

**"YES...
I condemned
the
Catholic
Church"**



- Who Changed The Sabbath?
- What's Wrong With Bingo?
- Why Blame The Bottle Instead Of The Man
- The False Alarm About The "Roman Hierarchy"
- Divorce Granted
- Don't Marry A Catholic!
- "Brother, Are You Saved?"
- Don't We All Worship The Same God
- Pomp . . . But Not Pompous
- Is It True That Catholic Countries Are Backward?

Spec
Capam

Why the Knights of Columbus Advertise Catholic Faith

The reason is simple. We Catholics want our non-Catholic friends and neighbors to know us as we really are and not as we are some times mistakenly represented.

We are confident that when our religious Faith is better understood by those who do not share it, mutual understanding will promote the good-will which is so necessary in a predominantly Christian country whose government is designed to serve all the people—no matter how much their religious convictions may differ.

American Catholics are convinced that as the teachings of Christ widely and firmly take hold of the hearts and conduct of our people, we shall remain free in the sense that Christ promised (John VIII, 31-38), and in the manner planned by the Founding Fathers of this republic.

Despite the plainly stated will of the Good Shepherd that there be "one fold and one shepherd," the differences in the understanding of Christ's teaching are plainly evident. It has rightfully been called "the scandal of a divided Christianity."

If there is anything which will gather together the scattered flock of Christ, it is the nationwide understanding of the Savior, what He did and how He intended mankind to benefit by the Redemption.

To this end, we wish our fellow-Americans to become acquainted with the teachings of Christ as the Catholic Church has faithfully presented them, since the day the apostles invaded the nations of the world in willing and courageous obedience to Christ's command: "Go, therefore, and make disciples of all nations . . ." (Matt. XXVIII, 19).

**SUPREME COUNCIL
KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS
Religious Information Bureau
4422 LINDELL BLVD. ST. LOUIS 8, MO.**

WHO CHANGED THE SABBATH?

There is a great deal of confused talk about "the Sabbath." This confusion has been exploited by some to the extent that they have founded new religions based almost exclusively on this single issue. A vastly greater number of sincere persons have been profoundly disturbed by it. Obviously, the question needs reasonable discussion.

It is said, for instance, that Catholics (and most Protestants as well) do not observe the Sabbath as instituted by God and recorded in the Ten Commandments (Ex. XX: 8-11). This happens to be true—the Jewish day of rest was never an obligation for Christians.

The Explanation

It is also asserted that the Catholic Church *changed* the official day of divine worship from Saturday to Sunday. In one sense, this is also true, but it needs to be carefully explained. (It is, incidentally, a remarkable inconsistency that many non-Catholics who reject the authority of the Catholic Church, follow her lead in this important matter.)

Finally, we are told that in settling upon Sunday as the day



of worship in preference to Saturday, the Catholic Church has changed the law of God. *This is utterly false.*

To understand the Third Commandment (the Fourth, as numbered by most Protestants), we must first ask: *What are the Ten Commandments?* This is

an important question, as there are some who believe that Christians are no longer bound by the Ten Commandments. The element of truth in this belief must be properly understood.

The Law of Moses, as we read in the Book of Exodus, was revealed to the Hebrew people by God. It was given to them because they were God's chosen people, and from them He was to bring forth the promised Redeemer of the human race. The Law laid down for them the religion with which they were to worship God. In particular, it impressed upon their consciousness the fact of sin, the need of redemption, and the importance of pleasing God. Probably a major part of these rules that we find scattered throughout the first books of the Old Testament already had been

long practiced among the Jews before the time of Moses. Some of the laws were undoubtedly directly revealed at Sinai for the first time, but the rest were in all likelihood existing laws and customs that God merely confirmed.

The Precepts

The full number of the Law's precepts is counted in the hundreds. They are principally as follows: The Ten Commandments (two versions — Ex. XX: 2-17; Deut. V: 6-21); the "Book of the Covenant" (Ex. XX: 20 — XXIII: 33); the "Deuteronomic Code" (the entire book of Deuteronomy); the "Law of Holiness," (Lev. XVII-XXVI); the "Priests' Code" (the rest of Leviticus, the Book of Numbers, and part of Exodus). In brief, the entire Law takes up the four books of Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy. Obviously, the Ten Commandments form but a tiny portion of the entire Law.

The precepts fall into several types — for example, some are ceremonial, some moral, some dietary (the distinction of foods). Some are merely the natural laws of human reason — it is to these that St. Paul refers when he says that "the Gentiles, who have no law, do by nature what the Law prescribes" (Rom. II: 14). Man's very reason tells him that it is wrong to lie, to steal, to murder, and the like. These laws oblige all men of all times. They would have been God's law even if He had not seen fit to confirm them solemnly

on Sinai.

The laws that existed simply for the Jews, however, were temporary. They were a preparation for Christ, who was to free men from the burden of sin and the Law which reminded men of sin. Christ came not to destroy, but to fulfill the Law. God's unchanging Law — the purpose to which the Jewish observances pointed — He did not destroy. But the prophetic precepts of the Law — rules for ceremonies, feasts and rites, for diet — all these were fulfilled in Christ. Having been fulfilled, they had no further meaning. They pointed to the coming of Christ; but after Christ's coming, they could no longer point.

Mosaic Law Ended

The New Testament makes it abundantly clear that the Mosaic Law no longer obliges. St. Paul's Epistles, notably Romans, Galatians, and Hebrews, emphasize this over and over again. St. Peter was vouchsafed a special vision in which God drove the point home to him (Acts X: 9-16); and at the first Church Council held by the Apostles in Jerusalem, he insisted that Christ's followers were no longer under the "yoke which neither we nor our fathers have been able to bear." Rather, he said, "we are saved through the grace of the Lord Jesus" (Acts XV: 10-11).

Where did this leave the Ten Commandments? They no longer remained as precepts of the Mosaic Law, for the Mosaic Law was

gone. Only to the extent that they contained part of the Law that men recognize "by nature," as St. Paul explained it, and only to the extent that they had been incorporated by Christ into His own commandments, did they continue to express the will of God for mankind.

Of the Ten Commandments, all but one express the natural law. All men of reason, whether they accept Biblical revelation or not, acknowledge that it is wrong to steal, to lie, to murder, to worship false gods, to treat sacred things irreverently, to commit adultery, to be avaricious, to dishonor one's parents. Further, they will acknowledge that it is a duty to worship God. But reason tells us of no special day to keep sacred to the Lord. God Himself would have to tell us this—just as He told the Jews to rest on Saturday.

Day of Rest

The Sabbath rule alone of the Ten Commandments was not part of God's natural law. It had been fulfilled and thus it passed away like the laws against eating pork, or the laws commanding ritual circumcision.

It is well to bear in mind also that this Sabbath law for the Jews had been purely negative. It set Saturday aside not as a day of special worship but as a day of rest. It was mentioned thus in every case (Ex. XX:10; XVI:22-30; XXXV:3; Num. XV:32-36, and the very "Sabbath" (Hebrew, *Sabbath*) means "rest."

"Sanctification of the Sabbath" according to the Jewish Law merely meant that no one did work. It did not prescribe any special religious worship. It is true, as we read in the life of Christ, the Jews later had special synagogue services on the Sabbath. But these were developed by Jewish traditions, and were not contained in the Law. The synagogues themselves are Jewish traditions. The worship prescribed in the Law of the Bible — the sacrifices — were to be held *every day*, and in the one Temple.

Christ and Sabbath

Christ Himself observed the Jewish Sabbath. He observed this law as He did that of ritual circumcision — not that He was bound by it, but that He wanted to give men an example of obedience to authority. Until He had proclaimed the end of the Mosaic dispensation, men were under this Law. Again, in preaching to the crowds in the synagogues on the Sabbath, He had the best opportunity to address large multitudes.

The Apostles, too, observed the Sabbath, as did most of the Jewish converts to Christianity. Although they were no longer obliged by the law, by observing it they found it much easier to win Jewish converts to Christianity. For the same reason, St. Paul circumcised Timothy (Acts XVI:3). The Gentile converts had no such problems, and they of course did not observe the Jewish customs in any way.

In Acts XX:7, for example, and

I Cor. XVI: 2, we see that their meeting day for Christian worship had already become the first of the week, Sunday.

St. Paul on Sabbath

And even though St. Paul and other Jewish Christians kept various parts of the Mosaic law, including the Sabbath, they were quick to deny that there was any obligation to do so. St. Paul, in fact, rebuked the Galatians precisely for tending to the observance of Jewish "days and months and seasons and years" (Gal. IV: 10). To the Collossians he not only emphasized that the Jewish Sabbath no longer obliged, but he gave the very fundamental reason: *that it was part of the prophetic law that had been fulfilled in Christ and had no further purpose.* "Let no one, then, call you to account for what you eat or drink or in regard to a festival or a new moon or a Sabbath. These are a shadow of things to come, but the substance is of Christ" (Col. II: 16-17).

Thus Saturday as the Jewish day of rest was never a law imposed on Christians. As for devoting Saturday to special ceremonies and acts of worship, this never had been the law of God anyway, but merely a custom. It remained for Christians to establish their own customs.

Sunday probably became the day of Christian worship, quite naturally. In the earliest days, the Jewish Christians gathered after the synagogue service Saturday

evening to hold their own Christian worship. These services lasted into the early morning hours, and thus the first day of the week became associated with Christian worship. As more and more Gentiles became Christians, the earlier attendance at the synagogue service disappeared, leaving only the Christian Sunday worship.

Sunday was also a logical day, as it was on Sunday that Christ arose from the dead, sealing our redemption, and on Pentecost Sunday the Church was established. There are numerous references, both in the Acts and in the Epistles, to show that the first day of the week was being observed by the Christians. By the end of the first century, as we learn from later writings: the "Teaching of the Twelve" (A.D. 90), the "Epistle of Barnabas" (A.D. 75-96), the epistles of Ignatius of Antioch (died A.D. 107), Sunday had so far replaced Saturday that the latter was no longer observed by any Christian.

Day of Rest

Only gradually did Christians begin to observe Sunday as a day of rest. In the beginning it was characterized not by rest but by rejoicing and special acts of worship. In the third century, as we learn from Tertullian, many Christians had begun to keep Sunday as a day of rest to some extent. And in the next century (A.D. 370) the Council of Laodicea decreed: "It is not right that Christians should imitate the Jews and rest

on the Sabbath day, but on that day they should work: preferring however the day of the Lord, they should rest if they can."

The real need of Sunday as a day of rest as well as worship came much later, in the sixth century. It became necessary, in view of a changing society and the vast number of laboring people, to set aside holidays to allow for the opportunity to assist at Mass and keep Sunday fittingly as a day of worship. Thus Sunday finally became a day of rest and cessation from work as well as the day of Christian worship.

No One Changed Sabbath

As Christians, therefore, we do not observe the Jewish Sabbath. No one has changed the Sabbath. The Sabbath has simply ceased to exist. We observe neither the Saturday "rest" as it was laid down in the Mosaic Law, nor the Saturday "worship" that Jewish tradition devised for the synagogues.

The Church has changed the day of worship. Actually, the "change" consists merely in establishing Sunday as a day of worship and of rest. The Church did

not do away with an existing Sabbath, for the Sabbath no longer existed.

The Bible records no "change" of the Sabbath. It records, however, the abolition of the Sabbath as part of the Mosaic Law, and it records the beginning of the custom of Sunday observance which later became Catholic law.

And although they do not oblige us as part of the Mosaic Law, the Ten Commandments form a convenient summary of the principal precepts of the laws by which we are obliged. Under the headings of the various commandments, it is easy to sum up the obligations we have either from God's natural law, from the revealed law of Christ, or from the just laws of constituted authority. It is in this way that we continue to observe the Ten Commandments. It is in this sense that we quote the various precepts. And thus we observe the Third Commandment — abiding not by a rule from whose yoke Christ died to set us free, but following the lead of the Apostles and adhering to the law of Christ's Church.

WHAT'S WRONG WITH "BINGO?"

Some people are opposed to gambling "on principle." In their code of conduct, it simply has no place. No one, of course, will question their right to feel as they do. Every man must determine the principles according to which he will regulate his life, and these principles are his own business and of his own conscience.

Others, however, will go a bit further. They say that gambling is "sinful" and "wrong" — wrong, not merely for themselves, but for everybody. Now this is a different question altogether. It is one thing to follow our own convictions, and quite another to tell society what it may and may not lawfully do. Before attempting this, one must be absolutely sure of his position.

And those who call gambling a sin are usually hard pressed to tell us why.

What Is Gambling?

Exaggeration always hurts any cause, however good it may be. There are many abuses connected with gambling, particularly organized gambling. These, of course, must be condemned. But we cannot right a wrong by committing



another. And it does no good for instance, to call gambling "stealing," which it certainly is not. Theft is the taking of another's rightful goods against that person's will. Nor is it correct to say that Christ condemned gambling when He cast the money-changers from the Temple. The

money-changers were not gambling; they were desecrating a holy place by turning it into a place of business.

On the question of gambling, there are three guiding principles to bear in mind . . . which apply equally to gambling and many other activities. The first is most important. That is: what may be in itself and in its proper circumstances perfectly all right, may in other circumstances be altogether wrong. Bathing, for example, is a commendable practice — but it would be wrong for a man to take his bath in a public park. He would find himself in jail if he did so.

Obedience to Law

In the second place, we know that some things which offend no law of morality may be in conflict with civil law. The just laws

of a nation, state, or city should be obeyed. Yet a man is not called immoral if he wilfully runs through red traffic lights, even though he is a law violater all the same.

Finally, there are things which may be opposed to no law whatever, but which should not be done regardless. They offend against what we call "fittingness." As St. Paul said: "All things are lawful for me, but not all things are expedient" (I Cor. VI: 12).

Now let's take a look at gambling.

Gambling in itself is not wrong or sinful. It is opposed to no law of God. This can be better recognized by examining the different kinds of gambling.

The dictionary defines "gamble" as "1.—To play or game for money or other stakes. 2.—To hazard, wager." Basically, five types of activity fall within the limits of this definition. We may, therefore, classify five types of gambling:

Betting. As on a race, or simply on any uncertain fact concerning which someone wishes to back his conviction with a wager.

Games of chance. These may involve pure chance or perhaps include a certain amount of skill. An example of the first would be a throw of dice, and of the second, certain types of card games.

Lotteries. Here the money of a number of people is pooled together and the total or at least some portion of it is allotted by chance

to one or several of the participants.

Insurance. For a cash consideration a person or an association will agree to pay a set sum on the chance of an accident or other event. This is only one type of insurance, of course. Some insurance is nothing but a simple savings account, while other insurance is out-and-out betting.

Speculation. Here one gambles on the rise and fall of various stocks, wagering his investment on the chance of gain.

Lawful Betting

Taking these in order, we can say, first, that betting will be lawful under certain conditions. It must never be an inducement to tempt someone to do wrong. A wager of this type would actually be nothing more than a bribe. It must be honest on both sides. It would be wrong, in other words, for someone to bet on a "sure thing" while the other person had no way of knowing he could not win. And each must be able to pay in the event that he loses. The money that is bet must be one's own, money that he can afford to use for this purpose and that he is not under obligation to spend otherwise.

Thus no one could reasonably call another to task for making an honest wager among friends. This is our own business. But it must be stated that the betting habit is subject to dangers. It can easily lead to real evils and, like everything else, it must be kept within

bounds of moderation.

Games of chance will be lawful if, again, one is using his own money that he can afford to spend in this way. There must be no fraud. The use of any trickery in the game would mean simple extortion. There must be an equal chance for all, as far as the element of chance is concerned.

Professional Gambling

Now here it is in order to point out that there is a vast difference between a family game of bridge for small stakes and the gaming in a professional gambling house. What may be all right in itself, as was previously noted, can become quite wrong because of circumstances.

Professional gambling houses, and organized gambling in general, encourage the desire of "something for nothing" that can become a consuming passion. They encourage gamblers to spend beyond their means, and they are responsible for many other evil results that usually follow in the wake of large-scale gambling. The professional gambler is in business to profit, furthermore, and the ordinary rules of chance are not always allowed to apply. Anyone who has ever seen a police exhibit of confiscated gambling devices knows that in a gambling house or in playing with professional gamblers the amateur player has little chance to win. In defending the right of our neighbor to enliven his game with a stake, therefore, we do not attempt to

justify the often heartless profession of gambling.

A Fair Chance

Lotteries can be considered lawful provided they are conducted fairly and provided there is a real, though admittedly small, chance for each participant.

It already has been said that what may offend no moral principle may, however, be forbidden by a law of the city or state. When laws of this kind exist, they should be obeyed. They are instituted by lawful authority for a good purpose, and the law-abiding citizen will abide by them. True, sometimes there may be so-called "blue laws" in force, but normally such regulations are necessary.

No law will ordinarily forbid a private wager or private game of chance, nor should it. It will generally provide, however, that gambling debts cannot be collected legally—that is, with the assistance of the courts. Lotteries are frequently forbidden because by their nature they require a large number of participants and are therefore easily subject to abuse. The purpose of anti-gambling laws is to protect the citizen from being victimized and also to avoid the evil consequences of organized gambling. This is the reason for the prohibition of gambling houses and restrictions on betting on horse racing.

Stock-Market Gambling

Insurance and stock-market speculation are taken so much for

granted that it is hardly necessary to say that they are lawful in themselves. Unfortunately, however, those who condemn the man who plays a game of chance for honest recreation will often be the first to acclaim the successful speculator as a public benefactor and "a captain of industry." They say that a few dollars won with a throw of dice is tainted, but a few thousands or millions from a successful gamble in stock is legitimate business. These last two forms of gambling, can also be abused and become sinful violations of justice. The man who falsifies the conditions under which insurance is written is simply stealing. And speculation with someone else's money, or with public funds, can be a greater sin than for a husband to squander the rent money on pinochle.

Finally, we should repeat: what is lawful may not be expedient.

Not Evil

Charitable causes, lodges, fraternities, churches, and other organizations frequently raise funds with games of chance, lotteries, bingo and the like. Many of us may feel that worthy causes should not be forced to raise money in this way. And while such devices may offend the taste of some, this does not make such activities evil in themselves.

If they are forbidden by the law, they should not be tolerated. No one should presume on the

law simply because the cause is a good one. Ordinarily, however, the law does not act against them. They are not subject to the abuses which have necessitated the law. They are small and not professional. Frequently, therefore, they are specifically exempted from what may be forbidden under the term "gambling."

Regardless of one's tastes, therefore, only a hypocritical conscience can be scandalized and call such harmless pleasures sinful. The same conscience would probably see nothing wrong if the organization floated an issue of stock and invited the public to take a chance in this way. They would call this legitimate business.

But though lawful, such things may be carried beyond reason. When this happens, the scandal will not always be hypocritical. If they are not really necessary, if they are carried out on a huge scale, if advantage is taken of the law's leniency in regard to a good cause — above all, if encouragement is given to the "gambling fever" of even the relatively few — sometimes the line between helping a good cause and gambling professionally becomes quite thin. It is definitely not fitting that a church, a fraternal order, or a veterans' association, should, for all practical purposes, be in competition with the professionals. It may still be lawful, but it will certainly not be expedient.

WHY BLAME THE BOTTLE INSTEAD OF THE MAN?

“Napoleon ‘met his Waterloo,’” says a little leaflet—“because Marshall Ney; his right-hand man, was one day late in arriving at Waterloo because of a drunken army.”

“When the soldiers of Germany entered into France,” it continues, “they conquered France for one reason.” You have probably guessed the reason, and you are right: “. . . the excessive consumption of alcohol by the French soldiers.” Another little known fact of history is revealed about the first World War. One of the deciding factors bringing about its conclusion, it seems, was that the German armies, after reaching the wine-cellars of France, became so drunk that they had to surrender!

Leaflets like this were formerly more prevalent than now, before the “noble experiment” of prohibition. They still remain, however, to some extent. And all of them read in much the same way. Tearful tales are told of homes and families wrecked by drunken husbands, of youth blighted by drunkenness and evil companions, of children delinquent because of



drunken parents. The publishers of such leaflets then proclaim the totally illogical conclusion that all drinking is sinful, all liquor is an evil, every man who takes a drink is rapping at the gates of hell.

Most of this “anti-liquor” pamphleteering is done from religious motives and Scripture quotations sometimes play a part in it. This is part of the same bad logic. The Bible condemns drunkenness — as does anyone of good sense. The Bible warns against the dangers of drinking. And, like Calvin Coolidge’s preacher, the Bible is against sin. But the Bible also takes the reasonable use of liquor for granted, which these critics conveniently overlook.

No one will deny that pamphlets like the one quoted are often the product of well-intentioned and sincere people. These persons really want to help others. But that does not make their methods any less misguided and dangerous. On the individual level they commit the same mistakes that prohibition made nationally. They resemble the type of individual who is willing to discard the rights

of free speech to combat Communism.

What Is Right?

The comparison is very apt. Communism is an abuse of one liberty just as drunkenness is an abuse of another. But in condemning the abuse, we must not deny the liberty. Only the hysterical and unthinking will brand as a "Communist" the man who insists on the rights of all to free speech. And similarly, when someone raises his voice to defend the right to drink, it does not necessarily mean that he is in the hire of the liquor industry, that he favors the open saloon, or that he is anxious for anyone to go down to a drunkard's grave.

A defense of the right to drink is not a defense of drinking. A Protestant defends his Catholic neighbor's religious rights, and the Catholic does the same for the Protestant. But this does not imply that either of them approves of the other's religion.

Further, there may be a great difference in what one chooses for the principles of his own conduct and what he grants his neighbors the right to do. The confirmed bachelor may have no inclination whatever to enjoy wedded bliss, but he does not look upon his married friends as guilty of misconduct.

Right and Wrong

Also, we must act as responsible men in designating things as wrong, sinful, or criminal. Merely

because we may not like something ourselves, does not make it wrong. When we say that it is sinful, we are trying to force our personal views on others. We are saying that not only can we not do this thing morally, but neither can anyone else. If we are going to try to regulate the lives of others we should at least be sure that we are laying down just rules.

Blame The Man

Now the things of God's creation are not evil. Wrong consists in the misuse of these things, in the violation of their rightful use. There is nothing that cannot be misused — but by the same token, if misuse made a thing wrong there would be nothing good in the world. One of the greatest American advocates of "temperance" — by which he meant prohibition — is said to have died of over-eating. He was guilty of the same sin that he professed to combat. But food is not an evil because of this. Automobiles and pistols do not become evil simply because a person misuses them in taking an innocent man's life.

Some may think it necessary to labor such a point. But it is in forgetting this that many who deplore the curse of liquor have done untold harm. They have actually encouraged drunkenness. By putting the blame on the bottle instead of the man, by telling him that it is impossible to use liquor moderately and reasonably, they have given all the justification needed by the weak-willed sot who

blames society for not forcing him to remain sober. No one is ever going to "reform" alcohol, shotguns, or automobiles — but there is a good chance of reforming men if the problem is approached with intelligence.

Drunkenness is a serious sin. A person who begins to drink with the intention of getting drunk or with the knowledge that he will get drunk, is guilty of this sin. He deprives himself of his responsibility and the use of his free will. He puts his own passing pleasure before his dignity as a human being. Thus he acts in a most unreasonable way and does great wrong . . . to say nothing of the harm and wrong that may result from his drunkenness.

But even if a man does not become drunk, he does wrong if he drinks immoderately. He lessens his sense of responsibility, puts himself in danger of drunkenness or other evils, and misuses drink by consuming too much of it.

Temperance a Virtue

Under certain conditions, it can be very wrong for a man to take even a single drink. There are those so prone to intemperance that they cannot content themselves with drink in moderation. For them, total abstinence will therefore be a solemn obligation. Temperance is a virtue required of all. Total abstinence is a safeguard required of many.

There is danger in strong drink. No one should minimize this fact. Neither should anyone minimize

the abuses that are frequently associated with drinking, with taverns and "cocktail parlors." The misuse of liquor has left behind it a trail of almost every evil known to man. We must recognize these facts. But we must place the blame where it belongs — with the individual. Only by working with the individual can we hope to check the evil that he causes.

Our Responsibility

And we must defend a man's right to serve liquor in his home, to buy it, to sell it, and to drink it in moderation. He should not lose his right because others abuse theirs. Along with his right he has obligations, of course, to himself as well as to others. He must develop an adult attitude toward liquor; he must act as a responsible person in this as in everything else. There should be no place among us for the hypocrite who "votes dry and drinks wet." This is the adolescent excuse of those who lack a sense of responsibility of their own and call on the law as a nursemaid to keep them out of trouble.

What has been said of drink can be said also of smoking — though with far less necessity. Tobacco is ordinarily not credited with the broken homes and crimes of "alcohol." Those who abuse tobacco as a "sinful habit" usually at the worst ascribe to it bad breath and such personal evils as the deterioration of health . . . some of which are possibly verified, most of which are probably

not. Many doctors in fact will not condemn moderate smoking.

It can be safely said — all advertisements to the contrary notwithstanding — that no one is adding years to his life by smoking a pipe, a cigar, or a cigarette. He may be adding to his peace of mind, however, as many smokers will maintain. Smoking may be classified simply as a not always useless, and sometimes expensive, pleasure. But it violates no moral law.

Catholic piety makes frequent reference to the "counsels of Christ." By this name we refer to what is a praiseworthy and meritorious deed, yet which is not a general obligation for all Christians. Christ expressed such a counsel in His words to the rich young man: "Go, sell whatever thou hast, and give to the poor" (Mark X: 21). While all are obliged to have their treasure in heaven, rather than on earth — while all must use the things of the world not for their own sake but as helps in living their life for the love of God—not all are obliged literally to divest themselves of worldly possessions. If, however, one should do just this, he would be following one of Christ's counsels.

Spirit of Sacrifice

Thus many Catholics willingly give up their goods and follow a life of poverty. Many forego marriage in order to serve God more completely and with undivided attention. Many deny themselves legitimate pleasures — certain

foods, drink, tobacco, and other luxuries. The virtues of giving up these things consists precisely in the fact that they are in themselves good and lawful — otherwise there would be a simple obligation on all. The love of God moves men in many ways, and not all express their love in the same manner. To anyone who has, for the love of God, denied himself any creature pleasure, the true Catholic should have nothing but praise.

But what must be avoided is the attitude of the Pharisee. The old Pharisees arbitrarily and of their own authority made many refinements on the Law of God. In being formally obedient to these, they considered themselves righteous, while regarding all other men outside the pale. The modern pharisee has no less arbitrarily and of his own authority refined the Law of Christ. Confusing his own prejudices with the divine Will, he has made the touchstone of Christianity to consist in abstinence from liquor, from tobacco, and from various types of recreation. Anyone indulging in such pleasures, he says, is not a Christian—even though he may have the charity to give all his goods to feed the poor.

This is a far cry from the spirit of charity and generosity which alone can make renunciation worthwhile. It is, rather, an echo of the man who went up to the Temple to pray, who gave thanks to God that he was not as other men . . . and went away unjustified.

The False Alarm About The "ROMAN HIERARCHY"

Perhaps you may recall the native-Fascist gang known as the "Black Legion." Quite similar to the Ku Klux Klan, it was formed in a northern industrial city to spread murder and arson against negroes, Jews, Catholics, the foreign-born, and other minorities. Part of its blood-curdling oath was directed against "the Roman Hierarchy." It is quite safe to say that none of the members had the vaguest idea of what the Roman Hierarchy is, but they were quite sure it is something pretty bad.

Perfectly innocent words can frequently be so consistently abused that their real meaning is forgotten. "Propaganda," is one of these. Originally, this word meant "to spread information." But now, when someone speaks of "your propaganda," he ordinarily does not have to explain that he means "your lying misinformation." (His own material he will call "publicity" or "documentation!")

Sacred Order

What is a hierarchy? The word has been used since at least the sixth century, and means, literal-



ly, "sacred rule" or "sacred order." While originally it was used to refer only to Church government, it also frequently has been extended in modern speech as a general word to signify relative importance — as when we speak of a "hierarchy of values." The word itself, of course, is not important. The Church had a hierarchy long before it was given this name. Likewise, most other religious organizations have a hierarchy though they may prefer to call it by other names. Some of those who rebel the loudest at the notion of a hierarchy are merely distinguishing between "your propaganda" and "our publicity."

Actually, there are two hierarchies in the Catholic Church — the *hierarchy of order* and the *hierarchy of jurisdiction*. The hierarchy of order or of ministry is simply the clergy, those who have received ordination and who are thus distinct from the laity. The clergy presides at public worship and administers the sacraments. This hierarchy is composed of the orders of bishops, priests, and deacons which are of divine ori-

gin, instituted by Christ and His Apostles.

However, it is in reference to jurisdiction that the word "hierarchy" is more commonly known and used both by Catholics and non-Catholics. The hierarchy of jurisdiction is the governing body of the Catholic Church — the Pope and the other bishops throughout the world. Together they form the succession from the Apostles, possessing the power to make laws, to sit in judgment, and to fix spiritual penalties when necessary. In general speech, though somewhat improperly, the bishops of a particular country are known as that country's "hierarchy."

The Church Organization

The nature of the hierarchy will be easier understood by looking briefly at the Church's visible organization.

The basic unit of the Catholic Church is the *parish* — a word derived from the Greek, meaning "dwelling around," that is, those who dwell around a definite house or church. What the family is to society at large, as a small society in itself and a "cell" of the political body, the parish is to the Church. The parish is a union of Catholics under a parish priest (pastor), who may or may not have assistant priests. The ideal parish will have its own school, and it will be the center for the religious life of the people who make it up. As the father is head of the family, the pastor is head

of the local church. Because of this spiritual fatherhood it became the custom to call the parish priest "father," and this title is now generally applied to all priests in the countries with which we are familiar.

The parishes of a given region unite to form a *diocese*. This is another Greek word which may be translated roughly as "a union of households." Each diocese is headed by a bishop who is the spiritual leader both of the clergy and laity of the district. The word "bishop" means "overseer," that is, a supervising priest. Some more important dioceses are known as archdioceses ("chief dioceses") and are headed by archbishops. The clergy of the diocese, for the purpose of assisting in the conduct of diocesan affairs, meet together with their bishop in councils which are known as synods.

Successors of Apostles

The bishop of each diocese is appointed by the chief bishop of the Church, the Pope, but each bishop becomes a successor of the Apostles in his own right. He is not merely the Pope's delegate as head of his diocese. Several dioceses are usually associated together with an archdiocese to form what is known as a province. This association is merely for mutual cooperation, however, as each diocese is an independent unit. Thus, to take an example, the Province of St. Louis consists of the Archdiocese of St. Louis and the following dioceses: Kansas

City-St. Joseph, Missouri; Jefferson City, Missouri; Springfield-Cape Girardeau, Missouri.

When the clergy of a province gather to discuss matters pertinent to the Church, it is known as a provincial council. When the meeting is on a national basis, we have a plenary council. In the United States, there is also the National Catholic Welfare Conference (it is not called a "council," because councils are always temporary, and the NCWC is permanent). This is a voluntary association of the bishops of the country, who meet together at stated intervals to discuss the position and problems of the Church in the United States. Through its headquarters the NCWC coordinates the work of the Church. It operates through departments (for example, the Department of Education, of Youth, of Social Action) which are divided into bureaus (for example, under the Department of Social Action are such bureaus as those of Family Life, and Rural Life). In carrying out this work, the specialized services and training of both clergy and laity are utilized.

Chief Bishop

The chief bishop of the Church is the Pope, the Bishop of Rome. He designates the other bishops and has responsibility for the whole Church. To assist him in his administration there are various agencies called Congregations ("bureaus") which are headed by Cardinals and which

draw on the best talent in the Church for the specialties with which they deal. Each Congregation is in charge of some specified matter (such as Sacraments, Rites, the Propagation of the Faith). The Cardinals (together called the "College") serve collectively as the Pope's advisors. Many Cardinals, however, are bishops of dioceses and are not stationed in Rome.

Catholics In U. S.

In most countries, there is an Apostolic Delegate, the official representative of the Pope. He has no diocese nor does he have control over the dioceses of the bishops of the country. He is present merely to provide a more convenient administration of the Church's affairs as delegated to act for the Pope. In those countries, however, where there is a diplomatic relationship between the civil government and Vatican City, he may also represent the latter and be known as the *Nuncio* ("ambassador").

For those interested in statistics, it might here be noted that in 1960, the Catholic Church in the United States possessed 26 Archdioceses; 114 dioceses; 5 cardinals; 32 archbishops; 190 bishops; 53,796 priests; 16,896 parishes. The total number of American Catholics, according to the best available figures, was 40,871,302.

Non-Catholics frequently ask about the title "Monsignor" that is given to certain priests. This is purely an honorary distinction

conferring no additional authority. It is bestowed on priests for long years of service or for some special work for the Church.

The modern complaint frequently raised against the Catholic hierarchy is that it makes the Church an undemocratic institution. In a sense, this is of course quite true. But those who see something to condemn in this simply do not recognize the meaning of religion. They are confusing religion with politics, or with a social club. Religion is not a matter of polls or of votes. Religion is what God has divinely revealed for our acceptance — not what we will make up for ourselves at our own pleasure. We have no right to take the Church and make it over according to what the prevailing political philosophy may be. We take the Church as we find it; we either accept it as it is, or we do not accept it at all.

Need for Authority

Some of those who are critical of the Church say: "We are not against the Catholic *people*; we are merely against the hierarchy." Now the hierarchical structure of Catholicism is Catholicism itself. To change this would be to do the impossible, to destroy the Catholic Church. The Church was founded by Christ as a religious authority, to protect His truths and to teach them in every age. To insure this, He sent the Holy Spirit. And over the Church He set His Apostles, whose successors are the bishops of the Catholic

Church. This is the Church. No one is coerced against his will to become a Catholic or to remain a Catholic. Faith is an absolutely free thing. But every Catholic who accepts the Catholic Church as Christ's authentic revelation accepts along with it its principles of authority and of government. He is perfectly at liberty to choose whatever political principles he will in the conduct of secular affairs, but in the conduct of religion, he chooses what Christ has ordained. Either he accepts the hierarchical Church as he finds it, or he makes a "hierarchy" of his own—or of himself—of his own whims and wishes.

But in a far broader sense the Catholic Church is the most democratic order in the world. It is democratic in the sense that the word is used even more commonly than in reference to government. When we call a man "democratic" and of "democratic principles," we mean that he recognizes the dignity of man, his worth as an individual, and his right to be judged on his own merits. And such a spirit has always prevailed in the Church, because such a spirit is, in the very best sense, Christian. It is according to this spirit, which is part of the Church's constitution, that the Church is, in God's providence, governed by those whom He has called to administer authority. This spirit has prevailed in a world that has known hundreds of changing political philosophies.

There is no governing "class"

in the Catholic Church. No parish is dominated by the wishes of a local "aristocracy." The parish priest or the bishop or the Pope himself may have come from the poorest family of the diocese. And all Catholics, whether rich or poor, professional man or common laborer, kneel together at the common Communion rail in the

same church, side by side. Pope, priest, bishop, layman, nun — they are all Catholics together. Though they may be responsible for the conduct of the Church in various ways, they are all bound by the same rules, and they acknowledge the same divine authority.

"DIVORCE GRANTED!"

Each year, thousands of men and women walk out of American courtrooms with these words ringing in their ears. And they may be quite convinced that their marriages actually have been dissolved. But the Catholic Church cannot agree.

The Catholic Church insists that marriages cannot be dissolved by any civil decree . . . that there is, in fact, no such thing as divorce. The Catholic conscience simply cannot concur with any law that maintains the possibility of divorce and remarriage. For which shall we acknowledge supreme—a law laid down by men . . . or the laws laid down by the Son of God, Who decreed: "*What therefore God has joined together, let no man put asunder*" (Matt.

XIX:7)? In matters of this nature, we can only conclude with St. Peter: "We must obey God rather than men" (Acts V: 29).

In discussing the Catholic teaching on marriage, it is best to make a few points clear from the very beginning. There is considerable confusion about this question — a confusion, we might add, that has not been helped by many who have taken it upon themselves to "explain" it to others.

And the first thing that can be made clear is this: *every marriage is sacred and holy* — whether those who marry realize this or not, and whether or not they are even particularly concerned about the matter. It is not they who are responsible for the institution of marriage, but God, Who has or-

dained it for a high and noble purpose. As long as they intend to enter a true marriage, therefore, they take all its consequences. They receive all its obligations along with all its privileges.

We should point out also that the Catholic Church distinguishes only two types of valid marriage—sacramental and non-sacramental. A sacramental marriage is that which is contracted by baptized persons — between two Catholics, between a Catholic and a baptized Protestant, or between two baptized Protestants. A non-sacramental marriage is that contracted by the unbaptized, or between one baptized and one unbaptized person.

The Sacramental Aspect

Both types of marriage are holy. Both confer the privileges and obligations of marriage. In addition, however, marriage between baptized persons is an instrument of divine help for the Christian life. For a fuller understanding of what is meant by the sacramental aspect of marriage, the reader is referred to our free pamphlet entitled *Christ's Seven Sacraments*.

Finally, it should be noted that a marriage is brought into existence by two contracting parties, through the promise that they mutually exchange. They have the power, however, to bring marriage into existence only as it exists as an institution ordained by God's law. Thus baptized persons, whether or not they know that marriage is a sacrament for the

baptized, will enter into sacramental marriage when they contract marriage. And in the case of all who have really intended to enter marriage, the marriage they contract will not be subject to divorce, whatever private thoughts the participants may have on the matter.

Marriage By Priest

Just as the state lays down certain formalities that must be observed before a marriage will have legal standing, so the Church imposes upon her own members certain laws that must be observed before the marriage, whether sacramental or non-sacramental, will be considered valid. Principally, she insists that the marriage of any Catholic must be contracted in the presence of a duly authorized Catholic priest, who stands as the Church's official witness. This law obliges a Catholic whether he is marrying another Catholic or a non-Catholic. When, however, the marriage is between two non-Catholics, it is not governed by the laws of the Catholic Church. No matter under what formalities the non-Catholic marriage has taken place, then, and whether it be sacramental or non-sacramental, the Church will consider it valid.

In reference to the known attitude of the Catholic Church regarding divorce, certain critics will be heard to say: "Yes, but what about annulments? Why does the Catholic Church sometimes annul a marriage and later permit those involved to contract a sec-

ond marriage in the Church — and to a different person? Isn't annulment just another word for divorce?"

There is all the difference in the world between a divorce and an annulment. A divorce, as has been stated, is the pretended dissolution of a true marriage. An annulment in the Catholic Church — more properly called "a decree of nullity" — is a declaration that there was not a true marriage from the beginning, even though it may have had all the outward appearances of being one.

If a man were to marry his first cousin in Illinois . . . or if a girl were to be married to her foster father in Massachusetts . . . those involved might consider themselves to be truly married. They might be entirely ignorant, even, of the fact that such marriages are forbidden by state law. But in both cases these unions would be declared null by the state. They would be treated as events which had never occurred. Divorce would not enter into the question at all.

Not A True Marriage

That is what an annulment means in the Catholic Church. It is simply a declaration, upon investigation, that a true marriage was not contracted in the beginning.

How can this happen? In four ways. (1) An invalidating law, such as the two civil prohibition mentioned above, might have made the marriage null. (2) The

parties themselves might invalidate the marriage by placing upon it an impossible condition — for example, making it a "trial" marriage. (3) One or both of the parties might have been forced to go through a marriage ceremony against his will. (4) If at least one of the parties is a Catholic, the marriage would be null if not contracted before a Catholic priest.

Proof Required

It is evident, merely from reading this list, that in some cases, it would be a simple matter to show that the marriage was null, whereas in others there would be the need of involved proof. As in all law, once an apparently valid marriage ceremony has taken place, it is presumed valid until proved otherwise. Thus, if a couple should later insist that they were forced to go through a marriage ceremony against their will, it would require a court trial with witnesses and incontestable proof before their word could be taken to cause the Church to declare the marriage null.

There is, therefore, a somewhat complicated system of laws in the Church that govern marriages and marriage "cases," a complication that can hardly be avoided in any matter governing human relationships. However, the marriage laws of the Church are fewer than in any single American State or foreign country. The entire series of Church laws on marriage consists of 131 canons in the Church's official Code of Canon Law, and

the canons on marriage trials are only 32. (Each "canon" or law, takes up about a small paragraph.)

When the nullity of a marriage is easily demonstrable, it may be so declared by the parties' own bishop, after he has weighed the evidence. Thus, if it can be proved, through authentic and incontestable documents, that at least one of the parties was a Catholic and that the marriage did not take place in the presence of a duly authorized priest, the bishop needs merely make certain of this and then declare the marriage null. The same is true with many of the invalidating laws. The number of these is thirteen, and most of them involve matters such as those mentioned above — blood relationship or legal relationship. If a relationship of this kind can be shown to have existed at the time of the marriage, then the marriage will be declared null by the bishop. He will hear the testimony of the two sides, examine the proofs, and then render his judgment.

Court Procedure

In every Church court examining marriage cases, there is one priest skilled in the law who has been appointed to act as "Defender of the Marriage Bond." In the cases of nullity mentioned above, it is his duty to examine the evidence upon which the bishop has made his judgment. If he believes that the bishop has declared the marriage null without sufficient evidence, it is his duty to appeal the case to a higher court. Here

the evidence will be thoroughly examined, and judgment will be made either in favor of the bishop's decision, or against it. If it is decided that the bishop did not have sufficient grounds to declare the marriage null, then the higher court will command a regular trial to be carried out to decide the question.

Court Trial

The cases just mentioned are the "simple" ones. In the case of those that are not "simple," a court trial must always be held. Several of the invalidating laws will of necessity demand involved proof. For example, if a man has carried off a woman against her will for the purpose of marrying her, there is an invalidating law against any marriage during this time. If a marriage should have taken place under these circumstances, it would be null. But it would have to be shown in a court of law that such an abduction actually took place. Likewise, where it is claimed that the parties never really intended to enter a true marriage, or that one or both were forced into the marriage, these matters will have to be proved to the satisfaction of trained lawyers and judges. And it is hardly necessary to say that this proof is usually very hard to establish.

The trials that take place in Church courts are similar to the court-room procedure with which most of us are familiar. Witnesses are called, testimony is taken,

and it is the Defender of the Bond's duty to attack the evidence with all his skill. Unless it can be shown without doubt that the marriage was null for one of the stated reasons, the marriage will still be considered valid and true. And even when the court has finally pronounced judgment, the case is not yet ended.

If the court should decide that the marriage is null, the Defender of the Bond *must* appeal to the higher court, where the whole case will be reviewed once more. If the court, on the other hand, decides that the marriage was valid, the parties *may* appeal to have the higher court re-try the case, if they wish. The judgment of this second court is rather important. If it agrees that the marriage was null, the judgment will be allowed to stand, unless the Defender of the Bond is still not satisfied, in which case he will appeal still higher. If it agrees that the marriage was valid, however, it is still the privilege of the interested parties to appeal to the highest court.

The Sacred Rota

The court of last appeal is the Sacred Roman Rota in Rome. It is the final court of judgment in all these involved cases. From what has been said, it will be easy to see why it actually issues few decrees of nullity. Long before the case reaches the Rota, it will usually have been seen either that the marriage was obviously invalid, or that its nullity is incapable of

proof. Thus less than half of the cases that come before the Rota are ever granted in favor of the plaintiffs.

From some will now come the inevitable question: "Why is it that the annulments we read about in the papers are usually granted only to Catholics with a lot of money or those with political or social position? These annulments must cost plenty."

Court Costs

Court procedure does cost money — as anyone knows who has ever had a case tried in the civil courts. But the Church does not use her courts to gain money. The expenses involved are only the inevitable ones. Neither does the Church grant annulments only to the wealthy or powerful and deny them to the poor. Unfortunately, it is only about the wealthy and powerful that we ordinarily read in our daily newspapers, while with the lives of the poor we are familiar only accidentally.

Among the cases of nullity usually cited by those who cannot believe that the Church has made up her laws for all, you will invariably find two. The first of these was the case of Marconi-O'Brien, where it was proved that the couple had never intended to enter a true marriage, having agreed beforehand to call off the union whenever it suited their convenience. The second is that of Marlborough-Vanderbilt, where it was proved from the testimony of the girl's own mother, relatives,

and friends, that she had been forced to go through a ceremony against her will.

As for costs, we might take the second case mentioned, that of the Duke of Marlborough. The first trial was held at Southwark, England. It lasted three months and the expenses were \$40. The retrial in Rome lasted six months. Sworn testimony had to be collected all over again from England and America. Yet the total court costs were \$200 . . . not very much for the parties in question.

Prince Denied Decree

It was not many years ago that the Catholic Church denied the annulment appeal of the Italian Prince Ludovico Potenzianni, a man of great prestige who could have "bought and sold" the Duke of Marlborough many times over. The appeal of Princess Charlotte of Monaco was refused though her father, Prince Louis, made a special trip to Rome for this purpose. History tells of far greater instances where power and wealth were never able to influence the matrimonial courts of the Catholic Church.

Neither do the poor suffer in Church courts. In the ten years from 1937 to 1947, 833 separate appeals for annulment were submitted to the supreme matrimonial tribunal of the Catholic Church. Of these cases, 478 were denied. Of the 355 granted, 185 — more than half — were handled entirely free of charge, as they involved poor people who were unable to

pay the costs of the extensive investigation and three strict trials. In the year 1958, cases before the Rota numbered 232. Of these, 113 were denied and 119 of the marriages were declared null. More than one-third of the total number of cases had been handled without any costs whatever. There may sometimes be fear that wealth or influence can vary the justice of civil courts. But not those of the Catholic Church.

Apparently it is the idea of some that the Church bends every effort and manufactures technicalities to declare a marriage null for her members. On the contrary, there are thousands of persons living today in this country alone who would be Catholics tomorrow but for the Church's strict laws. They are involved in "bad" second marriages, having been previously joined in unions which the Church simply cannot declare null. These people are unwilling to give up the person to whom they are civilly married, and thus they remain outside the Church. Any parish priest can tell you from his own experiences of these cases. The same priest may also be working on a number of cases that have been before the first court for months or years . . . but which cannot be decided because the evidence is simply not sufficient.

Proof Is Demanded

If a marriage was null and can be proved such, then it is the duty of the Church to declare it so. If this cannot be proved, however,

then the Church will defend the marriage as valid, without compromise. The marriage tribunals of the Church, said the Holy See, are not "a kind of clinic for unhappy marriages, where the judges are bound to adjust situations at all costs."

A few words might also be said with regard to the Pauline Privilege. This is a somewhat different thing, though it is frequently thought by non-Catholics to be the same as a decree of nullity.

This privilege was first promulgated by St. Paul. In writing to the Corinthians, having first insisted that no divorce might be tolerated, he added: "To the others I say, not the Lord: If any brother has an unbelieving wife and she consents to live with him, let him not put her away. And if any woman has an unbelieving husband and he consents to live with her, let her not put away her husband. But if the unbeliever departs, let him depart. For a brother or sister is not under bondage in such cases, but God has called us to peace" (I Cor. VII: 12-15).

Limited Conditions

Thus, for the good of the Christian Faith, such a privilege can take place under limited conditions. First, there must be the case of a non-sacramental mar-

riage that has taken place between two unbaptized persons. One of the parties later becomes baptized. If the unbaptized party refuses to continue the marriage in peace and harmony, the baptized person can proceed to contract a second, and sacramental marriage. This is the one exception made to the divine rule that marriage cannot be dissolved.

This privilege was recognized in the ancient Church and so interpreted. It was explained precisely in this way by Justin Martyr, who died about A.D. 163 (*Apologia*, II, n. 2), and Tertullian, who died around 222 A.D. (*Ad Uxorem*, I, 2, c. 2).

The use of the Pauline Privilege does not mean that the previous non-sacramental marriage was invalid in any way. If both parties had remained unbaptized, no power on earth could dissolve it. In practice, of course, the Privilege is almost always used by one who has entered the Church after the previous marriage has broken up. But in every case the unbaptized person must be questioned as to his desires. If he wishes to continue the marriage, respecting the other partner's religious liberties, even though he remains unbaptized himself, the marriage must continue and is not subject to the Pauline privilege.

DON'T MARRY A CATHOLIC!

The best advice that can be received by any non-Catholic who is contemplating marriage with a Catholic is . . . *don't do it*. This advice is given both by the Catholic Church and other religious organizations which adopt a responsible attitude toward the problem of mixed marriages. The reasons given by both will be pretty much the same.

If you are a non-Catholic marrying a Catholic in the Catholic Church, you must make an agreement — binding you as a person of honor—never to interfere with your partner's Catholic religion . . . and to have all your children baptized and educated exclusively in the Catholic Faith. This promise you must undertake to keep even if your Catholic spouse should die.

What It Means

Your marriage can be contracted only in the form prescribed by the Catholic Church — before a priest — and you could have no service of your own religion, if you belong to one. You will contract to live your married life according to the laws of the Cath-



olic Church.

Your family — religiously speaking — will be divided from the start. It will be you against all the rest. Even if you decide to attend the Catholic Church with them, it will be as an outsider. Your children will, at an early age, be confused. They will ask you questions you cannot answer. They will not understand. There will be inevitable conflicts between your personal desires and Catholic laws and practices. In a marriage union in which there should be perfect unity, there will always be the one all-important matter upon which unity will be impossible.

Suppose you try to avoid these results by signing the mixed-marriage agreement with no intention of keeping it. You will be beginning your married life with a lie . . . bartering your soul and future happiness for the sake of a ceremony. Suppose you persuade the Catholic to marry you "outside the Church." You have entered a union which the Catholic Church does not even recognize. Perhaps this means nothing to you . . . but it will, at least eventually, to

your Catholic partner. Later it will be a life-long source of reproach and sorrow. It will mean much to the Catholic's family, relatives, friends. And through neither of these expedients, wrong as they are in themselves, have you any assurance that the problems of a mixed marriage will be solved in any way.

Danger to Faith

Any religious organization — or any individual — who places a value both on marriage and religion, cannot be blind to the dangers of mixed marriages. In particular, the Catholic Church sees in mixed marriage a danger to the faith of the Catholic party . . . the probability of domestic discord . . . a danger to the faith of the children . . . and great difficulties in their upbringing and education.

In the early part of 1949, the *Christian Century*, an undenominational Protestant weekly, recorded a survey conducted under the auspices of 22 churches in "a middle class, densely occupied community in a large American city." The purpose of this survey was to see how mixed marriages there had worked out, not only with regard to the married couple, but also with reference to the children. The results were far from encouraging.

"If religion has any vital meaning for a person," one of the articles pointed out, "it will affect his ways of thinking and behaving. In spite of the rosy optimism of

young people who are sure their affection will bridge any differences between them, divergent religious attachments if they are taken seriously generally constitute a basis of conflict, especially after the advent of children. Only a few instances of homes broken because of religious diversity were discovered through this study, but in numerous families, the tension continued to be acute, even after 20 years of marriage."

A Protestant Survey

The study showed how, in the greatest number of cases, family unity had been preserved only through sacrifice of religion, or unity itself had disappeared. Children were exposed to religious conflict, and too frequently they were brought up in no religion at all. It concluded: "It is abundantly clear that interfaith marriages have unfortunate results for organized religion. Often both husband and wife drop their earlier allegiance. When they do persist in it, there is confusion for the children and perhaps conflict in the home."

One other remark is of interest. In speaking of the mixed-marriage agreement required by the Catholic Church, the author said: "In the majority of cases interviewed, where such an agreement had been signed, both partners felt bound by it." This leads us to explain the reasons for the mixed-marriage contract.

In the face of these sober facts which cannot leave a religious person unconcerned, Catholics can

be thankful that the Church has taken some steps to regulate the problem of mixed marriages. These steps, it is true, will not appeal to many non-Catholics, and by some they are bitterly resented. They represent, however, the Catholic conscience in regard to mixed marriage. And even though a non-Catholic may disagree with the Catholic Church on one or many points, he should be grateful that the Church attempts to guarantee the faith of the children in at least *some* definite religion. Only the most bigoted would prefer their children to grow up in infidelity rather than as Catholics.

A Mixed Marriage

A Catholic once said, rather whimsically: "The Church gives permission for a mixed marriage, and then stands by sadly shaking her head." This contains a great deal of truth. The Church has many misgivings. She is eager to be agreeably surprised if this particular marriage should be one of the happy mixed marriages which do occur. But meanwhile, she sees the dangers from long experience, and she tries to anticipate them as much as possible. Every item in the agreement which she insists upon is necessary. They represent problems that must eventually be faced . . . and it is far better to settle them in advance rather than later on.

For reasons which should be obvious, the Church forbids mixed marriages — the marriages of

Catholics with those not of the Catholic Faith. This prohibition, however, for good and weighty reasons in an individual case, can be dispensed (set aside). That is to say, the Church tries in every case to do the best possible good by her laws and regulations. She has laid down the law to avoid mixed marriages as much as possible. But she realizes that, because of special circumstances, it will sometimes be better to permit such a marriage in a given case. For this reason, she will dispense with the law.

Bishops of individual dioceses themselves lay down the conditions under which mixed marriages will be celebrated. It is up to them, for example, to decide whether the use of the church building will be permitted. Usually they will insist that the non-Catholic partner receive at least six hours of instruction in the Catholic Faith, to know better what obligations he is taking upon himself in marrying a Catholic. But in every case, the mixed-marriage agreement is required. This will read somewhat as follows:

The Agreement

"I, the undersigned, not a member of the Catholic Church, wishing to contract marriage with _____, a member of the Catholic Church, propose to do so with the understanding that the marriage tie is indissoluble, except by death, and promise on my word of honor that _____ shall enjoy the free exercise of religion according to

his/her belief, and that all children of either sex born of this marriage shall be baptized and educated exclusively in the faith and according to the teachings of the Roman Catholic Church; and furthermore, that no other marriage ceremony than that before the Catholic priest shall take place."

Solid Reasons

This agreement thus safeguards in advance the faith of the Catholic partner. It safeguards the proper marriage ceremony for a Catholic, and the true idea of the marriage that they are entering. It safeguards the religious faith of the children. The Catholic partner also signs a similar agreement, with the addition that he will pray and make sacrifices for the conversion of the non-Catholic, if this should be God's will.

It is particularly with the agreement as to the education of the children that most resentment is shown. "Why should I sign away my children's rights?" is the strange question often asked. But, we ask, what right is involved?—the right to believe nothing, to be brought up a pagan? Without such an agreement — as is the case in far too many mixed marriages—the child may be brought up with no religious beliefs at all. "Let him wait until he is old enough to make his own decisions" is a principle that will be applied in no other matter, though of far less importance. You will not let the child decide if he is to go to school, if he is to brush his teeth,

if he is to avoid playing with matches. Is he to be kept in ignorance as to the necessity of saving his soul?

No convinced Catholic could allow his children to be educated in any religion other than that which he believes to be the true one. The Catholic believes in baptism as a sacrament necessary for salvation, and in the utter necessity of true faith and worship. He could not, therefore, begin marriage with any plans other than these. The mixed-marriage agreement anticipates the problems that will arise later, and settles them in advance. That others may disagree with the Catholic belief is a recognized fact; but we must act on our own principles, not on theirs.

Bitter Critics

One Protestant leaflet on mixed marriage is entitled: "Look Before You Leap Into the Roman Marriage Contract." This is good advice. The mixed-marriage agreement has been upheld by the courts of our States as a legal contract. "Would you sign away your right as a parent to prevent your child from becoming a thief, an adulterer, or a murderer?" the leaflet goes on to ask. "Then how can you sign away your right to prevent your children from praying to the Virgin Mary and thus becoming idolaters?"

The leaflet, which denounces the Catholic agreement as "intolerant," also asserts that: "The Pope of Rome is the Antichrist." While we do not commend a type

of mind that places the Communion of Saints on a level with murder, adultery, and theft . . . the fundamental assumption is sound: if it violates your conscience to sign such an agreement, then in heaven's name do not do so.

Most non-Catholics, however, find nothing in the mixed-marriage agreement that violates their conscience. Most do not believe in the exclusive truth of any particular religious faith, including their own. Most believe that there is some truth in all religions, that religious distinctions are not too important, and most do not think of Catholic Faith and practice as does the author of the leaflet. But if you do—if your attitude toward your own faith is such that the Catholic agreement is contrary to your conscience — then do not sign. And, by the same token, do not marry a Catholic . . . for a Catholic cannot validly marry you in any other way.

View Question Squarely

With another type of viewpoint on mixed marriages and the agreement we have less sympathy. A widely-circulated pamphlet entitled, "To Sign or Not To Sign," maintains that "the non-Catholic, deeply in love, is emotionally unable to evaluate properly the far-reaching significance of his signing the contract. Love often makes sober reflection impossible and drives men to rash acts which they regret ever after."

This sort of attitude toward

marriage had better be left where it belongs — in the worst kind of "romantic" movie. If a person is unable to evaluate properly the far-reaching significance of the mixed-marriage agreement, he is certainly in no position to evaluate the far greater significance of marriage itself. He is surely not prepared to bind himself for a life of intimate union with another person, a union that will present daily trials and difficulties long after the honeymoon is over.

Don't Marry a Catholic!

Instead of encouraging young people in the idea that it is quite proper that they may be emotionally unfit, incapable of sober reflection, and prone to rash acts when on the threshold of their most momentous step in life, the pamphleteer could very well point out the idiocy of any such frame of mind.

We conclude as we began. To the Catholic, it is necessary to say little — he knows the attitude of the Catholic Church on mixed marriages. To the non-Catholic we say—Don't marry a Catholic. But if you do, then do it in the right way—in a marriage the Catholic has been taught to recognize as valid. To do this, you must be prepared to sign the mixed-marriage agreement. Don't compromise your conscience. If the agreement is against your conscience, then follow the advice of thoughtful persons of all faiths who advise you against a Catholic marriage.

A final warning. Don't ever imagine that you can avoid all this "red tape" and perhaps have a more "showy" wedding simply by becoming a Catholic. The Catholic Church doesn't want you under these terms, and, if you value your own soul, you do not want the Catholic Church under these terms. The Catholic Church awaits

with open arms anyone who desires to enter her fold with true faith — who believes in her as the instrument of Christ's redemption and who desires through her help to save his soul. But she wants no hypocrites. She would far rather see a Catholic marry a sincere non-Catholic than a "convert-for-a-day."

"BROTHER, ARE YOU SAVED?"

The judge of a civil court, in response to a complaint, gave judgment against a well-meaning soul who was standing on street-corners asking people: "Brother, are you saved?" This, said the judge, was a violation of another's privacy which could not be permitted in the name of religious liberty.



He might have added that the question is one that could not be answered. For only God can tell whether any man will or will not save his soul.

There are some, however, who rely on their interpretation of certain passages of the Scripture for the belief that they can have infallible assurance of their salvation. Having been "saved" themselves, it is their sincere purpose

to get others "saved," too. And thus it is quite common to hear their reproach: "I have never known a Catholic friend who could tell me that he was saved."

"Being saved," as they understand it, is a process which can be described as follows: The person is first urged to acknowledge the general fact that sin exists in the world, that sin can send him to hell, and that he cannot avoid sin all by himself. He acknowledges, in other words, that he needs salvation—freedom from the power of sin and the grace or favor of God to enable him to lead a good life and later to enjoy the happiness which God has designed for those who love Him. He is then urged to acknowledge that Christ

has, through His sufferings and death, redeemed the human race and that each individual human being may share in this redemption through faith. Finally, the person "accepts Christ as his personal Savior" — he believes in Christ as portrayed in the Gospels and trusts in Christ to accept him as one of His own. He then concludes that, come what may, he is now among the elect—he is saved.

System of Salvation

Obviously, there are some truths here, very valuable ones. Such a system of salvation — if it is true — certainly has its simplicity to recommend it. It cannot be denied that religion of this type has produced much good, even though it is sometimes the kind that "strains at the gnat and swallows the camel." This conviction of salvation is supposed to carry with it "conversion" — a change of life, the resolution to avoid evil conduct of all kind. Yet these persons may strenuously deny that good works must follow conversion, for they are "signs of faith." And when they say, as they do, that mere formal membership in a Church is valueless without inward acceptance of Christ, they are quite correct.

But all of this is beside the point. What must be answered is this: Is this actually Christ's way of salvation? How it makes one feel, matters very little. One's feelings are perhaps the easiest source of self-deception. The results our feelings may produce in our life

cannot serve as an ultimate proof. There are many other ways of life that produce equally good and better results . . . and one may do good things motivated by principles that are erroneous. That the plan is a simple one, proves nothing. The question is: Is it the right one? Conversion from evil to good is necessary — but the question remains: Does anyone have the right to say on this basis that he is "saved," that he has finally and once for all complied with the conditions of salvation?

He has no such right.

Those who assume they do base their teaching on the fact that in the Scripture salvation is attributed simply to faith. John V:24, for example, quotes the words of the Lord: "Amen, amen, I say to you, he who hears my word, and believes Him who sent me, has life everlasting, and does not come to judgment, but has passed from death to life." And further on: "Amen, amen, I say to you, he who believes in me has life everlasting" (John VI:47). They have faith, they argue, therefore they are saved.

Good Works Too

But salvation is not attributed in the Scripture exclusively to faith. It is also attributed to good works — even without the mention of faith. "Life eternal indeed he will give to those who by patience in good works seek glory and honor and immortality" (Rom. II:7). Our Lord is quoted

by St. John in his Apocalypse (Revelation) as saying: "Behold, I come quickly! And my reward is with me, to render to each according to his works" (XXII:12). And St. James expressly states that "You see that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only" (Jas. II:24).

Salvation is also attributed to love (John XIV:23), to hope (Rom. VIII:24), and to other virtues and qualifications. Even if we were supposed to take the Scriptures alone as a sufficient guide to salvation, we at least would have to take them as a whole. We could not content ourselves with isolated verses and disregard the rest.

The Christian Life

Christianity is not merely a fact to be accepted. It is a life to be lived. It consists not only in faith, but in good works, in hope, in love, in adherence to every command that Christ has given. We are to be judged not on our faith only, but in accordance with our living the Christian life. Faith and conversion start one on the road to salvation — but it is a road that one must travel throughout life, with Christ's help. And no one can give himself assurance that he will travel this road to the end, and that he will persevere in the good purpose he has undertaken.

"But if the just man turn himself away from his justice, and do iniquity according to all the abominations which the wicked

man useth to work, shall he live? All his justices which he hath done shall not be remembered: in the prevarication by which he hath prevaricated, and in his sin, which he hath committed, in them he shall die" (Ezechiel XVIII:24).

"Whoever perseveres to the end, he shall be saved," our Lord told His followers, having prophesied that "the charity of many will grow cold" (Matt. XXIV: 12-13). St. Paul certainly had great faith, but he did not assure himself of salvation. Rather, he said, "I chastise my body and bring it into subjection, lest perhaps after preaching to others I myself should be rejected" (I Cor. IX:27). And in the same Epistle, he warned his readers: "Let him who thinks he stands take heed lest he fall" (X:12).

Performance Counts

"Work out your salvation with fear and trembling," he wrote to the Philippians, "for it is God who of His good pleasure works in you both the will *and the performance*" (II:12-13). And on another occasion he very graphically stated the possibility of the loss of salvation on the part of one who had formerly sincerely believed in Christ (Heb. VI:4-6), as, indeed, did our Lord Himself (Matt. VII: 21).

Who, then, can assure himself of salvation? Who can predict with infallibility that he will persevere? Are we not free human beings? Then we have the power to lose our souls, if we so choose.

“Seek a church where the people know they are saved,” admonishes a pamphlet. Seek if you will . . . but do not expect to find. Or, if you find such a church, look at it closely — it is not the church of St. Paul nor of his Lord.

Christ has not assured each of us that we shall persevere to the end, that we shall not fall away. His promises are an assurance of our salvation only if we do our part. No other power can separate us from Christ, but we ourselves can will this separation.

Way To Salvation

We can, however, have many indications that we are on the road of salvation. The true sign of our love and faith in Christ is the keeping of His commandments (John XIV:15). If we are truly avoiding sin, we know that we are persevering in the faith which we have professed, for “whoever is born of God does not commit sin, because his seed abides in him

and he cannot sin, because he is born of God. In this the children of God and the children of the devil are made known” (I John III:9-10). Upon such bases can we place our well-founded hope of eternal salvation.

We have not been placed in this world to work out salvation on our own terms . . . but on Christ's. We must be content with salvation as it has been given to us, as a free gift — we cannot refashion it according to our own whims, assuring ourselves of something we have been given no grounds to believe.

“For whatever things have been written have been written for our instruction, that through the patience and the consolation afforded by the Scriptures we may have hope. Now may the God of hope fill you with all joy and peace in believing, that you may abound in hope and in the power of the Holy Spirit” (Rom. XV 4, 13).

DON'T WE ALL WORSHIP THE SAME GOD?



“Catholics tell us to investigate the Catholic religion,” some of our friends will complain, “and they invite us to come to church with them. Yet Catholics are not allowed to investigate Protestantism or to attend Protestant services. This is one-sided. Is the Catholic Church afraid that Catholics might lose their faith if they found out about Protestantism?”

This complaint is familiar and—according to Protestant principles—it is quite logical. Catholics, however, act not according to Protestant principles but according to Catholic ones. And it is Catholic principles that rule out religious instruction from Protestantism and participation in Protestant worship.

When we invite Protestants to investigate the Catholic Church, it is only because of what these Protestants themselves believe about their religious duties. In a very well-known Protestant bi-weekly, a writer presents the Protestant position as this: “We are always re-examining the truth of our own Protestant faith and trying to think through its mean-

ing . . . In a meeting . . . I said that among us many and frequently the best students asked whether the doctrines of salvation by faith alone and of the bondage of the will, etc., in all their reformation hardness were really fully in accordance with God’s revelation. . .”

Protestants who are represented by such a statement obviously have as their idea of religion that it is a *search for truth*. If the foundations of religion are constantly to be re-examined, if it is considered that truth is not yet possessed in a definitive form, then they may certainly be invited to look into what the Catholic Church teaches. It is only logical that in the search for truth the teaching of Catholicism should not be ignored.

But this is not the Catholic position on religion. In Catholic belief, the Catholic religion *is* the truth. The reasonable bases on which the Catholic Faith rests can be shown to the satisfaction of any inquiring person. We do not conceive of religion as a searching for, but as a possession of the truth. *We are not seeking truth—*

we have it. Hence we do not investigate what other religions have to offer.

Some may be tempted to dismiss this as prejudice and narrow-mindedness. But we repeat, the reasons for what we say of the Church can be *shown*. A non-Catholic may reply that these reasons are not sufficient to convince him. That is not the point; for us they are sufficient. And, incidentally, the non-Catholic might ask himself the question: Do I believe that there is the possibility—the real possibility—of accepting *any* religion as the absolute truth? In his honest answer to this question he may well find the reasons for his failure to be convinced . . . if indeed he has ever truly investigated the Catholic Church.

Catholic Truth

But do we mean that every Catholic, of whatever education, actually has gone through the proofs for the Catholic Church, so that he knows that he possesses the truth? No, of course not. But he knows that such proofs are possible and that they exist. Possibly one man in a million would be able to explain scientifically the rotation of the earth . . . the fission of the atom . . . or the material composition of the moon. But he knows the facts, and he knows that they can be proved by those competent to do so. Thus he is reasonable in accepting them as true.

Protestants and Catholics mean vastly different things when they

speak of “faith” and of “losing faith.” They consequently place vastly different values on its possession and loss. Loss of faith to some Protestants is not of major consequence. If it does not matter greatly what a man believes, then it does not matter much more whether he believes at all. Loss of faith can be just as much “the search for truth” as finding faith.

But faith to the Catholic means the acceptance of truths, on God’s word, which we must believe if we shall save our souls. This acceptance is a reasonable act. But it is precisely because not every person is capable of demonstrating these reasons that the Church safeguards faith in many ways which seem repressive to the Protestant.

A skilled debater might present to an unlearned Catholic arguments that he could not meet, arguments that might shake his faith. This does not mean that the arguments cannot be answered — they can. But that will do no good for the person in question. Meanwhile, faith is all important, and the Church cannot stand idly by and see faith destroyed in an individual simply because he is a poor hand in an argument. A Catholic who truly believes in the Church will, therefore, heed her command to stay away from non-Catholic religions.

In this sense, then, the Catholic Church is afraid that Catholics —some of them—might lose their faith. Her fear arises merely from her concern as to what might be

the eternal consequences of such a loss. As a solicitous mother, she cannot but do her best to prevent any such occurrence. Sensible parents will make no apology for guarding their children's moral principles against the subtle arguments of more worldly-wise individuals. Neither does the Church apologize for guarding the faith that she knows to be true.

To put the matter briefly, then—the ordinary non-Catholic does not consider religious truth as existing apart from the individual. If he accepts a teaching, then as far as he is concerned, that is his religious truth. If he discards it, it ceases to be the truth. But for the Catholic, religious truth—like moral truth, and any other truth—is a fact, no matter how many or how few accept it. Thus no one must be needlessly exposed to the danger of losing his faith any more than to the danger of losing his morals.

But there is an even more important reason for Catholics to avoid non-Catholic religious services. It is a reason that goes beyond the mere conviction of possessing truth and acknowledging no need to seek it elsewhere. Neither is it simply a fear of danger to one's faith. For there is relatively little danger that a Catholic's faith will be shaken by a Protestant religious service.

The reason is, rather, that worship is an act of religion. Worship is an expression of the faith that prompts it. To a greater or less degree, the worship of any re-

ligion is a reflection of the principles according to which that religion exists. Episcopalians worship in one way — according to the creeds and the prayer book of the Episcopalian Church. Methodists worship in their way, Quakers in theirs, Unitarians in a third way. And Catholics worship according to the faith of the Catholic Church.

Catholic Position

Catholics believe in one true Church. They believe that that one Church was set up for a great purpose — to guide mankind through its teaching authority and to safeguard Christ's revelation in its purity, to provide men with the sacraments, the means of heavenly grace, *and to offer due worship to God.* We believe, therefore, that the worship of the Catholic Church is that which God has commanded of us and that God will be displeased if we attempt to offer Him any other form of worship.

Do not misunderstand us. We do not say that God refuses to hear any sincere prayer. We do not say that persons of other faiths displease God when they worship Him according to their conscience. We know that many good people are outside the Catholic Church and that they are perfectly sincere in their own beliefs. Their worship is likewise sincere. But their worship would not be sincere if offered by us. For we do not believe in it if we are consistent Catholics.

We all worship God. But we

worship Him in many ways. And the Catholic who believes in the Catholic Church maintains that he worships God in God's way. If God has revealed a true Church to offer Him true worship, then it is base ingratitude for a member of this Church to attempt worship in any other way.

Consistent with his own principles, the Protestant can seek instruction from Catholicism and worship in the Catholic Church. Consistent with his principles, the Catholic can do neither of these

things. If a Protestant should, however, adopt toward his own religion the attitude that we adopt towards ours, we should expect him to take the position that we take.

Meanwhile, while we make our appeal to Protestants on their principles sincerely held, we can only insist that we have the right to be judged according to our own principles. It may not be possible for the non-Catholic to agree with them; but he can understand and respect them.

POMP...BUT NOT POMPOUS

“Christ walked about the countryside in simple homespun clothing and sandals. But the Pope is carried about on men's shoulders and cardinals wear red cloaks three yards long.”

Criticisms like this are heard from people who cannot reconcile the humility and simplicity of Christ with the magnificent cathedrals and the “pomp and ceremony” of the Catholic Church. “What,” some of



them ask, “would the Apostles say if they could see a High Mass in St. Peter's in Rome?”

Perhaps there are a few Catholics who enjoy ceremony just for its own sake. But Catholics in general are like other people in that they usually have some kind of a reason for whatever they do. And there are good and sound reasons for their love of the ceremonies of their Church.

We do not love something merely because it is surrounded with ceremony, but we surround with ceremony the things that we love. No sane man or woman desires marriage just for the sake of the wedding ritual. But realizing the importance of marriage, they will insist that the ritual be appropriately solemn and impressive.

To say that Catholics are attracted to their Church simply because of her ceremonies is as senseless as telling a man "You love this woman merely because she is your wife." Because he first loved her, he made her his wife. And because Catholics have loved the Church and what it represents, they have enriched her ministrations through the ages with the dignity of ceremony. If Catholics wanted ceremony merely for its own sake, they could belong to any number of cults which would provide them with more lavish display than is to be found in the Catholic Church.

Solemn Ceremonies

Ceremony is natural to man. When he deems a thing important, he is inclined to surround it with a degree of solemnity. The taking of an oath, commencement exercises, inaugurations, the launching of a boat—whatever may be the occasion—each has its appropriate ceremony and traditions. And this is inevitable. Man is not a spirit only, he is also a creature of senses — he is composed of body as well as soul. In what he does he acts as a whole man, with all man's powers.

It is not different in religion. Man worships God as a human being, with both body and soul. Along with his mind and will, his body, senses and feelings should also find their own proper expression in worship. True, these external signs of worship without inner conviction would be a sham and pretense, mere hypocrisy. Our worship must be of the spirit. But if it truly represents a wholehearted devotion, it will naturally find external expression.

External Signs

It is entirely unnatural, and ultimately harmful, to cast out the externals of religion altogether. Eventually this can only lead to a religion that will be harsh and artificial. It will cease to be real because it is unnatural. The Protestant critic, Ralph Adams Cram, has written:

"From the outbreak of the Protestant revolution, the old kinship between beauty and religion was deprecated and often forgotten. Not only was there, amongst the reformers and their adherents, a definite hatred of beauty and a determination to destroy it when found; there was also a conscientious elimination of everything of the sort from the formularies, services, and structures that applied to their new religion. This unprecedented break between religion and beauty had a great deal to do with that waning interest in religion itself . . .

"Man is, by instinct, not only a lover of beauty, he is also by nature a 'ritualist,' that is to say, he

does, when left alone, desire form and ceremony, if significant. If this instinctive craving for ceremonial is denied to man in religion, where it preeminently belongs, he takes it on for himself in secular fields; elaborate ritual in secret societies, in the fashion of his dress, in the details of social custom. He also, in desperation, invents new religions and curious sects, working up for them strange rituals. . .” (Religion and Beauty.)

Honorable Age

The Church’s ceremonies and rituals were not thought up overnight and then impressed upon an unwilling or merely passive laity. It is the Catholic people through the ages who are responsible for them. They show the honorable age of the Church. They show the Church’s continued life, that she is not some embalmed relic of the past. She has received customs and practices from those who were her first members; others she found in the age of the Fathers of the first few centuries; still others in the Middle Ages; and some even in modern times.

Thus ceremony shows the human side of the Church just as an unflinching teaching has shown the divine side. The Church teaches as she has ever taught and ever will, for the Church is the voice of Christ. But the Church is also a society of human beings. She worships with the tongues and actions of twenty centuries of Christian men.

Ceremony also, in its variation throughout the world — the different manners of expressing the same solemnity — shows the universal character of the Church. As Pope Benedict XV stated: “The Church is not Latin, or Greek, or Slav: it is Catholic.”

Exalting Christ

Our principle in using ceremonies, decorating churches, and adding dignity to Christian worship, is this: “We exalt the Christ Who humbled Himself.”

It is a poor excuse and a shabby pretense to maintain that, since Christ appeared among men as a slave, we should imitate His enemies by treating Him as one. Christ, Who possessed all, forewent all to give us the example of the spirit in which we should use worldly goods. But to what better use can we put worldly goods than in giving them back to God?

And let us look closely at the humble Christ. When the woman anointed His feet with precious ointment, did He draw back and rebuke her? By no means . . . the word of rebuke was administered by Judas. Did He complain when hailed by the populace of Jerusalem as the Messiah and conducted into the city in triumph? Rather, He said that if the people had remained silent, the very stones would have cried out.

Christ Was Honored

Did He deny Thomas the privilege of falling at His feet and hailing Him as Lord and God?

Did He condemn Herod's Temple, which was one of the wonders of the world for pure lavishness? Or did He not call it God's house and drive forth those who were profaning it? Did He not surround the working of His miracles with ceremony — and were not the miracles themselves external signs of the spiritual works which He performed?

Certainly He condemned vulgar display that was sought for its own sake. He would not be hailed as a merely temporal king. But He willingly accepted what was offered in a true spirit of faith and devotion. And this applies to the work of man's hands, to his actions, to his whole being.

For every wealthy church in this land, there are many poor ones. Few people are heard to complain because billions are spent annually on pleasures, games, the theatre, lodges, fortune-telling, and the like. But when a fraction of this goes to the glorification of God's religion, it is bitterly resented — usually by those who are least concerned and who have never contributed to any religious cause whatever.

Not Mere Vanity

In giving the leaders of the Church signs and symbols of honor, we do not extend homage to them as individual creatures, but to what they represent. No pope or cardinal or bishop would be so foolish as to attribute this honor to his personal qualities, but to the office which he holds.

In the armed forces, there is an elaborate system of rank and respect for rank. This is not to glorify individuals, but to impress upon all the respect that is due to lawful authority. When we receive an ambassador, even though his personal character may be repugnant, we show him marked honor. For he represents a government and a people. We do not do less for those who have been called to administer the conduct of God's Church.

Those who govern the Church, it may be true, can be tempted to forget that they are custodians, not possessors. It is the temptation of all who are placed in authority. They above all are conscious of how human they are. But the very few who have succumbed to this temptation are as nothing in the Church's long history when compared with those who always have given and who continue to give in their lives the exemplification of the Christian ideal: to be in the world, but to be not of the world.

Few men, for example, can leave the world having been touched by it as little as was Pope Pius X. In 1914, having been surrounded by the papal dignity for eleven years, he could leave behind him no personal possessions. He could only petition in his will that his successor might grant a small pension to his surviving relatives, his two sisters. Few could write, as he wrote: "I was born poor; I have lived poor; and I wish to die poor."

Is It True That Catholic Countries Are Backward?

“Look at the amazing progress of Protestant countries,” some people say, “and the backwardness of Catholic nations.”

Referring to South America, a recent Protestant article spoke of “an entire continent to the south of us . . . lying in spiritual darkness greater even than Dark Africa.” Similar statements are frequent, though they are not always quite so crudely put. “Missionaries” who make a habit of this kind of pronouncement, can scarcely call it “persecution” and intolerance when these countries accord them a cool reception.

The first and really necessary thing to be said about this type of sneer — for it can be called nothing else — is that it rests on an entirely false assumption. It is the snobbery that we expect of a child who has not yet learned the relation of values. “My Dad is richer than yours. My Dad is therefore superior to yours.”

Standards of Society

In defining what we mean by civilization, we can probably agree that it signifies: an arrangement of society in which the



equality of human nature is recognized, and man's inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness are both enjoyed and defended. Civilization and culture are the record of man's effort in achieving the purpose for which he was placed in this

world. Material progress, technology as it is called, and the amassing of wealth are merely one small aspect of this. To make them the single basis for evaluating all civilizations is to make them the whole purpose of existence. Such judgments are both superficial and stupid. They betray strictly earthly standards of those who make them.

The same people do not bother to define what are “Catholic countries” and “Protestant countries.” A Catholic country would be, we may suppose, one whose people profess the Catholic religion, to the virtual exclusion of all others. Ireland, Spain, Italy, and Portugal might fit such a definition. By the same principle, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, and Finland might justly be called Protestant countries.

But by what right may such countries as Holland, say, or Switzerland be called Protestant, when roughly 40% of the population of each is Catholic? As far as simple majorities go, neither Great Britain nor the United States, for example, is either Protestant or Catholic. The greater part of the citizens belong to no church. Several countries which are glibly called "Catholic" or "Protestant" actually comprise peoples which are largely only nominal supporters of the respective faiths named.

Fair Judgment

And most important of all, the person who is using "backward" Catholic countries as a prop to Protestantism forgets — honestly or merely conveniently — any fact other than that of the dominant religion of the country. He never seems to know any of the country's history, its difficulties, the actions of other countries against it, its natural resources—nothing, in fact, save that here and now it is in such and such a condition and that the majority of its people are Catholic. And sometimes he is misinformed about either or both of these points. Thus he will place himself in the ludicrous position of blaming the Catholic Church for her "failure" in some country — Mexico, for example — where, as a matter of fact, an anti-Catholic governing clique deprived the Church of any influence for a hundred years, closing her schools,

shutting down the churches, executing her clergy and driving her underground.

One refreshing aspect about these comparisons is how ridiculous they often look in retrospect. Take, for example, this excerpt from a book written less than a hundred years ago—a book which was in high favor at the time:

Progress and Decline

"Look at the progress of (England's) population, wealth, industry, and art, at the islands and territories she has subdued and settled, at her mastery of the seas, and the diffusion of her race, language, and religion throughout the world. At the present rate of progress in one century more, the Protestants speaking the English tongue will exceed three hundred millions, and outnumber the present members of both Greek and Romish churches; and what is one century compared with the eighteen preceding centuries?"

Again, compare Italy, the ancient seat of arts and power, depressed and degraded and impoverished under the Papal See for twelve centuries, with the Protestant States of Holland, won from the sea, Germany, England, and the United States, in which last the Protestants stand as ten to one compared with the Roman Catholics."

But how is the situation a century later? The British Empire is now a commonwealth of free nations with the non-British in a

great majority. England's "religion" — if this means the Anglican Church — long has been a small minority, even though it is still the state church. Catholics in England now outnumber Anglicans. As for the "present rate of progress" being sustained, far from there being 300 million English speaking Protestants throughout the world, there are not that many Protestants all told, of every language and race, and the combined Catholic and Orthodox Churches ("Greek and Romish Churches") throughout the world outnumber Protestants over three to one. (Statistics taken from the 1959 World Almanac, p. 715.)

Embarrassing History

No one has any desire to disparage the British people in their past heroic history and in the sacrifices they are making today. But, if material wealth was a valid argument once for her "Protestant civilization," would not her present economic decline be equally valid against it? And what of the might of "Protestant Germany?" Throughout the nineteenth century, those who liked to identify Protestantism and prosperity used to refer to the "three great Protestant *Teutonic* powers" (Germany, England, and the U.S.A.) whose destiny it was to dominate the world. That remains an embarrassing page of history today.

Has England's decline been due to Protestantism? Was Ger-

many's postwar degradation the result of dominance of the Lutheran religion? Are the backward areas of the United States retarded because they are populated by Protestants? No one would say yes to any of these questions. Then why not use the same common sense with Catholic countries? *This is not a one-way rule that applies only against Catholics.* Spain, at the height of her Catholic dominance, was the ruler of the world, culturally and politically. So was it with Portugal, so with Italy. Only when economic decline has set in, was it suddenly discovered that these countries were "depressed and degraded and impoverished under the Papal See."

The study of the rise and fall of civilizations and of national powers is a complex, not a simple one. Into it enter many factors, temporal, political, geographical, racial, personal, economic, and psychological. There is nothing in either Protestantism or Catholicism that inspires men to build armies, to conquer foreign peoples, to colonize. England became a power to supplant Spain not because of Protestantism, but because James II (a Catholic, incidentally) laid the foundations for the British navy that gave her this dominance.

Church Of The Poor

In one sense, however, the Catholic Church is delighted to be associated with poverty. She is the Church of the poor, and in this fact she glories. She finds it

strange when some persons think it a reproach in her that she counts so many poor members. They are not poor because they are Catholics. If they became Protestants, Mohammedans or infidels they would not become rich—but being poor, it is to the Catholic Church that they adhere. What the Catholic Church is, she owes to her poor.

In this country, there are relatively few wealthy Catholics. Wealthy people do not naturally gravitate toward Catholicism. Our schools, churches, and hospitals have been built through the sacrifices of ordinary people. Our priests and Bishops have come largely from the middle and lower income groups. Not long ago it was verified that not a single member of the Catholic hierarchy in the United States had come from a family that could afford a college education. Countries too, which are economically poor, which have not benefited from the resources that have made our country wealthy, or which have been exploited by wealthier countries, have remained faithful to the Catholic Church.

Wealth is not the end-all of human activity. Neither is it much of a Christian criterion. If Christ in His many teachings emphasized anything at all, it is that material goods are subordinate to the spiritual. It was not the poor that he implied would enter heaven with difficulty. Countries, like individuals, are to be judged not on what they have, but what they are.

It is true that material resources go hand-in-hand with real progress in other ways. They provide the means for scientific research and for development of the arts. But the painting, the sculpture, the architecture, the music, and the science that have poured forth from the Catholic countries of Christendom under ideal conditions — works which in many ways have never been equalled since — have not shown Catholic peoples slow to take advantage of the opportunity when it has been present.

Catholic Contributions

Civilization and culture can be manifest also in the relative records which various peoples have made in similar endeavors under similar circumstances. Take, for example, the colonization of America by both the Protestant and the Catholic peoples who came here. American school children of the United States, sad to say, are not told too much about the early history of this country. They learn about the Pilgrims landing at Plymouth in 1620 almost as though that were the only significant date following 1492. They hear very little of the French and Spanish missionaries who travelled the length and breadth of the New World establishing schools and missions for the natives. In contrast to the sturdy, God-fearing folk who laid the foundation for our great Republic, they are given to understand that the *Conquistadores* were motivated only by greed for gold.

To top this off, the picture is then drawn with the same old lines . . . Look at the wealth of North America, and the comparative poverty of the South. It does not seem to occur to any of them that the wealth of North America was exploited entirely by the invaders for themselves. The Indians lost their land, their liberties, and their lives in a series of outright robberies, broken treaties, and frauds which we now confess with shame. Those who were not exterminated were confined to ever smaller reservations. There was thus abundant wealth for the white man. Only a tardy conscience has restored some of the Indians' rights.

A Strong Contrast

But how different was the story in Catholic America. Here the white man did not simply become wealthy through the exploitation of the Indian.

As the Protestant historian Seaman has written: "It should be remembered, to the credit of the Spanish and Portuguese colonists, and the Catholic missionaries and Catholic policy, that they have been the means of changing the habits of life, and of civilizing more than twenty millions of American Indians and mixed breeds, while the Anglo-Saxon and German colonists and peoples have scarcely exerted any favorable influence upon the mind, the character, or the habits of life of more than one hundred and twenty thousand of the descendants of

the aborigines of our country.

"The English, Scotch, and German colonists to America had no regard, and scarcely any feelings of humanity, for the aborigines; they treated the Indians as savages, whose condition was nearly hopeless; as a race so degraded that it was not profitable to have much intercourse with them; intermarriage of the whites with them has been generally regarded as degrading, and in some of the colonies and states prohibited by law; and no efforts have been made to subject them to law, to incorporate them into the society of the white people as laborers and citizens, to restrain their vagrant habits, and to teach them industry by a system moderately and humanely coercive, as the youth of all civilized countries are taught to labor.

Helped Aborigines

"The Catholic colonists and states have pursued a very different policy. They have regarded the Indians as part of the human family, as having capacities for improvement as well as souls to be saved; and hence they mingled with the Indians, intermarried with them, subjected them to their laws as laborers and subjects, or citizens; taught them many of the useful arts, and how to work and habits of industry; improved their physical as well as their mental condition; restrained them from wars among themselves; raised them in the scale of civilization; and converted them into peacable,

quiet, and reasonably industrious citizens." (*Progress of Nations.*)

A Protestant paper, commenting on these inescapable facts said flippantly: "The Aztecs and Incas were slaughtered before they had a chance to learn how well they were being treated." This smug statement comes with poor grace. Some of the Indians, to be sure, were "slaughtered." The Spanish were not ashamed, nor should we be of them, to put a violent end to the charming Aztec custom of human sacrifice, tearing out the hearts of living bodies — which contemporaries estimated to account for 15 to 20 thousand lives annually. There is, however, nothing in Spanish-American history to equal for sheer ferocity and cold-bloodedness the spectacle of the great New England preacher, Increase Mather, who, in 1676, after a wanton massacre of 600 virtually helpless Indians, could enter the pulpit of the leading Congregational church in Boston and (in his own words) "thank God that this day we have sent 600 heathen souls to hell."

Less Race Discord

As a significant result of the Catholic policy, the Latin American countries, like most Catholic countries in general, are free from that racial prejudice and the idea of "superior" colors and races that are all too prevalent in this country and in others — such as South Africa — which have been subjected at one time to a strong Protestant domination.

Another claim used in trying to prove superiority of "Protestant countries" is the comparison of illiteracy statistics. Most of the figures frequently quoted are simply imaginary. Even where authentic figures are available, however, they usually provide no true basis for comparison.

What About Illiteracy?

As the *Encyclopedia Britannica* points out (in the article, "Illiteracy"): "Statistics on illiteracy are not collected in a uniform manner in various countries, nor do given figures represent the same age groups, so that much of their value for comparative purposes is lost." In some countries, the statistics have been estimated on the basis of the number that were able to sign their names in marriage registers. In others, the figure is set in proportion to the literacy of army conscripts. Even so, in the list of comparative figures in the *Encyclopedia*, such countries as Belgium, Czechoslovakia, and France, were all about in the same class together with Esthonia, the United States, and Canada. One country having the least number of illiterates is Switzerland, which is in a large part entirely Catholic. Obviously, then, if some Catholic countries are educationally inferior, the cause is to be sought elsewhere than in the Catholic Faith.

A far better way to gauge the attitude of a people to education is to examine the available figures on the actual schooling that is be-

ing provided and utilized. The following figures have been taken from the *Annual* of the International Bureau of Education and Instruction (Geneva), for 1938. In each case, we give the number of children out of every 1,000 of the total population who were receiving primary education in all available schools: Argentina, 147; Belgium, 116; Chile, 118; Czechoslovakia, 117; Denmark, 114; Finland, 103; France, 126; Great Britain, 131; Holland, 127; Ireland, 163; Italy, 111; Mexico, 111; Norway, 126; Poland, 145; Spain, 92; Sweden, 105; Switzerland, 118; U.S., 172. This list is not complete — some Catholic countries have a poorer record, as do some Protestant ones. But the figures certainly bear out that education does not rise and fall simply in accordance with the prevalent religion.

In Argentina, the *Annual* says, there are two primary school teachers for every single soldier. In the city of Buenos Aires alone, there are 81 public libraries. The Catholic tradition of education has been secure, wherever it has been allowed to exist without interference. There were 12 universities and 40 colleges founded in Latin America before 1636, when Harvard, the first North American college, was established. When the anti-Catholic government of France secularized French education, it was at the expense of suppressing 14,404 Catholic schools between the years 1902-04. All Catholic teaching orders were

driven from the country in 1904. If the country suffered educationally — as it did — it was the fault of the Church's enemies, and not of the Church.

What About Morals?

Morality is another basis on which civilizations are evaluated. There are many ignorant and calumnious judgments passed on the moral standards of certain countries, judgments that have been based on nothing but assumption and prejudice. The idea seems to be—a poor people will always be an immoral people. This is not only an insult to the nations in question; it is an insult to every man who is poor. It is hard to collect statistics on morality. Certain indications of moral standards, however, which are matters of record, can be established. Let us look, for example, at the latest available illegitimacy statistics as published in the *Encyclopedia Britannica*. For every 1,000 births in each of the following countries, the number given represents those which were illegitimate. England and Wales, 43; Scotland, 68; Denmark, 106; Finland, 89; France, 90; Germany, 110; Italy, 47; New Zealand, 45; Ireland, 20; Norway, 66; Sweden, 145; Switzerland, 38; Australia, 47; Holland, 19; U.S., 24. Illegitimacy, as is evident from these figures, does not run according to the material standard of living or the facility of education.

Far less do these figures reflect against Catholic countries. The

European Catholic countries have a far better record than do others. The exception noted by the author of the article in the *Encyclopedia* is with regard to Austria, where there was an illegitimacy record three times as high as that of England. But here there is also an explanation. In Austria, the civil law demanded conditions for a legal marriage that were impossible for a great number of people. Not only did one have to be able to read, write, and cipher, but he also had to possess a definite sum of money. The result was that thousands of people were actually married, but not in marriages that the state recognized. Still, in the state records, the children of these marriages would be classed as illegitimate. Church and State conflicts on marriage laws also have resulted in some degree for the high figures of illegitimacy quoted from other countries.

Who Is To Blame?

Undoubtedly there are explanations also for the extraordinary number of illegitimate births in the Scandinavian countries. No one is charging Lutheranism with the responsibility. There has been no intention in these comparisons of proving anything against Protestantism. The points that have been made are only those necessary to correct certain erroneous and unfounded impressions.

Anti-Catholics delight in seizing upon some country, some city, some province, which happens to be Catholic, and which happens

to possess characteristics subject to criticism. They can then say: "See . . . this is what you may expect if the Roman Catholic Church ever dominates." This is done particularly in matters of government. From what has been said, it should be obvious how fallacious this is. A nation's civilization and culture, material and otherwise, are dependent on many factors. In reference to many aspects of these, the religious factor is undoubtedly the least important.

"The American Way!"

Culture is largely a matter of taste. There are vast numbers of people in the world who are not hungering for what we are pleased to call "the American way of life." Many things in our life are quite admirable, but others are not so, and these people want no part of them.

An example of this may be seen in a recent book whose author holds up Catholic Quebec as the ultimate horror in Catholic civilization because, he says in shocked amazement: "*It has no divorce, no birth control, and no public schools.*" No Catholic will hang his head in shame because a Catholic province lacks the "blessings" of broken marriages and contraception. As for the public schools—the Catholic citizens of Quebec attend Catholic schools. The Protestants there have their own excellent school system. It never has occurred to these people to construct a third system of education for non-existent students.

KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS — RELIGIOUS INFORMATION BUREAU

4422 Lindell Blvd., St. Louis 8, Missouri

List of pamphlets available at the above address. One title may be requested at a time free of charge. Several titles, complete sets, and quantities of individual pamphlets may be ordered at 7¢ for each pamphlet, plus postage.

3. The Bible is a Catholic Book
5. Christ's Seven Sacraments
6. The Holy Sacrifice — the Catholic Mass
7. Why the Catholic Church says "Investigate" — Masons, Inquisition, Nuns
8. Speaking of Tolerance — Controversial periods in history
9. These Men They Call "Knights"
10. Why Catholics Believe As They Do — Existence of God, Immortality
11. A Short Story of the Popes
12. Let's Stick to Moses — Ten Commandments explained
13. But Can It Be Found in the Bible? — Bible not sole rule of faith
14. What Happens After Death?
15. Yes . . . I Condemned The Catholic Church
16. What Do You Mean "Only One True Church"?
17. But How Can Educated People Be Catholics?
18. No . . . Belief in God is not Enough!
19. The Real Secret of Successful Marriage
20. The Way to Everlasting Life . . . The Catholic Church
21. Is the Catholic Church a Menace to Democracy?
22. But Do You Really Understand the Bible? — Rules for understanding
23. A Letter to Our Non-Catholic Neighbors — Aspects of Catholic faith
24. Yes, the Mother of God Will Help You!
25. What Makes a Woman Choose Such a Life? — Life of a Catholic Nun
26. I'll Tell You Why I Am a Catholic
27. Why So Many Decide to Become Catholics — Convert stories
28. Let Us Judge Catholics by the Bible — Prayer to Saints, unmarried priests
29. But Would Christ Call You A Christian?
30. But Do You Understand What God Told Us? — Apostles' Creed
31. Should Children Learn About God—in School?
32. The Bible Is Not Our Sole Guide
33. This Was the Faith of Our Fathers
34. These Are Our Seven Deadly Enemies — Seven capital sins explained
35. Let's Test Catholic Loyalty — A Good Catholic is a good citizen
36. Remember the Sabbath . . . Keep It Holy — The "Sabbath Question"
37. I Am a Catholic Priest
38. But Why the Candles, Holy Water and Beads? — Sacramentals
39. The Reformation. Was It Reform or Revolt?
40. Why I Had to Embrace the Catholic Faith — Convert stories
41. Yes, Miracles Happened at Fatima
42. Does the Bible Contradict Itself? — Peter the Rock, Faith and/or Works
43. I Was Warned About the Catholic Church! — Religious Liberty
44. Why a Woman Needs the Catholic Faith!
45. The Early Years of the Catholic Church — First three centuries
46. Yes . . . A Priest Can Forgive Your Sins — Sacrament of Penance
47. But Why Don't You Pray to the Saints? — Communion of Saints
48. God's Story of Creation — Genesis
49. Is the Catholic Church Out of Place Here? — Catholicism and Loyalty
50. This Is the Catholic Church — Creed, Sacraments, Mass, Commandments
51. Revelation . . . A Divine Message of Hope — Revelations or Apocalypse
52. Does It Pay to be a Catholic? — How to be a Catholic
53. Think About Death and Start to Live — Catholic attitude toward death
54. What Do You Find Wrong With the Catholic Church?
55. His Name Shall Be Called God With Us — Divinity of Christ
56. The Infallible Church, Truth or Trickery? — Church of the Scriptures
57. Tell Us About God . . . Who Is He? Existence and nature of God
58. The Word Was Made Flesh — Humanity of Christ
59. Let Us Pray—Prayer
60. Gift of the Holy Spirit—Confirmation
61. The Church Says — Precepts of The Church
62. "Upon this Rock . . ."

Learn All About
THE CATHOLIC CHURCH
By Mail . . . At No Cost!

You can easily investigate Catholic faith and worship in the privacy of your home.

Just send us your name and address and advise that you desire to learn about the Church by mail.

We will send you an interesting course of instruction which is short, yet complete.

The book explaining Catholic faith and worship is written in an easy-to-understand form, and there are six tests sheets to be checked. There is no writing to do, and nobody will call on you unless you request it.

You merely mail your marked test sheets to us. We correct them and return them to you. This enables you to determine how well you understand the book and on what points further explanation by mail may help you.

There is no cost to you, no obligation.

Write today to:

Supreme Council
KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS
Religious Information Bureau
4422 LINDELL BLVD.
ST. LOUIS 8, MO.

Imprimatur:

✠JOSEPH E. RITTER

Archbishop of St. Louis

St. Louis, December, 1949

Published in United States of America
20th Reprinting, July, 1961