

THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

VOL. XIII.

APRIL, 1909.

No. 2.

THE INFALLIBLE POPE.

"The historian is seen at his best
when he does not appear."

The Romanist Klee in his *Dogmatics*, vol. 1, p. 210, called it a Protestant slander that Catholics thought the Pope infallible. (Hase I, p. 277.) The Scotch Catholic Father Keenan in his *Controversial Catechism* says of the Pope's infallibility: "This is a Protestant invention; it is no article of the Catholic faith." Since 1870 this damaging statement has been quietly dropped, and no hint given that the text differs from the author's own editions of 1846 and 1853. (Sidney, p. 86.)

In the "Form of Oath and Declaration," taken in 1793 by all Irish Catholics, occur the words: "I also declare that it is not an article of the Catholic faith, neither am I thereby required to believe or profess that the Pope is infallible." And a Synod of Irish Bishops in 1810 declared this oath and declaration to be "a constituent part of the Roman Catholic religion." (Quirinus, p. 189.) Archbishop Murray, Bishop Doyle, and others in 1824 and 1825 before both houses of Parliament swore, "that it is not an article of the Catholic faith, neither are Catholics bound to believe, that popes are infallible." (B. W.-A., p. 270.)

On July 18, 1870, Pope Pius IX decreed: "We teach and define that it is a dogma divinely revealed; that the Roman Pontiff, when he speaks 'ex cathedra,' that is, when in discharge of the office of Pastor and Doctor of all Christians, by virtue of his supreme Apostolic authority, he defines a doc-

MISCELLANY.

A Lutheran Letter to President Roosevelt with Comment.
(*Concluded.*) In our last issue we noted important actions of church bodies and utterances of editors on the above letter. Additional material of great value has come to hand since which evinces the intelligent and cordial appreciation with which the letter of the Lutheran Conferences of New York and of Philadelphia has been received throughout the country.

On December 9, 1908, *Der Christliche Apologete*, organ of the German Methodist Church, noted the sophistical reasoning against the Lutheran letter of protest, which a speaker at the late Catholic Missionary Congress had adopted, and which was declared by the *New York Freeman's Journal* one of the greatest orations delivered during the Congress. The Methodist editor said:

Nothing is more certain than that this Republic must prepare for a long, stubborn, and bitter fight with this historic enemy of

true Christianity, of the open Bible, and of human liberty. The weapons of Rome are not to be despised. They are strong and dangerous, because they are weapons of insincerity and earthly; they are derived from the Prince of Darkness and are forged at the forge of the father of lies. There are no dialecticians more skilled, no sophists more cunning (*i. e.*, men who by their false logic and specious representations darken truth and confuse people), than those trained to maturity in the schools of Rome. — The fact must not be concealed from the evangelical Christians of America that the Church of Rome is plotting to achieve nothing less than the gradual but final and complete subjugation of this country to the scepter of Rome. In striving to attain this end this political church-power proceeds without any scruples whatsoever.

On December 10 *The Lutheran Witness*, official organ of the English Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Missouri and other States, published the entire New York letter, and remarked editorially:

We feel justified in assuming that the letter of our New York brethren to President Roosevelt and the endorsing communication from the General Council pastors, as found in another column, will be read with more than ordinary interest. The danger to our free institutions from the machinations of the Romish hierarchy is real and is imminent. That the Romanists are sitting high in the councils of the nation is evidenced by an incautious remark of Cardinal Gibbons. This crafty head of the Romish Church in this country does not usually uncover his tracks, but when the President's letter was published, he could not resist the temptation to say with boyish boastfulness: "I knew it was coming out." One can only express surprise that the Cardinal so far forgot ordinary prudence — but this is not the first time that the show of the cloven hoof has spoiled a clever game.

The interest that the letter has aroused is nothing less than remarkable, and noteworthy endorsement has come from unexpected quarters all over the country. Our readers will do well to preserve the text of this letter and make it known in their circles of acquaintanceship.

Succeeding issues of this church-paper have again and again championed the New York letter, and among the English Lutheran papers of this country *The Lutheran Witness* may be said to have done yeoman's service in laying bare the per-

icious scheme of popery and fairly compelling Protestants to see the danger that is now upon us.

The *Christian Observer* (Presbyterian) of Louisville, Ky., in its issue of December 9 published an answer to President Roosevelt's letter to Mr. Martin by a Catholic priest, G. V. Fradryssa of Mobile, Ala. The letter does not take notice of the Lutheran missive, but is very valuable testimony on the crucial point in the controversy of the Lutheran pastors with the President.

The *Lutheran Evangelist* of December 10 remarked:

Our Christian President, whose sincerity of purpose will be questioned by none who know him, is receiving with quietness the strong reminders that came to him not only from Lutherans, but from Protestants of other names as well, that we must draw the line at the ballot box when the papal Hierarchy asks our votes. *The Evangelist* need not reiterate its key-note in this vigorous protest in which Protestants of all faiths are substantially a unit. So long as the Vatican stands by its historic claim of papal supremacy, — the Pope, the Vicar of Christ, to whose supreme authority alone all of us bow, — so long the American people will not elect a Roman Catholic to the Presidency. That God has a people, dear to Him and to us all, in the Roman Catholic Church, none of us question; but we will never acknowledge the unscriptural and un-American claim of the Vicarship of the Roman Pontiff. We are not surprised that our good and sensible President makes no reply to the protests that reach him from many influential quarters. There is a time to answer and a time to be silent.

On December 15 the news of the political controversy that had broken out in this country were proclaimed even in Germany. The New York correspondent of the *Koelnische Volkszeitung* in a lengthy letter rehearsed to his readers in Germany the main contents of the letter, minimized its importance, and called the request of the Lutherans that the President would qualify his remarks on bigotry arrogant.

Lutherisches Kirchenblatt, official organ of the Lutheran Iowa Synod, in its issue of December 17, repudiated the President's charge as going too far, reproduced a portion of the New York letter, and summarized the rest, with evident approval.

Harper's Weekly (December 5) had referred to the Lutheran letter, giving a correct summary of its contents, but placing its remarks under the caption "Anti-Catholic Prejudices." The *Young Lutherans' Companion* of December 19 took issue with the editor, as follows:

My dear editor Harvey, do you call that liberty of thought and speech in a free land? The editor had to give the Romanist a salve for his wounded heart! The truth of the Lutheran letter is recognized in plain words, but the whole question is headed "Anti-Catholic Prejudices"! Do our young Lutherans see livingly the tremendous force of that situation? American journalism trembles already before Rome. Journalists in America, "the land of the brave and the home of the free," are already willing to call the truth their reason and their conscience recognize as truth by the name of "prejudice," to please Rome. Is that religious liberty? Is that political freedom? Is that American? Is that the fruit of all the struggles of the Reformation, the Thirty Years' War, and every other movement of liberty in modern times? Or is it the awakening echo of the Medieval times, when Rome burned, flayed, sawed asunder, tore into pieces, boiled; encased in iron frames, buried in lime-pits in the cellars of the Church's Inquisition palaces all that did not believe as the Pope commanded?

Shame, George Harvey, for this servile fear before an enemy of the truth! And God help us Lutherans to a more sturdy Biblical faith and earnest Christian life, that we may have the power to confess our faith, our Christ, our Gospel, our principles, in the face of all the stress and press of Rome upon our heaven-born liberties in Church and State.

On January 8 a conference of Lutheran ministers in Southern Indiana (Missouri Synod) met in Indianapolis and passed resolutions which were published in the *Indianapolis News*, as follows:

Whereas, His Excellency, Theodore Roosevelt, President of the United States, has made the charge of unwarranted bigotry against any one who might refuse to vote into high office a Roman Catholic; and

Whereas, It is an undeniable fact that the separation of church and state, one of the chief corner stones of our Republic, is condemned as a most pernicious doctrine by the Roman church; and

Whereas, A loyal Roman Catholic who fully understands the

allegiance required of him by the Pope can never sincerely subscribe to the Constitution of the United States; therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That we cordially indorse the protest addressed by our brethren, the Lutheran ministers of New York City, to the President and published in the *New York Times* on the 16th of November, 1908. We emphasize the following facts:

Pope Boniface VIII, in his 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.

Cardinal Gibbons says:

The Roman Catholic church is not susceptible of being reformed in her doctrine. (*Faith of Our Fathers.*)

Pope Leo XIII, in his Encyclical *Humanum Genus* (April 20, 1884), condemns freedom of conscience and freedom of worship.

As eternal vigilance is the price of liberty, we deem it our duty, on purely patriotic grounds, to sound a warning, lest the grave danger to which our President seems to be blind be ignored by our fellow-citizens, and our Government pass into the hands of enemies of our religious freedom.

On the same date a press dispatch from Baltimore brought the following information:

The dissatisfaction rife among the Protestant denominations over President Roosevelt's letter, published a short time ago, in which he expressed the opinion that the time would come when the people would lay aside what he called "narrow bigotry" and elect to the presidency of the United States men of any religion, Catholic or Protestant, or of no religion at all, took definite shape at the meeting of the Methodist Episcopal ministers of the city. Strong resolutions, drawn up by a special committee, were adopted, attacking the President's position and indorsing the reply made to his letter by the Lutheran ministers of New York.

The Roosevelt letter was brought before the Methodist ministers at their regular meeting, which is held in the Eutaw Street church, two weeks ago. After some discussion it was at that time referred to a committee of five to properly frame the sentiments of the meeting in resolutions.

The following remarks of *The Westminster* were transferred to the *Lutheran Evangelist* of January 21:

We are not sectarian, and would never try to limit the individual liberty of any man. If a man wants to be a Roman Catholic, let him. So long as he serves God and obeys the law, and makes no effort to subordinate State and Church, we have no quarrel with him. But here is our position: The doctrine of a free church in a free State is fundamental with Protestantism. The doctrine of the Holy Roman Empire, a union between Church and State, close and eternal, is the fundamental doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church, and this union is to have for its head the Holy Father in the Eternal City. Rome dominated Europe until Luther's hammer broke the chain. If the time should ever come when Rome should become dominant in Washington in the person of a man as forceful, as resourceful, as insistent as Mr. Roosevelt has been, the doctrine of the supremacy of the Church and State would be felt in American life. We do not wonder the Lutherans cry out against the President's action. We do not wonder that the President declines to answer their letter. He probably knows when he is beaten, and their letter is in our view unanswerable.

Partly to chronicle the event and partly because the matter may be of some service to others whenever a like occasion is presented to them, we present the action of our brethren of the Indianapolis Conference on the subject of "moral legislation":

The following resolutions have been adopted by the German Lutheran Ministerial Conference of Indianapolis and vicinity:

"Whereas, we are continually being annoyed by requests of the Prohibitionists and anti-saloons to enlist our Lutheran congregations in favor of legislative action against manufacture and sale of beverages containing alcohol; and

"Whereas, on the other hand, our German Lutheran congregations are being represented among legislators as having declared themselves for the repeal of the county option law, passed in the recent special session of the Legislature,

"Be it known to all that these legislative questions have not been mentioned, much less discussed or resolved upon in our church meetings, and no petitions for or against the repeal of the county option law will be issued by our church bodies or their officers.

"Our members, as far as their membership in our church is concerned, are absolutely free to work for or against the bills which aim to allow and control, or to restrict and even forbid the sale of alcoholic beverages. We can think of one contingency only which would affect our churches and call for their resistance as church bodies, namely, if the use of wine in the Lord's Supper were to be prohibited by law of the State.

"Furthermore, having in mind the very frequent use of the Bible on the floors of the Legislature (not to speak of some astounding interpretations of Scripture), we offer the following principles, which are in thorough harmony with the Bible as well as with the Constitution of our dear country:

"1. It is not the province of the State and civil legislation to deal with sins of any kind as transgressions of the law of God, *i. e.*, the moral law of the Bible. The civil government must attempt the correction of the 'malum civile' only, the public wrong, whereby the civil rights and temporal welfare of individuals or communities are endangered or infringed.

"2. Proper civil legislation being the first and fundamental measure toward the protection of society and its members, it is the duty of every one who has a share in the exercise of the legislative power of the State to contribute his due share toward the enactment of such laws as will best serve the purpose of the State.

"3. The form and substance, however, of such legislative enactments are not to be determined by the Bible, the Word of God, but by the dictates of human reason, as found in those whose duty it is to contribute toward or assist in such enactments.

"4. In the legislative Assembly a member thereof does not represent his church or religious denomination, but all citizens of his district regardless of their religious convictions or affiliations. He should not attempt to inject the religious views of his church and pastor, nor even his own religious convictions, into the bills presented for enactment by himself or other members of the Assembly.

"5. Thus a conscientious legislator, under certain circumstances, might assist in the passage of a law which permits within the community of the State what God has forbidden to His Christians in the kingdom of His Son, Christ Jesus. Where the Senator or Representative was, by the dictates of reason and his best private judgment, moved to assist in such legislation, he should not be condemned by his church associates; nay, he ought to be commended for his mental capability of distinguishing between church and state.

"6. It is the duty of every citizen to obey the valid enactments of civil legislation, while in force, even though he may consider them

unwise, yea, detrimental to the public welfare. If he be an officer, he is bound to enforce even such laws. To countenance the non-enforcement of such laws is not civic righteousness, and must naturally breed a disregard for the observance of other laws, thus gradually bringing about a general corruption of public official life, aye, a universal lawlessness. It will be proper, however, for law-abiding citizens and officers to seek an early opportunity for amending or repealing the statutes which experience has proved to be ineffective or harmful.

“The foregoing principles are general, applying to enactments on marriage, divorce, usury, civil contracts, Sunday base-ball, sales of alcoholic liquors, and to every other legislative subject.

“In the name of the German Lutheran Conference of Indianapolis and vicinity,

“P. SEUEL, *President*.

“R. D. BIEDERMANN, *Secretary pro tem.*”
