

THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

VOL. VII.

OCTOBER 1903.

No. 4.

CHRISTIAN ARCHAEOLOGY.

(Concluded.)

VI. MISSIONS.

The Christian church was, from and in its very beginning, a missionary church. Its birthday was *the day of Pentecost*,¹⁾ a harvest feast for offering "firstfruits unto the Lord." Not the whole harvest, but firstfruits, of the new covenant were brought to the sanctuary by the preaching of the gospel to the pentecostal multitude. The whole harvest was to follow, of which those firstfruits were a part. What took place at Jerusalem was to be *the beginning*;²⁾ the continuation was to extend through Samaria and Galilee and throughout *all nations in all the world*, even to *the uttermost part of the earth*.³⁾ This was not merely a matter of choice and option with the church, but the will of the Master, published in a solemn charge, repeated at various times, even in his very last words spoken to his disciples before the chariot of cloud carried him out of their sight.⁴⁾ Nor were the ways and means to be employed in carrying out this work left to the choice and option of the workmen. The charge of the Master-builder specified also the means whereby his temple should be reared to the end of time. *Preach the gospel to every creature*, he said,⁵⁾ and, *Teach all nations*,

1) Acts 2, 1.

2) Luke 24, 47. Acts 1, 4.

3) Acts 1, 8. Matt. 28, 19. Mark 16, 15.

4) Acts 1, 8. 9.

5) Mark 16, 15.

IN MEMORIAM LEONIS XIII PAPAE.

In the Vatican palace at Rome, on the 20th of July, 1903, an old man died. For twenty-five years he had dwelt there in self-imposed imprisonment under the assumed name of Leo XIII. For twenty-five years he had posed as the vicerent of Christ, the successor of St. Peter, the visible head of the church on earth, the infallible teacher of all Christendom, none of which he had really been, nor could have been, for a single hour. For twenty-five years he had grossly defamed and vilely besmirched the greater and better part of all Christendom, condemned and impugned the most cherished liberties of churches and nations as at variance with justice and reason, falsely scored against the wonderful work of God to which we chiefly owe those liberties the most monstrous abominations, and openly and secretly, and not without success, endeavored the restoration of the most outrageous tyranny the world has seen and of which millions were freed by that same wonderful work of God.

And forasmuch as thousands upon thousands of Protestant Christians and citizens, and their teachers and leaders, are evidently unaware of the true significance of the said defunct old man, a significance in which they too were and still are and will continue to be most deeply concerned, we have deemed it a duty to bear testimony to what the deceased has been to us and our readers. And, lest it be said that we arraigned a man who can no longer defend himself, we will call to the stand but one witness, one who is most certainly competent to testify in behalf of Leo XIII, whom no one will look upon as biased against him, and to whom least of all he himself could consistently object, unless it be on the plea that no one should be held to incriminate himself by his own testimony. For the witness on whose testimony we will rest the case and let it go to the jury is

Leo XIII himself. What we shall submit will not be hearsay evidence, not purported sayings of his circulated in press dispatches or newspaper reports, not *dicta* which fell from his lips at table or emanated from his pen in private letters, but solemn public utterances, which he made as under oath, in official documents published under and over his name and title and directed to those by whom he would be heard in the name of God and as the lieutenant of Christ. The Latin text of the quotations from these official *Encyclicals* which we herewith submit was taken from an edition approved by Leo XIII himself. In the preface of the first volume the editor says:—

“May these ponderous words of our Most Holy Father penetrate to the most distant circles and everywhere meet with that appreciation which the exalted station of him, from whom they came, and their high significance demand.”

The charge we must prefer against Leo XIII on the testimony of his *Encyclicals* is this, that he was a bitter enemy and acrimonious defamer and impugner of *Protestantism*, and of *our free institutions*, of a free church in a free state, religious liberty, freedom of worship, freedom of conscience, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and the separation of church and state without which all these liberties are untenable; that all these liberties, which we possess and enjoy and cherish, and for which we thank God and pray that they be preserved to us and our children, Leo XIII has again and again condemned as evils and sources of evil, as being at variance with justice and reason; he has stamped it a wrong to claim, to grant, and to defend these liberties, and declared their temporary toleration on the part of the catholic Church a matter, not of right, but of expediency until, under improved circumstances, they be abolished. He has enjoined upon all catholic citizens the duty of infusing these principles “into the veins of the

state" and of exerting their political influence toward a reconstruction of our political institutions in accordance with the ideas of the Roman Pontiff.

Such is the indictment.

Now follows the evidence.—

When, in 1881, the gruesome assassination of the emperor of Russia by the Nihilists caused a cry of horror to reverberate throughout the civilized world, Leo XIII issued an encyclical to his prelates in all lands, in which he had the audacity to lay this monstrous crime and other atrocities to the charge of the Reformation. And this he did not in a passing way, but he made this calumnious accusation the very starting point of his treatise. These are the opening words of the Encyclical *Diuturnum illud*:¹⁾—

"That long and wicked war which was undertaken against the divine authority of the Church, resulted in that, to which it tended, namely in a common danger to human society and especially to civil government, which is the chief prop of the public welfare."²⁾

In the same Encyclical Leo XIII says still more distinctly what he means by "that wicked war" which, having run its course to "whither it tended," had resulted in such atrocious crimes. He says:—

"Since it was not possible entirely to deprive the states of their political power, all manner of crafty efforts were certainly made to weaken its force and to diminish its

1) The papal bulls and encyclicals are named by their opening words; and we quote them according to this usage.

2) *Diuturnum illud teterrimumque bellum, adversus divinam Ecclesiae auctoritatem susceptum, illuc, quo proclive erat, evasit; videlicet in commune periculum societatis humanae, ac nominatim civilis principatus, in quo salus publica maxime nititur.*

Diuturnum, p. 1.

majesty; and that chiefly in the XVI century, when many were infatuated by the new ideas.”¹⁾

The XVI century, as we all know, was the century of the Reformation, and the “new ideas” were those set forth by Luther and his co-laborers. That he refers to the “Reformation,” Leo XIII expressly says in the same Encyclical:—

“Indeed, that so-called *Reformation*, whose leaders and abettors radically assailed the power of church and state by new doctrines, was followed by sudden tumults and most audacious rebellions, chiefly in Germany, and that with so much fire and murder of domestic war, that hardly a place free from turmoil and bloodshed was to be found.—From this heresy, in the last century, a falsely so-called philosophy took its origin, and what is known as *modern law*, and government by the people, that boundless license which alone is considered liberty by the masses. From these it has come to kindred pests, to *Communism*, *Socialism*, *Nihilism*, abominations ill-boding and wellnigh death-dealing to civil human society.”²⁾

Here we have a veritable bundle of calumnies against the “Reformation.” It is an old, stale falsehood that the

1) Verum si fieri non potuit, ut e mediis civitatibus politica potestas tolleretur, certe libuit omnes artes adhibere ad vim eius elevandam, maiestatemque minuendam: idque maxime saeculo XVI, cum infesta opinionum novitas complures infatuavit.

Diuturnum, p. 5 sq.

2) Revera illam, quam *Reformationem* vocant, cuius adiutores et duces sacram civilemque potestatem novis doctrinis funditus oppugnaverunt, repentini tumultus et audacissimae rebelliones praesertim in Germania consecutae sunt: idque tanta cum domestici deflagratione belli et caede, ut nullus pene locus expers barbarum et cruoris videretur.—Ex illa haeresi ortum duxit saeculo superiore falsi nominis philosophia, et ius quod appellant *novum*, et imperium populare, et modum nesciens licentia, quam plurimi solam libertatem putant. Ex his ad finitimas pestes ventum est, scilicet ad *Communismum*, ad *Socialismum*, ad *Nihilismum*, civilis hominum societatis teterrima portenta et pene funera.

Diuturnum, p. 25.

insurrection of the peasants and other riots and tumults were fruits of the Reformation. The real causes will be found largely in the sweepings from the doors of Rome and papistical princes; the civil wars of the century were brought about by the persecuting potentates and their Romanist advisers, and if Luther and the real doctrines of the Reformation have bitter enemies to-day outside of the Papacy, it is along the rank and file of the Communists, Socialists, and Nihilists. By the way, when Leo XIII brands the doctrine of the Reformation a "heresy," he does precisely what his predecessor Leo X did when he anathematized Luther as a heretic.

The senseless charge that the modern enemies of law and order were the children of the Reformation is repeated in an Encyclical dated Dec. 28, 1878, in which Leo XIII also raises his voice against the "Socialists, Communists, and Nihilists," and says:—

"You are well aware, Venerable Brethren, that the fierce war which was from the beginning of the sixteenth century waged against the catholic faith by the Innovators, and which has hitherto continued with ever growing strength, has this for its end and aim that, all revelation having been set aside and every supernatural order overturned, the inventions, or rather the ravings, of reason only should be admitted." 1)

In one of his most celebrated Encyclicals, *Immortale Dei*, of Nov. 1, 1885, he says:—

"There was a time when the philosophy of the gospel governed the states, a time when that power and divine energy of Christian wisdom penetrated the laws, institu-

1) Probe enim nostis, Venerabiles Fratres, infestissimum bellum, quod in catholicam fidem inde a saeculo decimo sexto a Novatoribus commotum est, et quam maxime in dies hucusque invaluit, eo tendere ut, omni revelatione submota et quolibet supernaturali ordine subverso, solius rationis inventis, seu potius deliramentis, aditus pateret.

Quod Apostolici muneris, p. 7.

tions, and morals of the peoples, all the orders and relations of the state, when the religion instituted by Jesus Christ, firmly established in the dignified station to which it was entitled, flourished by the good-will of princes and the lawful protection of magistrates, when the priesthood and the civil power were happily united by concord and services of mutual friendship. . . .

“But that baneful and deplorable revolutionary movement which was stirred up in the XVI century, having first wrought confusion in the Christian religion, soon, as in its natural course, made its way to philosophy, and from philosophy to all orders of the civil community.”¹⁾

In an epistle to “all the princes and nations of the earth,” of June 20, 1894, Leo XIII likewise deplores that the Reformation had destroyed what had been built up in the middle ages. He says:—

“The beginnings and progress of this great work, the results of the labors of former ages, were making happy headway, when suddenly the disturbances of the XVI century flared up.”²⁾

1) Fuit aliquando tempus, cum evangelica philosophia gubernaret civitates: quo tempore christianae sapientiae vis illa et divina virtus in leges, instituta, mores populorum, in omnes rei publicae ordines rationesque penetraverat: cum religio per Jesum Christum instituta in eo, quo aequum erat, dignitatis gradu firmiter collocata, gratia principum legitimaque magistratuum tutela ubique floreret: cum sacerdotium atque imperium concordia et amica officiorum vicissitudo auspicato coniungeret. . . .

Sed perniciosa illa ac deploranda rerum novarum studia, quae saeculo XVI excitata sunt, cum primum religionem christianam miscuissent, mox naturali quodam itinere ad philosophiam, a philosophia ad omnes civilis communitatis ordines pervenerunt.

Immortale Dei, p. 27. 29.

2) Cuius tanti operis initia progressusque, superiorum aetatum parta laboribus, ad laeta incrementa properabant, cum repente discordia saeculo XVI deflagravit.

Praeclara gratulationis, p. 37.

We know what "the great work" with which the Reformation had to deal amounted to, and the papist princes and enemies of Luther who submitted their long arrays of grievances at the various German diets could also tell a tale of the blessings that came from beyond the Alps, and had grown to be wellnigh beyond endurance. We also know of the real blessings, both temporal and spiritual, which the Reformation brought to princes and nations and of which Leo maintains profound silence. In his sight it was and still is a source of evil, and evil only, and must therefore be retrieved, that the former order of things may be restored. After the words last quoted he proceeds:—

"The causes of discord still continuing, what wonder that so great a part of mortals is still in the bonds of inhuman vices and insane rites. Let us, therefore, with united efforts, endeavor to restore the former concord for the benefit of the common good."¹⁾

The princes and nations are, then, to become once more subject to the thralldom of Rome, from which the Reformation has made them free. Thus also the following words, quoted from the Encyclical of Dec. 22, 1887, are directed against the Reformation:—

"The beginning of *this impure pest*, the most detestable of all, was made by those who attributed to man, as by mere nature, that every one might, by his own reason and judgment, know and decide the things pertaining to the doctrine divinely given, and must by no means be subject to the authority of the Church and the Roman Pontiff, with whom alone it rests, by divine mandate and benefit, to guard this doctrine, to hand it forward, and with full truth to judge of it."²⁾

1) Insidentibus discordiae caussis, quid mirum, si tam magna pars mortalium moribus inhumanis et vesanis ritibus tenetur. Omnes igitur pari studio demus operam ut concordia vetus, communis boni caussâ restituatur. Praeclara gratul., p. 37.

2) Cuius impurae pestis, qua nulla est detestabilior, illi initia fecere, qui homini tribuerunt naturâ tantum, ut de doctrina divinitus

Ten years later, in an Encyclical of Aug. 1, 1897, written in commemoration of one of the most active and assiduous impugnors of the Reformation, the Jesuit Peter Canisius, Leo XIII said:—

“How great a task this man of eminent loyalty toward the catholic faith took upon himself in his zeal for the affairs of church and state is readily seen by those who view the aspect of Germany in the beginning of *the Lutheran rebellion*. Under the degeneracy and continued decadence of morality the way to error was paved; and error again completed the final downfall of morality. Hence, by and by, many fell away from the catholic faith; soon *the evil poison* spread throughout nearly all the provinces; then it infected people of all stations of rank and fortune, so that in the minds of many the opinion gained hold that the cause of religion in that empire had been reduced to its last extremities and that hardly a remedy remained to cure the disease.”¹⁾

An “impure pest,” an “evil poison,” the Reformation with its doctrine of “the freedom of a Christian man” was to Leo XIII. How could it be otherwise since, in his Encyclical of Jan. 10, 1890, he says:—

data posset quisque pro ratione indicioque suo cognoscere et decernere, minime vero auctoritati subesse deberet Ecclesiae et Pontificis romani, quorum unice est divino mandato et beneficio, eam doctrinam custodire, eam tradere, de ea verissime iudicare.

Officio sanctissimo, p. 21.

1) Quanti negotii munus suscepit vir catholicae fidei retentissimus, proposita sibi causâ rei sacrae et civilis, facile occurrit Germaniae faciem intuentibus sub initio rebellionis lutheranae. Immutatis moribus atque in dies magis collabentibus facilis ad errorem aditus fuit; error autem ipse ruinam morum ultimam maturavit. Hinc sensim plures a catholica fide descissere; mox pervagari malum virus provincias fere universas; tum omnis conditionis fortunaeque homines inficere, adeo ut multorum animis opinio insideret causam religionis in illo imperio ad extrema esse deductam; morboque curando vix quidquam superesse remedii. Militantis Ecclesiae, p. 5. 7.

“But the man who has, as he should, embraced the Christian faith, thereby becomes subject to the church, from which he is born, and is made a part of that greatest and most holy society, to govern which with supreme power, under the invisible head, Jesus Christ, is the proper office of the Roman Pontiff.”¹⁾

Not content with pronouncing his condemnation upon those who dissent from Rome in his own name, Leo XIII in his very first Encyclical, dated April 21, 1878, continued and repeated all the innumerable imprecations heaped upon the dissenters by earlier popes and called upon all the millions of his adherents to join him therein. He says:—

“All these condemnations, following the footsteps of Our Predecessors, We do, from this apostolic see of truth, confirm and repeat, at the same time earnestly beseeching the Father of lights, that all the faithful may perfectly in the same mind and in the same judgment agree with Us in thought and in speech.”²⁾

And for all this he claims divine authority. In an Encyclical already quoted he says:—

“Now, then, our duties in both respects, what to believe and what to do, are, as we have said, by divine right prescribed by the Church, and, in the Church, by the supreme Pontiff. Therefore the Pontiff must be able to judge by authority what the oracles of God contain, what agrees and what disagrees with its doctrine; in the same

1) Sed christianam fidem homo, ut debet, complexus, hoc ipso Ecclesiae ut ex ea natus subiicitur, eiusque fit societatis maximae sanctissimaeque particeps, quam summa cum potestate regere, sub invisibili capite Christo Jesu, romani Pontificis proprium est munus.

Sapientiae christianae, p. 11.

2) Has condemnationes omnes, Decessorum Nostrorum vestigia sectantes, Nos ex hac Apostolica veritatis Sede confirmamus ac iteramus, simulque Patrem luminum enixe rogamus, ut fideles omnes perfecti in eodem sensu eademque sententia idem Nobiscum sapiant, idemque loquantur.

Inscrutabili, p. 17.

way, to show what is honorable and what is vile, what we must do and what we must flee; for otherwise he could not be a sure interpreter of the word of God, nor a secure guide of life to men.”¹⁾

Next to our faith and the things thereto pertaining that which is most sacred to Protestant Christians is their “holy estate of marriage” with the relations resulting therefrom. But Leo XIII, who claims it as his prerogative to determine “what is honorable and what is vile,” informs us that there is no manner of holiness in our marriage. For he declares all marriages not consecrated by a catholic priest, who has power to administer the sacraments of the Church, to be marriages without the marriage bond, “legalized concubinage,” in which “the marriage bond does not exist,” and which is “void of the power and character of marriage.” He says:—

“But after impious laws, regardless of the sacredness of this great sacrament, held it to be of the same order with mere civil contracts, the sad consequence was that, violating the dignity of Christian marriage, the citizens resorted to *legalized concubinage instead of marriage.*”²⁾

1) Jamvero de utroque genere, nimirum et quid credere oporteat et quid agere, ab Ecclesia iure divino praecipitur, uti diximus, atque in Ecclesia a Pontifice maximo. Quamobrem iudicare posse Pontifex pro auctoritate debet quid eloquia divina contineant, quae cum eis doctrinae concordent, quae discrepent: eademque ratione ostendere quae honesta sint, quae turpia: quid agere, quid fugere, salutis adipiscendae caussa, necesse sit: aliter enim nec eloquiorum Dei certus interpres, nec dux ad vivendum tutus ille esse homini posset.

Sapientiae christ., p. 33.

2) At vero postquam impiae leges, Sacramenti huius magni religionem nil pensi habentes, illud eodem ordine cum contractibus mere civilibus habuerunt, id misere consecutum est, ut, violata christiani coniugii dignitate, cives legali concubinato pro nuptiis uterentur.

Inscrutabili, p. 19.

In his Encyclical of Feb. 10, 1880, he said:—

“Let no one be misled by that distinction so highly praised by the Regalists, on the strength of which they separate the nuptial contract from the sacrament with a view of turning over the contract to the power and judgment of the rulers of the state, while leaving the sacramental concerns reserved to the Church.—For such a distinction, or rather disruption, cannot be approved, since it is beyond dispute that in Christian marriage the contract cannot be separated from the sacrament, and therefore *no true and legitimate contract can exist* unless it be in the sacrament itself. . . . Hence it is plain that among Christians rightful marriage is in and by itself a sacrament.”¹⁾

This is to say that in a marriage not solemnized by a catholic priest there can be no real marriage contract and that such marriage is not rightful marriage at all.

In the same Encyclical we read:—

“Likewise it must be clear to all that if, among believers, a union between a man and a woman be contracted without the sacrament, it is *void of the power and character of marriage*; and though it be performed in agreement with civil laws, yet it cannot be of greater value than a rite or custom introduced by civil law; but that by civil law such things only can be regulated and administered as marriages bring forth of themselves in a civil way, and it is plain that

1) Nec quemquam moveat illa tantopere a Regalistis praedicata distinctio, vi cuius contractum nuptialem a sacramento disiungunt, eo sane consilio, ut, Ecclesiae reservatis sacramenti rationibus, contractum tradant in potestatem arbitriumque principum civitatis.—Etenim non potest huiusmodi distinctio, seu verius distractio, probari; cum exploratum sit in matrimonio christiano contractum a sacramento non esse dissociabilem; atque ideo non posse contractum verum et legitimum consistere, quin sit eo ipso sacramentum. . . . Itaque apparet, omne inter christianos iustum coniugium in se et per se esse sacramentum.

these cannot be brought forth where their true and legitimate cause, *the marriage bond, does not exist.*"¹⁾

And once more:—

"Lastly, since we well understand that no one must be shut out from our love, we commend to your authority, faith and piety, Venerable Brethren, those very miserable people who, carried away by the heat of lust and wholly unmindful of their salvation, *live in violation of divine right, not being united by the bond of legitimate marriage.* Let it be the aim of your wise endeavors to lead these people back to their duty, and strive for yourselves and with the aid of good men in every way that they may understand that they have acted heinously, that they may repent of their iniquity and make up their minds to *enter into lawful marriage according to catholic rite.*"²⁾

In this plain and outspoken disdain for what we hold sacred in our heart of hearts Leo XIII applies the Romanist doctrine that marriage is a sacrament of the Church, that the Roman Church only has all the sacraments of the Church and only a priest of that church can ordinarily administer

1) Similiter omnibus exploratum esse debet, si qua coniunctio viri et mulieris inter fideles citra Sacramentum contrahatur, eam vi ac ratione matrimonii carere; et quamvis convenienter legibus civicis facta sit, tamen pluris esse non posse quam ritum aut morem, iure civili introductum; iure autem civili res tantummodo ordinari atque administrari posse, quas matrimonia efferunt ex sese in genere civili, et quas gigni non posse manifestum est, nisi vera et legitima illarum caussa, scilicet nuptiale vinculum, existat. Arcanum, p. 45 sq.

2) Postremo loco, cum probe intelligamus, alienum esse a caritate Nostra neminem oportere, auctoritati, fidei et pietati Vestrae, Venerabiles Fratres, illos commendamus, valde quidem miseros, qui aestu cupiditatum abrepti, et salutis suae plane immemores contra fas vivunt, haud legitimi matrimonii vinculo coniuncti. In his ad officium revocandis hominibus Vestra sollers industria versetur: et cum per Vos ipsi, tum interposita virorum bonorum opera, modis omnibus contendite, ut sentiant se flagitiose fecisse, agant nequitiae poenitentiam, et ad iustas nuptias ritu catholico ineundas animum inducant.

Arcanum, p. 49.

them. He tells every Protestant married woman into her face that she is not really and truly a married woman at all, but a vile concubine, that, consequently, the babe at her breast is not a legitimate child begotten and born in honest wedlock, but a miserable bastard. And this she is to accept as final and by divine authority, as of God himself. In his Encyclical of Jan. 10, 1890, Leo XIII says:—

“To determine what are doctrines of divine revelation is the business of the teaching Church, to whom God has committed the custody and interpretation of his word. But the supreme teacher of the Church is the Roman Pontiff. Hence, as the sameness of mind requires perfect agreement in the one faith, so it demands that the will of all should be *perfectly subject and obedient to the Church and the Roman Pontiff as unto God*. But obedience must be perfect, because it is prescribed by faith itself, and has that in common with faith, that it cannot be divided.”¹⁾

The bitter hatred which Leo XIII bore toward Protestantism was also, together with his zeal for the aggrandizement of the Roman catholic church and for its restoration to its former religious and political position in the world, the mainspring of his enmity against what he termed the “modern liberties,” the free institutions which we enjoy under our form of government. Foremost among these, in his estimation and ours, is the freedom of worship, of religion, of conscience, of a free church in a free state.

1) Statuere vero quae sint doctrinae divinitus traditae, Ecclesiae docentis est, cui custodiam interpretationemque Deus eloquiorum suorum commisit. Summus autem est magister in Ecclesia Pontifex romanus. Concordia igitur animorum sicut perfectum in una fide consensum requirit, ita voluntates postulat Ecclesiae romanoque Pontifici perfecte subjectas atque obtemperantes ut Deo. — Perfecta autem esse obedientia debet, quia ab ipsa fide praecipitur, et habet hoc commune cum fide, ut divisa esse non possit.

Sapientiae christianae, p. 29.

In his Encyclical of June 20, 1888, Leo XIII says:—

“In the first place, then, let us consider with reference to individual persons what is spoken of as *freedom of worship*, which is a matter *highly detrimental to the salutary influence of religion*. . . .

“The meaning of this same liberty as considered with regard to states is this, that there is no reason why the state should exercise divine worship or desire its public exercise; that no religion should be preferred to another, but all be held as of equal right.”¹⁾

In the same Encyclical Leo XIII says:—

“Hence justice and reason forbid that the state should be godless, or, which amounts to godlessness, that the State should, as they express it, maintain the same attitude toward the various religions and grant the same rights to all of them promiscuously.”²⁾

Here we see that the freedom of worship is not only put down as inexpedient by the Pontiff, but as inconsistent with “justice and reason.” In the same Encyclical he, furthermore, says:—

“That so-called *freedom of conscience* is also highly praised; which, if thereby is understood that every one shall be free to worship or not to worship God as he may choose, is *sufficiently vanquished by the arguments above advanced*.”³⁾

1) Ac primo illud in singulis personis videamus, quod est tantopere virtuti religionis contrarium, scilicet de *libertate*, ut loquuntur, *cultus*. . . .

Eadem libertas si consideretur in civitatibus, hoc sane vult, nihil esse quod ullum Deo cultum civitas adhibeat aut adhiberi publice velit: nullum anteferri alteri, sed aequo iure omnes haberi oportere.

Libertas, p. 35.

2) Vetat igitur iustitia, vetat ratio atheam esse, vel, quod in atheismum recideret, erga varias, ut loquuntur, religiones pari modo affectam civitatem, eademque singulis iura promiscue largiri.

Libertas, p. 37.

3) Illa quoque magnopere praedicatur, quam *conscientiae libertatem* nominant: quae si ita accipiatur, ut suo cuique arbitrato aequae liceat Deum colere, non colere, argumentis quae supra allata sunt, satis convincitur.

Libertas, p. 47.

With the errors of the "Naturalists" sprung from the "kingdom of Satan," Leo XIII also classed the principle that all religions should enjoy equal rights in the political community, when, in his Encyclical of April 20, 1884, he said:—

"Then follow the decrees of political science. Here the Naturalists teach that . . . the state must be without God; that there is no reason in the various forms of religion why one should be preferred to another; that all should be treated alike."¹⁾

The separation of church and state, which is one of the great blessings we enjoy in this country, finds little favor in the sight of Leo XIII. In the Encyclical "*Libertas*" he says:—

"This is the origin of that *most pernicious* consecratory that the affairs of the state and those of the Church should be separated. But how absurd such doctrine is can be easily understood."²⁾

And again:—

"From this doctrine, as from its fountain-head and principle, flows that *pernicious opinion* that the affairs of the Church and of the state should be separated, while it is plain that both powers, though unlike in purpose and unequal in dignity, must yet agree in *harmony of action* and in *mutual services*."³⁾

1) Sequuntur civilis decreta prudentiae. Quo in genere statuunt Naturalistae . . . atheam esse rempublicam oportere: in variis religionis formis nullam esse causam, cur alia alii anteponatur: eodem omnes loco habendas. Humanum genus, p. 27.

2) Ex quo perniciosum illud gignitur consecrarium, civitatis Ecclesiaeque rationes dissociari oportere. — Sed haec quam absurde dicantur haud difficulter intelligitur. Libertas, p. 33.

3) Et ab hac doctrina, tanquam a capite principioque suo, illa manat perniciosa sententia de rationibus Ecclesiae a republica disparandis; cum contra liqueat, geminas potestates, in munere dissimili et gradu dispari, oportere tamen esse inter se actionum concordia et mutatione officiorum consentientes. Libertas, p. 55.

And once more:—

“Many would have *the state thoroughly and entirely separated from the Church*, so that in reference to all the ordinances of human society, to institutions, morals, laws, political offices, education, etc., they would have no more attention paid to the Church than if it did not exist, the utmost to be permitted being the freedom of individual citizens privately to apply themselves to religion if they choose. *Against these all the arguments hold good whereby We have refuted the opinion that the relations of Church and state should be torn asunder.* We would only add that it is highly absurd that the Church should be treated with reverence by the citizens and with contempt by the state.”¹⁾

And still more explicitly:—

“Thus Gregory XVI, by his encyclical letter beginning with the words *Mirari vos*, of the 15th of August, 1832, with great earnestness rejected certain doctrines which were then being promulgated, that it was not necessary to make a choice between divine worships; that every individual was free to judge of religion as he pleased; that every one’s conscience was his own sole judge; that every one might publish what he listed and foment revolutions. On the separation of the affairs of Church and State the same Pontiff said: ‘Neither could we predict more gladsome things to religion and civil government from the wishes of those who desire that the Church should be separated from the

1) Plures enim rempublicam volunt ab Ecclesia seiunctam et penitus et totam, ita ut in omni iure societatis humanae, in institutis, moribus, legibus, reipublicae muneribus, institutione iuventutis non magis ad Ecclesiam respiciendum censeant, quam si esset omnino nulla: permissa ad summum singulis civibus facultate, ut privatim, si libeat, dent religioni operam. Contra quos plane vis argumentorum omnium valet, quibus ipsam de distrahendis Ecclesiae reique civilis rationibus sententiam convicimus: hoc praeterea adiuncto, quod est per absurdum, ut Ecclesiam civis vereatur, civitas contemnat.

State and that the mutual agreement between the government and the priesthood should be broken asunder. Certain it is that that concord which always proved favorable and beneficial to Church and State is feared only by the lovers of a most impudent kind of freedom.' In much the same way Pius IX, as opportunity offered itself, marked several false opinions which had begun to prevail, and later had them collected, so that in so great a mass of errors catholics might have what they might follow without offending.'¹⁾

Among the "false opinions" condemned by his predecessor, Pius IX, in his "*Syllabus*," Leo XIII points out this one:—

"The Church must be separated from the State, and the State from the Church."²⁾

In another Encyclical Leo XIII says:—

"Certainly the Church as well as the State has each its own government; and therefore in conducting its own affairs neither submits to the other, of course within limits fixed by the immediate purpose of each. From this, how-

1) Sic Gregorius XVI per Encyclicas litteras hoc initio *Mirari vos* die XV Augusti anno MDCCCXXXII, magna sententiarum gravitate ea perculit, quae iam praedicabantur, in cultu divino nullum adhibere delectum oportere: integrum singulis esse, quod malint, de religione iudicare: solam cuique suam esse conscientiam iudicem: praeterea edere quae quisque senserit, itemque res moliri novas in civitate licere. De rationibus rei sacrae rei civilis distrahendis sic idem Pontifex: „Neque laetiora et religioni et principatui ominari possemus ex eorum votis, qui Ecclesiam a regno separari, mutuamque imperii cum sacerdotio concordiam abrumpi discipiunt. Constat quippe, pertimesci ab impudentissimae libertatis amatoribus concordiam illam, quae semper rei et sacrae et civili fausta extitit et salutaris.“ Non absimili modo Pius IX, ut sese opportunitas dedit, ex opinionibus falsis, quae maxime valere coepissent, plures notavit, easdemque postea in unum cogi iussit, ut scilicet in tanta errorum colluvione haberent catholici homines, quod sine offensione sequerentur. Immortale Dei, p. 37 sq.

2) Prop. LV. Ecclesia a Statu, Statusque ab Ecclesia seiungendus est.

ever, it by no means follows that they should be separated, much less that they should be in conflict."¹)

Here and elsewhere Leo XIII speaks of the church and the state as of two distinct provinces of which each has its own jurisdiction with a certain degree of independence. But his idea is that the two must by no means be separated. Thus, also, he says in the Encyclical *Immortale Dei*:—

"Therefore God has divided the care of the human race between two powers, the ecclesiastical and the civil power, the one at the head of divine, the other at the head of human affairs.... Hence it is necessary that between the two powers there should be *an established connection*, which may very properly be compared with *the union whereby the soul and the body are united in man*."²)

An intimate and organic union, as that by which body and soul are united, is here demanded for church and state, the church, of course, being assigned the place of the soul, which prompts the movements of the body. This is apparent from Leo's XIII Encyclical of June 20, 1894, where he says:—

"For God, the ruler and builder of the world, who most providently placed the civil and the religious power at the head of the society of men, would have the two remain distinct, but prohibited that they should be separated and conflicting. Yea more, the will of God himself as well as the common good of human society demands that *the civil*

1) Profecto et Ecclesia et civitas suum habet utraque principatum: propterea in gerendis rebus suis neutra paret alteri, utique intra terminos a proxima cuiusque caussa constitutos. Ex quo tamen nulla ratione disiunctas esse sequitur, multoque minus pugnantas. Sapientiae christianae, p. 37.

2) Itaque Deus humani generis procuracionem inter duas potestates partitus est, scilicet ecclesiasticam et civilem, alteram quidem divinis, alteram humanis rebus praepositam.... Itaque inter utramque potestatem quaedam intercedat necesse est ordinata colligatio: quae quidem coniunctioni non immerito comparatur, per quam anima et corpus in homine copulantur. Immortale Dei, p. 19 sq.

power should rule and govern in unison with the ecclesiastical power."¹⁾

Here we have the plain and absolute demand that "the civil power should rule and govern in unison with the ecclesiastical power." But Leo XIII goes even beyond this and demands that the state as such should have religion and exercise public worship. He writes:—

"It is plain that a state thus constituted must by public religion do justice to the many and important duties which bind it to God.—Nature and reason, which command every individual to worship God with holy veneration, because in his power we are and, having sprung from him, to him we must return, bind with the same law also the civil community."²⁾

Again he says:—

"To give no state care to religion and to respect God no more in regulating and conducting the affairs of the state than if he did not even exist, is a temerity unheard of even among the heathen, in whose hearts and minds not only the idea of gods, but also the necessity of a state religion was so deeply fixed that they would more easily have thought it possible to find a city without a soil than without a god. In fact, the society of mankind, for which we are by nature made, was constituted by God its Father, and from him as from its origin and source flows all the power and stability

1) Princeps enim atque opifex mundi Deus, qui hominum congregationi et civilem et sacram potestatem providentissime praeponit, distinctas quidem permanere eas voluit, at vero seiunctas esse et confluere vetuit. Quin imo cum Dei ipsius voluntas, tum commune societatis humanae bonum omnino postulat, ut potestas civilis in regendo gubernandoque cum ecclesiastica conveniat.

Praeclara gratulationis, p. 27.

2) Hac ratione constitutam civitatem, perspicuum est, omnino debere plurimis maximisque officiis, quae ipsam iungunt Deo, religione publica satisfacere.—Natura et ratio, quae iubet singulos sancte religioseque Deum colere, quod in eius potestate sumus, et quod ab eo profecti ad eundem reverti debemus, eadem lege adstringit civilem communitatem.

Immortale Dei, p. 11.

of the innumerable blessings of which it abounds. Hence, as individuals are by the very voice of nature admonished to worship God in piety and holiness, because of God we have received life and its concomitant blessings, thus and for the same reason nations and states."¹⁾

And in his Encyclical of Nov. 1, 1900, we read:—

"The same as with private individuals is the case with states; for they must needs come to a pernicious end if they stray from the way. The Maker and Redeemer of mankind, the Son of God, is the Lord of the earth and holds supreme power over men, individuals as well as political communities. *He gave him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, and all people, nations, tribes and languages shall serve him.* Dan. 7, 14. *Yet I have been made a king by him. . . . I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession.* Ps. 2. Hence where men live together in society the law of Christ must prevail, so that it be the guide and teacher not only of private but also of public life. Since this is so provided and ordained by God, and no one can with impunity set himself against it, therefore the state is not well taken care of wherever the Christian ordinances are not accorded the place they should hold."²⁾

1) Curam vero de religione publice adhibere nullam, et in rebus civicis ordinandis, gerendis, Deum nihilo magis respicere, quam si omnino non esset, temeritas est ipsis ethnicis inaudita; quorum in animo sensuque erat sic penitus affixa non solum opinio Deorum, sed religionis publicae necessitas, ut inveniri urbem facilius sine solo, quam sine Deo posse arbitrarentur. Revera humani generis societas, ad quam sumus natura facti, a Deo constituta est naturae parente: ab eoque tanquam a principio et fonte tota vis et perennitas manat innumerabilium, quibus illa abundat, bonorum. Igitur quem admodum singuli pie Deum sancteque colere ipsa naturae voce admonemur, propterea quod vitam et bona quae comitantur vitae a Deo accepimus, sic eandem ob causam populi et civitates.

Humanum genus, p. 29.

2) Quae autem privatorum hominum, eadem fere est causa imperiorum: haec enim ipsa in exitus perniciosos incurrere necesse

Thus, then, according to Leo XIII, the state must have religion. How many religions? "*One*," says Leo XIII. Which one? "*The true one*," says Leo. Here are his words:—

"Therefore, as no one is free to neglect his duties toward God, and the chief duty is with heart and life to embrace religion, and not any religion one may please, but which God has commanded and by certain and most indubitable signs established as of all religions *the true one*: thus likewise *states* may not without gravely offending deport themselves as if God did not exist, or cast aside the care of religion as not their business and of no use, or indifferently adopt out of many kinds that which they please; but they *must by all means adopt that mode and manner of worshiping God* whereby *according to his declared will* God would be worshiped."¹)

est, si digrediantur de *via*. Humanae procreator idemque, redemptor naturae, Filius Dei, rex et dominus est orbis terrarum, potestatemque summam in homines obtinet cum singulos, tum iure sociatos. *Dedit ei potestatem, et honorem, et regnum: et omnes populi, tribus et linguae ipsi servant.* Dan. 7, 14. *Ego autem constitutus sum rex ab eo.... Dabo tibi gentes haereditatem tuam, et possessionem tuam terminos terrae.* Ps. 2. Debet ergo in convictu humano et societate lex valere Christi, ita ut non privatae tantum ea sit, sed et publicae dux et magistra vitae. Quoniam id ita est provisum et constitutum divinitus, nec repugnare quisquam impune potest, idcirco male consulitur rei publicae ubicumque instituta christiana non eo, quo debent, habeantur loco. Tametsi futura, p. 17 sq.

1) Quapropter sicut nemini licet sua adversus Deum officia negligere, officiumque est maximum amplecti et animo et moribus religionem, nec quam quisque maluerit, sed quam Deus iusserit, quamque certis minimeque dubitandis indiciis unam ex omnibus veram esse constiterit: eodem modo civitates non possunt, citra scelus, gerere se tamquam si Deus omnino non esset, aut curam religionis velut alienam nihilque profuturam abiicere, aut asciscere de pluribus generibus indifferenter quod libeat: omninoque debent eum in colendo numine morem usurpare modumque, quo coli se Deus ipse demonstravit velle.

Immortale Dei, p. 13.

And if we ask, which religion is this? Leo XIII answers:—

“Since, therefore, it is necessary that there should be in the state the profession of *one* religion, *that* religion should be professed which is *the only true one* and which, especially in *catholic* states, is without difficulty recognized, as the marks of truth appear, as it were, stamped upon it. Hence it is *this religion those who are at the head of states should preserve and protect* if they would wisely and profitably, as they should, provide for the welfare of the political community.”¹⁾

And again:—

“Which is the true religion, he who will judge with prudence and sincerity will see without any difficulty. . . . For the only-begotten Son of God has established a society on earth which is called the Church . . . and for this reason it is by its nature such that its compass extends to the whole human race and is confined by no limits of space or time. *Preach the gospel to every creature.*—To this immense multitude of men God himself has assigned magistrates, who should rule with power; and it was his will that *one should be the head of all* and the greatest and most reliable teacher of truth, *to whom he committed the keys of the kingdom of heaven.*”²⁾

1) Cum igitur sit unius religionis necessaria in civitate professio, profiteri eam oportet quae unice vera est, quaeque non difficulter, praesertim in civitatibus catholicis, agnoscitur, cum in ea tamquam insignitae notae veritatis appareant. Itaque hanc, qui rempublicam gerunt, conservent, hanc tueantur, si volunt prudenter atque utiliter, ut debent, civium communitati consulere. Libertas, p. 37.

2) Vera autem religio quae sit, non difficulter videt qui iudicium prudens sincerumque adhibuerit. . . . Nam unigenitus Dei filius societatem in terris constituit, quae Ecclesia dicitur. . . . Ob eamque rem talis est natura sua, ut porrigat sese ad totius complexum gentis humanae, nullis nec locorum nec temporum limitibus circumscripta. *Praedicate Evangelium omni creaturae.*—Tam ingenti hominum mul-

And once more:—

“At the same time we address ourselves *to the princes and supreme rulers of nations* and solemnly entreat them again and again by the exalted name of the Most High God, that they may not reject the help of the Church which is offered them at this time of need, and that they would with unanimous endeavors *rally in friendship round about this fountain of authority* and safety and more and more unite themselves with it by the bonds of cordial love and esteem. God grant that, understanding the truth of what We say, and pondering that the teaching of Christ, as Augustine said, *is, if submissively heeded, a great safeguard to the state* (Ep. 138, al. 5, ad Marcellinum, n. 15.), and that in the safety of and *obedience to the Church* their public safety and quietude does lie, they turn their thoughts and care toward lifting away the evils by which the Church and *its visible Head* is afflicted, and it may thus come to pass that the nations over which they preside, walking the way of justice and peace, may enjoy a happy age of prosperity and glory.”¹⁾

titudini Deus ipse magistratus assignavit, qui cum potestate praeessent: unumque omnium principem, et maximum certissimumque veritatis magistrum esse voluit, cui claves regni caelorum commisit.

Immortale Dei, p. 15.

1) Simul autem ad Principes et supremos populorum Moderatores voces Nostras convertimus, eosque per nomen augustum Summi Dei etiam atque etiam obtestamur, ne oblatam sibi tam necessario tempore opem Ecclesiae repudient, atque uti consentientibus studiis circa hunc fontem auctoritatis at salutis amice coeant, Eique intimi amoris et observantiae vinculis magis magisque iungantur. Faxit Deus, ut illi, comperta eorum quae diximus veritate, ac secum reputantes doctrinam Christi, ut Augustinus aiebat, *magnam, si obtemperetur, salutem esse reipublicae*,^{*)} et in Ecclesiae incolumitate et obsequio suam etiam publicam incolumitatem et tranquillitatem contineri, cogitationes suas et curas conferant ad levanda mala, quibus Ecclesia eiusque visibile Caput affligitur, atque ita tandem contingat, ut populi quibus praesunt, iustitiae et pacis ingressi viam, felici aevo prosperitatis et gloriae fruantur. Inscrutabili, p. 15. 17.

^{*)} Ep. 138. alias 5. ad Marcellinum n. 15.

From all this it is perfectly plain that the church which all the states of Christendom, according to Leo XIII, are bound to establish as *their* church, the state church of all nations, must be the Roman church, the church which is presided over by the purported successor of the purported "chief of apostles," the "visible head of the church." In keeping herewith Leo XIII further says:—

"When these principles, which are largely advocated in our day, are made the foundations of the state, it readily appears into what and how unfair a position the Church will be forced. For where such doctrines are put into practice, catholicism is assigned a place in the state equal or even inferior to societies which are alien to it; no regard is had to the laws of the Church; the Church, which, according to the order and command of Jesus Christ, is to teach all nations, is *prohibited from laying a hand to the public instruction of the people*. Things of mixed jurisdiction are disposed of by the civil governments according to their own independent judgment, and herein they with a high hand set aside the most sacred laws of the Church. Therefore they draw the marriages of Christians over to their jurisdiction." 1)

And in the same Encyclical:—

"When the people is said to contain within itself the source of all rights and of all power, the consequence will be that *the state* thinks it owes no manner of duty to God;

1) His autem positis, quae maxime probantur hoc tempore, fundamentis reipublicae, facile apparet, quem in locum quamquae iniquum compellatur Ecclesia. — Nam ubi cum eiusmodi doctrinis actionum consentiat, nomini catholico par cum societatibus ab eo alienis vel etiam inferior locus in civitate tribuitur: legum ecclesiasticarum nulla habetur ratio: Ecclesia, quae iussu mandatoque Jesu Christi docere omnes gentes debet, publicam populi institutionem iubetur nihil attingere. De ipsis rebus, quae sunt mixti iuris, per se statuunt gubernatores rei civilis arbitrato suo, in eoque genere sanctissimas Ecclesiae leges superbe contemnunt. Quare ad iuris dictionem suam trahunt matrimonia christianorum. Immortale Dei, p. 31.

that it *makes no public profession of religion*; that it does not consider it its duty to inquire which of the many religions is the only true one, or to prefer the one to the others, or *to favor one of them most*, but that it must grant equal rights to all, provided only that they do not endanger the safety of the state. In full keeping herewith all questions of religion are left to private judgment, and every one is permitted to follow what ever religion he may choose, or none at all, if he approve none."¹⁾

Even a Protestant cannot fail to comprehend what was in the mind of Leo XIII. He was opposed to the "modern liberties" and free institutions simply because they are incompatible with the prerogatives he demands for the Roman church and the papacy. The Roman church must not be placed in the same line with other churches; it must not be prevented from putting its hand to the public schools; its laws must not be disregarded by the state; and all this can be properly adjusted only under one condition, which is this, that all the states of Christendom make the Roman church their state church and in all their departments become thoroughly and intensely Roman catholic. But to round out the evidence on this point we beg leave to add a few more quotations. In his Encyclical *Tametsi futura* Leo XIII says:—

"Therefore the common good loudly demands, that it is necessary to return, whence it would have been proper never to depart, to Him who is the Way, and the Truth,

1) Cumque populus omnium iurium omnisque potestatis fontem in se ipso continere dicatur, consequens erit, ut nulla ratione officii obligatam Deo se civitas putet; ut religionem publicam profiteatur nullam; nec debeat ex pluribus quae vera sola sit, quaerere, nec unam quamdam ceteris antepone, nec uni maxime favere, sed singulis generibus aequabilitatem iuris tribuere ad eum finem, dum disciplina reipublicae ne quid ab illis detrimenti capiat. Consectaneum erit, iudicio singulorum permittere omnem de religione questionem; licere cuique aut sequi quam ipse malit, aut omnino nullam, si nullam probet.

Immortale Dei, p. 31.

and the Life, and not only individuals, but human society at large. To this his possession Christ the Lord must be restored, and it should be brought about that all the members and parts of the body politic should draw and drink the life proceeding from Him, the laws in what they enjoin and what they prohibit, popular institutions, the seats of learning, the regulations of marriage and family life, the houses of the rich and the workshops of the laborers." ¹⁾

That Leo XIII, when he thus speaks of the return to Christ and Christianity, would be understood to mean the Roman Church and its Supreme Pontiff he says plainly in his Encyclical of March 19, 1902, from which we quote:—

"But if the said return should work true and full salvation, it must mean a return *to the bosom and embrace of the one holy, catholic, apostolic Church*. For all Christian wisdom is in fact embodied in the Church only, that supremely spiritual and in every way perfect society, which constitutes the mystical body of Jesus Christ, whose visible head is he who holds the place of the chief of apostles, *the Roman Pontiff*." ²⁾

And here it is not without significance that Leo XIII bases his hope for the realization of his end and aim on the

1) Clamat ergo communis salus, referre se necesse esse, unde numquam digredi oportuerat, ad eum qui via et veritas et vita est, nec singulos dumtaxat, sed societatem humanam universe. In hanc velut in possessionem suam restitui Christum dominum oportet, efficiendumque ut profectam ab eo vitam hauriant atque imbibant omnia membra et partes reipublicae, iussa ac vetita legum, instituta popularia, domicilia doctrinae, ius coniugiorum convictusque domestici, tecta locupletium, officinae opificum.

Tametsi futura, p. 29 sq.

2) Sed is, quem dicimus reditum, ut veram plenamque salutem efficiat, hoc vult, ad unius sanctae catholicae apostolicae sinum complexumque redire Ecclesiae. Etenim christianam sapientiam reapse sola totam Ecclesia continet, summe spiritualis illa quidem at numeris omnibus absoluta societas: in qua consistit corpus Jesu Christi mysticum, cuius acceptabile caput est, principis Apostolorum obtinens locum, romanus Pontifex.

Annum ingressi, p. 29.

very evils of modern society which he deplotes or professes to deplore. In his Encyclical *Inscrutabili* he says:—

“We firmly trust that with your cooperation all mankind, *admonished by so many evils and calamities*, will at last seek safety and prosperity in obedience to the Church and *in the infallible mastership of the Apostolic See.*”¹⁾

But what is to become of all the Protestants, when the state turns Roman catholic? Leo XIII has already answered this question. “All the members” of the state should “return to Christ,” which is to say, all Protestants should return to the Roman church and the Roman Pontiff. What if some should refuse? Should they be made to emigrate? And whither? Into the sea? For the Leonine theory of Christian statehood is to take in all nations in all lands. What is to become of the recalcitrant Protestants? For the present, of course, they *may be tolerated*. Says Leo XIII:—

“Indeed, when the Church judges that *it is not right that various kinds of divine worship should enjoy equal rights with the true religion*, she does not on that account condemn those rulers of states who, in order to secure some great benefit, or to prevent some great evil, according to custom and usage *patiently permit them severally to exist in the state.*”²⁾

Here, then, we are, in the first place, once more informed that “it is not right,” according to the judgment of the Church, “that various kinds of divine worship should enjoy equal rights with the true religion,” and we have

1) Firmiter confidimus, adlaborantibus Vobis, humanum genus tot malis et calamitatibus admonitum, tandem in Ecclesiae obsequio, in huius Apostolicae Cathedrae infallibili magisterio salutem et prosperitatem quaesiturum. Inscrutabili, p. 21.

2) Revera si divini cultus varia genera eodem iure esse, quo veram religionem, Ecclesia iudicat non licere, non ideo tamen eos damnat rerum publicarum moderatores, qui, magni alicuius aut adipiscendi boni, aut prohibendi caussa mali, moribus atque usu patienter ferunt, ut ea habeant singula in civitate locum.

Immortale Dei, p. 41.

heard that the civil power must "rule and govern in unison with the ecclesiastical power." Hence, if the civil power were able and willing to do what by right it should do, it would take away from all non-catholic churches the rights they now enjoy. More than that. The very existence of these churches in the political community is not, according to Leo XIII, based upon their right to exist, but upon considerations of expediency which may induce civil governments to "patiently permit" the existence of these "alien churches." And even such toleration is not enjoined or even recommended, but only conditionally permitted; for Leo XIII does not go beyond the concession that governments are "not condemned" by the Church when they exercise such toleration for reasons of policy. The formal right of existence is thus clearly denied to all Protestant churches in the political community constituted according to the political principles laid down by Leo XIII, which supply a broad basis for religious persecution by the police power of the state.

All this and many other things we and others should not be permitted to say and to publish if the political principles of Leo XIII prevailed in our country. In his Encyclical *On human liberty* he says:—

"Let us now briefly consider *the freedom of speech and of the press*. That such freedom, in no measure constrained, but exceeding all measure and bounds, cannot be right need hardly be said. . . . It is right freely and wisely to make known in the state what is true and honorable, that it may come before as many as possible. But it is proper that false opinions, the most deadly mental pest, as also vices which corrupt mind and morals, should be diligently suppressed by public authority, that they may not be allowed to spread to the detriment of the state."¹⁾

1) Iam aliquid consideretur de *libertate loquendi*, formisque litterarum quodcumque libeat exprimendi. . . . Quae vera, quae honesta sunt, ea libere prudenterque in civitate propagari ius est, ut ad quam-

"What is true and honorable," and what are "false opinions," and must be, accordingly, "diligently suppressed," would, of course, be ultimately determined by "the Church," whose task and prerogative it is to "teach all nations," and in unison with which civil governments must rule.

Of the freedom of thought and of the press Leo XIII furthermore says:—

"Thus that unrestricted *freedom of thought and of the press* is not in and of itself a boon in which human society might rightly rejoice, but the source and origin of many evils." ¹⁾

And, summing up his proscription of our liberties, Leo XIII delivers himself thus:—

"Hence, from what has been said, it follows that there is no such thing as the right of asking, defending, or granting freedom of thought, of writing, of teaching, or of religion promiscuously, as so many rights by nature conferred upon man." ²⁾

Here, then, we have our summary judgment. We are in possession of those precious liberties. That is wrong. We claim them under our State Constitutions. That is wrong. The Constitutions themselves are wrong in granting them. We grant them to others who come to our shores. That, too, is wrong. We defend them with mouth and pen. That is emphatically and doubly wrong, most of all, if we defend them against such an assailant as Leo XIII.

plures pertineant; opinionum mendacia, quibus nulla mentis capitalior pestis, item vitia quae animum moresque corrumpunt, aequum est auctoritate publica diligenter coerceri, ne serpere ad perniciem reipublicae queant.

Libertas, p. 39.

1) Sic illa quidlibet sentiendi litterarumque formis quidlibet exprimendi facultas, omni moderatione posthabita, non quoddam est propria vi sua bonum, quo societas humana iure laetetur: sed multorum malorum fons et origo.

Immortale Dei, p. 35.

2) Itaque ex dictis consequitur, nequaquam licere petere, defendere, largiri, cogitandi, scribendi, docendi, itemque promiscuam religionum libertatem, veluti iura totidem, quae homini natura dederit.

Libertas, p. 57.

But of what real consequence is it to Protestant Christians the world over and to Protestant Americans what the old man of the Vatican may have said or written? Do we consider his utterances in any way binding upon us? Most certainly not. But there are, among our fellow-citizens, millions who do consider them binding upon themselves, in whose opinion the doctrines of Leo XIII are clothed with divine authority, not only the doctrines concerning spiritual and religious matters and duties, as concerning prayer, confession, the mass, etc., but also his published principles and precepts concerning temporal and political affairs. This is a point which Leo XIII has been very careful to inculcate; as when he wrote:—

“These are the *precepts* of the catholic church concerning the constitution and *government of states*.”¹⁾

And again:—

“Hence in this difficult course of affairs, catholics, if they but *hear Us as they ought*, will easily see *what are their respective duties* concerning both what they should think and how they should *act*. As to their *opinions*, it is necessary that they should in each and every point hold with firm conviction and, whenever the case demands, openly profess, *what the Roman Pontiffs have taught or may in future teach*. And *especially concerning the modern acquisitions called liberties*, it behooves every one *to abide by the judgment of the Apostolic See* and to make its opinion his own.”²⁾

1) Haec quidem sunt, quae de constituendis temperandisque civitatibus ab Ecclesia catholica praecipuntur. Immortale Dei, p. 41.

2) Itaque in tam difficili rerum cursu, catholici homines, si Nos, ut oportet, audierint, facile videbunt quae sua eiusque sint tam in *opinionibus*, quam in *factis* officia. — Et opinando quidem, quaecumque Pontifices romani tradiderint vel tradituri sunt, singula necesse est tenere iudicio stabili comprehensa, et palam, quoties res postulerit, profiteri. Ac nominatim de iis, quas *libertates* vocant novissimo tempore quaesitas, oportet Apostolicae Sedis stare iudicio, et quod ipsa senserit, idem sentire singulos. Immortale Dei, p. 47.

And once more:—

“This disposition and order must obtain all the more in the Christian commonwealth, the more numerous those things are which are within the scope of *the political wisdom of the Pontiff*; for it is his business not only to rule the Church, but in general so to regulate the acts of *Christian citizens*, that they fitly agree with the hope of obtaining eternal life. From this it appears that besides the utmost harmony of thoughts and acts *it is necessary to act in accordance with the political wisdom of the ecclesiastical power.*”¹⁾

In the performance of his business “to regulate the acts of Christian citizens” and to lay down for them “their respective duties,” “especially concerning the modern acquisitions called liberties,” Leo XIII not only sets forth general principles, but also adds particular instructions. He says:—

“It is, therefore, plain that catholics have just cause to apply themselves to politics. They do not, and should not do this with the intention of approving what is not at the present time praiseworthy in public affairs; but to apply these affairs to the best advantage for the true and sincere welfare of the people, with the purpose fixed in their minds to *infuse the wisdom and virtue of the catholic religion as a wholesome sap and blood into the veins of the state.*”²⁾

1) Haec dispositio atque hic ordo tanto magis valere in christiana republica debet, quanto Pontificis politica prudentia plura complectitur: eius enim est non solum regere Ecclesiam, sed generatim civium christianorum actiones ita ordinare, ut cum spe adipiscendae salutis aeternae apte congruant. Ex eo apparet, praeter summam sententiarum concordiam et factorum, necesse esse politicam potestatis ecclesiasticae observare in agendo sapientiam.

Sapientiae christ., p. 45.

2) Quamobrem perspicuum est, ad rempublicam adeundi caussam esse iustam catholicis: non enim adeunt, neque adire debent ob eam caussam, ut probent quod est hoc tempore in rerum publicarum rationibus non honestum; sed ut has ipsas rationes, quoad fieri potest, in bonum publicum transferant, sincerum atque verum, destinatum animo habentes, sapientiam virtutesque catholicae religionis, tanquam saluberrimum succum ac sanguinem, in omnes reipublicae venas inducere.

Immortale Dei, p. 49.

The imagery of this instruction is highly significant. By the "sap and blood" circulating through its veins a living organism is gradually and spontaneously built up, and the formation of its various tissues and organs depends on the quality of the blood coursing through its channels. To infuse into the veins of the state the wisdom and virtue of the catholic religion means a sure and thorough modification of our political life and institutions in the direction of Romanism, especially toward the political principles exhibited in the Encyclicals of Leo XIII. Roman catholics are, according to the politician of the Vatican, bound to be Roman catholics also in politics, and to change the organism of the state in the direction above indicated is one of their allotted tasks. This also appears from the following instruction:—

"It is necessary that all catholics who are worthy of this name should be, *first of all*, desirous of being in fact and appearance *loving sons of the Church*, to reject without hesitation whatever is inconsistent with this title; to *use political institutions*, as far as it can be honorably done, for the protection of truth and justice; to strive to exercise their freedom of action within the bounds prescribed by the ordinance of nature and the law of God, and to *exert themselves toward bringing over the entire state to the Christian likeness and form which We have described*. . . . The one and the other will be best achieved, if every one *deems the precepts of the Apostolic See the law of his life*, and obeys the Bishops, whom *the Holy Ghost has made overseers to govern the church of God*."¹⁾

1) Catholicos quidem, quotquot digni sunt eo nomine, primum omnium necesse est amantissimos Ecclesiae filios et esse et videri velle: quae res nequeant cum hac laude consistere, eas sine cunctatione respuere: institutis populorum, quantum honeste fieri potest, ad veritatis iustitiaeque patrocinium uti: elaborare, ut constitutum naturae Deique lege modum libertas agendi ne transiliat: dare operam ut ad eam, quam diximus, christianam similitudinem et formam omnis respublica traducatur. . . . Atque optime utrumque impetrabitur,

Again he says:—

“The defense of the catholic name demands with necessity that in professing the doctrines set forth by the Church all should be of the same judgment with the utmost constancy, and in this respect every one must *beware lest he in any way connive at false opinions or withstand them less mildly than truth will permit*. . . . In like manner it is *not permitted* to follow one form of duty in private, and another in public, so that *the authority of the Church were observed in private and rejected in public life*.’’¹⁾

And once again:—

“If, however, because of peculiar political circumstances it is, for the time being, *expedient* that the Church should *acquiesce* in certain *modern liberties*, not because she herself approved of them, but because she deems it *expedient* that they be permitted, she would, of course, *if the times have changed for the better*, make use of her freedom and, by advice, exhortation, and obsecration, strive, as it behooves her, to perform the duty assigned to her by God, to care for the eternal salvation of men. This, however, *is at all times true*, that the freedom of all things promiscuously granted to all is, as we have often said, not in itself desirable, because it is repugnant to reason that what is false and what is true should be of equal right.’’²⁾

si praescripta Sedis Apostolicae legem vitae singuli putent, atque Episcopis obtemperent, quos Spiritus sanctus posuit regere Ecclesiam Dei.

Immortale Dei, p. 51 sq.

1) Defensio quidem catholici nominis necessario postulat ut in profitendis doctrinis, quae ab Ecclesia traduntur, una sit omnium sententia, et summa constantia, et hac ex parte cavendum ne quis opinionibus falsis aut ullo modo conniveat, aut mollius resistat, quam veritas patiatur. . . . Pariter non licere aliam officii formam privatim sequi, aliam publice, ita scilicet ut Ecclesiae auctoritas in vita privata observetur, in publica respuatur. Immortale Dei, p. 53.

2) Si vero ob singularia reipublicae tempora usuveniat, ut modernis quibusdam libertatibus Ecclesia acquiescat, non quod ipsas per se malit, sed quia permissas esse iudicat expedire, versis autem

Such is the political platform of catholic citizens everywhere as laid down by their supreme and infallible teacher and lawgiver, who demands "that the will of all should be perfectly subject and obedient to the will of the Church *and the Roman Pontiff as unto God*," and that "every one deem the precepts of the Apostolic See the law of his life." They must be Roman catholics also in politics. They must in no instance approve of or even connive at what the See has condemned. They must exert their endeavors and improve every opportunity to abrogate what is at variance with the "political wisdom" of the Pope. They must bide their time, and what cannot be achieved at present, they must be ready to do later, "when the times may have changed for the better" and it will be no longer "expedient" for the church to "acquiesce" in certain "modern liberties." They must endeavor to bring about such "change of time for the better." For these and other purposes they must "use political institutions" and "apply themselves to politics." And all this in obedience to the Pontiff, "as unto God."

It is not our purpose or business just now to investigate how a true Roman catholic can consistently be and remain a true and loyal citizen of the United States or to take or administer an oath of office under the Constitution and Statutes of the State of Missouri. We are now dealing with Leo XIII. We have submitted the testimony upon which we base our charges, and we hold that the evidence amply covers the bill.

Is the accused willing to stand on his testimony? Or has he anything to retract? Let us hear him once more. In his last great Encyclical, which he published on the oc-

in meliora temporibus, adhibitura sane esset libertatem suam, et suadendo, hortando, obsecrando studeret, uti debet, munus efficere sibi assignatum a Deo, videlicet sempiternae hominum saluti consulere. Illud tamen perpetuo verum est, istam omnibus et ad omnia promissae tributam libertatem non esse, quemadmodum pluries diximus, expetendam per se, quia falsum eodem iure esse ac verum rationi repugnat.

Libertas, p. 51.

casion of his entrance upon the twenty-fifth year of his pontificate, and in which he once more cast his slurs upon "that mournful fight of the Innovators which flared up in the sixteenth century," upon "marriage stripped of all sanctity," upon the "state separated from the Church," Leo XIII endorsed and upheld his former Encyclicals, saying:—

"This was also the purpose of the chief documents published by Us, especially the Encyclical Letters *On Christian Philosophy*, *On human liberty*, *On Christian marriage*, *On the Masonic order*, *On civil government*, *On the Christian constitution of states*, *On Socialism*, *On the chief duties of Christians*, *On the labor question*, and others on similar subjects."¹⁾

-
- From the testimony of Leo XIII it, then, appears,
- that he has pilloried the Reformation as heretical in principle and as the source of the most heinous crimes and abominations, subversive of law and order in church and state;
 - that he has defamed the lawful marriage of millions of Protestants as legalized concubinage, stripped of all holiness, and void of the very essence of marriage, the marriage bond;
 - that he has condemned our most precious liberties, freedom of conscience, freedom of worship, freedom of church and state, freedom of thought, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, as evils and sources of evil, and as contrary to justice and reason, evils which it were wrong to claim, to grant, or to defend;
 - that he has solemnly charged his followers in all lands to accept these utterances as of divine authority, and to

1) *Eo spectarunt quae profecta sunt a Nobis documenta praecipua, nominatim Encyclicae Litterae de philosophia christiana, de libertate humana, de matrimonio christiano, de secta Massonum, de politico principatu, de civitatum constitutione christiana, de sectis Socialistarum, de praecipuis christianorum officiis, de conditione opificum, aliaeque simili argumento.* Annum ingressi, p. 31.

shape their thoughts and acts according to them, carrying them into execution in private and public life; that he has done all this that it should stand not only in his life-time, but for all times to come; that he has done all this with the pretense and under the guise of assiduous care and solicitude in behalf of the temporal and spiritual welfare of all men and all nations, whereby thousands were misled to consider the smiling defamer and impugner of all that is sacred to them a friend and father of all mankind.

Our readers have before them the indictment and the evidence. Their verdict cannot be doubtful.

We might have preferred still other and different charges against Leo XIII and substantiated them from his Encyclicals. We might have shown that in Leo XIII Antichrist sat enthroned in the church of Christ, an impostor and usurper, not a shepherd of the flock of Christ, but a ravenous wolf, an enemy to our soul's salvation. But for our present purpose we deemed it proper to restrict ourselves to the points set forth in our arraignment. What we want is a conviction in the face of certain false judgments and as a protest against certain outrages committed upon our sacred interests as Protestant Christians and citizens by such as professed to speak in our name, while we feel in conscience bound to disavow their every word and their right of giving utterance to statements and sentiments utterly incompatible with true Protestantism and with the loyalty of citizens and magistrates whose duty it is to uphold the free institutions of a free country. For if, under our present indictment and in the light of the evidence adduced, the accused cannot but stand "guilty as charged," then indeed *the old man who died in the Vatican palace at Rome on July 20, 1903, was the most acrimonious, persistent and dangerous enemy of Protestantism and of free religious, social and political institutions the world has seen for the last twenty-five years.*

A. G.