

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

MISCELLANY.

A Lutheran Letter to President Roosevelt with Comment.

A document, the great significance of which was apparent from the moment of its publication, and the value of which is being recognized with daily increasing clearness, was ordered prepared by our brethren of the Pastoral Conference of the City of New York, on the four hundred and twenty-fifth anniversary of the birth of Martin Luther, November 10, 1908. Because of the intrinsic merit of the document and for the purpose of future reference, it seems proper that this document be embodied in our publications, in the original form in which it appeared in the *New York Times* of November 16, and that valuable comment upon this document be noted, for the same reasons. The New York daily said:

President Roosevelt's letter to J. C. Martin, made public a week ago, in which he denounces as "unwarranted bigotry" any refusal to vote for a candidate for office because of the candidate's religious connections, and suggested the possibility that some day a Catholic might be elected President of the United States, has aroused the leaders of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in this city. In an open letter to Mr. Roosevelt, which will be received by the President to-day, the New York City members of the Synodical Conference of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of America have taken issue with the President upon his utterances and point out some facts which they say should be considered before Mr. Roosevelt's views should be accepted.

The local members of the Lutheran Conference, at a meeting in this city last Tuesday, designated a committee, consisting of the Rev. William Schoenfeld, pastor of Immanuel Church, Eighty-eighth Street and Lexington Avenue, and the Rev. Martin Walker, pastor of St. Matthew's Church, 145th Street and Convent Avenue, to prepare and issue an open letter to President Roosevelt making clear that, while the Lutherans would deplore the injection of any religious controversy into a political campaign, strong opposition should be shown to any church body which seems to bring about that result.

The letter was mailed Saturday night and is as follows:

HON. THEODORE ROOSEVELT,

White House, Washington, D. C.

Sir: — Convinced of your deep sincerity, and in full agreement with you as to the fundamental principle of the separation of Church and State, as enunciated in your letter to Mr. J. C. Martin, members and pastors of our Church, and other Churches as well, have been amazed to see the indiscriminate and self-contradictory application you make of that principle itself, and this in the stricture made by you on those who might refuse to vote for a Roman Catholic for the highest office in the gift of our people.

Of course it is subversive of the basic principle of a real separation of Church and State to permit the religious belief or non-belief of any candidate for public office to determine the casting of one's vote for or against such candidate, except when that very religious belief or non-belief antagonizes this principle of complete separation of Church and State and all those rights and liberties which are included therein and safeguarded thereby. We agree with you, therefore, that those citizens are to be severely criticised who vote against a man merely because he is a Unitarian, a Jew, a Methodist, or any other religionist.

But were you not aware of the fact that the Roman Catholic Church has again and again, for centuries back and down to modern times, through its official head and other authorities, denounced as wholly wrong and as things to be tolerated only so long as they cannot be changed the complete separation of Church and State, full religious liberty, freedom of conscience, of speech, and of the press, and that, moreover, it proclaims its teachings and principles to be unchangeable, and boasts of being "semper idem"?

Lest we be accused of either misapprehension or misrepresentation, permit us to quote some of the pertinent official declarations of the authorities of the Roman Catholic Church.

Pope Boniface VIII, in his famous Bull *Unam Sanctam*, declared:

In this Church and in its power are two swords — to-wit, a spiritual and a temporal, and this we are taught by the words of the Gospel. Both, therefore, the spiritual and the material swords, are in the power of the Church, the latter indeed to be used for the Church, the former by the Church, the one by the priest, the other by the hands of kings and soldiers, but by the will and sufferance of the priest. It is fitting, moreover, that one sword should be under the other, and the temporal authority subject to the spiritual power. We moreover proclaim, declare, and pronounce that it is altogether necessary for salvation for every human being to be subject to the Roman Pontiff.

Pius IX, in his *Syllabus* of 1864, condemns as an error the proposition that "the Church must be separated from the State, and the State from the Church."

Leo XIII, in his Encyclical *On the Christian Constitution of States*, November 1, 1885, indorses this declaration of Pius IX, and in his Encyclical *On Human Liberty*, June 20, 1888, condemns what he terms "the fatal theory of the right of separation between Church and State."

In the same encyclical Leo declares:

From what has been said it follows that it is quite unlawful to demand, to defend, or to grant unconditional freedom of thought, of speech, of writing, or of worship, as if these were so many rights given by nature to man.

Pius IX, in his *Syllabus* of December 8, 1864, on *The State*, declares that it has not the right of establishing a national Church separate from the Pope nor the right to the entire direction of public schools.

Have these declarations ever been revoked by the Roman Catholic Church? If so, we have gained no knowledge thereof. All that we have read by Roman Catholic writers was merely an attempt either to justify these declarations or to take the edge off of them in order to meet attacks from those who maintain that the Romanist, if he be a loyal adherent of his Church, its official teachings and principles, is in irreconcilable conflict with the principles set forth in the Constitution of the United States. Even Cardinal Gibbons, in his book *The Faith of Our Fathers*, makes these significant statements, the best he has to offer in vindication of his Church against the charge that it is opposed to civil and religious liberty:

A man enjoys religious liberty when he possesses the free right of worshipping God according to the dictates of a right conscience and of practicing the form of religion most in accordance with his duties to God. (49th edition, 1897, p. 264.)

The Church is indeed intolerant in this sense that she must never confound truth with errors; nor can she ever admit that a man is conscientiously free to reject the truth when its claims are convincingly brought home to his mind. Many Protestants seem to be very much disturbed by some such argument as this: Catholics are very ready now to proclaim freedom of conscience because they are in the minority. When they once succeed in getting the upper hand in numbers and power, they will destroy this freedom because their faith teaches them to tolerate no doctrine other than the Catholic. It is, therefore, a matter of absolute necessity for us that they should never be allowed to get this advantage.

Now, in all this there is a great mistake, which comes from not knowing the Catholic doctrine in its fullness. I shall not lay it down myself lest it seem to have been gotten up for the occasion. I shall quote the great theologian Becanus, who taught the doctrine of the schools of Catholic theology at the time when the struggle was strongest between Catholicity and Protestantism. He says that religious liberty may be tolerated by a ruler when it would do more harm to the State or to the community to repress it. The ruler may even enter into a contract in order to secure to his subjects this freedom in religious matters, and when once a contract is made, it must be observed absolutely in every point, just as every other lawful and honest contract. (p. 268.)

What else are these obviously mildest declarations of Romanists but a confirmation of the charge that the Roman Catholic Church does not stand for full and perfect religious liberty, as understood by all Americans and defined in our Federal Constitution, that every man shall be free not only to worship God according to the dictates of a "right conscience" and to practice a "religion most in accordance with his duties to God," but according to his conscience and his conception of his duties to God, right or wrong, so long as he is not thereby led to endanger the equal rights and liberties of his neighbor, or to interfere with the free exercise of the Government's power in the equal protection of all citizens?

Is there any comment necessary on the Cardinal's quotation from Becanus to show that it in no wise commits the Roman Catholic Church to the principle of religious liberty, but most clearly decries that principle as an evil to be tolerated only by reason of necessity, "when it would do more harm to the State or to the community to repress it?"

Are we not, then, compelled to maintain that a loyal Roman Catholic who fully understands the allegiance required of him by the Pope can

never sincerely subscribe to the Federal Constitution, nor, if he does subscribe to it, never can be expected to abide by it, enforce and defend it? Papacy and Vaticanism cannot be separated from the Roman Catholic religion. If anyone should entertain an idea that this were possible, let him read Cardinal Gibbons's afore-quoted book.

How, then, could we, as firm believers in the principle of complete separation of Church and State, and the liberties based thereon and safeguarded thereby, conscientiously and consistently help to elect to the Presidency a member of the Roman Catholic Church, so long as that Church does not officially, through its Pontiff or Church Council, revoke its diametrically opposed declarations?

Are the 2,000,000 and more Lutherans of this country, not to speak of the millions of other Protestants, who take this position for the reasons stated, to be accused of bigotry or fanaticism because of such, their stand, aye, be denounced as being disloyal American citizens? We protest that it is neither personal feeling nor religious antagonism which determines our attitude in this matter, but solely our disagreement with the Roman Catholic Church on this basic political principle, a disagreement growing out of the rejection and denunciation by the Roman Catholic Church of that very principle which you admonish all faithfully to uphold not only in theory but in practice.

We do not wish to be understood as though we accuse the bulk of the Roman Catholics of being disloyal American citizens. We sincerely believe a great many do not fully realize that the position the hierarchy of their Church maintains with reference to the principle in question, especially in view of the outgivings of their teachers in this country, and that if it came to an issue compelling a decision either for the Constitution or the Papal hierarchy, they would decide in favor of the former, upholding the Constitution of the United States. Yet, in determining our attitude in this matter, especially when it comes to electing a man to the highest public office, we must be guided by the official teachings of the recognized authorities of the Roman Catholic Church.

We have considered it to be our duty not to keep silence in this matter because, in our judgment, that would have been an act of cowardice, nor do we wish to do anyone an injustice, nor in any manner traduce any man or body of men. If, therefore, in aught we have said we are laboring under error, we shall be pleased to have you enlighten us and with us the millions who occupy the same position, and shall be sincerely grateful to you for such enlightenment. But if we are right in our contention and position, we ask you to show your unquestioned sincerity and courage by an acknowledgment of the correctness of our contention and the attitude based thereon.

We are,

Very Respectfully,

WILLIAM SCHOENFELD,
MARTIN WALKER,

*for the New York Pastoral Conference of the Synodical
Conference of the Lutheran Church.*

Immediately after the above publication the *New York Times* printed the following item, which was secured, no doubt, by one of their city reporters:—

Most Catholic clergymen were averse yesterday to discussing the open letter of the Lutheran pastors to President Roosevelt on the question of the separation of Church and State without first having

given the subject mature consideration. The Rev. Father T. McClosky of the Society of Jesus, in his sermon in St. Francis Xavier's Church yesterday, however, made this reference to the President's letter, and also to Mr. Taft's letter which the President-elect sent to clergymen in Minnesota:

We have more religious liberty in this country than in any other. We expect honesty in business and in our other relations with our neighbors. As an instance of this honesty we have that wonderful letter of our Chief Executive in reply to a bigot. His sentiments are our sentiments. We agree with him that the man for public office is the man best fitted for that office, regardless of the opposition of bigots to the religion which he professes.

To-day in the newspapers we have another characteristic reply to another bigot who wrote to Mr. Taft about Catholic favoritism. Mr. Taft made a fine American answer.

The Lutheran (General Council) of November 19th said editorially:

A protest from the Lutheran pastors of the Synodical Conference in New York City has reached our eyes which is in accord with the position we have taken.

On November 21st the *American Citizen* of Boston, Mass., reprinted the greater portion of the New York letter, under the caption, "The Church of Martin Luther Rebukes President Roosevelt for His Unwise and Untimely Letter."

The Pastoral Conference of Chicago, composed of members of the Missouri Synod, published its endorsement on November 25th, as follows:

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE EV. LUTH. PASTORAL CONFERENCE OF THE
- EV. LUTH. MISSOURI SYNOD, CITY OF NEW YORK.

Reverend Brethren, —

The Chicago Conference of the Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and other States, in session at Chicago, November 17, 1908, having read the protest your honorable body sent to His Excellency, Theodore Roosevelt, President of the United States, regarding the open letter addressed by him to J. C. Martin of Dayton, O., has instructed the undersigned Committee to draw up the following resolution endorsing your protest, to-wit:

Whereas one of the fundamental principles of our national organism is the thorough separation of Church and State, and this principle has stood the test of more than hundred years under our glorious Constitution, and this doctrine of the First Amendment

should be looked upon as one of the chief corner-stones in the foundation of our republic; and

Whereas this principle is condemned as a most pernicious doctrine by the Roman See, Leo XIII, in his Encyclical of June 20, 1888 (*Enc. Libertas*, pp. 33. 55), saying: "This is the origin of that most pernicious consecratory that the affairs of the State and the Church should be separated," which doctrine was enjoined upon the Catholics by his predecessor, Pius IX, in the Encyclical *Immortale Dei* (p. 39); and again,

Whereas the Constitution of the United States (Amendments, Art. 1) prohibits Congress from making any law discriminating in favor of, or against, any form of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press, and

Whereas the Roman See, Leo XIII, in his Encyclical *Humanum Genus* of April 20, 1884, condemns freedom of conscience (p. 27), freedom of worship (p. 47), and in the Encyclical *Immortale Dei*, by Pius IX (pp. 39. 41. 57), the freedom of speech, of teaching and of the press,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that we heartily endorse in every regard the protest of your honorable body, feeling assured that we voice the sentiment of all Lutherans and of every adherent of the principle of total separation of Church and State vouchsafed by our blessed Constitution.

Chicago, Ill., November 19, 1908.

W. C. KOHN, <i>Pastor.</i>	} Committee.
G. SCHUESSLER, <i>Pastor.</i>	
F. P. MERBITZ, <i>Pastor.</i>	

On the same day the Presbyterian Ministers' Association of New York and vicinity spoke through *The Presbyterian*, thus:

Resolved, That this association cordially indorses the letter of the New York Lutheran ministers to President Roosevelt, and sympathizes with them in their protest against the charge of "narrow bigotry" by him made, against any who might refuse to vote for an otherwise fit person who happens to hold to some particular creed.

The letter of our Lutheran brethren makes it very clear that the antiquated policy of the Vatican—the claim to supremacy in temporal things as well as spiritual—renders it inadvisable, on purely patriotic grounds, to vote into high office a man who holds allegiance first to the Pope and then to the people.

Also on the same day *Evangelisk Luthersk Kirketidende*, the organ of the Norwegian Synod of Lutherans, in an editorial article, inscribed, "Catholics as American Citizens," quoted portions of the New York letter, and on December 2 recorded the action of the Chicago Conference noted above, and in particular, the statement of the Chicago pastors, that they are convinced that all Lutherans in our country from the Atlantic to the Pacific and from the Gulf to Canada share their sentiments. —

The Lutheran Evangelist (General Synod) of November 26th reproduced the letter of the New York Conference, omitting only the quotations from Roman Catholic writers, and added the following editorial comment:

The Evangelist gives liberal space to the courteous, manly, and unanswerable letter of our Lutheran brethren to President Roosevelt, upon his late pronunciamento, throwing down the bars that separate Protestant and Roman Catholic at the ballot box. . . . Read the letter of the Lutheran brethren.

On the same day *The Lutheran* published a letter of protest to President Roosevelt from within its own body, which letter begins with the information to the President that the New York letter has been "unanimously endorsed" by the Lutheran Pastoral Association and the German Lutheran Pastoral Conference of Philadelphia.

On November 28th *The Young Lutheran's Companion* (Swedish Augustana Synod) said:

Last week will, perhaps, go down in Church history as a memorable one, as the first in which the Lutheran Church of America has taken Rome publicly to task, in the letter sent by Missouri Lutherans to our beloved President (see *Chicago Tribune*, November 16). In that letter the President is reminded of the grave danger to American institutions from the Roman church. It is a grand document, confessional, unafraid, clear, Lutheran, conscience-awakening!

The official organ of the Missouri Synod, *Der Lutheraner*, on December 1st, published an editorial article under the caption: "Our strictures, as Christians and as American citizens, on the papacy." After rehearsing the genesis of the New York letter, the editorial states that it was but proper that the protest

was raised in the way in which it was raised, and that the letter containing the protest is endorsed. — On December 2d the Lutheran Pastoral Conference of St. Louis and vicinity, composed of members of the Missouri Synod, passed the following resolutions: —

Resolved, That we cordially endorse the letter of protest sent by our brethren of New York City to our beloved President, Hon. Theo. Roosevelt, and that, with them, we deprecate the imputation of bigotry to any citizen of the United States who refuses to vote for a Roman Catholic for president of our country;

Resolved furthermore, That with our brethren of New York City we are eagerly awaiting the reply of our beloved President.

On December 3d *Augustana*, the official organ of the Swedish Lutheran Church in America, under the heading, "Rome, Roosevelt, and the Lutheran Church," said editorially, that the protest of the German Lutherans of New York "reminds one vividly of the frankness of confessors in olden times, and witnesses the fact that there are still found Lutherans who are Protestants and who dare to raise a protest against Rome. President Roosevelt has not replied to the protest, and that, assuredly, for reasons that are manifest. We cannot see how he could have replied without modifying, in a considerable measure, what he had said before. It was not easy for him to do that, and he knew well enough that what the protesting Lutherans had said had waked an echo in the Protestant hearts of the country."

On December 5th *Lutherische Kirchenzeitung*, official organ of the Ohio Synod, after taking extensive notice of the New York letter of protest by reproducing a portion of its contents, concluded by saying: "All who know the doctrine and history of the Roman Church will surely endorse the views expressed in the letter of the Lutheran pastors of New York. To elect a Catholic President would mean to hand the government of our country over to the Pope and the Jesuits. From this preserve us, good Lord!"

The last comment which we have opportunity to note is dated December 6th and is taken from *Friedensbote*, the

official organ of the Evangelical Church in North America. In a continued article, "President Roosevelt on Bigotry in Politics," the editor, after noticing the New York letter briefly, says: "What surprises me, is that a majority of the Presbyterian Ministers' Association of New York City has taken sides, on November 22, with the protest of the Lutherans. . . . These protests are not issued by general church bodies but by local societies. The whole matter is a little storm in a teapot. To conclude, it remains questionable whether President Roosevelt himself would vote for a Catholic candidate for the presidency. I can only repeat what I have said: In my judgment, the President is right in the main. His vigorous expressions must be taken in the bargain."—This comment leaves one guessing whether the Evangelical editor considers it proper to call an American citizen a bigot for refusing to vote a Catholic into the presidency. We believe he does.

On the Subject of "Roman Catholic Tolerance" apt words were spoken by *The Presbyterian* of October 28th in an editorial article, and at the same time a bad habit which American Catholics seem to cultivate, that of relating history in *majorem papae gloriam*, was deservedly chastised. In the instance alluded to it was Cardinal Gibbons who was called to order. *The Presbyterian* said:

Roman Catholicism is tolerant in Protestant communities because it has to be. We hear a great deal about the difference between Romanism in this country and in nations where it has its own way. There is such difference. Officials of the Roman Church will say and do things in connection with Protestants in this country which they would not think of saying and doing elsewhere in the world. The famous "Bishop law" of New Jersey was framed by a Roman Catholic lawyer as the production of a conference in which bishops of the Roman Catholic Church, of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and untitled bishops of Presbyterian and other denominations agreed together. But all this seeming liberality is a consequence of the Protestant environment of the Roman Church, not of any change in its spirit.

Cardinal Gibbons, in his sermon before the recent great Roman

Catholic assembly in London, took occasion to declare the great service the Roman Catholic Church has done for liberty.

It was a somewhat surprising utterance, in view of the fact that the Papal anathema still rests, since 1888, upon "modern liberties." But being made in connection with the mention of civil liberty in America, which the Cardinal represented, it gave occasion to Rev. Dr. Randolph H. McKim, of Washington, to address to the Cardinal a few suggestions which place the "toleration" of Lord Baltimore, in Maryland, in a different light from that shown by the Cardinal. The distinguished prelate said, with regard to Maryland: "This colony of British Catholics was the first to establish on American soil the blessings of civil and religious liberty. While the Puritans of New England persecuted other Christians, and while the Episcopalians of Virginia persecuted Puritans, Catholic Maryland gave freedom and hospitality to Puritans and Episcopalians alike."

Dr. McKim asks the Cardinal to say whether it is not a fact that Lord Baltimore's colony, called a colony of "British Catholics," was composed in very large part of Protestants, and that, therefore, a policy of religious toleration was a political necessity. He also reminds the Cardinal that the famous edict of toleration was passed by a legislature, two-thirds of whose members appear to have been Protestants, and that the charter of the colony, granted by a Protestant King to Lord Baltimore, required that the religion of the English Church should be recognized. He suggests also that the genesis of the edict of 1649 is traceable to the act of the House of Commons of 1647, which, in language identical with the Maryland act, decreed that the inhabitants of all American plantations should "have and enjoy the liberty of conscience in the matters of God's worship."

Dr. McKim's historical references quite destroy the force of Cardinal Gibbons's specious plea for admiration of Roman Catholic toleration. They show that the celebrated religious liberty of Lord Baltimore's colony was, like whatever liberality that Church has ever shown in this country, simply a necessity of the case. The Catholics of the seventeenth century were surely not more anxious for civil and religious liberty than the Puritans or Episcopalians. To refrain from persecuting or prosecuting each other simply because the life of their colony depended upon their mutual toleration, was no proof of a liberal spirit. Nor, we are obliged to believe, is it such to-day. If it were possible for the Roman Church to obtain ascendancy in this country, Protestantism would soon feel the heavy hand of restriction. The present Pope is no better friend of civil and

religious liberty than Innocent X or Pius IX. Nor has the Church altered its essential spirit.

We have great sympathy with the present Pope in his ardent desire to withstand the errors of modernism. We regret sincerely that he has gone about it in the wrong way. He has followed strictly the Papal precedents by which civil and religious liberty are confused with the errors of materialistic unbelief. But since he has done so, it is absurd for Cardinal Gibbons to be exploiting the alleged services of his Church to such liberty in the past. Past and present are alike in the Church's spirit of arrogant dominance over the bodies and souls of men. That spirit is restrained only by its environment. In England and America, it can at present do little harm. But suppose Catholics were to establish a new colony somewhere in the world just now. Would Protestantism or civil liberty be tolerated? Would Cardinal Gibbons venture to say that they would?
