





908273

AED 6768  
c.3

# Is the Catholic Church a Menace?

BY

DUDLEY G. WOOTEN

New York  
THE PAULIST PRESS  
120 West 60th Street  
1915

COPYRIGHT, 1915, BY "THE MISSIONARY SOCIETY OF  
ST. PAUL THE APOSTLE IN THE STATE  
OF NEW YORK."

# Is the Catholic Church a Menace?

---



HERE are prevalent in this country certain false conceptions of the relations of our government and institutions to the great subject of religion. These erroneous ideas fall generally under two heads, according as they are accepted and advanced by the two classes of persons who entertain them.

On the one hand is that large, nondescript class who love to call themselves "Free-thinkers"—which for the most part implies freedom from serious religious thought—and who assert and claim to believe that the American people, in the foundation of this Republic, adjured forever the sentiment of religion as a factor in social and political life, and forbade its recognition in any form whatsoever; in other words, that this is by choice and constitution a nation without religious principles, faith or hope. The men who hold to these extreme views range in character and influence through all the grades of mental and moral obliquity, from the intellectual cynic, whose sneer at sacred things is a pitiful exhibition of degenerate egotism, to the dangerous agitator whose rabid blasphemies reek with the filthy venom of rebellion against the laws of God and man.

On the other hand there is the vast army of sectaries, societies, denominations, associations, leagues, fellowships and fraternities, whose name is legion, and whose warring creeds have torn the "seamless garment of the Faith" into fragments. With the zeal of the bigot and the pietistic cant of

NOTE.—The author is not a Catholic. He writes of the Church from the point of view of a consistent American, an experienced jurist, a careful and unbiased student of history.

the Pharisee, the leaders of some of these discordant religionists, now, as in the beginning of the government, vehemently proclaim that this is a Protestant nation, that "popery" and "papists" have no place in the social and religious scheme of American institutions, that Catholicism is hostile to civil and political liberty, and that Catholics should be barred from participation in the activities and aspirations of our national life.

Both of these factional opinions are equally and fundamentally fallacious, and it is doubtful which of the two is the more vicious in its motives, the more destructive in its tendencies, or the more un-American in its essential antagonism to the true spirit of republican government.

The author of the Declaration of Independence did indeed inaugurate in his native State the great movement in favor of absolute religious equality and freedom, and to his courageous struggle the American people owe the universal constitutional guarantees of liberty of conscience and worship that now prevail throughout the United States. To his determined efforts was due the adoption of the First Amendment to the Federal Constitution, wherein it is provided that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof;" and he procured, after many years of bitter opposition, from the so-called Anglican or Episcopal Church the passage of the Virginia "Statute for Religious Freedom," which has served as the mother and the model of similar legislation in all the other States. Jefferson has given us in his *Autobiography* the reasons that impelled him to make this the great object of his public life and labors.

He points out how the Congregationalists in New England, the Presbyterians in the Middle Colonies, and the Episcopalians in the South had built up by law and governmental support a despotic monopoly of religious worship, taxing and robbing the whole public to maintain their ecclesiastical privileges, persecuting and proscribing all other faiths and forms of worship, and gradually establishing over the minds and consciences of men an odious system of spiritual tyranny. Of

the original thirteen colonies only three—Maryland, Pennsylvania and Rhode Island—permitted the slightest liberty of conscience or freedom of belief in religion. Maryland was a Catholic colony, founded by the Calverts as a refuge for the faithful driven to the New World by British bigotry and brutality, and by them and the Carrolls it was ever maintained as the home of absolute equality, toleration and freedom in matters of faith and devotion. Pennsylvania was settled mainly by Quakers and Irish immigrants, and they were compelled in self-defence to adopt and enforce a large measure of religious freedom. Rhode Island was the child of Puritan proscription against the Baptists, and the exiled Roger Williams proclaimed spiritual liberty as his declaration of independence from the narrow and cruel bigotry of the New England fanatics. But Maryland alone, and from the beginning, was always religiously free, despite the repeated efforts of the Virginia Episcopalians to stamp out her liberties.

It was against these intolerable burdens of ecclesiastical oppression and spiritual slavery that Thomas Jefferson waged an unrelenting warfare, and so well did he succeed that to-day his standard of religious freedom is the accepted standard of every American State. Perhaps its clearest and most comprehensive expression is contained in the Constitution of the State of Washington, in the following words:

“Absolute freedom of conscience in all matters of religious sentiment, belief and worship shall be guaranteed to every individual, and no one shall be molested or disturbed in person or property on account of religion, but the liberty of conscience hereby secured shall not be so construed as to excuse acts of licentiousness, or justify practices inconsistent with the peace and safety of the State. No public money or property shall be appropriated for or applied to any religious worship, exercise, or instruction, or the support of any religious establishment. No religious qualification shall be required for any public office or employment, nor shall any person be incompetent as a witness or juror in consequence of his opinion on matters of religion, nor be questioned in any court of jus-



tice touching his religious belief to affect the weight of his testimony" (Art. I., Sec. 11).

It should be remembered and emphasized that all of the foregoing guarantees and prohibitions were called into being and rendered necessary by the proscriptive and intolerant laws, ordinances and practices of the Protestant colonies and States in America. This is made clear by the historical records, and by Jefferson's own arguments as the father of religious freedom in the United States.

But this fixed policy of absolute neutrality towards the various forms of religious belief and worship, so far as the government and legislation are concerned, does not imply that the American people are an irreligious or a non-religious nation.

Constitutions, laws and institutions are the visible instrumentalities by which the body politic and social is controlled and regulated in its organic functions; but antedating and dominating these tangible agencies and expressions of government are the inherited sentiment and character of the people by and for whom the government exists. There is a "spirit" politic and social, as well as a "body" politic and social, and it is this higher and more intimate faculty that gives to American nationality its distinctly religious character, in which Christianity is the dominating force. America is indeed a Christian land, by right of discovery, exploration, settlement and inheritance. The whole system and theory of American national life and thought are based upon Christian doctrine, and have been developed by Christian policy and practice. The underlying principles of our government and the cardinal virtues of our social and political organization, are those which Christianity introduced into the world and first inculcated as the fundamentals of civic righteousness and social stability. Columbus plowed unfriendly seas to seek new fields for the Faith. The Catholic sovereigns of Spain who sent him westward across the unknown Atlantic expressly commissioned him to find new lands for God's kingdom, and the funds that furnished his voyages came from the treasury of the Church.



The first Christian congregations organized within the territory that now comprises the United States were Catholic, and the first Christian services celebrated in that territory were those of that Faith. That was in the early part of the sixteenth century, a hundred years before the Cavaliers landed in Virginia or the Pilgrims in New England. The first missionaries in the New World were those from Catholic countries, and where they labored, Christianity meant mercy, peace and preservation to the native tribes, instead of pillage, cruelty and extermination.

But all other colonies and settlements on this continent were likewise established to propagate the creed and institutions of Christianity. All of the original colonies chartered by English monarchs to explore and settle in this country were required in so many words to provide by law for the spread of Christianity, and to administer their governments in accordance with its faith and practice. Every one of the original thirteen States of the Union, both before and after the separation from Great Britain, enacted as part of its laws that the Christian religion should be the accepted faith of its inhabitants, the source of political and personal morality, the standard of public policy and police regulation, and the indispensable basis of society and government. Nearly every State that has since come into the Union has declared to the same effect, and in those that have not, the courts have held that the declaration is implied and understood from the very nature of our institutions.

The Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, early in the last century, decided: "Christianity, general Christianity, is and always has been a part of the common law of Pennsylvania; not Christianity with an established church, and tithes, and spiritual courts, but Christianity with liberty of conscience to all men." In the famous "Girard Will Case" the Supreme Court of the United States held the same thing, and in the recent case of Holy Trinity Church vs. United States, that great tribunal, in an exhaustive opinion by Justice Brewer, discusses the whole subject, and among other things declares:

“No purpose of action against religion can be imputed to any legislation, of State or Nation, because this is a religious people.” After reviewing the laws, charters, constitutions and judicial decisions of the American Union and its several States from the inception of the government, the Court further says: “There is no dissonance in these declarations. There is a universal language pervading them all, having one meaning: they affirm and reaffirm that this is a religious nation. These are not individual sayings, declarations of private persons; they are organic utterances, they speak the voice of the entire people. . . . These, and many other matters that might be noticed, add a volume of unofficial declarations to the mass of organic utterances that this is a Christian nation.”

One of the most interesting and convincing judicial decisions on the subject is that of the great Chancellor Kent, delivering the judgment of the Supreme Court of New York, in the case of *People vs. Ruggles*, in which he says: “The people of this State, in common with the people of this country, profess the general doctrines of Christianity, as the rule of their faith and practice; and to scandalize the Author of these doctrines is not only, in a religious point of view, extremely impious, but, even in respect to the obligations due to society, is a gross violation of decency and good order. The free, equal and undisturbed enjoyment of religious opinion, whatever it may be, and free and decent discussions on any religious subject, are granted and secured; but to revile, with malicious and blasphemous contempt, the religion professed by almost the whole community, is an abuse of that right. Nor are we bound by any expressions in the Constitution, as some have strangely supposed, either not to punish at all, or to punish indiscriminately the like attacks upon the religion of Mahomet or of the Grand Lama; and for the plain reason that we are a Christian people, and the morality of the country is deeply ingrafted upon Christianity, and not upon the doctrines of these impostors.” How far we have drifted away from this sound and salutary standard of American Christian sentiment, is daily demonstrated by the

free dissemination of the indecent and blasphemous publications that are maintained for the sole purpose of reviling the oldest and the only authentic representative of Christianity in this Republic.

It is historically, legally, and fundamentally true, that nowhere in all the literature of our laws and constitutions, or in any transaction of life or business, is there any recognition of any other than the Christian religion. The infidel, the rationalist, the pantheist, the materialist, and the agnostic are totally unknown to the institutions of this land, and the courts have time and again decided that the only Supreme Ruler of the Universe known to American jurisprudence and polity is the God of the Old and the New Testaments—the Christian's God. It is not to be wondered at, as the logical consequence of this situation, that the census statistics show that less than two per cent of our population professes adhesion to any other faith than that of Christianity. That is not to say, however, that ninety-eight per cent of the population are Christians; it merely means that only a negligible fraction openly avows anti-Christian or non-Christian beliefs.

It is not the purpose of this pamphlet to deal with questions of dogma and doctrine, as related to the spiritual side of religious belief and worship, for we have seen that those issues belong to the domain of conscience, over which American secular institutions are forbidden to exercise jurisdiction. But the Christian character of our governmental institutions and policies being firmly established, as above shown, the attitude and relations of the Catholic Church towards them become clear, and are consonant with her historic teaching and practice. Having been the pioneer of Christianity in this Western World, and the founder of religious liberty and toleration in the United States, she cannot occupy any other position than one of loyalty to the Christian principles that underlie the whole structure of our political and social constitution as a people. There has been no authentic instance of any act, utterance or policy of the Church in this country since the foundation of the Republic, or even

before, in which there has been manifested, directly or indirectly, covertly or openly, any other attitude towards the laws, government and public policy of the United States, or of any State, than that of complete and cheerful accord and obedience. All that has been said, and is being said, to the contrary, is baseless fabrication and malicious slander. Indeed, upon examination it will be found that these attacks upon the alleged hostility of the Church to American ideas and principles of government are predicated upon some remote and apochryphal incident of Old World experience, and not upon anything that has been said, done or threatened by Catholicism in our own country or within recent times.

And a further candid and critical investigation will almost invariably disclose that the arguments and attacks against the Church, on account of her supposed misdeeds or mistakes in other countries and distant ages, are based upon absolute falsehoods, absurd misconceptions, or exaggerated statements by partisan historians and avowed enemies of Catholicism. For the past four centuries there has been no limit to the mendacity, malice, prejudice and perversity of Protestant and skeptical writers who have assumed to chronicle and condemn the course and conduct of the "Roman" Church. About all of the information on this subject that is current among non-Catholics is derived from these polluted sources. The foes of the Church in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries actually arrogated to themselves the invention of printing and the freedom of the press as the peculiar production of Protestantism, and their servile imitators ever since have prostituted those great agencies of knowledge and enlightenment to the basest uses of religious bigotry and proscription. Hence, the man who makes an assertion derogatory to the historic policies and practices of Catholicism, must support it by less tainted testimony than that derived from the historians of the so-called Reformation and their successors, or from the literature of infidelity and rationalism. Tried by the accepted tests of competent and credible evidence, none of the loose libels and vindictive accusations being circulated so freely by the purveyors

of anti-Catholic literature, merit the serious consideration of honest seekers after the truth. For example, no theme has been so industriously exploited and so thoroughly distorted by radical anti-Catholics as the "temporal power of the Pope," and the people of the United States are being constantly warned against that terrible and insidious menace to their liberties and institutions. The whole subject is silly in the extreme, and totally irrelevant to any existing or possible situation in this or any other country, but it is precisely that sort of foolish and futile attack upon the Church that seems to constitute the chief material for her calumniators; so it may be worth while to notice it here, especially as it bears somewhat upon other aspects of the discussion in hand.

The temporal power of the Popes at this period of the world's history has only an academic interest anywhere, and it never had or can have any meaning or applicability in the United States. At no time or place did it ever have the significance and scope sought to be attached to it by the ignorant and distempered controversialists who make of it a "mountain of offence" on the part of the Papacy. The authority of the Head of the Church over temporal and secular affairs in former times was derived and exercised under two sources of jurisdiction, the one strictly territorial, the other ancillary to the functions and powers of the Church as recognized by the Christian nations of Europe for more than a thousand years. Briefly but correctly stated, those two aspects of temporal power were as follows:

- (1) The so-called Papal States, located in central Italy, contiguous to Rome, with some provinces elsewhere, belonged to the Sovereign Pontiff, in virtue of his sacred office, by gift and cession from the various Christian monarchs of Europe, as well as by actual purchase from the Papal revenues. Beginning with Constantine, the secular founder of Catholic Christendom, followed by Pepin and Charlemagne of France, and a long line of loyal Catholic sovereigns of that and other Continental countries, those States were transferred to the Papacy as tokens of fealty to the Holy See, as voluntary con-



tributions to the resources of the Church, and for the practical purpose of securing the safety, dignity and independence of the Popes amid the dangers and disorders of those turbulent times. Over them the Papacy held and exercised absolute dominion and ownership, as did the rulers of other nations and states in that era; and their history for nearly fifteen hundred years demonstrates that no countries in all Europe were more prosperous and happy, or enjoyed in their government and institutions a larger measure of wisdom, justice, benevolence and freedom, than those same Papal States. Moreover, although this little group of commonwealths contained a small area and limited resources, they furnished the nucleus of a political, military and naval power that, in the hands of the strong and capable Pontiffs of the middle centuries, was able not only to withstand the invasion of the Moslem hordes of Asia and Africa, but to curb and crush the lawlessness and tyranny of European monarchies. More than once this territorial sovereignty of the Popes saved Christianity from unholy conquest and spoliation from without, and at home compelled the haughty governments of Christendom to obey that rule of right, reason and justice which the Church has ever maintained to be the limit and the test of all lawful human power. The civil and political revolutions in Italy during the nineteenth century by degrees alienated and destroyed the jurisdiction of the Papacy over the States of the Church, and finally, in 1870, the last shred of territorial and temporal authority, so long and so beneficially exercised by the Popes over those principalities, was swept away, and the Vicar of Christ was driven within the walls and gardens of the Vatican.

Thus the only real, tangible temporal power the Papacy ever possessed is seen to have been very restricted in its territorial jurisdiction, and founded upon the voluntary concessions of the Christian rulers of Europe, as well as upon wise and salutary considerations of both civil and religious policy. It has ended; but it was never an evil influence nor evilly exerted, and the manner of its extinction was in entire harmony with the forcible confiscations and spoliations that have signaled

the supremacy of atheistical and anarchical ideas in certain of the modern nations, from the contamination of which even the American Republic has not escaped in recent years.

(2) The other aspect in which the Church, in the centuries past, assumed and exercised a measure of control over secular affairs and temporal institutions, presents a totally different problem, and in its ultimate analysis involves fundamental and far-reaching conceptions of Christianity in its relations to human governments. From the time of Constantine to the completion of what is called the Protestant Reformation, Christianity was the one dominant religion of Europe, and its sole and undisputed representative was the Catholic Church. During that period all of the kingdoms of the Continent, and Great Britain as well, professed and exhibited their loyalty to the Roman See, and their sovereigns paid homage to the spiritual authority of the Roman Pontiffs. In their temporal capacities the nations of Christendom were separate and supreme within the limits of their respective dominions, but internationally they all acknowledged a common allegiance to the religious headship of the Papacy. By the fictions of Feudalism their monarchs were "cousins" by courtesy, and by the bond of Christian fellowship they were "brothers in the Faith." Together they vied in service and fealty to the Church; together they planned and prosecuted expeditions for the discovery and acquisition of new territories for the kingdom of God; and by their united resources and power they organized and carried forward that wonderful series of chivalric campaigns to rescue from Moslem desecration the birth-place and the tomb of Christ.

It was perfectly natural and logical, then, that very early in the history of this Christian fellowship of the nations, resort should be made to the authority of the Church to settle international disputes, to accommodate personal controversies between rival monarchs, and to establish and enforce a code of ethics and justice for the intercourse and conduct of the Christian rulers of Europe. Their religion was the one interest and influence to which they all acknowledged obedience,



and its representative at Rome was the one potentate whose supremacy they all revered, and to whom they could submit their differences without compromise of dignity or loss of prestige. Moreover, they had sought to insure his neutrality and independence by investing him with supreme authority, temporal and spiritual, in the Papal States where he held his court. So it came about that the Popes were called upon to act as final arbitrators in vexed matters of statecraft and diplomacy between the various courts and countries of Europe, and eventually they were appealed to in the domestic difficulties and local problems of the several nations and their rulers. This indirect but potent participation of the Papacy in the temporal concerns of the European governments, was brought about by the voluntary solicitation of the interested parties; it was in its nature and scope purely disciplinary, advisory and limited by the necessary conditions of all arbitrations between sovereign contestants, and it ceased to have any effective meaning with the destruction of Christian unity and fellowship by the forces of Protestantism.

It thus appears, to the satisfaction of any sensible and unbiased student, that the power of the Papacy in temporal affairs, both immediate and intermediate, has ceased to be a practical question, for that power is no longer exercised or asserted anywhere, is not compatible with existing conditions and circumstances even in the Old World, and was never a possible contingency in this country. During the time when the authority of the Church was evinced through Papal intervention and arbitration, as above noticed, it exerted a tremendous influence upon the national and international transactions of all the Christian countries; for, besides the great moral weight of a central and authoritative tribunal whose decrees and acts were based upon the immutable rules of Divine justice and righteousness, the subtle terrors of ecclesiastical displeasure and the substantial disadvantages of formal excommunication were very real in that age of universal allegiance to the authentic standards of Christian duty and fidelity. Certainly, no sufficient substitute has been afforded the modern

nations; else many of the lamentable occurrences of this age never would have been possible.

There is then left for our practical consideration the actual and relevant facts bearing upon the present attitude of the Church towards temporal and secular affairs, and more particularly in our own land. These may best be understood in the light of past events. The exigencies of certain periods of European development, the safety and protection of its own existence and institutions in various critical emergencies, and the personal qualities and public policies of several of the great Roman Pontiffs in the earlier centuries, all operated to modify and sometimes to obscure the fundamental position of the Papacy in its dealings with human governments; but in the final analysis it will be found that the historic and authentic attitude of Catholicism has always been substantially the same in regard to the true and proper relations between Church and State. The Catholic view upon this subject is radically different from that asserted and put into practice by the politico-religious system that was inaugurated in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries under the general name of "Protestantism," and is much more in harmony with the American conception of Christianity in connection with the government and secular institutions of this Republic. This is easily demonstrated by a recurrence to a few historical facts.

After the Decree of Milan, in 313 A. D., the relations between the Church and the imperial government began to take definite shape. Constantine himself declared that the supreme ecclesiastical authority had the right to decide all questions between kings and emperors, and all disputes between rulers and their subjects; but the Church did not readily assent to nor assume this extraordinary function and responsibility. She stood upon the canon of her Divine Founder: "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's." It was thus early the fundamental tenet of both the Papal and the imperial governments that there should be absolute separation of Church and State, each independent and supreme in its own sphere, but

coördinating and coöperating with each other in their respective fields of usefulness. That was the original Christian conception, and after the lapse of all the intervening centuries, and making allowance for changed conditions of social and political organization, that is the present conception of the Catholic Church in this country. Gregory the Great, who was Pope in the latter part of the sixth century, the father of the Mediæval Papacy, and easily the dominant figure of his age, held to that view, denying that the hierarchy had any right to interfere with temporal institutions or the secular arm of government, beyond the duty to protest against wickedness, oppression and injustice. In fact, he counseled the submission of the ecclesiastical to the secular power in all matters except those of spiritual faith and practice, upon the Apostolic theory that the lawful ruler of the State represents God in the domain of temporal jurisdiction. At the same time, he maintained that it was the corresponding duty of the State to protect the Church in her spiritual privileges, and in her rights and integrity, as the organized representative of Christianity. Accordingly, when the safety of Rome and the sovereignty of the Papacy over its own estates in Italy and elsewhere were threatened by the Lombards and Franks, and the secular authorities refused to respond to the call for protection, he did not hesitate to appoint civil governors in the Roman provinces, to organize an army, to wage a war of defence, and to make treaties of peace and settlement, without waiting for the imperial sanction. He assumed this supreme power because of the practical necessities of the occasion, and by his firmness, courage and wisdom, in that emergency, he undoubtedly saved the Church from an appalling peril, and made Rome the religious and political capital of Christendom.

Again, in the latter part of the eleventh century, the great Hildebrand—Gregory VII.—was compelled, by the exigencies of his situation and the pressing demands for a reformation in the Church, to assert and to enforce an extraordinary authority over the secular governments of Europe; and his haughty and imperious temper led him to go much further than

any of his predecessors in the Papacy had gone, in assuming a disciplinary power over human rulers. He came to the Chair of Peter in the year 1073, in the midst of the most dismal and disheartening period Christianity had ever known. The conflicting forces of barbarism and feudalism had disorganized and degraded all departments of life. The fall of the Carolingian empire had left Europe the prey of chaos, corruption and calamity, rendered more dire by other national and international changes. The Church had not escaped the general depravity and demoralization, for the Emperor of Germany and other temporal rulers had usurped the right to appoint ecclesiastical officers and to dispense religious privileges, influenced, for the most part, by bribery and favoritism. Many priests were living in open violation of their vows of celibacy, and gross immorality pervaded every order of society, civil and religious. In this crisis Hildebrand determined to purge and purify the ecclesiastical system, and to redeem the Church from this shameful condition. Henry IV., the German emperor, abetted by other sovereigns, defied the Pope's authority even in these matters of reform and discipline within the Church. Gregory promptly excommunicated him and his advisers, and absolved his subjects from all allegiance to the emperor. This brought the defiant monarch across the Alps, barefoot in the dead of winter, as a penitent supplicant for the Papal pardon. Gregory justified his acts in this and other similar instances upon two grounds: (1) Because the preservation of the Faith and the integrity of the Church demanded that the Head of the Church should enforce a reformation of existing abuses, and that as such Head he had supreme power over any secular potentate who sought to invade the spiritual jurisdiction of the Pope; (2) Because the emperor, by his impious and corrupt conduct, as well as by other acts of arbitrary oppression and injustice, had violated the contract that existed between him and his subjects to rule justly and righteously, and therefore the Church, as the forum of conscience and the tribunal having peculiar supervision over the obligations and consecration of Christian rulers, had the



authority to declare him no longer emperor, and to absolve his people from their part of the mutual contract that always exists between a sovereign and his subjects. In this last ground we find an expression of the remarkable attitude which the Papacy, partly of its own motion and partly at the solicitation of the Christian governments of Europe, assumed towards the respective rights of the common people and their royal rulers. Until the close of the reign of Charlemagne the general position of the Papacy was that of implicit obedience to temporal rulers in matters secular and governmental. After that period there arose and developed into strong operation, the view that all lawful monarchs, especially if they claim to govern as Christian rulers should, are bound to govern agreeably to a contract, express or implied, between themselves and their subjects, to rule reasonably, righteously and justly. Every king and emperor in Europe in those days professed devotion to Christian ideals and principles, and they all sought to wear their crowns at the hands and by the consecration of the Papacy or its duly authorized legates. The ancient coronation oaths of that era were all administered and solemnized by the sanctions of the Church, and they all contained express provisions recognizing that the sovereign held his power by the consent and for the welfare of his people, and the solemn vow that he would rule justly and righteously. Hence, when a monarch so conducted his government as to violate these fundamental conditions and obligations of his sovereignty, it was considered to be a matter of such flagrant violence against his oath and consecration as to warrant intervention and, if need be, summary correction by the Church. Accordingly history relates a multitude of cases in which the Popes intervened to compel despotic kings and corrupt emperors to respect the rights and liberties of their subjects, to enforce the rule of righteousness and justice between contending factions and rival aspirants in nearly every country in Europe, and generally to exercise over the temporal powers of that age a corrective and compulsory influence in favor of the weak against the strong, the oppressed against the oppressors,

and the just against the unjust. This wise and salutary policy constitutes one of the glories of Catholicism in the past, and it indicates clearly the traditional and inherited temper of the Church towards popular liberties and free government. It is a significant fact, to be remembered by every Catholic, that the first time in English history that the coronation oath of an English king was so altered as to omit therefrom the acknowledgment that the monarch holds his office "by the concurrent consent of his people," and to substitute therefor the declaration that he is king "by right of inheritance," was when Edward VI., the son of Henry VIII., was crowned as the first Protestant sovereign of Great Britain, in 1548. This vital change from popular approval to hereditary absolutism was made by Archbishop Cranmer, whom the "Encyclopedia Britannica" calls "the first Protestant primate of England."

Returning to the policy of the Mediæval Papacy, the next great Pontiff after Gregory VII. was Innocent III., in many ways the most admirable of all the Popes of that era, who ruled at Rome in the years from 1198 to 1216. He added immensely to the power of the Papacy, but in the direction of its spiritual and ecclesiastical functions. He held to the same views in reference to temporal powers as had been announced by Gregory the Great in the sixth century, disaffirming the right of the Church to intermeddle with secular matters. Later, in the last years of the thirteenth and the early part of the fourteenth centuries, Boniface VIII. and John XXII. reverted to the stern and radical policies of Hildebrand, and became involved in violent struggles with the reigning monarchs of Europe. Their views and acts, however, like those of Gregory VII., were largely colored and compelled by the practical necessities and difficulties with which they had to deal, in endeavoring to protect the Church from spoliation and oppression by the rapacious rulers of England and France. The divergent opinions upon the subject of the respective jurisdiction and powers of the secular and ecclesiastical arms of government, were advocated with more or less violence and radicalism throughout the several centuries preceding the so-called Re-

formation, both sides often going to extremes. It gradually assumed the aspect outwardly of a struggle between imperial and Papal power, between the spiritual and the material forces of civilization, between Divine revelation and human reason. But through it all the Church—when not drawn into the contest by the necessity of self-protection, or the voluntary solicitation of those who sought her authority as arbitrator, or in the capacity of supreme judge in the forum of Christian conscience—maintained her original position of disavowing any right or policy of interfering with human governments in their temporal and secular functions, and demanding absolute freedom from domination by earthly rulers in matters pertaining to spiritual faith and practice. Ultimately she lost the battle with the sinister forces of rationalism and imperialism, and the heel of the State was placed upon the neck of the Church. \*Historically and logically considered, Protestantism was the triumph of those forces, and its intellectual, moral and religious merits were merely the superficial manifestations of a revolution in civil, political and religious conceptions, the final futility of which is now apparent in the discordant and helpless condition to which it has brought the minds of men in those countries that fell under its sway. In the name of religious reformation it discarded the authority of the only agency and representative of Christianity known among the nations, and substituted therefor the variable and vagrant opinions of mortal judgment, to be forced into an arbitrary and artificial unity and harmony by the power of secular sovereignty; for let it be clearly understood that Protestantism gained its ascendancy by the aid of the temporal powers, and in whatsoever country it was accepted, it established and maintained its supremacy by the compulsion of governmental regulation and support.

The "Thirty Years' War," which ended in 1648, accomplished the final destruction of Papal authority as the central source of Christian unity and influence in Europe, and its results crowned the victory of the new politico-religious cult. The Treaty of Westphalia, which closed the war, embodied



the concrete ideas and policies of Protestantism, chief among which was the startling declaration—"The Religion of the Prince is the Religion of the Land" ("cujus regio, ejus religio"). Here we have, for the first time in Christian history, the bold and brutal announcement that the state is the centre and source of religious authority and spiritual light; that kings are such by divine right; and that the Church of Christ is a hydra-headed human institution, changing her faith according to the variations of race and climate, and subject to the frail and fluctuating rulership of as many earthly potentates as there may be lands to govern and princes to govern them. In all the long controversy of the preceding centuries, as to the relative jurisdiction and powers of the imperial and Papal governments in their respective spheres, no such audacious and impious contention had ever been advanced by the most radical advocates of imperial supremacy. It meant the complete merger, in each particular country, of temporal and spiritual authority, with a secular sovereign as the incarnation of both religious and political power. It necessarily implied the destruction of all unity of religious belief, all certainty and stability of moral and spiritual standards, all reliable and binding authority in matters of faith and worship. Inasmuch as Protestantism also proposed to itself an unlimited freedom of personal and private judgment in spiritual concerns, there was thus presented the paradoxical problem of how to accommodate the "religion of the prince"—which must be the "religion of the land"—with the varying shapes and shades of individual religious opinion among his subjects. The attempt to carry into execution these two incompatible propositions inevitably would lead to chaos and calamity. The enforcement of the one involved the extinction of religious liberty and freedom of worship; the indulgence of the other must produce non-conformity, independentism, sectarian revolt and religious anarchy; while the joint effect of the two must weaken the spiritual influence of religion in general, and gradually destroy the efficiency and virtue of Christianity as a moral, social and political force.

Those are the consequences one would naturally and reasonably expect from the practical operation of the new system, and the history of the last three hundred years in the Old World proves conclusively that precisely those consequences have ensued. Following the success of the boasted "Reformation," each one of the countries in which Protestantism was dominant adopted that form of belief as the "religion of the prince," and therefore, "religion of the land;" and they proceeded to enforce its observance by all the pains and penalties of disfranchisement, confiscation, persecution and proscription.

For the first time since its birth, Christianity, so-called, found itself an institution of the State, governed by human potentates and maintained by a rigorous system of governmental despotism. There being no longer any common source of authentic faith and doctrine in the domain of ethical and spiritual truth, there could be no uniformity of international morals nor any unity of national religion. The pride of intellectual achievement, the speculations of human reason, the corruptions of material and commercial cupidity, and the cruel conceptions of imperial ambition usurped the mastery of men's minds and aspirations, growing apace with the centuries, until we behold the present cataclysm in European civilization at which the world stands aghast. In the view of the student of the logic and philosophy of history, the climax has come in the due order of events. It is the legitimate sequence of a system of faith and morals in which the prerogatives and precepts of the Prince of Peace have been usurped and perverted by the princes of this world, and a war of materialism and imperialism is wrecking the structure of a civilization based upon no stronger foundation than human folly and frailty.

Transplanted to America in the seventeenth century, Protestantism began the same course in its relations to the civil and political power that characterized its conduct in the older countries of Europe. As before stated, all of the colonies in what afterwards became the United States, except Lord Baltimore's colony in Maryland, were settled under Protestant con-

trol, and without exception they established their religion as that of the government, enforcing its code of morals and its creed of worship by the severest legal penalties and restrictions. The odious system was finally swept away by Jefferson and his colleagues in their triumphant struggle for civil and religious liberty, and the American Republic was firmly committed to the fixed and fundamental policy of the absolute separation and independence of Church and State, each supreme in its own domain, but coöperating as coördinate agencies in securing and advancing the prosperity, happiness and freedom of the whole country. That, as we have already seen, was the primitive and positive principle and policy of Catholicism in the days of Constantine and Gregory the Great, and from it the Catholic Church in its corporate capacity has never departed through all succeeding centuries, notwithstanding that the individual views and temporary exigencies of certain of the Pontiffs, amid the turbulent vicissitudes of Mediæval Europe, may sometimes have led to apparent modifications and relaxations in the application of the doctrine.

Deprived of government support and enforcement, American Protestantism was left to develop in the United States along the lines of its fundamental concept—the right of private judgment upon all questions of religious faith—and the inevitable result has speedily followed, with cumulative confusion and increasing loss of practical influence as the years go by. According to official statistics in the United States, the number and variety of non-Catholic organizations having religious objects are amazing. Dr. H. K. Carroll, a Methodist clergyman, was the Government expert in charge of the "Division of Churches" in taking the Eleventh Census, and he has since published a volume covering the statistics of 1890, 1900, 1906, and 1910, entitled "The Religious Forces of the United States," which contains some curious and candid statements. Among other observations, this Protestant minister says: "We scarcely appreciate our advantages. Our citizens are free to choose a residence in any one of fifty States and Territories, and to move from one to another as often as they have

a mind to. There is even a wider range for choice and change in religion. One may be a pagan, a Jew, or a Christian, or each in turn. If a Christian, he may be six kinds of an Adventist, twelve kinds of a Mennonite or Presbyterian, thirteen kinds of a Baptist, sixteen kinds of a Lutheran, or seventeen kinds of a Methodist. He may be a member of any one of 143 denominations, or of all in succession. If none of these suits him, he still has a choice among 150 separate and independent congregations, which have no denominational name, creed, or connection."

Now, when our courts and constitutions have declared, so often and so emphatically, that Christianity is a part of the common law and universal inheritance of this land and people, they meant to say that Christianity is the foundation of our civilization as a nation; that it furnishes the standard of social righteousness, political justice, personal character and public integrity; that its principles, practically applied in the domain of ethics and morals, contain the true solution of all the problems that may confront us—the satisfactory and authoritative basis upon which to discuss and determine the reasonable rights of all men, individually and socially, and of government as the creature of man for the preservation of organized society. They meant likewise to imply, as the necessary predicate of the proposition, that there must be some safe, stable and authoritative source of Christian principles and policies—some standard of uniformity and authenticity for true Christianity; and this quite aside from any question of spiritual faith or religious worship, with which our government refuses to meddle. Where can this source and standard be found? It certainly will be a vain and fruitless quest to seek it among the discordant and innumerable propagandists whom Dr. Carroll has so graphically described; for they not only reject any uniform Christian faith and practice in the purely religious realm, but they utterly fail to offer any concrete and harmonious conception of what Christianity means in its workable adaptation to individual, family, social and political life; and in fact it would sometimes appear as if some of these

sects and schisms espoused every heresy and vagary of social and political radicalism, as a refuge against spiritual inanition and a bid for sensational popularity.

Catholicism has always and everywhere claimed to be the exclusive representative of Christianity, as that religion was promulgated by its Divine Founder and committed to His Church on earth; and its cardinal tenets and teachings have not changed since it became the organized depositary of that Faith, now nearly two thousand years ago. This is true, not only of the sacrosanct and sacerdotal mission of the Church among men, but also of her relations to the problems and principles of man's temporal interests as a member of human society and a subject of secular government. Hence, intelligent, representative and patriotic American Catholics claim—and in this claim they are joined by a steadily increasing number of intelligent, patriotic, representative Americans who are not Catholics either by inheritance or education—that the Catholic Church stands for those things in the daily life of the people—in their educational, social, industrial, domestic and political interests and institutions, that come closest to the fundamental principles of American government, and will promote and protect most effectively the ideas and ideals of American nationality.

For this reason they believe and assert that so far from being a menace or a discordant force in the secular affairs of the United States, the Catholic Church fulfills and is destined to exhibit, in its temporal influence, precisely that function that was contemplated in the constitutional and judicial declarations quoted above, that "Christianity is a part of the common law of the land." In support of this belief and assertion it is only necessary to call attention to a few of the historic tenets and teachings of Catholic Christianity, as applied to current questions of government and social science; for, upon the fundamental issues of life and morals, the Church stands now where she has always stood.

The pagan idea of life and its theory of government were founded upon the conception of humanity as a mass—men as



mechanical atoms in the constitution of society. The State or the Government was the centre source of power under that system, and the individual was absorbed into and dominated by the central authority or those who controlled it. The Roman law defined a person as "a man endowed with a civil status," that is to say, with such rights as the civil authority might confer upon him. Christianity exactly reversed these ideas. Under the Christian system every man became a person in the eye of the law as well as in the sight of God, with all the rights that God gave him at the moment of creation. The personality of man and his divinely conferred attributes and sovereignty are the essential concepts of the Christian scheme, as taught by the Catholic Church. Our Declaration of Independence and all our organic laws embody precisely the same conception of man and society and government, as their very words expressly proclaim.

So that Catholicism maintains that whatsoever movement or measure of reform or innovation proposes or tends to impair or to destroy this personality of the citizen, or to absorb and merge it into the sovereignty of the State, by any method of socialistic paternalism, thereby denying to man his God-given and inalienable rights, is not only un-American, but is also pagan in its origin, anti-Christian in its conception, reactionary and not progressive in its objects and effects.

Again, the personality of man being the fundamental principle of Christianity, both as a religious belief and as a social and political influence, the next step in the formation of society is the recognition and preservation of the family tie. Marriage in some form is the basis of the family, the source of all social growth, and the corner-stone of human governments. Here, too, Christianity introduced a new rule into the world—a new note in the harmony of social and political life. Among the pagan nations, and even under the ancient Hebrew government, marriage was a loose and variable bond, dissoluble upon slight provocation and for frivolous causes. But Christ taught and enjoined the holy and indestructible character of marriage, and the Church He established has maintained it as

such throughout every succeeding age. Consonant with this vital and inviolable tenet, Catholics hold that the sacrament of marriage is the corner-stone of the Christian home and family; the soul of Christian civilization, the citadel of social purity and peace, the only safeguard of stable and righteous government among men. That the stability of the marriage tie is the basis of family life, and that this in turn is the only foundation of national life and morals, is held by all Americans; only the radical revolutionaries whose visionary and violent schemes of regeneration and reform are the real menace to our liberties and institutions deny it.

Upon the great and absorbing question of education, the Church holds to views that are sometimes misunderstood or misrepresented to her prejudice; but upon proper investigation it will be found that they are not only compatible with the whole theory and structure of our civilization, but that ultimately they embody the only sure and safe guarantee for the preservation of American ideas and institutions. The Catholic view is that education should promote character—individual and national. Character is purely a moral attribute—the concrete product of the symmetrical development of man's mental, spiritual, and physical nature. It has no necessary relation to nor dependence upon mere intellectual culture, material prosperity, or physical well-being, either as a personal quality or as the collective possession of a people or nation. A nation, like an individual, may be brilliant, powerful, rich and resourceful, endowed with every gift of material and mental achievement, and yet depraved or defective in its morals and degraded or impoverished in its ideals. It may boast all the trophies of intellectual and physical prowess, and still lack the essentials of happiness and contentment and the blessings of equality and justice. The moral virtue of character is the indispensable predicate of both personal and social success in any true and Christian sense of the word, and it follows that any system of education that fails to develop and to give paramount importance to the moral qualities of its pupils, falls far short of being a satis-



factory or a salutary institution. Sensible and observant men of all creeds, and of no creed at all, are fast coming to adopt and to avow these opinions. It is only a question of time and of a practicable method of change, when our much-vaunted system of state education will undergo a radical revolution, to conform its objects and results to the real purpose of character-building, instead of being merely a machine for turning out so much morally-sterilized manhood and womanhood.

As the logical corollary of its position on education, Catholic Christianity also contends for the truth that is so patent in the pages of history, that a people may have a perfectly organized social system, with every rule and regulation of material welfare, physical comfort and political order, and yet possess no hope beyond its mechanical perfection, no ideal, no higher destiny beyond the daily routine of toil and obedience, no motive in life but the satisfaction of physical appetites and necessities. Modern Socialism asks us to accept that kind of civilization, as the acme of human achievement in the sphere of social and political perfectibility. A more dismal and monotonous system of hopeless, helpless, heartless degradation and despotism it would be impossible to conceive. Against this paralyzing propaganda the Catholic Church sets its face like flint, and in so doing it is rendering one of the most loyal, lasting and beneficent services to this Republic that it is possible for any organization to perform.

In all of the leading matters thus briefly mentioned, it will be discovered that Catholicism touches the very vitals of present-day problems, and that its unyielding opposition to all of the destructive and dangerous tendencies of the times, as well as its steadfast adhesion to the cardinal principles of American republican government, entitle it to be considered a bulwark of domestic security, a champion of social equality and justice, and a perpetual ally of political stability, authority and peace.

And these facts are not being ignored by the great body of American citizens, as is attested by the marvelous growth of the Church in recent years. Dr. Carroll, the Methodist statis-

tician above quoted, says in his book: "The miracle of growth is, of course, the Roman Catholic Church. It has been three times as great as that of the Methodist group, and six times as great as that of the Lutheran group." Accordingly, the Catholics outnumber vastly any other religious organization in the United States, they lead all the rest in the extent and value of their church property, in their schools, colleges, hospitals, and all the agencies of social betterment and organized charity. These accessions have not come from the ignorant, the credulous and the superstitious classes, but mainly from the educated and ambitious citizens of this Republic, who love liberty and law and a government that bases its claim to superiority upon the fundamental doctrine that there can be no true freedom in any realm of thought or action without effective authority to proclaim and maintain it. In this age of universal unrest and innovation, amid the babel of doubt, debate and confusion, the thinking, serious-minded, patriotic men and women of this land are seeking for some sound and rational basis of belief and judgment and justice, and they are finding it in that Faith that "neither deceives nor can be deceived;" that stretches back two thousand years, with line upon line and precept upon precept enlightening the perplexities of the present; and that enshrines in its sacred creed the immutable belief in

"One God, one law, one element,  
And one far-off divine event,  
To which the whole creation moves."









