

# THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

---

---

VOL. I.

APRIL 1897.

No. 2.

---

---

## Doctrinal Theology.

### BIBLIOLOGY.

This chapter of theology was by our earlier dogmatists commonly dealt with in their *Prolegomena*, where they treated of the nature and the principles and source of theology. It was not unreasonable to dwell on the source of doctrine before exhibiting the substance of Christian doctrine as comprised in *Theology proper*, *Anthropology*, *Christology*, *Soteriology*, and *Eschatology*. This was the more pertinent as the principal positions of Bibliology, especially the divine origin and authority of the Bible, were generally conceded, and to impugn the inspiration of the canonical books of the Old and New Testaments would have been looked upon as preposterous by theologians of all churches and schools. The great ancestors of modern Protestant theology, Zwingli, Calvin, Melancthon, never theoretically or dogmatically assailed this stronghold of scriptural theology. Even Calixt, the Noah of the present generation of neologists in what is called the Lutheran Church, did no more than plant the first germs of unscriptural Bibliology for future development and would probably have been amazed and appalled at the growth of thorns and thistles gone into seed in these latter days.

## Historical Theology.

---

### LEO XIII AND THE AMERICAN LIBERTIES.

The Roman See is a political factor and asserts itself as such the world over, wherever it has a following. Though the days of Gregory VII, Alexander III, and Innocent III, are over and past, the spirit of papal Rome has remained. The present Pope is as truly a political pope as any of his predecessors has been. His active mind is assiduously occupied in making and unmaking political constellations in both hemispheres, and not only in such Roman catholic strongholds as Italy, Spain, and the Central- and South-American states, but also in protestant Europe, Canada, and our United States. Among all the questions ventilated in his Encyclicals, political and social problems stand foremost. Leo XIII is far more a politician than he is a theologian. And yet, his political utterances are those of the so-called vicegerent of Christ, the man who claims and is by millions believed to be the visible head of the Church and the infallible teacher of Christendom, who demands assent to his doctrines and obedience to his precepts by catholics everywhere, America not excepted. And if political authority be said to include or presuppose a good and valid title to the soil, American catholics will find no difficulty in acknowledging their allegiance to the political See of Rome. "Is not this whole country really a catholic land? Is it not under the care of Catholic saints? Are not their holy names borne by more than three hundred American cities from shore to shore, from mountain to the sea? St. Augustine guards the Atlantic coast! St. Francis sits by the Golden Gate! Far in the north great St. Paul keeps watch and ward! On the gulf, at either side, sweet

San Antonio safely guides! In the heart of the land St. Louis, king and saint! St. Joseph near, and on the hither side, our gracious lady, Nôtre Dame, queen of all!" Thus, endorsed by "tremendous applause, the delegates rising and cheering vociferously for several minutes, during which the speaker retired," Dr. Dunne of Florida addressed the Catholic Congress at Baltimore in November, 1889, and the report was published with an Episcopal *Imprimatur*.<sup>1)</sup> Speaking of the political and civil order of this country, Dr. Brownson, of Detroit, on the same occasion, said: "The American system is also anti-Protestant, and must either reject Protestantism or be overthrown by it. Based on natural law and justice, our institutions are incompatible with a religion claiming to be revealed, but which fails to harmonize the natural and the supernatural, reason and revelation, calls reason 'a stupid ass,' and says nature is totally depraved."<sup>2)</sup> If these words have any meaning at all, it is that Protestants are only tolerated in this country as a foreign and, more than that, an objectionable element, irreconcilably antagonistic to the institutions, the political and civil order, of the United States and, consequently, worthy of being either suppressed or expelled—by whom? Dr. Dunne's question is still ringing in our ears: "Is not this whole country really a Catholic land?" And Dr. Brownson tells his co-religionists: "If Catholics separate religion from politics, claiming that politics are independent of religion, how can the church produce any effect in support of popular government?"<sup>3)</sup> Catholics are here reminded of their duty to be Catholics also in politics. The same duty was also enjoined on the "Catholic Periodical Press" in a paper read before the same Congress by Dr. Wolff of Norristown, Pa., in which, among other things, the author said: "There is room to fear that as regards a class of sub-

---

1) *Souvenir Volume*, p. 46.

2) *Ibid.* p. 29.

3) *Ibid.* p. 29.

jects which are essential parts of Catholic doctrine, some of our Catholic journals are less careful than they should be to acquaint themselves with and follow the teachings of the church and of her approved theologians. We refer to subjects pertaining to the authority of the church, the office and authority of the sovereign pontiff of the church, his rights and power, and especially his right to independence of every temporal sovereign or government; we refer, also, to all those subjects which relate to the origin and constitution of human society; to the basis of civil government, its origin, authority, power, and the limits of its authority and power; to the industrial questions of the day, the relation of labor and capital, or rather, the relation of employers and employes; to the right of individual ownership of property and the limits of that right. As regards all of these Subjects, or most of them, there is reason to think that less attention, than should be, is given by Catholic editors and writers to the teachings of the church and its theologians; and that some of them, indeed, imagine that they are free to adopt and express whatever opinions they please respecting these subjects, regardless of the official utterances of sovereign pontiffs of the church and of its theologians. . . . No more grievous mistake can be made than to imagine that the subjects referred to are not included in the scope of Catholic doctrine and in that *magisterium* or authority to teach with which Christ has invested his church. Religion has to do with all the relations of man, to God, to himself, to his individual neighbor, and to society. The church comprehends in its teaching office all that religion comprehends, and consequently, all that is involved in and grows out of the relations just mentioned. The subjects we have referred to are inseparably connected with those relations. . . . Catholics, therefore, err most grievously when they allow themselves to be deluded into supposing that the subjects to which we are referring are mere matters of opinion, and that they are at liberty to

think, speak, write, or act with regard to them as they please." 1)

In pointing out the "guides" whereby "Catholic editors" may be enabled "safely, prudently, and efficiently" to perform their work, the author of the paper last adduced says: "The encyclicals, too, of our Holy Father, Leo XIII, are an inexhaustible store-house of instruction on these subjects." 2) While "inexhaustible" is putting it rather strong, the encyclicals of the present Pope are certainly very rich in doctrinal statements bearing upon the management of public affairs, not thrown in as *obiter dicta*, but chiefly in the form of coherent treatises directly and expressly intended as normative utterances of the highest ecclesiastical authority. In his encyclical of Nov. 1, 1885, he says:

"These are the doctrines and commandments of the catholic church concerning the constitution and government of states." 3)

And again:

"These things, venerable Fathers, We have had to communicate to all the nations of the catholic world concerning the Christian constitution of states and the duties of individual citizens." 4)

What, then, we ask, are the doctrines and commandments of the Roman church concerning the constitution and government of states, according to the present Pope? What does Leo XIII teach concerning the Christian constitution of states and the duties of individual citizens?

One of the fundamental principles of our national organism is the thorough separation of church and state. Ours is, in fact, the only country in which this principle

1) Ibid. p. 49.

2) Ibid.

3) Haec quidem sunt, quae de constituendis temperandisque civitatibus ab Ecclesia catholica praecipuntur. *Enc. Immortale Dei*, m. p. 41.

4) Haec quidem, Venerabiles Fratres, habuimus, quae universis catholici orbis gentibus traderemus *de civitatum constitutione christiana*, officiisque civium singulorum. *Encycl. Immortale Dei*, p. 56.

has obtained full recognition in theory and practice. The idea of religious liberty, of the equality of all religions in the body politic, an idea which was entirely foreign to the states of antiquity, was but once, and then but for a very short time, recognized in the legislation of a great political organism before it was permanently established in our country. It was in the edicts published by Constantine the Great after the downfall of Maxentius in 312, that this principle first entered in to civil legislation, only to be again abandoned by Constantine himself, who in his day by his imperial command ordered the bishops of Christendom to travel and assemble as he would command his military officers to march and go into camp, and sent the greatest theologian of his age into exile because of a religious controversy in which he was the acknowledged leader of orthodox Christianity. Luther had grasped the idea. Among the 41 *errors* of Luther condemned in the Bull of Leo X issued in 1520, the 32d was that "it is against the will of the Spirit that heretics be burned."<sup>1</sup>) But the principle never gained ground in Europe. It was not carried into the Western World by the Pilgrim Fathers, and the history of the First Amendment would be a subject for a highly interesting chapter in American history from a theological point of view. But the principle of the thorough separation of church and state has stood the test of a hundred years under our Constitution, and the doctrine of the First Amendment should be looked upon as one of the chief cornerstones in the foundation of our republic.

But this principle is condemned as a most pernicious doctrine by Leo XIII. In his encyclical of June 20, 1888, he says:

"This is the origin of that most pernicious consecratory that the affairs of the state and of the church should be

---

1) *Haereticos comburi est contra voluntatem Spiritus.* Luth. Opp. var. arg. IV, p. 276.

separated. But how absurd such doctrine is can be easily understood.'<sup>1)</sup>

In the same encyclical we read:

"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."<sup>2)</sup>

And again:

"From this doctrine as from its fountain-head and principle flows that pernicious opinion of the propriety of separating the interests of the church and the state, 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."<sup>3)</sup>

1) Ex quo perniciosum illud gignitur consecrarium, civitatis Ecclesiae-que rationes dissociari opertere.—Sed haec quam absurdi dicantur haud difficulter intelligitur. *Enc. Libertas*, m. p. 33.

2) 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 respiciendam censeant, quam si esset omnino nulla: permessa ad summum singulis civibus facultate, ut privatim, si libeat, dent religioni operam. Contra quos plane vis argumentorum omnium valet, quibus ipsam de distrahendis Ecclesiae rei que civilis rationibus sententiam convicimus: hoc praeterea adiuncto, quod est perabsurdum, ut Ecclesiam civis vereatur, civitas contemnat.—*Ibid.* p. 55.

3) Et ab hac doctrina, tamquam 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. *Ibid.*, p. 55.

In the encyclical *Immortale Dei* he endorses the condemnation of the proposition, "The Church must be separated from the State, and the State from the Church,"<sup>1)</sup> by his predecessor, Pius IX.

The First Amendment says: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion." The Constitutions of thirty-two states provide that no preference shall be shown any one sect; others, that there shall be no established church; and all states (except Alabama?) have in their fundamental law secured freedom of conscience in matters of religion to their citizens. To quote the language of one or two, the Constitution of Wisconsin, Art. I, S. 18. says:

"The right of every man to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of his own conscience shall never be infringed, nor shall any man be compelled to attend, erect, or support any place of worship, or to maintain any ministry, against his consent. Nor shall any control of, or interference with the rights of conscience be permitted, or any preference be given by law to any religious establishments or mode of worship. Nor shall any money be drawn from the treasury for the benefit of religious societies or theological seminaries."

The people of the State of Missouri declare in Art. I of their Constitution:

"IX. That all men have a natural and indefeasible right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their own consciences; . . . that no human authority can control or interfere with the rights of conscience. . . .

"X. That no person can be compelled to erect, support or attend any place of worship, or to maintain any minister of the gospel, or teacher of religion. . . .

"XI. That no preference can ever be given, by law, to any church, sect, or mode of worship.

---

1) Prop. I.V. — Ecclesia a Statu, Statusque ab Ecclesia seiungendus est. *Immortale Dei* p. 39 Not.



“XII. That no religious corporation can be established in this state, except that by a general law, uniform throughout the state, any church, or religious society, or congregation, may become a body corporate for the sole purpose of acquiring, holding, using, and disposing of so much land as may be required for a house of public worship, a chapel, a parsonage and a burial ground. . . .”

And now let us hear Leo XIII. Defining liberty of conscience and religion he says:

“The meaning of this same liberty in its political aspect 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 allowed to enjoy equal rights.”<sup>1)</sup>

To the same effect, the encyclical *Immortale Dei* says:

“As the people is said to contain within itself the source of all rights and all power, the consequence is that the State thinks it owes no manner of duty to God; that it makes no public profession of religion; that it is not its duty to inquire which of many is the one true religion, or to prefer any 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 religion he may choose to follow, or none at all, if he approve of none.”<sup>2)</sup>

---

1) 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. *Encycl. Libertas*, p. 35.

2) Cumque populus omnium iurium omnisque potestatis fontem in se ipse continere dicatur, consequens erit, ut nulla ratione officii obligatam Deo se civitas putet, ut religionem publice 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

And the encyclical *Humanum genus*, of April 20, 1884:

“Then follow the decrees of political science. Here we find the Naturalists stating that . . . the state must be without God; that there is no reason why one form of religion should be preferred to another; that all should be treated alike.”<sup>1)</sup>

And opposing the liberties thus defined he 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.”<sup>2)</sup>

“In the first place, then, let us consider with reference to individual persons the so-called *freedom of worship*, which is a matter highly detrimental to the salutary influence of religion. The foundation on which it is based is this, that it rests wholly with every individual to profess any religion he may choose or none at all.”<sup>3)</sup>

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

capiat. Consentaneum erit, iudicio singulorum permittere omnem de religione quaestionem; licere cuique aut sequi quam ipse malit, aut omnino nullam, si nullam probet. *Enc. Immortale Dei*, p. 31.

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. *Enc. Humanum genus*. p. 27.

2) 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. *Enc. Libertas*, p. 47.

3) Ac primo illud in singulis personis videamus, quod est tantopere virtuti religionis contrarium, scilicet de *libertate*, uti loquuntur, *cultus*. Quae hoc est veluti fundamento constituta, integrum cuique esse, aut quam libuerit, aut omnino nullam profiteri religionem. *Enc. Libertas*. p. 35.

which, especially in catholic states, is without difficulty recognized." 1)

"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 by no means doubtful 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 adopt that mode and manner of worshipping God whereby according to his declared will God would be worshiped." 2)

"Which is the true religion, he who will judge with prudence and sincerity will readily see. . . . For the only-begotten Son of God has established a society on earth called the Church. . . . 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 most reliable teacher of truth, to whom he committed the keys of the kingdom of heaven." 3)

1) 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. — Cum igitur sit unius religionis necessaria in civitate professio, profiteri eam oportet, quae unice vera est, quaeque non difficulter, praesertim in civitatibus catholicis, agnoscitur. *Enc. Libertas*, p. 37.

2) 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 iudiciis unam ex omnibus veram esse constiterit: eodem modo *civitates* non possunt, citra scelus, gerere se tanquam 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. *Enc. Immortale Dei*, p. 13.

3) Vera autem religio quae sit, non difficulter videt, qui iudicium prudens sincerumque adhibuerit. . . . Nam unigenitus Dei filius societatem in

*What church Leo XIII would urge upon the states of Christendom, he has already told us in unmistakable terms. Not to establish the Roman church, of which the so-called successor of St. Peter is the head and teacher, as the State Church, is a "grave offense" on the part of such states as Missouri and Wisconsin and the United States of America. Leo XIII is not content with the position which the Roman church holds in this country. He 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 at variance with it; no regard is had to the laws of the Church; the Church which according to Christ's order and command is to teach all nations, is prohibited from even touching the public instruction of the people. Things of mixed jurisdiction are disposed of by the civil governments according to their own judgment, and in such cases the most sacred laws of the Church are with a high hand set aside by them. Therefore they render the marriage of Christians subject to their jurisdiction."*<sup>1)</sup>

The Roman church is not content with being on a level with other churches in the state. Leo complains: "They

terris constituit, quae Ecclesia dicitur. . . . Tam ingenti hominum multitudini Deus ipse magistratus assignavit, qui cum potestate praeessent: unumque omnium principem, et maximum certissimumque veritatis magistrum esse voluit, cui claves regni caelorum commisit. *Enc. Immortale Dei*, p. 15.

1) His autem positis, quae maxime probantur hoc tempore, fundamentis reipublicae, facile apparet, quem in locum quamque iniquum compellatur Ecclesia. Nam ubi cum eiusmodi doctrinis actio rerum 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 Iesu 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 iurisdictionem suam trahunt matrimonia christianorum. *Enc. Immortale Dei*, p. 31.

deal with the Church in this wise: having taken from her the character and rights of a perfect society, they take her to be like the other communities existing within the state."<sup>1</sup>) And even the relation of church and state is not, according to Leo's views, to be a coalition on equal terms of mutual aid, but "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."<sup>2</sup>) The "Church" would, of course, claim the part of the "soul" whereby the "body" must be directed and governed, and that government would, in our country, endeavor to do away with other rights now enjoyed by American citizens. Leo XIII 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, can by no means be countenanced, goes without a saying."<sup>3</sup>) And further: "What is termed *freedom of teaching* deserves to be judged in like manner."<sup>4</sup>) And summing up: "From what has been said, it follows that there is no such thing as the right of asking, defending, or granting the freedom of thought, of writing, of teaching, or of religion, promiscuously, as so many rights by nature conferred upon man."<sup>5</sup>)

1) Sic agunt cum Ecclesia, ut, societatis perfectae genere et iuribus opinione detractis, plane similem habeant ceterarum communitatum, quas republica continet. *Enc. Immortale Dei*. p. 33.

2) Itaque inter utramque potestatem quaedam intercedat necesse est ordinata colligatio, quae quidem coniunctioni non immerito comparatur, per quam anima et corpus in homine copulantur. *Enc. Immortale Dei*. p. 21.

3) Iam aliquid consideretur de *libertate loquendi*, formisque litterarum quodcumque libeat exprimendi. Huius profecto non modice temperatae sed modum et finem transeuntis libertatis ius esse non posse, vix attinet dicere. *Enc. Libertas*. p. 39.

4) De ea, quam *docendi libertatem* nominant, oportet non dissimili ratione iudicare. *Enc. Libertas*. p. 41.

5) Itaque ex dictis consequitur, nequaquam licere petere, defendere, largiri, cogitandi, scribendi, docendi, itemque promiscuam religionum libertatem, veluti iura totidem, quae homini natura dederit. *Enc. Libertas*. p. 57.

It is perfectly clear that these political principles of Leo XIII are in direct opposition to the free institutions of our country, which has in its national constitution prohibited Congress from making any law discriminating in favor or against any form of religion, or prohibiting the exercise thereof, or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press.<sup>1)</sup> Of course, Leo XIII knows very well that Roman catholics have had a hand in the making of these institutions, and that many of his subjects are prominent in the political life of a country so constituted; but he is again politician enough to provide a construction calculated to prevent these points from being scored against him. He says: "Indeed, if the Church does not deem it right that various kinds of divine worship should enjoy equal rights with the true religion, she does not on that account condemn those regulators of public affairs who, in order to secure some great benefit, or to prevent some great evil, so far accommodate themselves to custom and usage as to permit these things to exist in the state."<sup>2)</sup>

Leo XIII is not a Reformed Presbyterian. Though he condemns our non-religious state, he does not enjoin upon his followers to abstain from the exercise of the rights of citizenship under our Constitution, but rather recommends that they should take an active part in politics, and that with a twofold end in view: to make the most of the present, and to keep an eye on shaping the future. He says: "It is, therefore, plain that catholics have good and sufficient cause to go into 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 turn

---

1) Amendments, Art. I.

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 causa mali, moribus atque usu patienter ferunt, ut ea habeant singula in civitate locum. Enc. Immortale Dei. p. 41.*

these affairs to best advantage for the true and genuine welfare of the people, with the purpose fixed in their minds to infuse the wisdom and virtue of the catholic religion as a most wholesome *succus et sanguis*<sup>1)</sup> into the veins of the State."<sup>2)</sup> The imagery of these words is very significant. By the blood circulating through its veins a living organism is gradually but surely formed and transformed in a continual and spontaneous process, and the changes thus brought about are not functional only, but organic. To infuse into the veins of the state the wisdom and virtue of the catholic religion means a sure, though gradual, organic change of our political life and institutions in the direction of Romanism, especially toward the principles exhibited in the Encyclicals. Roman catholics are, according to Leo XIII, bound to be Roman catholics also in politics, and to change the organism of the state as above indicated, is their allotted task. Here are Leo's words. "It is necessary that all catholics who are worthy of this name should be, first of all, desirous of being in fact and in appearance loving sons of the Church; to reject without hesitation whatever is inconsistent with this title; . . . to exert themselves toward bringing over the entire State to the Christian form and image 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 Spirit hath made overseers to govern the church of God.*"<sup>3)</sup>

1) i. e. sap and blood.

2) Quamobrem perspicuum est, ad rempublicam adeundi causam esse iustam catholicis: non enim adeunt, neque adire debent ob eam causam, 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 virtutemque catholicae religionis, tamquam saluberrimum succum ac sanguinem, in omnes reipublicae venas inducere. *Enc. Immortale Dei.* p. 49.

3) Catholicos quidem, quotquot digni sunt eo nomine, primum omnium necesse est amantissimos Ecclesiae filios esse et videri velle: quae res ne-

Rome is biding her time, but not in complacent inactivity, and the Pontiff would have his people be ever mindful of their prerogatives. He says: "If, because of peculiar political circumstances it is *expedient* that the Church should *acquiesce* in certain modern liberties, not because she herself so preferred, but because she deems it *expedient* to permit them, *she will, if times have changed for the better*, make use of her freedom and by advise, exhortation, and obsecration, strive, as it behooves her, to perform the duty God has assigned her, to care for the eternal salvation of men. This, however, *is at all times true*, that the freedom of all things granted to all promiscuously is, as we have often said, not in itself to be desired, because it is repugnant to reason that falsehood and truth should enjoy equal rights."<sup>1)</sup>

"Falsehood and truth!" These have ere this been dangerous terms for Roman Pontiffs, and Leo XIII should be rather careful in using them. How will he bear the light of history with such statements as these? "There has been a time when the philosophy of the Gospel ruled the states. At that time that power and divine influence of Christian wisdom had penetrated the laws, institutions

---

queant cum hac laude consistere, eas sine cunctatione respuere; . . . dare operam ut ad eam, quam diximus, christianam similitudinem et formam omnis respublica traducatur. . . . Atque optime utrumque impetrabitur, si praescripta Sedis Apostolicae legem vitae singuli putent, atque Episcopis obtemperent, quos *Spiritus sanctus posuit regere Ecclesiam Dei*.\*) *Enc. Immortale Dei*, p. 41 sq.

1) Si vero ob singularia reipublicae tempora usuveniat, ut modernis quibusdam libertatibus Ecclesia acquiescat, non quod ipsa per se malit, sed quia permissas esse iudicat expedire, versis autem 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 promiscue tributam libertatem non esse, quemadmodum pluries diximus, expetendam per se, quia falsum eodem iure esse ac verum rationi repugnat. *Enc. Libertas*, p. 51.

\*) Acts XX, 28.



and morals of the nations and all the ranks and relations of political life; when the priesthood and the government were by concord and mutual friendly services auspiciously combined.”<sup>1)</sup> “This is attested chiefly by the cities of Italy. By their municipal constitution they acquired prosperity, wealth, glory and fame at the time when the wholesome influence of the Church had pervaded all the departments of the State without resistance by any one.”<sup>2)</sup> What are we to think of a Pope who speaks of “falsehood and truth” when he would make us believe that the days of papal rule in Italy and other parts of Europe, times, the nauseating stench of which for generations and centuries rose toward stars, were so many golden ages in European history? Does he insist upon being reminded of the times when Peter Damiani wrote his *Liber Gomorrhianus*; of the centuries during which *Pseudo Isidore* was the fundamental law of the Roman see; of the vestibule of hell established at Rome under Innocent VIII and Alexander VI; and of many other similar periods of mediaeval history? But here we remember that Leo XIII is a politician, and a politician *in malam partem*, who with a brazen face will utter a falsehood knowing it to be a falsehood, and knowing that many others will know it to be a falsehood, but also knowing that those for whom his utterances are intended will receive them as the Law and the Prophets of their Creed, the only difference between him and a secular politician being this, that what the latter claims on the strength of his political leadership, the Pope claims as by divine authority. Here

---

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 reipublicae ordines rationesque penetraverat . . . cum sacerdotium atque imperium concordia et amica officiorum vicissitudo auspicato conjungeret. (!) *Enc. Immortale Dei*, p. 27.

2) Quod testantur potissimum civitates italicae, scilicet prosperitatem, opes, gloriam nominis principali iure adeptae, quo tempore salutaris Ecclesiae virtus in omnes reipublicae partes, nemine repugnante, pervaserat. *Enc. Libertas*, p. 59 sq.

we have his words: "In order to be of one mind, it is necessary that all should perfectly agree in one faith, and also that the will of all should be perfectly subject and obedient to the Roman Pontiff as unto God. And this obedience must be perfect because it is enjoined by faith itself and has this in common with faith, that it cannot be divided; yea more, if it is not absolute and complete in all points, the mere semblance of obedience remains, its nature is abolished."<sup>1)</sup> And again: "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."<sup>2)</sup>

According to these doctrines and injunctions, no Roman catholic can in full consistency be a citizen of the United States, or take an oath of office whereby he binds himself to uphold the Constitution of the United States or of any

---

1) Concordia igitur animorum sicut perfectum in una fide consensum requirit, ita voluntates postulat Ecclesiae romanoque Pontifici perfecte subiectas atque obtemperantes, ut Deo.—Perfecta autem esse obedientia debet, quia ab ipsa fide praecipitur, et habet hoc commune cum fide, ut dividua esse not possit: imo vero si absoluta non fuerit et numeros omnes habens, obedientiae quidem simulacrum relinquitur, natura tollitur. *Enc. Sapientiae christianae*, p. 29.

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

state in the Union with such sections as we have quoted from the Constitutions of Wisconsin and Missouri. We have heard Dr. Brownson tell his Catholic Congress that "the American system is anti-Protestant;" but his attempt at substantiating his statement is a miserable failure proving only that Mr. Brownson is a Romanist who is utterly incapable of keeping temporal and spiritual things asunder, of giving unto reason the things that are subject to reason, and leaving to revelation that which is of revelation, even as we are told to render unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's.<sup>1)</sup> But having had Leo XIII on the witness-stand, we are willing to rest our case with his testimony in proof of *our* charge that THE ROMAN SYSTEM IS ANTI-AMERICAN. And Rome is already a power in this country. *Videant Consules!*

A. G.

---

1) Matt. 22, 21.

---