

THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

VOL. XIII.

JULY, 1909.

No. 3.

A COMPARISON OF THE APOSTOLIC WITH OUR LUTHERAN CONGREGATIONS IN REGARD TO THE LANGUAGE QUESTION.

(By request.)

A practical question of the greatest importance that confronts our Lutheran congregations to-day is the so-called language question. Every one of our German congregations must sooner or later answer the question: "Shall we introduce the English language into our pulpit and school"? Congregations that have already answered this part of the question in the affirmative will soon find it necessary to determine how much English it is expedient to introduce. These questions are more easily asked than answered to the satisfaction of all parties concerned. The experience of centuries teaches that there always will be some who declare themselves most emphatically against any introduction of a new language, who look upon such an innovation as a falling off from the faith of the fathers, as a pandering to syncretism and heresy, and as the ruination of our parochial schools. And if we pastors and teachers, and the members of our congregations do not know what ground and position to occupy when we are confronted by this question, much harm and havoc is likely to result which might have been avoided, if the question had been properly dealt with.

In studying the language question, we find that the first apostolic congregations experienced a transition of language somewhat like the one we are constrained to deal with. If experience is the best teacher, then, most undoubtedly, can we

THE ROMANISTS' REPLY.

The controversy which was precipitated by certain unfortunate remarks of our late President, charging a number of his fellow-citizens with bigotry, has afforded the spokesmen of the Roman Church in America a rare opportunity to bare their mind to the nation. The un-American tenets of the Roman hierarchy were placed, since the middle of last November, in the lime-light of public attention throughout the States as on no previous occasion. Not only did the American press promptly canvass the numerous Protestant disavowals of the President's sentiments; not only were the citizens of the North American Republic informed of the danger with which a cherished institution of theirs is threatened, but the Catholics themselves were, at one of the most representative gatherings of their church in this country, acquainted in a most emphatic, and one might say, in an official manner, with the fact, that a serious grievance had been preferred against their acknowledged leaders by their fellow-citizens. The grievance was supported by highly respectable men and bodies of men, and its character and scope was such that it amounted, in effect, to an indictment of the Catholic Church for insincerity in regard to a vital interest of the American Nation. A situation had thus been created by the Protestant protests which was pregnant with meaning to every holder of the American franchise, and thousands, in and outside of the Roman fold, were anxious to hear the Romanists' reply to the Protestant charge.

There is no gainsaying this fact, however much it be attempted. Romanists have tried from the outset to minimize the importance of the Protestant charge. It was said by them that the Protestant laity had no share in the movement; that not even the clergy of those bodies who went on record in regard to the issue raised were a unit in raising the protest; that it was merely a handful of clergymen who represented nobody but their crabbed selves that had raised this dismal hue and cry in the land, and would achieve nothing else by it than the

confirmation in the public mind of the correctness of the Rooseveltian idea that they were bigots. That was the trend of the first Romanists' replies. The controverted points were, as a rule, left untouched. A few Romanists, like Rev. Thomas of the Paulist Fathers, as reported in the *Homiletic Review*, and Rev. Sullivan, speaking through the *Pioneer Press* of St. Paul, averred that the Roman principles in question had found application in other lands and in former ages, but would never be applied in twentieth-century North America. The pronouncements of Pio Nono, Leo XIII, Pius X on the relation of Church and State were passed over with a discreet silence. Besides, Americans were assured that Catholics could be perfectly loyal to our republican institutions because their popes had de facto recognized those institutions as binding upon Catholics and favorable to the cause of Catholicism. The fact that the papal recognition was significantly limited for opportune reasons, that it is subject to revision at any time, and that Catholic loyalty actually depends upon the pleasure of the popes, — these facts, too, were not touched upon.

On December 6 a somewhat official reply to the Protestant charges was essayed by a Romanist at Philadelphia. The Very Reverend D. I. McDermott spoke at St. Mary's Church, and his remarks were published later with the sanction of Archbishop Ryan in a pamphlet of thirty-one pages bearing the inscription: "The Preachers' Protest Against President Roosevelt's Denunciation of Religious Bigotry in Politics." The very phrasing of this title breathes the spirit of contempt: it diminishes the authorship of the protests quantitatively and depreciates it qualitatively. It views the protesting parties as a moiety of the nation's citizenship, and not a very respectable one at that. They are merely "preachers." A Roman priest to whom the chrism has been applied can put a wealth of meaning into this word "preacher." What is a "preacher" compared with a "priest"? The former is a declaimer upon religious subjects, pleading for acceptance with his audience and always at the mercy of his weak and questionably constituted adherents,

without dignity, without authority, and without historic prestige. The latter boasts a divine appointment as an organ of God in "the alone saving church;" he is able to effect the awful mystery of reproducing the atoning sacrifice of the Redeemer; his authority extends not only to the living, but even to the realm of departed spirits, he looks back upon a bright galaxy of illustrious predecessors in office, etc. Thus this authentic reply came steeped in haughty insolence and scorn.

The reply characterized the resolutions passed by Lutheran, Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian ministers and the letters of Protest issued anent the President's remarks as "the latest recrudescence of a plague," that had first appeared in the days when the Christ was in the flesh. He had been charged with disseminating views subversive of the loyalty of the Jews to their Roman government. The early Christians had been subjected to the same calumny. Catholics in the days of Henry VIII and Elizabeth had suffered martyrdom for the same cause. And when to-day they are represented as disloyal to their country, they are simply bearing the cross which their Master and His early disciples bore, and their Master had even foretold this state of affairs Matt. 10, 24, 25. But as Christ had avowed His fidelity both to Caesar and to God, Matt. 22, 21, so the Catholics experience no real conflict between duty to the State and duty to the Church. They merely resist the encroachments which the civil authorities attempt upon the rights of the Church. — How an intelligent and educated person can advance this argument with the facts of history as stated in the Protestant letters to President Roosevelt before him, passes comprehension, unless one assumes insincerity as the writer's guiding principle. The Protestant Church came into existence with a twofold charge against the Church of Rome. It charged Rome, first and foremost, with not rendering unto God the things that are God's, with setting up its teachings in opposition to the teachings of God's Holy Word. It charged Rome, secondly, with not rendering unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, with extending its jurisdiction into the domain of the civil

power. Matt. 22, 21 practically was read thus by Rome: Render unto the pope the things that are Caesar's and the things that are God's. Practically, we say; for Rome did not expunge the original reading from the New Testament, but it made the original reading of no effect by her teaching and her dire activity. The Philadelphia orator virtually argues thus: Christ was charged innocently with high-treason because of His teaching. The Roman Church teaches as Christ taught. Therefore the Roman Church is charged innocently with treasonable intent. The fallacy in this syllogism lies in the minor premise. The Roman Church does not teach Christ's doctrine on the relation of the Church to the State, nor did Christ teach what Roman popes have taught on this subject. What Boniface VIII, Pius IX, Leo XIII, and Pius X have said in regard to this matter, not only in a general way, but also with a direct and special application to the United States of America, is the exact contrary of what Christ has said. It is an avowed principle of ecclesiastical polity with the Roman Church that "*the Church*" cannot carry on its work unless it is given political power. It has solemnly claimed authority to wield not only that sword which is mentioned in Eph. 6, 17, but also that which is named Rom. 13, 4. And it has not only claimed, but also grasped and wielded the latter sword with fearful effect, as the historical records of the older nations in Europe, and the history of Mexico and the South American states on our own continent show. Accordingly, we shall have to revise the argument of the Philadelphia priest thus: Christ was unjustly suspected of proclaiming doctrines hostile to the authority of the civil powers, but the Roman Church is justly charged with that evil. The papal claims find no shelter in the teachings of Jesus.

The orator proceeded to measure the Protestant protests against Protestant practice at home and abroad as regards the principle of the separation between Church and State. He finds that in nearly all Protestant countries the Reformation has resulted in the establishment of state-churches, hence has suc-

ceeded in removing the evil of Papocaesarism only by erecting in its stead the other evil of Caesaropapism. He finds also that Protestants in our country have in the colonial period tolerated, and have, after the Constitution was adopted by the States, again and again demanded the union of Church and State. From these facts he draws the conclusion that by their protests to the late President the Protestants have involved themselves in a ridiculous contradiction, that they are glaringly inconsistent, that it is nothing but envy of the power of the Roman Church that has prompted their utterances, that with the facts of Protestant history before them unbiased men must grant that Protestant ascendancy in our country would imply just as great a danger to the existing separation of Church and State as Catholic ascendancy. This is, of course, a *Tu quoque* argument. The Philadelphia orator gives the Protestants a Roland for their Oliver. Yet he says: "We have no intention of entering a plea of avoidance and confession." Nevertheless, that is exactly what he has done. The greater part of his discourse is nothing else than an effort to tell the Protestants: "You are another!" "Physician, heal thyself!" "You are in like condemnation." After the splendid parallel drawn in his opening remarks between the Christ and the Roman Church, this turn in the argument affects one rather queerly.

This argument, too, is fallacious. The fact that the principles of Protestantism have not been carried out in Germany, in Great Britain, in the Scandinavian States, in the American Colonies cannot be cited against American Protestants who live under the Constitution of the United States. In the North American Republic and its basic law Protestants view the realization of that principle which they had striven in vain elsewhere and in other times to apply in its full extent, and for the application of which they are still laboring elsewhere. Every movement for the disestablishment of a state-church is an effort to obtain what Americans have achieved more than a century ago. American Protestants, some of the very men who wrote to President Roosevelt, have also resisted the

aim of the National Christian Association in our country. Rev. McAllister and his *Christian Statesman* have not spoken the mind, *e. g.*, of the Lutherans who deprecated the bigotry-letter of the late President. It is therefore irrelevant to cite the civil aspect of Protestant churches in other lands and in former times against the men who protested to President Roosevelt. But the Roman Church cannot plead a difference in its favor between her attitude toward the separation of Church and State in this country and elsewhere and between now and then. *Roma semper eadem*, is a standing boast of the Roman hierarchy, and that this boast is not a mere empty phrase is shown by encyclicals of the most recent popes to American Catholics. *Tolerari potest*, is the best that the popes have been able to say in regard to the position which their church occupies in this country.

The last important argument of the Philadelphia orator was a concession and a denial. He conceded that the Roman Church favors a union of Church and State; he denied that the Protestants understand correctly the nature of that union as Catholics view it. Catholics advocate merely "a moral union," and that is all that has been intended by the bulls of Boniface VIII, Leo XIII, and the Syllabus of Pius IX. On this point it is sufficient to hear the speaker in order to discover the invalidity of his argument. He says:

The way Protestants "understand" Catholic documents is often very ludicrous. In the Stack-O'Hara case, a learned judge discovered a frightful threat against the priest in the Bishop's phrase: "This order binds sub-grave." His honor translated sub-grave "this side of the grave."

If these preachers read these Papal documents without their preconceived notions of Catholic disloyalty, if, instead of reading into them with jaundiced eyes, the insinuations and accusations of these protests, they read them to learn the sense in which Catholics understand and accept them, they would find them full of sound American doctrine. Doctrine to which these teachers subscribe, in which they glory when they are not writhing in the spasms of Romaphobia.

What do the preachers themselves teach about the Church being superior in its order to the State? They maintain that the spiritual order is superior to the temporal, that the law of God is superior to that of man, that, in case of conflict between these two, the civil law must yield to the higher law. They maintain that conscience is supreme, that civil authority must bow to it, that to assert the rights of conscience against the civil power is nothing more than a defense of the inalienable rights of man, that to claim the State is supreme in spirituals as well as temporals is a denial of religious liberty.

Let us compare their teaching with the doctrine of the Papal Bulls and Syllabus. It is, first, that God is the author of all law,—that impressed upon the tablets of the heart, and that inscribed on tables of stone. It is, second, that there is no authority but that which is from God. It is, third, that God is the Sovereign Lord whom peoples and rulers, and individuals, State as well as Church, must obey. It is, fourth, that the Church is not the author of the law, but only its administrator. It is, fifth, that the civil law is not binding in conscience when it is a violation of the law of God. That while the civil law may compel men to bear wrongs, it cannot compel them to do wrong. The whole doctrine of Papal documents on this point is summed up in the words of the Apostles, when scourged and forbidden to preach any more in the name of Jesus, they said: "We must obey God rather than men."

The preachers will recognize all this as sound political and Protestant doctrine, and claim they do not differ from Catholics in regard to it. They will tell us that what they really object to in the encyclicals as a menace to Republican institutions and the source of Catholic disloyalty is the fact that the Pope's decisions in all cases of dispute between the civil and the ecclesiastical authorities are final, and that, as he is opposed to our institutions, the tendency of his judgments must inevitably be to make Catholics traitors to their country.

If the Pope is not the supreme judge in case of a conscience troubled by the civil authority, commanding and the ecclesiastical forbidding, will the preachers tell us who is? If the Pope is not, is some politician to direct the scrupulous conscience? In place of the Pope, would they have Nero or Napoleon, Henry VIII, or Clemencau set the uneasy conscience at rest on all questions of political morality?

In the supposition that Christ was still on earth, He would certainly be the Judge to determine in a given case what things belong to Caesar and what things belong to God, when obedience is due to

Country and when to Church; and from His decisions conscience could take no appeal.

When Christ laid down for all time the law upon these matters, a law which has sorely troubled secular rulers, but to which no politician even could offer a specious objection: "Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's," He foresaw, as men have since witnessed, the difficulties that would arise in determining at times what belongs to Caesar and what belongs to God. As Christ certainly foresaw that it would perplex men at times to distinguish what belongs to the State from what belongs to God, He could not have neglected to establish an authority as competent as Himself to adjust differences, to settle disputes, to hold the balance evenly between the citizen and the country, in judging all questions of conscience.

For this purpose Christ established a Church. "Upon this rock I shall build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against her." That she was to take cognizance of "the practical duties," as the preachers call them, even the political duties, is evident from His words: "And if he will not hear them, tell the Church: and if he will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as heathen and the publican."

Christ was King of kings, Lord of lords. "All power is given to me in heaven and on earth." His authority to rule was not derived from the consent of the governed. To His Apostles He said: "You have not chosen me, but I have chosen you." That His representatives in the Church were to take His place and exercise His authority is evident from His words: "He that hears you hears me, and he that despises you despises me, and he that despises me despises Him that sent me."

The Church, then, no more than Christ, was to learn from kings, emperors, presidents, or legislatures what is politically right or wrong, whether the laws of men are in violation of the laws of God or not. On the contrary, they were to learn this from the Church.

If the preachers admit that Christ appointed a supreme guide in all matters of conscience, will they tell us where he is to be found if not in the Pope? If they deny this, without claiming themselves as this guide, will they tell us that the State is the supreme guide in matters of conscience? If so, what becomes of their boasted inalienable rights, of religious liberty, of freedom of conscience, of the higher law if the State can dictate in them? If they deny that there is such a supreme religious guide of conscience, they must assume that God has no right to rule men, that He may rule the heavens,

but that men will rule the earth. In their last analysis, all their insinuations against Catholic loyalty amount to a denial of God's right to rule men, to a denial of His existence; amount to, in the words of a French infidel, "making the people king, the people priest, the people God."

In exercising her supreme authority in solving doubts of conscience as to civil duty, the Church leaves to the State what God gave to her, she leaves to individuals the free-will that God gave to them to accept or reject her decrees. She employs no force to compel them to adopt her notions of their duty, she leaves it to God to punish the disobedient. If the Popes, during 1900 years, have never encroached upon the just rights of nations, have in no case taught Catholics to resist civil authority, what reason have the preachers to prophesy that they will do so in the future?

In the matter of union of State and Church, the preachers themselves certainly do not wish to see these two great powers for good pulling apart, opposing each other, at war one with the other. They do not approve of legislation that is contrary to the teachings of the Church; the State, for example, desecrating the Sabbath while the Church seeks its sanctification. They desire to see State and Church live in harmony, to see them cooperating, each in its sphere working into good. The preachers know that legislation that sins against the conscience cannot promote the political interests of the State.

In advocating a moral union of Church and State, the Popes teach that State and Church are distinct and supreme, each in its order; but that they are not separated; that they are united just as body and soul, though distinct, are united. That, as the welfare of the body depends largely upon its subjection to reason, so the welfare of the State depends largely upon following the guidance of the Church; that, as the uncontrolled appetites of the body would war against the aspirations of the soul, and involve both body and soul in destruction, so would legislation, uncontrolled by the law of God, war against the prerogatives of the Church and inflict injury upon both State and Church; that, as the separation of the body from the soul is physical death, so the separation of the State from the Church is moral death.

In condemning separation of Church and State, Popes have condemned it only when it means the emancipation of the State from the laws of God, when it means the supremacy of the State, in spirituals. The separation of politics from religion is as injurious to the State as it is to the Church, is as destructive of civil as it is of religious liberty. Where would these boons be, if a civil ruler

could dictate in matters of creed and worship? As what God denies to the body is good for both body and soul, so what the Church denies to the State is good for both State and Church.

This moral union of Church and State is all that the Church insists on. Her anxiety to have representatives at foreign courts arises from a desire to cultivate friendly relations with them, to adjust satisfactorily all differences that may arise between them and their Catholic subjects, and not from any desire to meddle with the domestic affairs of those governments, whether they be Protestant or Catholic, or a desire to be subsidized by them.

Let us bear in mind that the popes have denounced liberty of conscience, that they have declared that nobody's conscience is to be respected except it be properly instructed, and that only the Catholic Church can rightly instruct men's consciences; let us note that the Philadelphia orator distinctly claims for the Church the authority to settle all disputes as to what belongs to the State; lastly, let us realize the force of the simile of the union between body and soul as typifying the union between State and Church, and we will be convinced that this "moral union" is no small, innocent affair, that it means nothing less than that the State must do the behests of the Church, even as the body executes the will of the soul.

We note also the sinister claim that the presence on earth of a supreme authority for settling doubts as to the respective functions of State and Church is necessary. Formerly that authority was vested in Christ while He lived among men; now it is vested in the Pope, to whom the prerogatives which Christ has asserted for Himself have passed over. Query: What estimate does this Romanist place on the written Word of God for guiding, instructing, and disabusing men's minds of erroneous notions in regard to questions of the extent of authority? When Christ replied to the Pharisees: "Render unto Caesar," etc., He did not hand down a new decision, but applied an existing principle. Christ did not claim to be a court of arbitration, a sort of Hague Tribunal for the adjustment of political disputes everywhere in the world, nor did He appoint a successor for this purpose in the person of the Roman pontiff.

Christ applied God's Law as He found it; and His followers do the same. Scripture is a sufficient guide to them, and they require neither popes nor politicians to tell them what they owe to God and what to Caesar.

The Roman Church "employs no force," says our orator. "She leaves it to God to punish the disobedient. If the popes, during 1900 years, have never encroached upon the just (!) rights of nations, have in no case taught Catholics to resist civil authority, what reason have the preachers," etc. Here is brazen-faced audacity, indeed. When the Lutheran theologian Johann Gerhard wrote his "Confessio Catholica," which Kurtz terms "die tuechtigste und wuerdigste Polemik gegen die katholische Kirche," he grouped the weapons of Rome's warfare against alien creeds under two heads: *dolus et vis*, cunning and violence, and he fills pages of his ponderous tome with minute and detailed evidence to substantiate either assertion. The Macmillan Co. of New York has published, in our own day and land, H. C. Lea's "History of the Spanish Inquisition." As a sample of Roman forbearance we cite Lea's account of the first autodafé in Mexico, February 28, 1574.

The accounts of the auto as given by Senor Medina are somewhat confused, but from them we gather that there were seventy-four sufferers in all. Of these, three were for asserting that simple fornication between the unmarried was no sin; twenty-seven were for bigamy; two for blasphemy; one for wearing prohibited articles although his grandfather had been burned; two for "propositions;" one because he had made his wife confess to him, and thirty-six for Lutheranism, of whom two, George Ripley and Marin Cornu, were burned. These Lutherans were all foreigners of various nationalities, but mostly English, consisting of Hawkins's men. One of these, named Miles Phillips, has left an account of the affair, in which he says that his compatriots George Ripley, Peter Momfrie, and Cornelius the Irishman were burned, sixty or sixty-one were scourged and sent to the galleys, and seven, of whom he was one, were condemned to serve in convents. The wholesale scourging was performed the next day, through the accustomed streets, the culprits being preceded by a crier calling out, "See these English Lutheran dogs, enemies of God!" while inquisitors and familiars shouted to the executioners, "Harder, harder, on these English Lutherans!" (p. 205 f.)

We pass on to another reply to the Protestant charges which has come from within the Roman Church. This insignificant "storm in a teapot" which Protestants have aroused has nevertheless brought the foremost Romanist in America into the arena. Press notices from New York to San Francisco had heralded the coming of his reply weeks before the March number of *The North American Review* made its appearance. Americans were all ears to hear what Cardinal Gibbons would have to say to the Protestants on the relation of the Church to the State. "The Church and the Republic" was the title chosen for his article. He began with a strong avowal of Catholic loyalty to the political institutions now in force in our country.

They love their country with the spontaneous and ardent love of all patriots, because it is their country and the source to them of untold blessings. They prefer its form of government before any other. They admire its institution and the spirit of its laws. They accept the Constitution without reserve, with no desire, as Catholics, to see it changed in any feature. They can with a clear conscience swear to uphold it. (p. 321.)

No establishment of religion is being dreamed of here, of course, by any one; but were it to be attempted, it would meet with the united opposition of the Catholic people, priests, and prelates. (p. 322.)

We do not doubt it. The Catholics have no reason to desire a change in the Constitution under which they have had such a marvelous growth. It would be like cutting down the tree that has sheltered them. Nor is the danger which Protestants foresee exactly portrayed by the suggested change of the Constitution. While the Catholics are in a minority, it is, of course, impossible for them to make such a change. When they shall muster a bare majority, they may consider it inexpedient and impolitic to make the change. When they shall be in the majority to an overwhelming degree, they may find it superfluous and useless to make the change. They may prefer to leave the venerable old document stand, and even claim to uphold it by giving it the proper interpretation and application. For liberty of conscience and of worship is also defended by Romanists, with the understanding that it must be liberty of

a conscience rightly instructed and liberty of worship in the true religion.¹⁾ As to a possible establishment of religion in our country it is not likely either that that will come in the form of a constitutional amendment, at least not for a generation. But something else Catholics are not only "dreaming of," but laboring for with the utmost energy. In Cardinal Gibbons's home at Baltimore, probably in his cathedral, a remarkable sermon was preached on the hundredth anniversary of the establishment of the Catholic hierarchy in the United States, Sunday, November 10, 1889. The speaker was Archbishop Ireland, who chose for his text Ecclesiasticus 4, 33: "For thy soul strive for justice, and even unto death fight for justice, and God will overthrow thy enemies for thee."²⁾ From this warlike text the speaker proceeded to set forth "The Mission of Catholics in America." He said:

There is so much at stake for God and souls, for Church and Country! There is so much in dependency upon our cooperation with the divine action in the world! The duty of the moment is to understand our responsibility, and to do the full work that Heaven has allotted to us — for our souls to strive for justice, and even unto death to fight for justice. (p. 54.)

Let me state, as I conceive it, the work which, in God's providence, the Catholics of the United States are called to do within the coming century. It is twofold: To make America Catholic, and to solve for the Church universal the all-absorbing problems with which religion is confronted in the present age. (p. 55.)

The conversion of America should ever be present to the minds of Catholics in America as a supreme duty from which God will not hold them exempt. (p. 56.)

The work is to make America Catholic. As we love America, as we love the Church, it suffices to mention the work, and our cry shall be, "God wills it," and our hearts shall leap toward it with Crusader enthusiasm. (p. 56.)

We know that the Church is the sole owner of the truths and graces of salvation. . . . The Catholic Church will preserve, as no

1) See Gibbons's *The Faith of Our Fathers*, 49th ed., p. 264.

2) See *The Church and Modern Society*. Lectures and addresses by John Ireland, Archbishop of St. Paul, vol. I. (Second edition.) Chicago and New York. D. H. McBride & Co. 1897. p. 50—84.

human power, no human church can preserve, the liberties of the Republic. (p. 56.)

Five years prior to this oration, on the same date and at the same place, the same speaker had said to the Third Plenary Council:

Whatever the works of zeal which Catholic priests and laymen attempt or do in any country, where the episcopate is not established, the Church is not rooted in that country, nor can she attain there her full growth. (l. c., p. 49.)

It is such utterances as these that Americans would like to have explained by Cardinal Gibbons whenever he chooses to disavow any intention on the part of his church looking in the direction of an "establishment of religion." There are various ways in which this might be done; the passing of a bill to that effect by Congress is one way. It is easy for the Cardinal to deny that Catholics are "dreaming" of that way. But "converting" America, substituting "the Church" for every "human church" now operating in the United States, and placing "the Church" under the fostering care of that power which alone can erect a Roman episcopate, is another way. Does the Cardinal disavow this also? His colleague from St. Paul has pleaded for justice, and his oration was a call to arms for the defense of justice. This may have been a figurative expression, even as the allusion to Crusader enthusiasm with which he desired to see American Catholics animated. But we inquire: Justice to whom? If in "converting" America Catholics are "fighting for justice," then present conditions as they apply to the status of their Church in our country cannot be viewed by them as being just. Leo XIII has declared that the Catholic Church in America "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." (*Longinque Oceani*, January 6, 1895.) Between the Cardinal's very luminous avowal of satisfaction, the pope's equally clear expressions of dissatisfaction, and the archbishop's heroic appeal for justice, the American public will be perplexed and bewil-

dered, not knowing which of these estimable gentlemen to believe, or whether it is possible to believe all of them. In order to clear the situation of all doubt and equivocation, it will be necessary to cancel Archbishop Ireland's sermon and the papal encyclical of 1895, or Cardinal Gibbons's article of March, 1909, cannot stand. For no person of average intelligence will be able to harmonize these three statements:

1) All the Catholics of the United States, people, priests, and prelates, would unite in opposing an establishment of religion in this country. (Gibbons.)

2) It is not sufficient for securing the full growth of the Catholic Church in the United States, that she be granted liberty; the laws should be made to favor her, and the public authority should extend its patronage to her. (Leo XIII.)

3) Catholics should fight even unto death for justice, *i. e.*, to make America Catholic, to solve the church problems of our country. (Ireland.)

What the Cardinal has said regarding Catholic love of our country is a gratuitous assurance. What he has said about an establishment of religion is subject to question and discount as long as he fails to openly reject the encyclical *Longinque Oceani* in those portions where it censures American institutions, and as long as he permits men like Archbishop Ireland, Archbishop Donahue, and Father Hecker to speak about the ideals of Catholicism in the United States as they have spoken. If the Cardinal is right in this part of his article, he is not a true Romanist; if he is a loyal son of the pope, he has erred in what he has written.

In Part II of his article the Cardinal arrays the charges of the Protestant ministers against the "national policy of religious liberty and equality before the law," and in Part III he shows how detestable they are. The American nation, he holds, has not spoken through the protesting ministers, but through Mr. Roosevelt; and the American nation believes better things of its Catholic citizens than the protesting ministers. What *the nation* thinks regarding the justice of the controversy

with Mr. Roosevelt and the Catholics is mere conjecture. It would require a national vote to obtain real facts on the strength of which a writer could claim that the nation is with him, not with the other party. For the present it is extremely uninteresting, except to politicians, to know how many citizens admire or approve of, how many deplore and disapprove of Mr. Roosevelt's letter, and how many are indifferent or feel that their interests demand that they express no opinion on the matter. The point of real importance is whether the protests of ministers are based upon facts, not how much these protests are liked.

The Cardinal sees in these protests an effort to establish a religious test for obtaining or exercising the functions of citizenship in the North American Republic. If Catholics are to be kept out of office, it follows, of course, that candidates for office will have to be required to state that they are not Catholics. This is not necessary at all. If a person is identified with political views and principles at variance with the Constitution of the United States, he excludes himself from holding office in our country. If such a person claims that his creed compels him to hold those divergent political views and principles, he will be told that in that case his creed must also compel him not to desire office. If he complains of unjust discrimination and invalidation of his rights as a citizen, he will be told he is free to practice any religion he chooses, but he is not free to upset the Constitution of the country. If Catholics were to believe that the Trinity consists of four persons, and that the Virgin Mary belongs to it, no American citizen would deny them the right under our Constitution to believe thus. If an apotheosis of the pope were inaugurated by them, no one would oppose them on political grounds. If they were to add another sacrament to their number, appoint new festival days and ceremonies to be observed by their worshipers, it would be of no concern to the citizens of our republic as citizens. But when they say: "It is quite unlawful to demand, to defend, or to grant unconditional freedom of thought,

of speech, of writing, or of worship," they will be told: "Such views will not be tolerated in this country. If you call those views your religion, we are sorry that you have embraced such a religion. To us those views are not religious views; we view them as political principles, and shall resist them as such, not as religion." Just as we resist polygamy, no matter what the religion of Mormonism may have to say about that matter; or as we oppose anarchism despite the anarchist's declamation that revolution is part of his creed. The Cardinal mistakes and misstates the issue when from the protest of the ministers he makes out a case of religious intolerance and political dissatisfaction. The protesting ministers would leave both, the Catholic religion and the American Constitution, intact. But they declare against the Catholic religion when it is seen in conflict with the American Constitution. For to allow the particular Catholic tenet of the supremacy of the Church over the State would mean that every non-Catholic citizen must surrender his liberties, in order that Catholics may practice what they call their religion.

The concluding parts of the Cardinal's article deal, or pretend to deal, with the papal utterances which had been attacked by the ministers. As a matter of fact, the Cardinal has not referred to a single citation contained in the Protestant letters. He speaks (Part IV) of "the distinction between the civil and the ecclesiastical powers" as "firmly established in the Catholic teaching." Each has its distinct domain and authority. "Neither obeys the other within the limits to which each is restricted by its constitution." For this "distinction" the Roman Church has fought throughout the Middle Ages. If any pope were to declare against this "distinction," he would stand self-condemned and would be disobeyed by Catholics. Protestants, on the other hand, have everywhere ingloriously gone down before the power of Caesarism, and their churches are creatures of the State.

The Catholic Church has always retained her spiritual independence; her union with the State has always been an allegiance

of independent powers, not the subjection of a vassal to her liege lord. Her doctrine on the subject has been this: in a country wholly or predominantly Catholic, the most desirable relation is the friendly union and cooperation of Church and State, neither power sacrificing its liberty and each acknowledging the other.

The Cardinal, in this part of his article, employs two terms, "distinction" and "separation;" the former when he rehearses the tenets of the Catholic church, the latter when he speaks of conditions in our country and elsewhere as regards the relation of Church and State. That the Catholic Church has logically and dogmatically "distinguished" between the civil and the ecclesiastical power no one denied. The very citation from *Unam Sanctam* which the Lutheran ministers embodied in their letter shows this. That the Catholic Church, while "distinguishing" between Church and State, has violently resisted their *separation*, her own history in every age and country shows. While she has been in power no creed except her own was tolerated, and she has employed the civil powers to suppress alien creeds. When she was not in power, she sought to obtain favorable terms from the State, and in the meantime protested that she was not given her full liberty. She has submitted to these conditions only as long as it was not in her power to change them. She has occasionally made a virtue of necessity, that is all. To cite these cases of sullen submission and represent them as the true Catholic ideal of the relation of Church and State, is a pretty piece of naiveté. If the Cardinal's representations are correct, what need was there of *Unam Sanctam*, the *Syllabus*, *Longinque Oceani*, *Immortale Dei*?

Distinction? Yes, Rome can distinguish between Church and State. In Spain, where her influence has been supreme for ages, the officers of the holy Hermandad do not wear friars' garments, and they do not make their arrests by pointing a crucifix at the offender, but they probably strike him with a bludgeon or shoot bullets at him, just as a worldly policeman would do in the United States. And the judges in Madrid or

Sevilla do not sit in their chair counting beads, dispensing justice from Leviticus, the Sermon on the Mount, or the Epistles of St. Paul, and fining culprits so many Ave Marias, Pater-nosters, wax candles, or the like. They probably decide law-suits according to the law of Spain, and sentence criminals to the jail or the gibbet, just like our American justices. The distinction is there—yes, but it is a distinction that is worth-less as an exhibition of the practical operation of the principle of separation as between Church and State. The distinction is there, but where is the difference?

We were rejoiced to find in the May issue of *The North American Review* a reply, ably written, to the Cardinal's article. The Rev. William Schoenfeld, Pastor of the Evangelical Lutheran Immanuel Church, New York, wrote under the caption, "Separation of Church and State—a Policy or a Principle?" This initial question lays bare, at one stroke of the pen, the very heart of the Cardinal's serpentine reasonings. After re-hearsing the history of the letter which the Lutheran pastors of New York had addressed to President Roosevelt, the author reproduces verbatim the letter, in order "that there may be no suspicion of our twisting aught that we said, and that every one may form his own judgment on the Cardinal's charge, and what else he has advanced in his article."

The contentions of the Lutheran letter are then made very clear, as follows:

1. That the First Amendment of the Constitution proclaims the complete separation of Church and State as a principle, and not as a mere policy.

2. That the Roman Catholic Church, speaking through its recognized authoritative head and teacher, has persistently denounced that principle, and declared separation of Church and State to be a condition that is to be tolerated only so long as necessity and expediency required.

3. That a loyal Roman Catholic can, therefore, never be an upholder and defender of separation of Church and State as a principle, but that he can merely acquiesce in it as a matter of policy; and that, for this reason, it would be inconsistent and self-contradictory

if loyal American citizens, subscribing without reservation to the principle of separation of Church and State, were to help elect a man to that office, which, above every other, is entrusted with the duty of upholding and defending what President Roosevelt styled "one of the foundations of American life."

These three points the author elucidates in the remainder of his article, which deserves the closest study as a successful refutation of every claim set up by the Cardinal. The article, we note, has been reproduced in toto, omitting only the well-known New York letter, in *The Lutheran Witness* of June 10th.

There are indications that the policy of Romanists at present is, to continue replying to, without answering, the Protestant indictment, and at the same time to make the most of the Roosevelt letter to Mr. Martin. We hear of Catholic gatherings in many places where the remarks of Roosevelt are applauded and applied to the men who took exception to them. Others, outside of the Roman fold, have interpreted the silence of Mr. Roosevelt as a discreet withdrawal, and have sympathized with the late President because they have felt that he must be embarrassed by the hasty utterance of words the full import of which was not understood by him at the time. They would be disposed, in charity, to allow a great and good man to make his retreat in silence, and to let the matter rest. But the indiscreet gloating of the leaders of the Roman Catholic Church over the bigotry remarks of the President must be more embarrassing to the President than the open and manly appeal of the Protestants. While he may have considered it safe not to speak out to his critics, he may find it necessary to speak to his admirers. For to be admired as he has been lately is the worst calamity that could have befallen him.
