to aid his plans with regard to the Church and to society. And not only should the Catholic Club universally exhibit the harmony between being a good Catholic and a good citizen, but it should show how one can submit with docility to the teachings of the Pope, and sustain at the same time with all his strength the liberties of his country. (l. c. p. 214.)

We have here a plain echo from *Longinque Oceani*. But the wand of the magician has again passed over the papal bull. Listen how innocently everything that the Pope had said sounds as it comes from the lips of his legate! For “state” we read “society” and “social authority;” for “enjoying the favor of the laws and the patronage of the public authority” we read “maintaining the equilibrium between social authority and social freedom.” There is a reminder that a conflict is on between these two, and that it is an old conflict. (*Query*: Who in America is engaged in this conflict?) The Catholic Church is the arbiter in this sad disagreement. The echo winds up with an appeal to “sustain the Pope on every occasion.”

The gentleman from St. Paul whom we mentioned before

says that "undue prominence" is being given to a certain Lutheran letter to President Roosevelt. (See p. 50 of this issue.) He calls the contents of that letter "an antiquated charge," and declares that "up to the present there is positively no 'de fide' doctrine" (that is to say, no doctrine constituting an essential part of Catholic belief) "existing in the church" to prove the hostility of the Roman Church to the principle of the separation of Church and State. No "de fide doctrine;" this is good. *Risum teneatis, amici!* What about the "de facto" teaching of Rome? No one charged the Catholics with having embodied their anti-American tenets in their Sunday school leaflets, or in their catechisms for children. The point made was this: Gentlemen, so says your Pope, and so you must do, whether the statement is de fide or de infidelitate. That is just the truth which we are trying to make Catholics see, that *they must disobey their pope, in order to be loyal American citizens.* "Antiquated"? Would to God this were so! No Lutheran has any interest in flaunting *Unam Sanctam* in the face of a peaceful nation and sounding an alarm. The man who is responsible for our present fears is not dead more than five years, and his successor has not unsaid, but solemnly reaffirmed, what his predecessor said.

The gentleman from St. Paul and the editor of *The New World* of Chicago have also cited the state-churches existing in some Lutheran countries, to show that the protest from New York is not in keeping with the general practice of Lutherans. This is beside the mark. The Lutherans who protest are living in America, not in Germany, nor Sweden, nor Norway. Moreover, these protesting Lutherans have never endorsed a state-church. Fact is, many of them have come to America because they could not conscientiously live in a state-church. Besides, we do not grant that state-churches are identical with the Roman hierarchy. And lastly, the argument of the New York letter, and also of a similar one from Philadelphia, does not seek to exalt a Lutheran church tenet, and to denounce a Roman tenet, because it differs from the Lutheran. True, the Augsburg Con-

fession in the 28th Article plainly teaches the separation of Church and State, as the gentleman from St. Paul has correctly observed. But he seems not to have observed that the Lutheran letter from New York does not cite the Augsburg Confession, that the authors never thought of citing the confessional writings of their church in this issue. The Augsburg Confession merely happens to coincide, in this instance, with a political principle, and it is from that well-known American principle, *as citizens*, not as Lutherans, that the authors have addressed the President. The Presbyterians and the Baptists have no connection with the Augsburg Confession, and it is not known that their churches anywhere in the world are allied with the state, yet the Presbyterians and the Baptists have said the same things as the Lutherans.

It is plain to any calm observer of the trend of affairs in our country that ROME WANTS THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA FOR HERSELF. Not in a subdued whisper, not *sotta voce*, but loud and ever louder comes the urgent call: “America and Catholicism,” “Rome and Washington.” At Chicago, during the recent Catholic Missionary Congress, Bishop P. J. Donahue of Wheeling, W. Va., spoke in the evening session of Wednesday, November 19th. The *Chicago Inter-Ocean* sums up its remarks in the significant headline in bold print:

“SEES CATHOLIC REPUBLIC.”

It reports that the bishop “pictured an era of the future when Catholicism will be supreme throughout the United States.” And it quotes him as saying:

Half a century hence, or at the most a century hence, I see a Catholic country. In the winter months, from the Atlantic to the Pacific and from the North to the South, I hear one Angelus bell after another calling the millions to prayer. Over the land arc dotted the Catholic churches. I see Christ ruling and Christ loving through this broad nation. I see the extinction of all fads and various philosophies.

Of these words it might be said what someone has said of similar utterances of Catholics fifteen years ago: they are

worthless as prophecies, but they are valuable as confessions. Our country has reason to be awake, to observe, and to ponder. In noting the letter of protest which Lutheran clergymen in New York addressed to President Roosevelt, the *St. Louis Mirror* of December 3d said:

VOTING AND CATHOLICISM.

Church organizations of the Lutherans and the Presbyterians have remonstrated with the President for denouncing as a calumny the assertion that Protestants will not vote for a Roman Catholic for President. The President wrote magnanimously, but we believe he is mistaken. We believe that if the issue were presented of a Catholic candidate for President, the vast majority of Protestants would vote against such a candidate because of his religious faith, believing that in a crisis of a moral sort he would be dominated by Roman Catholic as superior to American considerations. We don't defend this attitude. We simply state it as a fact. We have no hesitation, either, in stating that a great deal of the surprise in Mr. Taft's vote for President was due to Catholic support because of Mr. Taft's friendliness to the Catholic Church in the Philippines. The Catholic vote gave such a city as Brooklyn to Taft. This fact may make trouble in future, but as a fact we must accept it.

Cardinal Gibbons also foresees trouble; and in his judgment the trouble is imminent. He says, as quoted in *The Lutheran* of December 10th:

There is a great evil in the land which forebodes revolution or a partial upheaval of society.

This language, coming as it does on the heels of the New York letter to President Roosevelt, is significant. Surely, the Baltimore ecclesiastic would not call his church organization "a great evil" nor anything that Catholics have done. Nor is the letter of the President to Mr. Martin the great evil. For Catholics love that letter, and the Cardinal has, no doubt, increased his importance in his own church, because he has been able to say: "I knew the letter was coming." The "great evil" must have arisen later than the President's letter. Something has happened since then that "forebodes revolution or a partial social upheaval."

Yes, there may be trouble; but there is a way to forestall trouble: the ceaseless agitation of the issue which the popes have forced upon us. Not all Catholics actually know what their popes have said. Not all Protestants know it. The average American citizen does not know it. They must be told. And they must be told also that the opposition to a Roman Catholic President of the United States is made "on purely patriotic grounds," not from bigoted zeal.
