

1950

The political and social philosophy of the Roman Catholic church from Leo XIII to the present

<https://hdl.handle.net/2144/4965>

"Downloaded from OpenBU. Boston University's institutional repository."

BOSTON UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL

Thesis

THE POLITICAL AND SOCIAL PHILOSOPHY OF ^{ROMAN} THE CATHOLIC CHURCH
FROM LEO XIII TO THE PRESENT

by

Armando Garcia Rosa

(A.B., Boston University College of Liberal Arts, 1948)
submitted in partial fulfilment of the
requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts
1950

AM
1950
no

copy 1

Approved
by

First Reader Robert J. Benedict
Assoc. Professor of Government

Second Reader Carl E. Purinton
Professor of Religion

To The Reverend Peter R. Blynn, Episcopal man of God,
gentleman, scholar, wise counselor, and friend.

January, 1950

Armando Garcia Rosa

Introduction

The object of this thesis is to define the political and social philosophy of the Roman Catholic Church from the time of Leo XIII to the present. In order to accomplish this task, it will be necessary to divide this investigation into three parts.

Part I will define the political philosophy of the Roman Catholic Church in theory and practice. This will be followed by an analysis of two pertinent Letters of Leo XIII. It will be the task of this Part to demonstrate that the political philosophy of the Roman Catholic Church collides with the theory and practice of American democracy.

Part II will present the social philosophy of the Roman Catholic Church. This social philosophy will be broken down into the fields of Education, Science and the general needs of our modern society. It will be the responsibility of this Part II to show that the social philosophy of the Roman Catholic Church, too, constitutes a threat to the democratic constitutionalism of The United States.

Part III will constitute the conclusion of this investigation and will also include more contemporaneous material.

It is suggested that in order to more fully understand the historical background of this nineteenth century, and standard history of this period ought to be read since this era is so inextricably connected with the Rome of Leo XIII and his successors; the knowledge of one is contingent upon the other.

Inasmuch as the encyclicals of Leo XIII, Pius XI and Pius XII form the main points of departure in the discussion of this problem, a complete list of these letters will be found in the appendix. These are ecclesiastically-approved versions of the Papal originals. These letters are included in this investigation to fulfill the obvious requirement of academic responsibility, and also because these letters can be used as convenient checks in the case of those who rightfully wish to test the accuracy of some or all the assertions which this investigation will make.

Since this study is of the opinion that the political and social philosophy of the Church of Rome collides sharply with the theory and practice of democracy as it is known and practiced in the United States, and since this investigation also claims that this assertion can be substantiated by the examination and study of official Roman Catholic literature, the bulk of the reference-material will be drawn from official Roman Catholic sources. This approach is purposeful because then, the criticism of the Roman Catholic position that the sources of this study and others like it are of an unreliable and biased origin, cannot be validated.

Another weighty reason for this particular method is the more obvious one: the authoritarianism of Rome comes from her official pronouncements; if these are examined and studied, it will be plainly seen that what Rome says about democracy and what the actual doctrines about the democratic process are in

the unquestionable realities of the papal utterances and the opinions of the Church doctors and the Roman Catholic Encyclopedia, are entirely different.

This investigation does not suggest either plainly or by indirection that a wholesale persecution of the Roman Catholic Church ought to take place on the grounds that it threatens the safety and future of The United States. To advocate such would be to deny the very philosophy on which this thesis stands. What is intended by this study is to show that the rule of Rome and the concepts of modern political and social democracy are totally incompatible.

If there are to be changes in the attitudes of Rome (and this thesis holds to this possibility by implication) these changes will have to come about through the democratic process. The like is true in the case of the United States with reference to the many efforts of the Roman Catholic Church to obtain obvious preferential treatment, particularly in the instance of support of parochial schools. It is the opinion of this study that such a threat to the democratic process not only in the United States but in other areas as well can only be met through the use of the enlightened techniques of democratic constitutionalism.

Part III comprises the conclusion which embodies the ideas already stated, namely: the political and social philosophy of the Roman Catholic Church from the time of Leo XIII to the present collides sharply with the theory and practice of

American democracy.

It cannot be over-emphasized that all the Letters in the order of their appearance in this study are the official pronouncements of the Roman Catholic Church and that the material cited in the list of annotated readings following the bibliography and the bibliography itself are but reflections and refinements of these Letters.

Every effort has been made to present as accurate a picture of the political and social doctrines of Rome as is possible. That the author of this investigation is no longer a communicant of the Roman Catholic Church does not minimize his obligation to scholarship and objectivity; hence the encyclical letters themselves, with the requisite ecclesiastical imprimatur.

Boston University
Graduate School, 1950

Armando Garcia Rosa

Introduction

Part I

	page
I. The Church, The State, And Democracy	11
II. On Civil Government, Leo XIII	38
III. On The Christian Constitution of States, Leo XIII	56
IV. Summary - Corporate or Democratic State?	70

Part II

V. The Church And Society	81
VI. The Church And Education	98
VII. The Church And Science	117
VIII. Summary - The Collision of Powers	137

Part III

Introduction

IX. Conclusion	156
Abstract	165
Appendix	169
Bibliography	170
Additional Annotated References and Readings	173

Part I

The selection of material to support any given proposition may or may not present any problem depending upon whether or not a sufficiently adequate bibliography exists. Even when an adequate bibliography be available, there is always the problem of selection and evaluation. In the final analysis, it must remain the major responsibility of the investigator for the selection of the source material.

In this instance, it is obvious that more than ordinary reliance is placed on two sources: Charles C. Marshall's The Roman Catholic Church In The Modern State and Paul Blanshard's American Freedom And Catholic Power. It is not that these are the only two sources because the literature on this subject is voluminous.

The reasons why these two books form the principle points of departure are the following:

1. In the case of Marshall's book, it is ideally organized to bring out the specific areas; scientific, social, political and philosophical, which, from the American constitutional point of view, collide with the theory and practice of American democracy. This book does not discuss Roman Catholic theology but rather presents in a very clear manner the chief areas of conflict between Rome and American constitutional democracy. In view of the distinctive treatment of this subject, a treatment chiefly distinguished by an absence of emotional

animus, available documentation, and careful organization, this book by a Charles C. Marshall of the New York Bar forms one of the basic sources of this investigation.

2. With respect to Paul Blanchard's book, much the same reasoning prevails here but with this additional observation: Paul Blanchard becomes too emotional and far too trivial at many points in his efforts at substantiating some of his accusations against the Roman Catholic Church. This observation constitutes a serious limitation because such an obvious failing plays directly into the hands of his Roman Catholic critics who seek by any means to discredit him (Roman Catholic authorities allege that Paul Blanchard is a "renegade Catholic"). However, in spite of this failing, an outstanding feature of this book is that a majority of the documentation is of an official Roman Catholic nature. In other words, while Marshall's book criticizes the Roman Catholic Church mostly from outside sources, Paul Blanchard uses the very words of the Church, words and ideas taken verbatim from her own sources, to prove the hostility of Rome to modern democracy. For this particular reason, even if for no other, this vital work of Blanchard is also used as a basic source.

Another factor influenced the selection of these two books as primary sources: the chronological span of these two texts covers approximately the time span of this thesis. In particular, Marshall surveys this controversy from approximately 1870 up to the significant presidential election of 1928 in which

Alfred E. Smith played so significant a role. Blanshard, on the other hand, brings this controversy up to the present time.

The literature on this subject falls into two distinct classes:

1. those which are thoroughly documented; and,
2. those which are less adequately validated or in many cases, not at all.

In the case of the documented ones (and the number of these is far too small), the following are listed in the order of their excellence:

- a. Our Fathers Faith And Ours, A Comparison Between Protestantism And Romanism, David S. Schaff, D.D., G.P. Putnam And Sons, New York & London, Second Edition, 1929 (1928)
- b. The Catholic-Protestant Mind, Conrad Henry Moehlman, Harper & Bros., New York and London, 1929
- c. The Catholic Crisis, George Seldes, Messner, 1939
- d. Will America Become Catholic, John F. Moore, Harper & Bros., New York and London, 1931
- e. The Church, Catholic And Protestant - A Study of Differences That Matter, William Adams Brown, Ph.D., D.D., Charles Scribner's Sons, New York and London, 1935
- f. Separate Church And State Now, Joseph Martin Dawson, Richard R. Smith, New York, 1948

With respect to that class of books less documented and therefore less reliable and objective, the list is monumental but a few of the more reliable and well-known ones are:

- a. Rome Stoops To Conquer (et al.) E. Boyd Barrett
(It ought to be mentioned here that Mr. Barrett has very recently returned to Roman Catholicism and he is now living as a Catholic layman in seclusion. He has also most recently published a book in which he explains his religious anabasis.

- b. The Catholic Church Against The Twentieth Century, Avro Manhattan, London, Watts & Co., 1947
Vatican And World Politics, Avro Manhattan, Gaer, September, 1949
- c. Roman Catholicism And Freedom, Cecil John Cadoux, Independent Press, Ltd., Memorial Hall, E.C4, Fourth Edition, London, 1947

As far as these of the second classification are concerned, they are not entirely without merit but, as in the case of the first one(s), they are either too personal, relying too much on the opinion or testimony of the recorder, or, in the instance of Cadoux's book, too philosophical, too ineffectual, and far too wanting in responsible documentation.

To be more specific: Mr. Barrett is far too emotionally connected with the subject to be in a position to be factual. What damaging accusations he does make are of so personal a nature that he can neither prove their authenticity nor can the reader disprove their truthfulness. Mr. Barrett leaves far too much to his own authority and leaves one far too many times with the feeling of neither being satisfied with the truth or the error of the points Mr. Barrett is trying to make.

The two Manhattan books are equally of a limited reliability because the author does not provide enough documentation. As a matter of fact, the Book Review of The New York Times made that very observation of too little responsibility for the sweep of the book. One has the feeling, much the same as in the case of Mr. Barrett's books, of wondering just where the author secured his facts, and one further wonders about the reliability

of the material as a whole. One is never quite sure how to evaluate this material, and in the absence of more corroborative evidence, one finally tends to reject these as reliable source materials.

To sum up; these and other books discussed but not used as sources, were not utilized not because the facts as such were being questioned. Rather these sources were rejected because their substantiation was either absent or too meagre. This investigation is not afraid of facts, favorable or unfavorable; what it has constantly sought is to have these facts stand or fall on reasonably objective evidence, preferable that evidence which can be checked. To answer the query that these less documented books are no less valid if the allegations contained in these can be found to be substantiated in other books, the only answer which can be given and the most obvious is why not use adequately validated sources in the first place.

Therefore, to satisfy the requirements of scholarship and objectivity, additions will be made in the notes at the end of each chapter. These notes will indicate additional sources, those already discussed, which will parallel the discussions in the several chapters in Marshall and Blanchard.

Chapter I

On July 19, 1870, the Vatican Council convened by Pope Pius IX adjourned leaving in the fundamental law of the Catholic Church the Constitution Pastor Aeternus, First Dogmatic Constitution On The Church of Christ. (1) This document is made up of an introduction which states the general purpose and four chapters, each of which treats of a particular pronouncement.

The introduction, being a statement of purpose, says that the *raison d'être* of this Pastor is that it is felt necessary by the Catholic Church to state clearly the doctrine of the Universal Church for all the faithful to observe, since the Church was given this divine responsibility by Christ Himself. The preamble says that

"...We, therefore, for the preservation, safe-keeping, and increase of the Catholic flock, with the approval of the Sacred Council, do judge it to be necessary to propose to the belief and acceptance of all the faithful, in accordance with the ancient and constant faith of the Universal Church, the doctrine touching the institution, perpetuity and nature of the sacred Apostolic Primacy, in which is found the strength and solidity of the entire Church; and at the same time to proscribe and condemn the contrary errors so hurtful to the flock of Christ.

Chapter I of this Pastor concludes with the following canon:

(Canon) If anyone, therefore, shall say that Blessed Peter the Apostle was not appointed the Prince of the Apostles and the visible head of the whole Church Militant, or that the same directly and immediately received from the same our Lord Jesus Christ a primacy of honour only, and not of true and proper jurisdiction; let him be anathema.

Chapter II concludes with this canonical thought:

(Canon) If, then, anyone shall say that it is not by the institution of Christ the Lord, or by divine right, that Blessed Peter has a perpetual line of successors in the primacy over the universal Church; or that the Roman Pontiff is not the successor of Blessed Peter in this Primacy; let him be anathema.

Chapter III of this Pastor will form the main focus of this discussion about the Church because an analysis of this and other chapters will indicate the following conclusion: this Pastor, for the purposes of this investigation, may be considered at least one source of the political power which the Church arrogates for itself. This assertion will justify itself as this discussion proceeds.

Chapter III declares that:

Hence We teach and declare that by the appointment of our Lord the Roman Church possesses a sovereignty of ordinary power over all other Churches, and that this power of jurisdiction of the Roman pontiff, which is truly episcopal, is immediate; to which all, of whatsoever rite and dignity, both pastors and faithful, both individually and collectively, are bound, by their duty of hierarchical subordination and true obedience, to submit, not only in matters which belong to faith and morals, but also in those that appertain to the discipline and government of the Church throughout the world; so that the Church of Christ may be one flock under one supreme pastor, through the preservation of unity, with the Roman pontiff. This is the teaching of Catholic truth, from which no one can deviate without loss of faith and of salvation.

The third paragraph of this same chapter asserts that this power of the Supreme Pontiff is not to the prejudice of the power of the Bishops and lesser echelons of authority, but rather that this power constitutes the protection and the strength of the Church.

The fourth paragraph states that the Pope enjoys direct and free communication in governing the universal Church with all pastors of this Church, in order that they (the pastors under Papal jurisdiction) "may be taught and ruled by him (the Pope) in the way of salvation." It is also condemned in the latter part of this same paragraph as heresy the notion that the government of the universal Church depends upon the assent of the power of the State. Paragraph five states that, since Christ Himself appointed Peter and his successors as rulers over the universal Church, the Pope has the consequent right to be the supreme judge of the faithful⁽²⁾ in all cases pertaining to the Church; the Pope is the last appeal; (3) and that there is no authority greater than the Pope and consequently, his judgment cannot be reviewed. (4) Therefore, those who claim that the Pope's judgments are reviewable by an ecumenical council are wrong. This chapter concludes with the canon: (5)

(Canon) If then any shall say that the Roman pontiff has the office merely of inspection or direction, and not full and supreme power of jurisdiction over the universal Church, not only in things which relate to the discipline and government of the Church spread throughout the world; or assert that he possesses merely the principal part, and not all the fullness of this supreme power; or that this power which he enjoys is not ordinary and immediate, both over each and all the Churches and over each and all pastors of the faithful; let him be anathema.

Chapter IV of this Pastor states that the Pope, as the successor to Peter, is infallible when he, the Pope, teaches ex cathedra, that is, when he speaks on matters of faith and morals, as well as in connection with problems of the discipline

of the Church. He, the Pope, cannot err because Christ promised Peter, in Matthew 16:18, that such would not occur. Since all the popes have descended from Peter, this promise in Matthew applies also to the present pope and to all future Popes. This chapter continues with statements based on previous Church councils that Christ promised to found a Church with Peter as the first head, ^{and} (5) that, consequently:

the Roman Catholic Church enjoys supreme and full primacy and pryncedom over the whole Catholic Church, (6)

and that, lastly,

The Roman Pontiff is the true Vicar of Christ, and the head of the whole Church and the father and teacher of all Christians. (7)

This chapter continues with several assertions, all based on previously valid Church sources, that bishops, singly and in synod, may indicate to the pontiff dangers which threaten the Faith, that a pope may, by summoning synods and councils, take such action as is needed to repair any damage done to the Faith, and that the holy Doctors have asserted that the See of Peter must remain inviolable if It is to continue to be the repository of Faith, according to the promise made by Christ. It is here that the doctrine of Papal Infallibility is defined: (8)

Therefore, faithfully adhering to the tradition received from the beginning of the Christian faith, for the glory of God our Saviour, the exaltation of the Catholic religion, and the salvation of Christian people, with the approval of the sacred council, we teach and define that it is a dogma divinely revealed: that the Roman Pontiff, when he speaks ex cathedra, that is, when, in discharge of the office of pastor and teacher of all Christians, by virtue of his supreme

Apostolic authority, he defines a doctrine regarding faith or morals to be held by the universal Church, is, by the divine assistance promised to him in Blessed Peter, possessed of that infallibility with which the divine Redeemer willed that His Church should be endowed in defining doctrine regarding faith or morals; and that, therefore, such definitions of the Roman pontiff are of themselves, and not from the consent of the Church irreformable. (9) But is anyone---which may God avert!---presume to contradict this our definition, let him be anathema.

Before beginning a critical analysis of this document and its ramifications with respect to the theory and practice of American democracy, it is thought best to first to posit several definitions, all from the Roman Catholic frame of reference, of terms which are to be found in this Pastor. This is necessary because, unless the Catholic sense of these definitions be understood the impact caused by the collision of Roman Catholic political philosophy will be lost.

The first of these is "ordinary jurisdiction" which is defined by Catholic authority as (10)

Ordinary jurisdiction is one which is exercised by the holder, not by reason of any delegation, but by virtue of the office which he himself holds... Jurisdiction is immediate when its possessor stands in direct relation to those with whose oversight he is charged.

Another one, that of "supremacy" is reaffirmed in the Code of Canon Law, promulgated by Benedict XV in his Bull, Providentissima Mater Ecclesia, May 27, 1917, and also explained by the Reverend Doctor S. Woywod's treatise, A Practical Commentary On The Code Of Canon Law, vol. I, p. 85 (Cannn 218). This dual rôle of 'supremacy' and 'infallibility' is further explained by Cardinal Merry del Val in his The Truth

Of Papal Claims, that both terms are practically the same, and that if 'supremacy' be accepted, the acceptance of 'infallibility' logically follows. He says: (11)

Had anyone the right to say that the Pope, who, by virtue of his supremacy, is the ultimate court of appeal in matters of faith, is mistaken, that person would also have the right to disobey him, and this right to disobey him would put an end to the supremacy.

The doctrine of infallibility is defined by this same cardinal as claiming for the Holy Father freedom from error only when he speaks as head of the Holy Church in matters of faith and morals. This infallibility does not apply to personal peccability or to the pontiff's competence or opinions outside his jurisdiction which is that of maintaining inviolate the Faith of Christ as revealed to Peter and the Apostles and passed down to successive popes through the Primacy of Peter.

Morality is defined by the Catholic Encyclopedia as:

...human conduct in so far as it is freely subordinated to the ideal of what is right and fitting. This ideal governing our free actions is common to the race. (12)

Ethics is defined as

...the science of the moral rectitude of human acts in accordance with the first principles of natural reason. (13)

Now that a few basic definitions have been indicated, the remaining task will be to orient the philosophy as found in this Pastor to the concepts of American democracy as indicated in the Constitution and in the writings of leaders in the development of American political thought.

To begin with, the acceptance of this Constitution is

binding. Thus Papal Constitutions are :

ordinations issued by the Roman pontiffs and binding those for whom they are issued, whether they be for all the faithful or for special classes or individuals. the binding force of pontifical constitutions, even without the acceptance of the Church, is beyond question. (14)

Thus speaks the Catholic Encyclopedia. It will be noticed that nothing new is proposed in this Constitution; what is enunciated, to all intents and purposes, is the sum and substance of all previous doctrines, if the words 'in accordance with the ancient and constant faith of the universal Church' are to be taken on their face value. The very provision that this Constitution cannot be questioned and must be accepted is indicative of the extreme authoritarian character of this Pastor, as well as the previous papal citations on which this Pastor is based.

This Constitution must be accepted, not by reason of the fact that it comes from a source of authority which derives its powers from the consent of the governed, but solely from the fact that its author being the Pope, and being free from error in matters of faith and morals, so wills it. Since there is no appeal from the decision(s) of a pontiff, as has been previously been demonstrated, and since he is accountable to no one, and since his power of supremacy and infallibility is coterminous with himself---that is, since his supremacy comes out of the very nature of his office, such a pronouncement is necessarily authoritarian. It does not take into account differences of opinion and extenuating circumstances, nor does it recognize the element of the impact of cultural changes and

the inherent instability of mores.

In Chapter IV is found the definition of Infallibility. Now, this doctrine of infallibility is a theological conception in that it claims for the pope immunity from error while speaking as head of the Church on matters of faith and morals. To this doctrine is subtly added the doctrine of supremacy which claims for the pontiff supreme authority in those matters concerning faith and morals not covered by infallibility. The Pastor clearly states that what the pope teaches under infallibility and also under supremacy must be accepted. To justify this state of affairs, Cardinal Merry del Val in his same book, The Truth of Papal Claims, claims that, as the Supreme Court of the United States is final in all questions of law, so is the Pope, too, final in all questions of law (faith and morals).

This analogy is not only poor but extremely naive. The Supreme Court of the United States is composed of jurists who are appointed by an executive, with the advice and consent of the Senate, who is himself elected by the population through proper channels. In other words, even if our highest judicial authority from which there is no appeal be at the top of our governmental pyramid, the authorization for the very existence of this authority comes from the bottom of this same pyramid, the electorate. The Pope, on the other hand, is responsible to no one, he is his own law and makes it as he sees fit. He cannot be removed, censured, or criticized.

Charles C. Marshall, in his authoritative book makes an excellent point with reference to papal infallibility and supremacy when he says:

Latin theology keeps the dogma of infallibility within the realm of the unknown---'...in the twilight until wanted in the glare.' The pope is speaking infallibly if he is speaking ex cathedra, and he is speaking ex cathedra when he is speaking as Pastor Aeternus with the intention of teaching infallible truth. If his utterance does not expressly declare itself as infallible the infallible intent may be gathered from the matter or from the occasion of the utterance (C.E., vol. vii, p. 796 b, c.). Thus, referring to certain teaching in the Bull Unam Sanctam, of Pope Boniface VIII and its status in matter of infallibility, the Catholic Encyclopedia (vol. xii, p. 266c) says: "This declaration, even if it be not one of those portions of the Bull in which the pope is defining a point of faith (i.e., defining infallibility)" is so clearly connected with the parts expressly stated to possess such character that it is held by theologians to be theologically certain..." (15)

In other words, anything that the Pope may say as the official head of the Church must be accepted even if what is being said or a part of it be not an essential part of that which the Pope is defining as infallible. This is explained on the grounds that the words 'faith' and 'morals' are never specifically defined and delimited. Consequently, even the most ordinary dialectical skill can bring almost any activity under the heading of either. A good example of this manner of thinking is from Cardinal H. E. Manning, who said:

Now I may be asked, why should the Holy Father touch on any matter of politics at all? For this plain reason; because politics are a part of morals. What the moral law of the Ten Commandments is to the individual, politics are to society. Politics are nothing more than the morals of society---the collective morality of Christian men united together under social law... Politics are morals on the widest scale. (16)

Here is what the Catholic Encyclopedia has to say with reference to morality and religion: (17)

The Church has ever affirmed that the two are essentially connected, and that apart from religion the observance of the moral law is impossible.

It is obvious here that the Catholic Church is using 'religion' and 'morality' in its own very restricted sense. Who defines the content of religion and who delimits the meaning of moral law?

Again the Catholic Encyclopedia speaks: (18)

Faith and morals in a very special sense are the domain of the Church; within their limits she must have independent, sovereign power and be able to discharge autonomously her most sacred duties.

It is significant that in the above statement the extent of 'limits' can mean what the Church wishes it to mean. Where does the 'limit' of the Church's competency end with regard to faith and morals, when the sense of these words and their meaning is constantly subjected to adaptation to the situation as the Church sees it at any given moment?

Just before the adoption of the Pastor Aeternus, Lord Acton had this to say about this document: (19)

It makes civil legislation on all points of contact, marriage, education, clerical immunities, mortmain, even on many questions of taxation and Common Law, subject to the legislation of the Church, which would be simply the arbitrary will of the Pope. Most assuredly no man accepting such a code could be a loyal subject or fit for the enjoyment of political privilege.

It is clear that the implications of this Pastor are disturbing. The Pastor affirms the supremacy of the Church over

the State in matters resulting from a penumbra of both institutions. The claims of this document are made in perpetuity and apply to all Churches for all time, despite the fact that for many years the Eastern Church and some of the Western Church repudiated this very assertion. The Pastor further claims that its doctrinal pronouncements are "in accordance with the ancient and constant faith of the universal Church" (20) yet this was repudiated by parts of Christendom and also by some prominent theologians. The Reverend Doctor J.J.I. von Döllinger was excommunicated for denying this assertion (21); Lord Acton denied it but was not excommunicated because Pius IX did not quite dare: Lord Acton was far too prominent a Catholic and equally superior as a scholar to be bludgeoned into sophomoric acceptance of that which appeared to him as impossible of acceptance. Even the good and famous Cardinal Gasquet admitted that Lord Acton was "the most erudite man of his day." (22)

Now it is clear that these eminent churchmen, living at the time of the Pastor, did not recognize the doctrinal pronouncements of this document as in accordance with the ancient faith. Obviously those who lived before the promulgation of this document could not have known it, so this document becomes, necessarily so, retroactive in its command and submission. This Pastor makes it binding on faith that these doctrines, even if not infallible, were made under the authority of supremacy and, therefore, have the force of infallibility. Lord Acton expressed this thought very clearly when he said:

...Catholics will be bound, not only by the will of future Popes, but by that of former Popes, so far as it had been solemnly declared. They will not be at liberty to reject the deposing power, or the system of the Inquisition, or any other criminal practice or idea which has been established under penalty of excommunication. (23)

Lord Acton further substantiates in his Correspondence that Pope Pius V approved of the plan to murder Queen Elizabeth, (24); that Pius V declared "that he was willing to spare a culprit guilty of a hundred murders rather than a single notorious heretic" (25); that the same Pius V assured the king of France that the lives of the Huguenots should not be spared because of their offenses against God (26); that Gregory XIII, when informed about the Massacre of Saint Bartholemew, ordered a jubilee in thanks to God that He might give the king of France aid and strength in continuing his work, (27); and that Urban II claimed that "the killing of excommunicated persons no murder if done from religious zeal only." (28) Whether or not Lord Acton submitted ex animo to the Pastor is a question which only Lord Acton himself knew. He may have accepted them pro forma as Cardinal Gasquet points out but the Cardinal is extremely selective in his letters because the material quoted above does not appear in Cardinal Gasquet's compilation of 'facts' designed to prove that Lord Acton accepted the Pastor in the totality with which was required of its acceptance. (29)

Perhaps the final touch of authoritarianism in connection with the primacy of the Pope is to be found in a sermon delivered by Cardinal Manning at the Pro-cathedral of Kensington

in 1868, where the Cardinal represents the pope as saying the following: (30)

I say I am liberated from all civil subjection; that my Lord made me the subject of no one on earth, king or otherwise; that in His right I am sovereign. I acknowledge no civil superior; I am the subject of no prince; and I claim more than this: I claim to be the supreme judge on earth, and director of the consciences of men---of the peasant that tills the field, and the prince that sits on the throne---of the household that lives in the shade of privacy, and the legislature that makes laws for kingdoms. I am the sole last supreme judge on earth of what is right and wrong. Your progress is departure from Christian civilization; in that path you may have many companions, but me you will not find.

Even the most unsophisticate can see the danger of complete authoritarianism in this frank and unabashed statement.

It will now be the task of this chapter to examine in detail the philosophy of this Pastor and to determine whether or not the thoughts contained therein are compatible to established American political doctrine.

The one dominant theme in this Pastor is the concept of sovereignty but in the Roman Catholic sense, obviously. Now this sovereignty is losing much of its terror and significance especially when it is considered that, in the light of contemporary socio-political events, there is little evidence that absolute sovereignty exists. While it may be true that such a concept may still play a part in the politics of today, the trend seems to be in the direction of de-emphasizing this claim and re-emphasizing cooperation and mutual association. However, this concept of sovereignty is still of paramount importance to the thinking of the Roman Catholic Church. In fact, it is this

concept which appears to be the foundation-stone of the whole political structure of the Church.

Before this theory of sovereignty in the Roman sense can be discussed, there first must be an understanding of just exactly what this concept means from the strictly secular sense. One definition of this term, conceded to be one of the most concise is that of President Lincoln who said that sovereignty was a "political community without a political superior." (31) This concept is further defined by the Century Dictionary.

It is essential to the modern conception of sovereignty that it should be exclusive of any other human superior authority, should be wielded by a determinate person or organization of persons, and should be on the whole habitually obeyed by the bulk of the community. (32)

This concept is also defined by Dunning "as the supreme and supereminent power of doing what pertains to the spiritual and bodily welfare of the members of the State." (33) Now in the case of the United States, the State is sovereign in the sense that its controlling power is vested in "the Civic Primacy of its People---from which the government is derived and by the consent of which its authority exists." (34) There is no other power above this civic sovereignty and any other power, spiritual or secular, which would arrogate for itself this same sovereignty must, perforce, collide with the sovereignty of the State.

On the other hand, the Catholic position with regard to this problem is this: Roman sovereignty, too, is characterized by a government but its powers are not derived from its members

nor does this sovereignty rule by virtue of the consent of its members. It amounts to a sovereignty by Divine right; it arrogates for itself not only the rights of a church community but also rights of a political community. When the modern democratic state claims for itself the same political rights which the sovereignty of the Church equally claims, serious clashes inevitably result. The prime difference between these two claims is that one derives its power from those whom it governs, and the other governs by powers which it claims are conferred on it by God and to which God it alone is responsible. The clash is obvious especially when it occurs in a country such as the United States which has a tradition of self-government and civic initiative.

To return to the Pastor and to compare the concept of sovereignties will constitute the remaining task of this chapter.

In the formal decree of the Pastor Aeternus is found the brass concept of Roman Catholic sovereignty which claims for itself as represented by the Pope, and to which all members owe allegiance in matters of faith and morals and to the government of the Church throughout the world, under the pain of loss of salvation. Conscience and prior allegiance to the State are not accepted, and while this is mentioned in ^{the} Roman doctrine of the supremacy of conscience, yet the Pastor clearly states that to ^sdisobey will result in eternal damnation. To all intents and purposes, the rôle and the dignity of the human conscience, so

important a base of our political thinking, is completely ignored. This is very clearly expressed by Marshall when he says:

Under such conditions the power to exercise the individual conscience is obviously paralyzed, and the sovereignty of the Church is in no real sense qualified by the freedom of the individual conscience. Further, it is a sovereignty, in the belief of its members, superior to the State in matters belonging to morals if there is a conflict between the Church and the State. (35)

This Catholic position with respect to sovereignty had its beginnings in the Medievalism of old. In theory, at least, in the Middle Ages, the Church and State were coterminous; one was a prerequisite for the other and one aided and abetted the other. This notion came about as a result of the idea of unity resulting when a state declared itself "Christian" state. The unity was more apparent when this "Christian" state functioned through two Christian rulers, the Catholic ruler and the Pope. J. N. Feggis has an interesting observation with regard to this union of Church and State when he says:

'The Holy Roman Empire, however shadowy its power, was, so long as men made it an aim to work for, a testimony to the most important characteristic of political thought till the close of the seventeenth century---the belief in the intimate connection of politics and religion. The ideal of the Empire, with Christ as its King and His two vicegerents upon earth, was that of a theocracy. This is the explanation of the otherwise strange fact, that men should ever have believed in so unworkable a theory, as that of two equal heads of the State. Christ is the real head of the Empire, and Pope and Emperor are both conceived rather as executors armed from above with administrative powers than as themselves ultimate authorities.' (36)

However, perhaps a more pointed statement on this problem comes

from Lord Bryce, when he said:

'Both Papacy and Empire rose in an age when the human spirit was prostrated before authority and tradition, when the exercise of private judgment was impossible to most and sinful to all. Those who believed the miracles recorded in the Acta Sanctorum, and did not question the Psuedo-Isidorian decretals, might well recognize as ordained of God the twofold authority of Rome, founded, as it seemed to be, on so many texts of Scripture, and confirmed by five centuries of undisputed possession. Both sanctioned and satisfied the passion of the Middle Ages for Unity.' (37)

This theory of the coterminosity of these two powers was known as the theory of the Two Powers under one State. The trouble arose when these two powers collided in matters which affected both of these powers, matters which arose because of the essential twofold nature of man, physical and moral, temporal and spiritual. This claim of the superiority of the Spiritual power over the temporal based on the belief that the prime purpose and end of One is on a far higher level of importance than the other, reached its zenith in the person of one Pope Boniface VIII who, in 1302, declared in his Bull Unam Sanctam, and which the Catholic Encyclopedia sums up, as follows:

(38)

- '(1) Under the control of the (Roman) Church are two swords, that is two powers, the expression referring to the medieval theory of the two swords, the spiritual and the secular...
- (2) Both swords are in the power of the (Roman) Church; the spiritual is wielded in the (Roman) Church by the hand of the clergy; the secular is to be employed for the (Roman) Church by the hand of the civil authority, but under the direction of the spiritual power.

- (3) The one sword must be subordinated to the other; the earthly power must submit to the spiritual authority, as this has precedence of the secular on account of its greatness and sublimity; for the spiritual power has the right to establish and guide the secular power, and also to judge it when it does not act rightly. When, however, the earthly power goes astray, it is judged by the spiritual power; a lower spiritual power is judged by a higher, the highest spiritual power is judged by God.
- (4) This authority, although granted to man, and exercised by man, is not a human authority, but rather a Divine one, granted to Peter by Divine commission and confirmed in him and his successors. Consequently, whoever opposes this power ordained of God opposes the law of God... 'Now, therefore, we declare, say, determine and pronounce that for every human creature it is necessary for salvation to be subject to the authority of the Roman pontiff.'

Obviously, this unlimited sovereignty as alleged by Catholic doctrine presumes, and logically so if the initial premises are accepted, that coercion can and will be used to enforce this dogma. That force, -physical force- has been used can be demonstrated and even today it is taught:

The question has been raised whether it be lawful for the (Roman) Church, not merely to sentence a delinquent to physical penalties, but itself to inflict these penalties. As to this, it is sufficient to note that the right of the (Roman) Church to invoke the aid of the civil power to execute her sentences is expressly asserted by Boniface VIII in the Bull Unam Sanctam. (39)

The qualification, with reference to this terrifying statement, and the defence most used for those who would question this statement is that such would only apply to a country which is completely Roman Catholic in spirit. While that may be true, what is being discussed is the fallaciousness of a theory and not the practicability of its application. The application

would follow just as soon as there appeared on the scene sufficient power to implement it.

Even the Angelic Doctor Saint Thomas Aquinas taught that:

'...The Church no longer hoping for his conversion, looks to the salvation of others, by excommunicating him and separating him from the Church, and furthermore delivers him to the secular tribunal to be exterminated thereby from the world by death.' (40)

Here is a crass example of the Church securing for itself the sovereign right of shedding blood in the case of those who would dare disagree with her dicta.

However, it is interesting to note just exactly what the Catholic Encyclopedia has to say on this same subject concerning the Church's right in using force in maintaining her doctrinal supremacy: (41)

'...present-day legislation (of the Roman Catholic Church) against hersy has lost nothing of its ancient severity; but the penalties on heretics are now only of the spiritual order; all other punishments which require the intervention of the secular arm have fallen into abeyance.'

It is interesting to note, as Marshall points out, that the word 'abeyance' is used instead of 'abolished' or some other word which would indicate that such reliance of the secular arm was no longer approved. Instead, is found a word, which, according to the Century Dictionary, is defined as a "state of suspended action or existence, or temporary inactivity." Again reference is made to the theory of the Two Powers; it is not only a question of the Church's arrogating to itself complete temporal as well as spiritual power in a nation which is predominantly Catholic, it is also the question that to the Church

these are objective and inherent rights and, in the case wherein a nation is not essentially Catholic, the Church will assume this power position just as soon as it secures for itself the position of a religious majority.

In order that the question of the modern applicability of this assertion of the Church might be parried, note should be taken of what the manual of instruction used by the Brothers of the Christian Schools has to say: (42)

'211. Which are the temporal penalties that the Pope may inflict? Public penances, fines, exile, detention, etc.

212. Which are the marks of the Pope's power in the (Roman) Church?

The Pope's power is: A plenary power. In things of ecclesiastical right, there is nothing that the Pope may not do when necessity demands it;

2nd. A supreme power. The Pope has no superior here below; he is subject to God alone;

3rd. A universal power, extending to all, pastors and faithful;

4th. An ordinary power, that is, a power inherent in the very dignity of Sovereign Pontiff, and not an accidental power derived by delegation or commission;

5th. An immediate power, which he may exercise over all, either in his own person directly, or through delegates appointed by him.' (cf. Pastor, chapter iii)

Particular attention should be paid to the fourth statement in the above quotation. It will be seen that at once there is a hopeless struggle between the theory and practice of American democracy which posits as its main thesis that, what ever may have been the genesis of the State as a concept, our own state is nothing more than the sum of the powers allocated to it by those who comprise it and who give it form. If the

above conception were adopted, (and there is sound reason to believe that such is the intention of the Church) obviously this and any other government which has for its activating principle the sovereign-primacy of its citizens would be denied existence.

This Roman claim of sovereignty has been a consistent doctrine, and has enjoyed the patronage of the Church's highest authorities. (43) It will be shown later that this same doctrine is as applicable today as it was in 1250 when Pope Innocent IV said that not only did Christ establish a pontifical but also a royal sovereignty (14); in addition, this doctrine is found in the Pastor when it says that 'We teach and declare that by the appointment of our Lord the Roman Church possesses a sovereignty'; Leo XIII in his Immortale Dei (1885) says that 'The Almighty has appointed the charge of the human race between two powers, the ecclesiastical and the civil, the one being set over divine, the other over human beings. Each in its kind is supreme...' Leo XIII continues this line of thinking in his Letter Sapientiae Christianae, on the Chief Duties of Christians as Citizens. (1890), when he says: (44)

But the supreme teacher in the Church is the Roman Pontiff. Union of minds, therefore, requires, together with a perfect accord in the one faith, complete submission and obedience of will to the Church and to the Roman Pontiff, as to God Himself. This obedience should, however, be perfect, because it is enjoined by faith itself, and has this in common with faith, that it cannot be given in shreds;---nay, were it not absolute and perfect in every particular, it might wear the name of obedience, but its essence would disappear.

The Holy See has always condemned those who have taught that:

...coercive jurisdiction of every kind belongs to the civil power alone, and sought to restrict the Church to the use of moral means...

The Roman Church has consistently taught that it has: (45)

received from God power, not merely to direct by counsel and persuasion, but further to command by laws, and to coerce and compel the delinquent and contumacious by external and salutary penalties...

This Church also claims that: (it) (46)

'...is not dependent on the permission of the State for her existence, but holds her charter from God.'

'...there is a fallacy in the assertion that the Church is a spiritual society; it is spiritual as regards the ultimate end to which all its activities are directed, but not as regards its present constitution not as regards the means at its disposal. (47)

So much for the official pronouncements of the Roman Catholic Church on the subject and definition of sovereignty. Obviously there can be no limit to this power of the Pope because he is the judge of his own pronouncements. The Pope is not limited by tradition, nor is he necessarily limited by the law of nature or the dicta of the Fathers because it is contained in the Pastor the provision that: (48)

'the existence of tradition has nothing to do with evidence, and that objections taken from history are not valid when contradicted by ecclesiastical decrees. Authority must conquer history.'

Marshall sums up this whole problem when he says: (49)

By this sovereignty the Church of Rome is distinguished from other churches. The latter impart their instruction to members as opinion. The instruction of the Pope is imparted to Roman Catholics as law, according to an article of faith. The instruction in the one case

is human opinion; in the other it is sovereign and divine law de fide. Herein is the point of conflict between the Roman Church and the modern State; in the Roman Church, absolute monarchy de fide, the mind and the will of one; in the State, democracy, a synthesis of free wills, government by the consent of the governed, with the right of ultimate appeal to the community. Thus in the modern State two sovereignties exist, that of the State and that of the Roman Church, claiming jurisdiction in certain points over the same matters. (Here Marshall quotes the noted Catholic writer and apologist Hilaire Belloc)

'The Catholic Church is in its root principle at issue with the Civic definition both of freedom and of authority. For the purpose of the State, religion is either a universally admitted system, or a matter of individual choice. But by the definition which is the very soul of Catholicism, religion must be for the Catholic First, a supreme authority superior to any claims of the State...'
(50)

It is admitted that much time has been spent in delineating this problem of sovereignty not only from a secular point of view but also from the Roman Catholic point of view. The reason for this will be more obvious as this investigation unfolds, but this much can be said: all that will be said in the remaining chapters of this investigation cannot be clearly understood unless the historicity of this Catholic problem of sovereignty, and its place in modern Roman Catholic political thought be understood. If the case for Catholicism has overshadowed that of Democracy as known and practiced in the United States, it is because of the format of this Part. The defence of the democratic concept will follow upon the analysis of Leo's two Letters, using them as points of departure.

A word of caution is felt necessary here: It is not intended to give American Democracy any degree of pontifical

certainty or infallibility just because it is being used as a basis of comparison to Roman politics and sociology. It is to be understood that the practices of Roman Catholicism collide with any type of government which bases its genesis, whole or in part, on the consent of the governed. Therefore, let it be understood that this investigation is not inferentially at least imputing to Democracy, in the only form under which it has seen Democracy operate but not necessarily the only form in which it (Democracy) can work, the very authoritarianism for which the Roman Catholic Church is being tasked.

References

Chapter I

N.B. Unless otherwise indicated the term 'Catholic Church' means the Roman Catholic Church, as far as this investigation is concerned.

The Pastor Aeternus is reproduced in its entirety in Marshall, pp. 347-357.

1. Marshall, Charles C. The Roman Catholic Church In The Modern State, Dodd, Mead & Co., N.Y., New and enlarged edition, 1931
2. Ibid, pp. 60-61
3. Ibid, p. 61
4. Ibid, p. 61
5. Ibid, p. 61
6. Ibid, Appendix I, p. 354, #17
7. Ibid, p. 354, #18
8. Ibid, p. 356
9. Ibid, p. 356, #23
10. Ibid, p. 61-62, #12
11. Ibid, p. 65
12. Ibid, p. 67, #18
13. Ibid, p. 67, #19
14. Ibid, p. 57, #1
15. Ibid, p. 66, #17
16. Ibid, p. 3, #4
17. Ibid, p. 3, #5
18. Ibid, p. 4, #7
19. Ibid, pp. 67-68, #21

20. Ibid, pp. 68-69
21. Ibid, p. 69, #22
22. Ibid, pp. 69-70, #23
23. Ibid, p. 71, #28
24. Ibid, pp. 71-72, #30
25. Ibid, p. 72, #31
26. Ibid, p. 72, #32
27. Ibid, p. 72, #33
28. Ibid, p. 72, #35
29. Ibid, p. 72, #36
30. Ibid, pp. 74-75, #42
31. Ibid, p. 17, #3
32. Ibid, p. 17, #3
33. Ibid, p. 17, #3
34. Ibid, p. 19
35. Ibid, p. 21, #11
36. Ibid, pp. 22-23, #12
37. Ibid, pp. 22-23, #12
38. Ibid, pp. 23-25, #16
39. Ibid, pp. 27-28, #20
40. Ibid, pp. 28-29, #24
41. Ibid, p. 29
42. Ibid, pp. 29-30, n.
43. Ibid, p. 30, #27, 28
44. Ibid, p. 31, #30, 31, 32
45. Ibid, p. 32

46. Ibid, p. 32
 47. Ibid, p. 32, #33
 48. Ibid, p. 35, #42
 49. Ibid, pp. 36-37, #44a
 50. Ibid, p. 37, #45

* * * * *

Suggested Collateral Readings

Catholicism And The American Mind, Winfred Ernest Garrison, Willett, Clark and Colby, 440 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Illinois, 1928. Chapter III

The Catholic-Protestant Mind, Some Aspects of Religious Liberty in the United States, Conrad Henry Moehlman, Ph.D. Harper & Bros., New York, London, 1929. Chapter IV

Our Fathers Faith And Ours - A Comparison Between Protestantism and Romanism, David S. Schaff, D.D., Second Edition, G.P. Putnam's Sons, New York & London, 1928. The Knickerbocker Press. It is difficult to cite individual chapters of this very excellent treatment because the whole book is extremely germane to this whole problem. This book is by far the best of its kind. It is written without malice or bitterness of any kind. It is a scholarly and thoroughly documented study.

For an excellent discussion of Papal Infallibility see Chapter XV

Chapter II

Before beginning a detailed analysis of this very important Encyclical Letter of Leo XIII, it is felt necessary first to introduce some clarification of the doctrinal position of this and other Letters. At the outset, the Reverend Dr. John A. Ryan wrote the following statement with reference to the relevance of this Letter:

The most authoritative doctrine that we possess regarding the nature, authority, and object of the State, and the relations that should subsist between the State and the Church. (1)

It will now be necessary to appraise exactly what the Catholic Encyclopedia has to say with regard to the authority of Encyclical Letters: (2)

In modern times, usage has confined the term almost exclusively to certain papal documents which differ in their technical form from the ordinary style of either Bulls or Briefs, and which in their superscription are explicitly addressed to the patriarchs, primates, archbishops, and bishops of the Universal Church in communion with the Apostolic See.

From the nature of the case encyclicals addressed to the bishops of the world are generally concerned with matters which affect the welfare of the Church at large. They condemn some prevalent form of error, point out dangers which threaten faith or morals, exhort the faithful to constancy, or prescribe remedies for evils foreseen or already existent.

Although it is only during the last three pontificates that the most important utterances of the Holy See have been given to the world in the shape of encyclicals, this form of Apostolic Letter has long been in occasional use. (3)

As for the binding force of these documents it is generally admitted that the mere fact that the pope should have given to any of his utterances the form of an encyclical does not necessarily constitute it an ex cathedra statement and invest it with infallible

authority. The degree in which the infallible magisterium of the Holy See is committed must be judged from the circumstances, and from the language used in the particular case. (4)

It is clear from the above that an Encyclical may be issued under the authority of infallibility and that it may also be issued under the cloak of supremacy. In the last analysis, any Encyclical is binding on obedience and acceptance. This conclusion is based on an article in America, the well-known Catholic journal, which said, with respect to the force of Papal Encyclicals, that:

'...a Papal Encyclical invariably demands from Catholics, first, respect, in view of the source from which it emanates, and next absolute obedience...Hence the genuine Catholic at once yields respect and obedience.(5)

So much for the doctrinal importance of an Encyclical.

Since this and other encyclicals can be found in the Appendix, all references which will be made will refer to the original document(s). This is felt necessary because of the need of exactitude in quotations.

1. The long-continued and most bitter war waged against the divine authority of the Church has reached the culmination to which it was tending, the common danger, namely, of human society, and especially of the civil power on which the public safety chiefly reposes.
3. Wherefore, being, by the favor of God, entrusted with the government of the Catholic Church, and made guardian and interpreter of the doctrines of Christ, We judge that it belongs to Our jurisdiction, Venerable Brethren, publically to set forth what Catholic truth demands of every one in this sphere of duty; thus making clear also by what way and by what means measures may be taken for the public safety in so critical a state of affairs.

4. In every association and community of men necessity itself compels that some should hold pre-eminence; lest society deprived of a prince or head, by which it is ruled, should come to dissolution and be prevented from attaining the end for which it was created and instituted.
5. Indeed, very many men of more recent times, walking in the footsteps of those who in a former age assumed to themselves the name of philosophers, say that all power comes from the people; so that those who exercise it in the State do so not as their own, but as delegated to them by the people, and that by this rule, it can be revoked by the will of the very people by whom it was delegated. But from these Catholics dissent, who affirm that the right to rule is from God, as from a natural and necessary principle.
6. It is of importance,...that those who may be placed over the State may in certain cases be chosen by the will and decision of the multitude, without opposition to or impugning of the Catholic doctrine. And by this choice, in truth, the ruler is designated, but the person by whom it is to be exercised is determined upon.
7. There is no question here respecting forms of government, for there is no reason why the Church should not approve of the chief power being held by one man or by more, provided only it be just, and that it tend to the common advantage. Wherefore, so long as justice be respected, the people are not hindered from choosing for themselves that form of government which suits best either their own disposition, or the institutions and customs of their ancestors. (7)
8. But as regards political power, the Church rightly teaches that it comes from God, for it finds this clearly testified in the Sacred Scriptures and in the monuments of antiquity; besides, no other doctrine can be conceived which is more agreeable to reason, or more in accord with the safety of both princes and peoples.
9. In truth, that the source of human power is in God the books of the Old Testament in very many places clearly establish.(et sq.)

10. The Fathers of the Church have taken great care to proclaim and propagate this very doctrine in which they had been instructed. 'We do not attribute,' says St. Augustine, 'the power of giving government and empires to any but the true God.' (et.sq.)
11. And indeed nature, or rather God Who is the author of nature, wills that man should live in a civil society;...But now, a society can neither exist nor be conceived in which there is no one to govern the wills of individuals, in such a way as to make, as it were, one will out of many, and to impel them rightly and orderly to the common good; therefore God has willed that in a civil society there should be some to rule the multitude. But no man has in himself or of himself the power of constraining the free will of others by fetters of authority of this kind. This power resides solely in God, the Creator and Legislator of all things; and it is necessary that those who exercise it should do it as having received it from God. (8)
12. Those who believe civil society to have risen from the free consent of men, looking for the origin of its authority from the same source, say that each individual has given up something of his right, and that voluntarily every person has put himself into the power of the one man in whose person the whole of those rights has been centered. But it is a grave error not to see, what is manifest, that men, as they are not a nomad race, have been created, without their own free will, for a natural community of life. It is plain, moreover, that the agreement which they allege is openly a falsehood and a fiction, and that it has no authority to confer on political power such great force, dignity, and firmness as the safety of the State and the common good of the citizens require.
13. Whence it will behoove citizens to submit themselves and to be obedient to rulers, as to God, not so much through fear of punishment, as through respect for their majesty; nor for the sake of pleasing, but through conscience, as doing their duty.
14. (Biblical quotations; c.f. original document)
15. The one only reason which men have not for obeying is when anything is demanded of them which is openly repugnant to the natural or divine law, for it is

equally unlawful to command and to do anything in which the law of nature or the will of God is violated. If, therefore, it should happen to any one to be compelled to prefer one or the other, viz., to disregard either the commands of God or those of rulers, he must obey Jesus Christ, who commands us to 'give to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's (Matt.xxii.21), (et sq) And yet there is no reason why those who so behave themselves should be accused of refusing obedience; for if the will of rulers is opposed to the will and the laws of God, they themselves exceed the bounds of their own power and pervert justice; nor can their authority then be valid, which, when there is no justice, is null. (9)

21. But afterwards, when Christian rulers were at the head of States, the Church insisted much more on testifying and preaching how much sanctity was inherent in the authority of rulers. Hence, when people thought of pryncedom, the image of a certain sacred majesty would present itself to their minds, by which they would be impelled to greater reverence and love of rulers.
23. On the other hand, the theories of the body politic invented by late writers have already produced great ills amongst men, and it is to be feared that they will cause the very greatest disasters to posterity. For an unwillingness to attribute the right of ruling to God, as its author, is no less than a willingness to blot out the greatest splendor of political power and to destroy its force. (10) And they who say that this power depends on the will of the people err in opinion first of all: then they place authority on too weak and unstable a foundation. For the popular passions, incited and goaded on by these opinions, will break out more insolently; and, with great harm to the common weal, descent headlong by an easy and smooth road to tumults and to open sedition. From this heresy there arose in the last century the false philosophy---a new right as it is called, and a popular authority, together with an unbridled license which many regard as the only true liberty. Hence we have reached the limit of horrors, to wit, Communism, Socialism, Nihilism, hideous deformities of the civil society of men and almost its ruin.
24. It is therefore necessary to seek a higher and more reliable reason for obedience, and to say explicitly that legal severity cannot be efficacious unless men

are led on by duty, and moved by the salutary fear of God. But this is what religion can best ask of them, religion which by its power enters into the souls and bends the very wills of men, causing them not only to render obedience to their rulers, but also to show their affection and good will, which is in every society of men the best guardian of safety.

25. For this reason the Roman Pontiffs are to be regarded as having greatly served the public good, for they have ever endeavored to break the turbulent and restless spirit of innovators, and have often warned men of the danger they are to civil society. To princes and other rulers of the State we have offered the protection of religion, and we have exhorted the people to make abundant use of the great benefits which the Church supplies.

26. All things that are of a civil nature the Church acknowledges and declares to be under the power and authority of the ruler: and in things thereof for different reasons the decision belongs both to the sacred and to the civil power, the Church wishes that there should be harmony between the two so that injurious contests may be avoided. (11)

So much for the major paragraphs of this Letter.

It will be seen at the outset that the distillate of this Letter will be found in quotation 11. Using this particular citation as a point of departure, several questions suggest themselves.

This paragraph makes the initial assertion that nature through God ordained that man should live in a civil society. This dictum is nothing new for Aristotle observed that 'man is by nature a political animal.' (12) As a matter of fact the one characteristic of this Letter and others like it is the fact that political and social pronouncements are made in such a manner as to give the impression that the Church was the initial author and progenitor of them when, in most cases, the reverse

is true: the Church merely reiterates what is already too commonly known. The above observation is a case in point.

Now there is no question in the mind of any responsible political scientist of the necessity of some kind of authority in society; as a matter of fact society is not possible without authority, one cannot be thought of without the other. The question here is not of the necessity of a ruler but rather the source and limitations of the power which this ruler must necessarily possess. The question as to whether the power does or does not come from God is a classical one because, obviously, such would depend upon one's religious philosophy or lack of it.

To continue the analysis of this paragraph, a comment must be made on the thought that no man has the right to take for himself the right to rule others. What this means is that, if a man does rule, he does so from the authority of God and not as an inherent right. Now, if this right resides in God and if God appoints man as temporary custodian of this right, obviously God must use some means visible to man that he might receive this mandate to rule. In paragraph 9 is found the unabashed statement that the source of political power comes from God. If the Catholic Church is the only Church founded by God (13), then the inescapable conclusion follows that all political power (as well as spiritual power) comes from God. This conclusion is very logical for those who either see and are not disturbed or who are blissfully unaware that constantly the Church equates God with the Church and the Church with God. The assumption is,

primarily, that the Church is the official foundation of God. That there may be an honest difference of opinion in this matter, the Church does not allow. Further citations will bear out this assertion.

If the political philosophy of this Encyclical were carried into practice, the result would be a theocracy. Now, a theocracy is a system of government whose regulating principle is based on some particular theology. It is not necessary that clerics participate directly in government, they can participate indirectly by the very fact that they (the Clergy) form the court of last appeal in all matters of state. Obviously, it would not be necessary for the Church to participate actively in government if her authority and decisions formed the court of first and last instance in all matters pertaining to government.

It is the claim of democratic political tradition that the authority to rule primarily resides in those who wish to be ruled and that this power given to individuals to exercise for the common good can be taken away by force if necessary, if it becomes apparent to the citizenry that the powers allocated to their rulers are being used in a manner dangerous to the common welfare. (14) This the Catholic Church denies but denies in such wise as to give the impression that what it would advocate is far superior to that which it would destroy. This is apparent in paragraphs 8, 9, 11, 12 and 13. In other words, the Church says this: Man cannot rule other men in and of his own powers but only so through God Who is the first and last source of all

power. Since God established the only Church on earth with Peter as its first head, only this Church (God) can lead men to their salvation.

Even though the Church recognizes in paragraph 26 that there are affairs of a purely civil nature, yet the Church's assertion of competence in all matters pertaining to faith and morals can be made to cover even this civil area because of the fact that there is no strict interpretation of these two terms. Faith and morals constitute what the Church wishes them to mean at any given historical moment. It is obvious that in their state of undelimitation the Church can wield more power than if these were specifically defined. In other words, a theocracy which this Letter would envisage and political democracy as it is known and practiced in the United States would hopelessly clash because the Church would arrogate for itself the right and the prerogative of deciding when such a condition existed. Obviously, in a conflict between the Church and the State, it is the Church which decides the outcome of the Contest. (15)

It is interesting to note the treatment the Church meted out to those of her allegiance who dared to disagree with her ideas of a despotic theocracy.

It seems that the Papal empire had reached its zenith up to the death of the Emperor Frederick II in 1250, a position which the Papacy enjoyed largely through the efforts of Innocent III. But with the death of Boniface VIII, the Papacy fell from its position of power just as the temporal arm of the Church-

State, or, perhaps more exactly, the State-Church, fell with the death of Frederick II. (16) During the half century in which these Two Powers struggled for supremacy, the result was "disaster to both, and both entered the valley of humiliation." After this struggle, the Church turned its attention to the struggle of the democratic principle which was still evident in the Church. These theories of democracy had been developed by St. Thomas Aquinas, Dante, and Marsilius of Padua.

Here is what the Catholic Encyclopedia has to say about the teaching of Dante: (17)

a single supreme temporal monarchy as the empire is necessary for the well-being of the world, that the Roman people acquired universal sovereign sway by Divine right, and that the authority of the emperor is not dependent upon the pope, but descends upon him directly from the fountain of universal authority, which is God.

This doctrine obviously strikes a democratic note in that it says that the emperor's authority comes directly from God and not via the Pope, and that it states that the people are the source of government. The Church showed her displeasure by putting Dante's De Monarchiâ on the Index, after having burned it publicly in Bologna. (18)

Marsilius of Padua had attached himself to the Emperor Lewis the Bavarian who had, in turn, entered into a bitter struggle with Pope John XXII. As a result of this struggle between a secular and a papal power, Marsilius published his famous The Defensor Pacis, from which the following quotation is taken: (19)

We declare that according to the Truth and to the opinion of Aristotle, the Lawgiver, ... the primary, essential and efficient source of law, is the People, that is the whole body of citizens or a majority of them, acting of their own free choice openly declared in a general assembly of the citizens and prescribing something to be done or not done in regard to civil affairs under penalty of temporal punishment. I say a majority, taking account of the whole number of persons in the community over which the law is to be exercised.

[(It makes no difference)] whether the whole body of citizens or its majority acts of itself immediately or whether it entrusts the matter to one or more persons to act for it. Such person or persons are not and cannot be the Lawgiver in the strict sense, but only for a specific purpose and at a given time and on the authority of the primary lawgiver.

Concerning the treatment of heretics and dissenters in general, Marsilius says: (20)

I say that no one has the right to coerce the heretic or other infidel by any penalty or punishment, real or personal, so far as his status in this life is concerned.

St. Thomas, on the other hand, taught that all kings ruling over Christian peoples ought to subject themselves to the Pope as they themselves do to Jesus Christ Himself; that "the necessary effect in the medieval state of the excommunication by the Pope of a secular ruler was to release subjects from civil authority and to make void oaths of allegiance;" (21) and that the State was obliged to exterminate all the heretics which the Church had turned over to it, thus supporting the authority of the Church. (22)

It is noteworthy to examine what Dunning has to say about the teaching of Aquinas on the relation of Church and State: (23)

Hence, while the king is supreme in temporal affairs, these must be directed to the higher end, and to this

extent he is subject to the priest under the law of Christ.

The instant that the Church declares him (the secular ruler) excommunicated for apostacy, his subjects are ipso facto released from his authority, and their oaths of allegiance lose all binding force.

Emerton says that: (24)

The political doctrines of Aquinas work out, therefore, to the ultimate supremacy of the papal government over all the civil authorities of Christendom.

Obviously the Church could not tolerate Marsiglio; him she excommunicated; she also showed little sympathy for the theories of Dante, but Aquinas she canonized and made his system of philosophy the official philosophy of the Catholic Church to be taught in all schools of theology and philosophy. In fact, Leo XIII penned an Encyclical Letter Aeterni Patris which says just that. It therefore is clear that there is no reason to believe that the Church would be any more tolerant in the times of Leo XIII and his Civil Government that it was in the times of old.

This Letter of Leo runs counter to the theory and practice of American political democracy on another count, and this count is in the area of particular law, the law of the Church or Canon Law, Corpus juris canonici. As Marshall phrases it:

(25)

Government, in the State, is an institution of divine authority, yet its forms, and the persons who administer it, all originate from the people. But in the Roman Church the forms of government, and the persons who administer it, do not so originate. By alleged Divine Revelation the Pope is supreme, and by him the forms of government, and the persons who administer it, are determined.

With respect to Canon Law, the Encyclopedia says: (26)

Canon law is the body of laws and regulations made by or adopted by ecclesiastical authority, for the government of the Christian organization and its members.

Canon law may be divided into...Divine Law...based on the nature of things and on the constitution given by Jesus Christ to His Church; and human or positive law, formulated by the legislator, in conformity with the Divine law. (27)

However, the most sweeping statement of all is to be found again in the Catholic Encyclopedia, of which the following is an abridgement: (Marshall) (28)

The sources of...positive ecclesiastical law are essentially the episcopate and its head, the pope...The pope, as head of the episcopate, possesses in himself the same powers as the episcopate united with him...In proportion as the administration of the Church became centralized, the intervention of the Popes in legislation became more and more marked...They are the fruitful source of Canon law; can abrogate all laws made by predecessors or Councils, legislate for the whole Church or for a part, for a particular country, or for individuals. The Pope is not legally obliged to obtain the consent of any person or persons; is limited only by Divine Law, natural and positive, dogmatic and moral. He is the living law, having all law in the treasury of his heart...From the earliest ages the letters of the Roman Pontiffs constitute, with the canons of the councils, the principal element of Canon Law.

In this statement are found several statements which definitely are at sharp variance with democracy; as a matter of fact all of them are.

At the outset, there is an identification and a very dangerous one, between the Pope and his office; the Pope and his office are one and the same thing. This amounts to the dictum L'état c'est moi, only in this case, the saying should be changed to La loi c'est moi. This means that the law which the

Pope promulgates comes from himself; this means that the source of law comes from him who makes it. This concept runs sharply into conflict with our recognized philosophy of law which has for its source the needs of society, usages, and custom. Such a papal philosophy of law would have no other check than its promulgator; he alone would be the judge of the kind of law needed. Along with the Papal doctrine of Infallibility and Supremacy, it is easy to see that such law would amount to nothing more or less than Papal dictatorship.

This same Pope is responsible only to himself in matters of this law; he may abrogate previous law, and whatever body of law he draws upon is the law as promulgated either by himself or his predecessors. Clearly, then, there is no appeal or check on this law.

Here is what the Catholic Encyclopedia has to say about the limitations of the Pope, (Cardinal Hergenröther) (29)

'The pope is circumscribed by the consciousness of the necessity of making a righteous and beneficent use of the duties attached to his privileges...He is also circumscribed by the spirit and practice of the Church, by the respect due to General Councils and to ancient statutes and customs, by the rights of bishops, by his relation with civil powers, by the traditional mild tone of government indicated by the aim of the institution of the papacy--to feed--and finally by the respect indispensable in a spiritual power towards the spirit and mind of nations.

The Pope's office is to explain and interpret the law. His interpretation alone has the force of law. He remains master of the law. He can suppress it either totally or partially. (30)

The Pope is subordinated to none save Christ alone. He is the supreme teacher as he is the supreme ruler, but

his powers do not extend to matters that are extrinsic to the Church. (Note: this means little when it is realized that it is the Pope who decides what matter is or is not extrinsic to the Church.) (31)

The Pope can dispense individuals from the obligation of all purely ecclesiastical laws, and can grant privileges and exemptions in their regard. (32)

Finally Pope Gratian, the 'true founder of the science of canon law,' says that: (33)

They (the Popes) are above all the laws of the Church, and can use them according to their wish; they alone judge and cannot be judged.

According to the above revealing statements it is not difficult to see just exactly how our system of political democracy would survive in such an environment of legal dictatorship. The Constitution and all that it stands for would be speedily abrogated; its provisions for speedy and reasonably impartial court-trials would be endangered; but the most basic consideration of all that has made the United States what it is in spite of all its failures is that our law, if the Roman philosophy of law should prevail, would be coterminous with the judges who would dispense it. There again would be found that fatal identification of law with the one who sits in judgment and not, as in the case of American law, a separation of law and the one empowered to dispense it. Law, at least in the American sense, has always meant that body of customary usages which in the past have been found workable but which may be changed by lawfully stipulated means. This law has represented, in the last analysis, the accretion of social usages which originally came from the interaction of peoples. Furthermore, this law has always

recognized the essentially evolutionary character of society and that the body of law must adjust itself to this slow but evident evolution. This is evident by the frequent reversals of the Supreme Court.

The obvious conclusion of this chapter must be, therefore, that the political philosophy expressed in the Encyclical examined runs sharply into conflict with the theory and practice of American political democracy.

References

Chapter II

1. Marshall, op.cit., p. 89, #3
2. Ibid, p. 89, #4
3. Ibid, p. 89, #5
4. Ibid, pp. 89-90, #6
5. Ibid, p. 90, #7
6. Cf. ch. II, 2
7. Italics in original
8. Ibid
9. Ibid
10. Ibid
11. Ibid
12. Aristotele, Politics, pp. 54-55, The Modern Library, 1943
13. A CATECHISM OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE, Revised Edition of the Baltimore Catechism, No. 3. St. Anthony Guild Press, Patterson, New Jersey, 1941 and 1949, with the Imprimatur of Bishop Boland, Bishop of Paterson, October 31, 1948., pp. 115-132.
14. a. The Constitution And What It Means, Edward S. Corwin, p. 1, #2
b. The Federalist, The Modern Library, 1937, p. 173
15. Marshall, op.cit. p. 47
16. Ibid, p. 160, #34
17. Ibid, p. 161, #36
18. Ibid, p. 165, #44
19. Ibid, pp. 162-163, #37
20. Ibid, p. 163, #39

21. Ibid, p. 164, #42
22. Ibid, pp. 164-165, #43
23. Ibid, p. 164, #42
24. Ibid, p. 164, #42
25. Ibid, p. 169
26. Ibid, p. 169, #53
27. Ibid, pp. 169-170, #54
28. Ibid, pp. 172-173, #62
29. Ibid, pp. 171-172, #61
30. Ibid, p. 173, #63
31. Ibid, p. 173, #64
32. Ibid, p. 173, #65
33. Ibid, pp. 173-174, #66, 67

* * * * *

Suggested Collateral Readings

The Catholic-Protestant Mind, Conrad Henry Moshlman,
op.cit. Chapter V

Our Fathers Faith and Ours, David S. Schaff, op.cit.,
Chapters XIV, XXVIII, XXIX this is a very meaty chapter
which repays careful reading, XXXI this chapter of
Casuistry and Probabilism is the key to this whole problem
of Rome versus modern democracy, and Chapter IX for the
disturbing Roman doctrine of the death penalty to heretics.

Chapter III

Attention now is directed to an analysis of another of Leo's letters, Immortale Dei, or The Christian Constitution Of States.

At the outset, that this document constitutes the most authoritative statement with regard the Church and State relations is plain from the opinion expressed by the Reverend Doctor John A. Ryan when he said:

The most authoritative doctrine that we possess regarding the nature, authority, and object of the State, and the relations that should subsist between the State and the Church. (1.)

It now becomes necessary to list and examine salient points of this Letter in much the same manner as before. (2)

1. And in truth, whenever the Church has set her foot, she has straightway changed the face of things, and has attempered the moral tone of the people with a new civilization, and with virtues before unknown. All nations which have yielded to her sway have become eminent for their culture, their sense of justice, and the glory of their high deeds. (3)

3. It is not difficult to determine what would be the form and character of the State were it governed according to the principles of Christian philosophy. Man's natural instinct moves him to live in civil society, for he cannot, if dwelling apart, provide himself with the necessary requirements of life.... But as no society can hold together unless some one be over all, directing all to strive earnestly for the common good; every civilized community must have a ruling authority, and this authority, no less than society itself, has its source in nature, and has, consequently, God for its author. Hence it follows that all public power must proceed from God. Everything, without exception, must be subject to Him,... so that whosoever holds the right to govern, holds it from one sole and single source, namely, God, the Sovereign Ruler of all. There is no power but from God. (Rom. xiii. 1.)

4. The right to rule is not necessarily, however, bound up with any special mode of government. It may take this or that form, provided only that it be of a nature to insure the general welfare.
5. Then truly will the majesty of the law meet with the dutiful and willing homage of the people, when they are convinced that their rulers hold authority from God, and feel that it is a matter of justice and duty to obey them, and to show them reverence and fealty, united to a love not unlike that which children show their parents. Let every soul be subject to higher powers. (Rom. xiii. 1.)

To despise legitimate authority, in whomsoever vested, is unlawful, as a rebellion against the divine will, and whoever resists that, rushes willfully to destruction. He that resisteth the power resisteth the ordinance of God, and they that resist purchase to themselves damnation. (Rom. xiii. 2.)
 To cast aside obedience, and by popular violence to incite to revolt, is therefore treason, not against man only, but against God.

6. As a consequence, the State, constituted as it is, is clearly bound to act up to the manifold and weighty duties linking it to God, by the public profession of religion. Nature and reason, which command every individual devoutly to worship God in holiness, because We belong to Him and must return to Him since from Him We came, bind also the civil community by a like law. Since, then, no one is allowed to be remiss in the service due to God, and since the chief duty of all men is to cling to religion in both its teaching and practice---not such religion as they may have a preference for, but the religion which God enjoins, and which certain and most clear marks show to be the only one true religion---it is a public crime to act as though there were no God. (4)
 All who rule, therefore, should hold in honor the holy name of God, and one of their chief duties must be to favor religion, to protect it, to shield it under the credit and sanction of the laws, and neither to organize nor enact any measure that may compromise its safety. This is the bounded duty of rulers to the people over whom they rule.
7. Now, it cannot be difficult to find out which is the true religion, if only it be sought with an earnest and unbiased mind; for proofs are abundant and

striking.

13. The Almighty, therefore, has given the charge of the human race to two powers, the ecclesiastical and the civil, the one being set over divine, and the other over human things, Each in its kind is supreme, each has fixed limits within which it is contained, limits which are defined by the nature and special object to the province of each, so that there is, we may say, an orbit traced out within which the action of each is brought into play by its own native right. But inasmuch as each of these two powers has authority over the same thing---related differently, but still remaining one and the same thing---might belong to the jurisdiction and determination of both, therefore God,....has marked out the course of each in right correlation to the other. For the powers that are, are ordained of God. (Rom. xiii.1.)
14. There must, accordingly, exist, between these two powers, a certain orderly connection, which may be compared to the union of the soul and body in man.
17. In such an organization of the State, there is nothing that can be thought to infringe upon the dignity of rulers, and nothing unbecoming them; nay,....it adds to it permanence and luster. Indeed, when more fully pondered, this mutual co-ordination has a perfection in which all other forms of government are lacking, and from which excellent results would flow, were the several component parts to keep their place and duly discharge the office and work appointed respectively for each.
18. In political affairs, and all matters civil, the laws aim at securing the common good, and are not framed according to the delusive caprices and opinions of the mass of the people, but by truth and by justice; the ruling powers are invested with a sacredness more than human, and are withheld from deviating from the path of duty, and from overstepping the bounds of rightful authority; and the obedience of citizens is rendered with a feeling of honor and dignity, since obedience is not zervitude of man to man, but submission to the will of God...
23. Sad it is to call to mind how the harmful and lamentable rage for innovation which rose to a climax in the sixteenth century, threw first of all into confusion the Christian religion, and next, by natural sequence, invaded the precincts of philosophy

whence it spread amongst all classes of society. From this source, as from a fountain-head, burst forth all those later tenets of unbridled license which, in the midst of the terrible upheavals of the last century, were wildly conceived and boldly proclaimed as the principles and foundation of that new jurisprudence which was not merely previously unknown, but was at variance on many points with not only the Christian, but even the natural law.

24. Amongst these principles the main one lays down that as all men are alike by race and nature, so in like manner all are equal of their life; that each one is so far his own master as to be in no sense under the rule of any other individual; that each is free to think on every subject just as he may choose, and to do whatever he may like to do, that no man has any right to rule over other men. In a society grounded upon such maxims, all government in nothing, more nor less than the will of the people, and the people, being under the power of itself alone, is alone its own ruler.
25. The authority of God is passed over in silence, just as if there were no God; or as if He cared nothing for human society;...or as if there could be a government of which the whole origin and power and authority did not reside in God Himself. And since the populace is declared to contain within itself the spring-head of all rights and of all power, it follows that the State does not consider itself bound by any kind of duty towards God...Moreover, it believes that it is not obliged to make public profession of any religion; or to inquire which of the very many religions is the only one true; or to prefer one religion to all the rest; or to show to any form of religion special favor; but, on the contrary, is bound to grant equal rights to every creed, so that public order may not be disturbed by any particular form of religious belief.
26. And it is a part of this theory that all questions that concern religion are to be referred to private judgment; that every one is to be free to follow whatever religion he prefers; or none at all if he disapprove of all. From this the following consequences flow: that the judgment to each one's conscience is independent of all law; that the most unrestrained opinions may be openly expressed as to the practice or omission of divine worship and that every one has unbounded license to think whatever

he chooses and to publish whatever he thinks.

31. The sovereignty of the people, however, and this without any reference to God, is held to reside in the multitude; which is doubtless a doctrine exceedingly well calculated to flatter and to inflame many passions, but which lacks all reasonable proof, and all power of insuring public safety and preserving order.

To hold therefore that there is no difference in matters of religion between forms that are unlike each other, and even contrary to each other, must clearly leads in the end to the rejection of all religion in both theory and practice.

32. So, too, the liberty of thinking, and of publishing, whatsoever each likes, without any hindrance, is not in itself an advantage over which society can wisely rejoice. On the contrary, it is the fountain-head and origin of many evils. Liberty is a power perfecting man, and hence should have truth and goodness for its object. But the character of goodness and truth cannot be changed at option. These remain ever one and the same, and are no less unchangeable than Nature herself.

A State from which religion is banished can never be well regulated; and already perhaps more than is desirable is known of the nature and tendency of the so-called civil philosophy of life and morale. The Church of Christ is the true and sole teacher of virtue and guardian of morals. (5)

34. Doctrines such as these, which cannot be approved by human reason, and most seriously affect the whole civil order. Our predecessors the Roman Pontiffs (well aware of what their apostolic office required of them) have never allowed to pass uncondemned. Thus Gregory XVI in his Encyclical Letter Mirari vos, of date August 15, 1832, inveighs, with weighty words against the sophisms, which even at his time were being publicly inculcated--namely, that no preference should be shown for any particular form of worship; that it is right for individuals to form their own personal judgments about religion; that each man's conscience is his sole and all-sufficient guide; and that it is lawful for every man to publish his own views, whatever they may be, and even to conspire against the State.

35. From these pronouncements of the Popes it is evident

that the origin of public power is to be sought for in God Himself, and not in the multitude, and that it is repugnant to reason to allow free scope for sedition. Again, that it is not lawful for the State, any more than for the individual, either to disregard all religious duties or to hold in equal favor different kinds of religion; that the unrestrained freedom of thinking and of openly making known one's thoughts is not inherent in the rights of citizens and is by no means to be reckoned worthy of favor and support. In matters, of mixed jurisdictions, it is in the highest degree consonant to nature, as also to the designs of God, that so far from one of the powers separating itself from the other, or still less coming into conflict with it, complete harmony, much as is suited to the end for which each power exists, should be preserved between them.

36. This then is the teaching of the Catholic Church concerning the constitution and government of the State. By the words and decrees just cited, if judged dispassionately, no one of the several forms of government is in itself condemned, inasmuch as none of them contain anything contrary to Catholic doctrine, and all of them are capable, if wisely and justly managed, to insure the welfare of the State. Neither is it blame-worthy in itself, in any manner, for the people to have a share greater or less, in the government: for at certain times, and under certain laws, such participation may not only be of benefit to the citizens, but may even be of obligation. The Church, indeed, deems it unlawful to place the various forms of divine worship on the same footing as the true religion, but does not, on that account, condemn those rulers who, for the sake of securing some great good or of hindering some great evil, allow patiently custom or usage to be a kind of sanction for each kind of religion having its place in the State. And in fact the Church is wont to take earnest heed that no one shall be forced to embrace the Catholic faith against his will....
39. Therefore, when it is said that the Church is jealous of modern political systems, and that she repudiates the discoveries of modern research, the charge is a ridiculous and groundless calumny.
41. As regards opinion, whatever the Roman Pontiffs

have hitherto taught, or shall hereafter teach, must be held with a firm grasp of mind, and, so often as occasion requires, must be openly professed. (6)

49. But in matters purely political, as for instance the best form of government, and this or that system of administration, a difference of opinion is lawful. Those, therefore, whose piety is in other respects known, and whose minds are ready to accept in all obedience the decrees of the Apostolic See, cannot in justice be accounted as bad men because they disagree as to subjects We have mentioned; and still graver wrong will be done them, if---as We have more than once perceived with regret---they are accused of violating, or of wavering in, the Catholic faith.

The first paragraph represents the classical Catholic interpretation of history not only used by this and other Pontiffs but, equally unfortunate, by Catholic scholars. It amounts to the belief that where history and divine authority clash, it is history which must give way. Cardinal Newman said with reference to this problem, referring to:

'doctrines which lie beyond the direct evidence of history'

that:

'the immediate motive in the mind of a Catholic for his reception of them is, not that they are proved to him by Reason or by History, but because Revelation has declared them by means of that high ecclesiastical Magisterium which is their legitimate exponent. (7)

It is clear that the Magisterium referred to is the Pope; hence for Newman, as for any Catholic, authority (the Church) takes precedence over history or in politics or over any discipline, for that matter. Obviously, such would mean that all disciplines would have to be vassals of Catholicism or cease to exist altogether. It is clear that the logical and justifiable

extension of this doctrine would mean that American political democracy would have to bow to Catholicism or perish.

Item three contains the thought that, since man is instinctively a social being, man, therefore, needs some authority. The like is true of society, it too must need some authority. But authority comes from God and all rulers who do rule, do so by reason of an authority coming from God. All that may be true but the fact remains that the essence of American philosophy holds, while it does not deny the place of God in the scheme of things, it does insist that the power to rule resides in the electorate directly.

However, the items which bear most directly on this problem are these: 6, which treats of the relation of the Church to the State; 13, which treats of the 'two powers'; 23, which treats of the 'new jurisprudence'; and 31, which reflects the Catholic opinion of 'religious toleration.' It is in this order that these items will be dismissed.

The first, item six, says, among other things that the State ought to favor the Catholic church and religion by adopting it as the only recognized religion. Such a provision runs directly into Constitutional and State opposition in the guise of prohibitions on both levels keeping these two powers separated. (8) In other words, according to this Letter, men would be denied the privilege of freedom from religion as well as freedom of religion. However, freedom from the Catholic point of view, amounts to a questionable 'freedom' to do what has been

already decided what can or ought to be done: the only freedom is that of accepting. Of course, the meaning of 'religion' as it is used here and elsewhere is the Catholic religion, just as church means the Roman Catholic Church, and just as God is meant, inferentially at least, in terms of the Catholic Church. Since the Catholic Church is the only church founded by God, the tendency is to think of one in terms of the other.

In terms of political philosophy, this provision of Leo XIII would amount to a papal dictatorship because, once any political system denies to men the liberty to think (and that means, too, the privilege of making many mistakes, perhaps foolish ones or even tragic ones,) any semblance of democracy atrophies and dies. From this dictum, this papal dictatorship would naturally spread to other fields of human endeavor. Deny a man the right to question the relative values of one religion as against those of another, or deny a man the right of freedom from religion (wrong though he may be), the result is not a free and unfettered spirit but a sniveling and obsequious shell of a spiritless human shape. It will be noticed that here as well as in other places how the Church intrudes in matters which are purely political. This can be done because of the latitude of meaning of the terms 'faith' and 'morals.' This is what the famous Dr. Ryan has to say about this particular problem:

Since the State is by far the most important of the secular societies to which man belongs, its obligation to recognize and profess religion is considerably

greater and stricter than is the case with the lesser societies. And the failure of the State to discharge this obligation produces evil results of corresponding gravity. It exhibits in most extensive proportions the destructive power of bad example. (9)

Clearly, then, such a provision would seriously endanger the present state of religious freedom (partial though not yet complete) which obtains in the United States at the present time.

The next item to be discussed is the famous but by no means new theory of the 'two powers' or the theory of the Church and State as the Roman Catholic Church sees it. Leo XIII is very diplomatic or cautious here; it is one thing to say that there are two powers and that each has its own area and influence and that the two of them ought to operate. What Leo very carefully omits is this: in an area of conflict, who decides the outcome? The Catholic Church, obviously. Who decides in the event of a choice between the Church and the State? Again the Church, as has been pointed out before. Again this is political doctrine foisted under the guise of Papal infallibility and Supremacy. It constitutes (this and other Letters as well) a direct interference with the rights of sovereignty of this or any other country whose system of government does not meet with the approval of Rome.

Item 23 discusses this 'new jurisprudence' which the Church again condemns because it constituted nothing more than an open break with the then traditional thinking. The condemnatory assertions here are nothing more than assertions

with no proofs offered. Obviously, these will be believed by the initiated. The political ramifications, again, are very serious from the point of view of political democracy. A regime whose head can make assertions which are not and cannot be subjected to criticism, analysis or even to complete rejection constitutes a police state.

The last item to be examined is that one which very cleverly equates the irresponsible mobocracy which no responsible democracy advocates with the freedom of peoples to choose their own religion or even to reject it. This is a particularly dangerous and unprincipled form of smear-technique. The idea is to link that which is obviously in disrepute with that which is not desirable for partisan reasons. That it works is shown by many statements in this very letter where responsible liberalism is linked to irresponsible license and mobocracy.

The rest of this Letter discusses, in the main, the theory (and what amounts to a concerted objective) that the Catholic religion ought to be made the official religion of this and any other country.

Here is what Dr. Ryan has to say, with regard to the probability of this coming about: (10)

In the long run and with sufficient enlightenment, truth will be sufficiently mighty to prevail by its own force and momentum, but its victory can be greatly hastened by judicious assistance from the State.

What is truth here? The Church, obviously.

Again Dr. Ryan:

'...It is not impossible to know which religion is the

right one, inasmuch as the Church of Christ comes before men with credentials sufficient to convince all those who will deliberately examine the evidence with a will to believe. (11)

Here again is the closed reasoning; while it may be true that the Church comes forward with her credentials, these are not to be questioned but must be accepted only on the self-styled assertion of authority of the one presenting them. Such a claim would immediately collide with any semblance of independence of thought or integrity of sovereignty.

The closing observation of this chapter is a quotation from this Letter: (12)

Yet, though all this is true, it would be very erroneous to draw the conclusion that in America is to be sought the type of the most desirable status of the Church, (cf. the Letter Longinque Oceani, Catholicity In The United States, by Leo XIII) or that it would be universally lawful or expedient for State and Church to be; as in America, dissevered and divorced. The fact that Catholicity with you is in good condition, nay, is even enjoying a prosperous growth, is by all means to be attributed to the fecundity with which God has endowed His Church, in virtue of which unless men or circumstances interfere, she spontaneously expands and propagates herself; but she would bring forth more abundant fruits if, in addition to liberty, she enjoyed the favor of the laws and the patronage of public authority.

In substance, this means that America did not accomplish her rise to eminence through the freedoms and the privileges which are here through her particular philosophy or system of government but did so only because of the Church. Such is unmitigated arrogance as well as the shearest nonsense. The Catholic Church here is directly interfering with the sovereign rights and dignity of the United States by stating that the rights which the

United States Constitution afford her are not enough, and that the Church feels that the laws and public authority ought to give the Church full and unlimited freedom. This 'freedom' as has been shown before, would amount to a complete marriage between Church and State with the consequent loss of not a few but all of our freedoms and rights which through the past years have been so dearly bought in blood. Thomas Jefferson once said: (13)

I consider the government of the United States as interdicted by the Constitution from intermeddling with religious institutions, their doctrines, discipline or exercises.....I do not believe it is for the interest of religion to invite the civil magistrate to direct its exercises, its discipline, or its doctrines..... Every one must act according to the dictates of his own reason, and mine tells me that civil powers alone have been given to the President of the United States and no authority to direct the religious exercises of his constituents.--

and,

Reading, reflection and time have convinced me that the interests of society require the observation of those moral precepts only in which all religions agree (for all forbid us to murder, steal, plunder, or bear false witness) and that we should not intermeddle with the particular dogmas in which all religions differ, and which are totally unconnected with morality. The varieties in structure and action of the human mind as in those of the body, are the work of our Creator, against which it cannot be a religious duty to erect the standard of uniformity. The practice of morality being necessary for the well-being of society, he has taken care to impress its precepts so indelibly on our hearts that they shall not be effaced by the subtleties of our brain. We all agree in the obligation of the moral precepts of Jesus. (14)

References

Chapter III

1. Marshall, op.cit., p. 88
2. Vide supra, Chapter VI
3. Marshall, p. 91
4. Italics mine, A.G.R.
5. Ibid
6. Ibid
7. Marshall, p. 91, #9
8. The Constitution of The United States, Amendments I and II
9. Marshall, p. 116
10. Ibid, p. 122
11. Ibid, pp. 122-123
12. Ibid, p. 125
13. On Democracy, Thomas Jefferson, p. 115
14. Ibid, p. 116

Suggested Collateral Readings

Separate Church And State Now, Joseph Martin Dawson,
Richard R. Smith, New York, 1948. Chapters VI, VII, XI

Our Fathers Faith And Ours, David S. Schaff, op.cit.
Chapters III, VIII, XXIX.

Chapter IV

It will be the task of this chapter to summarize this Part and also to draw on more contemporary material relating to the problem under discussion.

It is the opinion of Part I that the political philosophy of the Roman Catholic Church from the time of Leo XIII to the present collides unmistakably with the theory and practice of American Democracy. This collision takes on a very definite form in the Catholic attitude against those who would differ or oppose her theocratic aims. In the days when the Church and State were one, anyone who dared to oppose the Church was outlawed from society and, in most cases, executed by the civil arm, which arm was under the jurisdiction of the Church. This chapter will demonstrate that this Roman attitude has not changed.

This is what the Pastor of Leo XIII says about this theory of outlawry;

'...The only-begotten Son of God established on earth a society which is called the Church, and to it He handed over the exalted and divine office which He had received from His Father, to be continued through the ages to come.....This society is made up of men, just as civil society is, and yet is supernatural and spiritual,...hence it is distinguished and differs from civil society, and what is of the highest moment, it is a society chartered as of right divine, perfect in its nature and in its title, to possess in itself and by itself, through the will and loving kindness of its Founder, all needful provision for its maintenance and action. ()

Again Leo XIII: (2)

Whatever, therefore, in things human is of a sacred character, whatever belongs either of its own nature or by reason of the end to which it is referred, to the salvation of souls, or to the worship of God, is subject to the power and judgment of the Church. Whatever is to be ranged under the civil and political order is rightly subject to the civil authority.

Again Leo XIII, but this time in his Annum Sacrum, as quoted by Pius XI: (3)

The Empire of Christ extends not only over Catholic peoples and over those who, reborn in the font of Baptism, belong by right to the Church,....it embraces even those who do not enjoy the privilege of the Christian Faith, so that all mankind must be said to be under the dominion of Jesus Christ. (3)

Pope Pius XI in his Encyclical Letter Mortalium Animos affirmed the doctrine that those who choose not to enter the temple of God (the Roman Catholic Church, obviously) or those who decided to leave it would become a stranger to all hope for salvation. (4) He also said that 'whoever is not under the protection of the Pope shall be overcome' in an address to some Maltese pilgrims; (5); in Pius XI's Letter Ubi Arcano he affirms that the power of the Pope should not be limited or subjected to any human laws; (6); in his Encyclical Quas Primas is found the statement that the Church should demand 'as her right, a right which she cannot renounce, full liberty and independence from the civil power' (7); in this same Pontiff's Encyclical on Education is found the statement that God conferred on the Church exclusive title and right to educate (8); and that, lastly, in a letter to Cardinal Gasparri, Pius XI said that the Roman Catholic alone is to decide what lies

within the jurisdiction of conscience, and that in a 'Catholic State' liberty of conscience and liberty of expression are to be judged from the point of view of Roman Catholic doctrines and laws. (9) Obviously, those not conforming to Roman Catholic doctrine and law would be outlawed from society.

There is little break in the teaching of such noted theologians as Tarquini (1875), Granderath (1888), De Luca (1898), and Lépicier, all of whom teach that all heretics should be morally outlawed, and, indirectly, that all should be civilly outlawed. These men were all professors of Canon Law at the Gregorian University in Rome, and therefore, all spoke under official and with official approbation. (10) This Lépicier taught that the power to strip heretics of their rights includes that right of life itself; that formal heretics ought to be executed; that this power of executing heretics belongs not only to the Church but also to the State; and that the State ought not to shrink from discussing and facing this teaching out of regard for this modern age. (11)

In the Concordat between Rome and Italy, it is specifically stated that anyone who has incurred the displeasure of the censure of ecclesiastical authorities will be barred from holding any office or position which would bring such an offender in contact with the public. (12) Such a provision is a direct interference with the political affairs of any country and with Italy in particular.

This is what the Reverend Doctor John A. Ryan and the

Reverend Father Moorhouse F. X. Millar in their work The State And The Church have to say with regard to freedom of religion of non-Catholics: (13)

If these are carried on within the family, or in such inconspicuous manner as to be an occasion neither of scandal nor of perversion to the faithful, they may properly be tolerated by the State...Quite distinct from the performance of false religious worship and preaching to the members of the erring sect, is the propagation of the false doctrine among Catholics. This could become a source of injury, a positive menace, to the religious welfare of true believers. Against such an evil they have a right of protection by the Catholic State...If there is only one true religion, and if its possession is the most important good in life for States as well as individuals, then the public profession, protection, and promotion of this religion and the legal prohibition of all direct assaults upon it, becomes one of the most obvious and fundamental duties of the State. (13)

In the pamphlet entitled Freedom of Worship, written by the Reverend Doctor Francis P. Connell, C.S.S.R., S.T.D., with the ecclesiastical approbation by Cardinal Spellman, is found this series of statements: (14)

It is a fundamental Catholic doctrine that Jesus Christ, the true Son of God, in the course of His earthly life established a religious society, which He called His Church

From this it follows that, as far as God's law is concerned, no one has a real right to accept any religion save the Catholic religion, or to be a member of any church save the Catholic Church, or to practice any form of divine worship save that commanded or sanctioned by the Catholic Church.

Such then, is the first Catholic principle relevant to religious liberty - that man has not an unqualified right to practice any religion he may choose. It was in accord with this principle that Pope Pius IX, in his Syllabus of 1864, condemned the proposition: 'Every man is free to embrace and to profess that religion which, guided by the light of reason, he judges

true.' (Denzinger, "Enchiridion," n. 1715)

This objection is based on a misinterpretation of the 'right of conscience.' It is true, one who makes a sincere and sufficient investigation to discover what is right, and is then convinced that he may adopt a certain mode of action, is allowed to act accordingly as far as his subjective dispositions are concerned. Such a person is said to be acting with an invincibly erroneous conscience.

At the same time, he has no real right to perform an action which is in fact sinful, however sincere he may be in judging it lawful. For a genuine right is something objective, based on facts as they actually exist.

Hence, the mere fact that a person sincerely believes a certain religion to be true gives him no genuine right to accept that religion in opposition to God's command that all must embrace the one true religion. Neither does it necessarily oblige others to allow him the unrestricted practice of his religious beliefs.

The Catholic attitude toward non-Catholic religious beliefs is known technically as doctrinal intolerance. To modern ears this expression may have a disagreeable sound, but when understood correctly it signifies nothing else than the logical attitude of mind that any intelligent person takes toward views he knows to be erroneous. (Obviously views not in accord with Catholic doctrine. A.G.R.)

These quotations form only a sample of the rest of this disturbing pronouncement. The doctrine in this article amounts to no more or no less the continuation of the principles set down by the theologians cited previously. This document would have all religions other than Catholic suppressed directly or indirectly. This is indicated in the following quotation from the official CHARTER OF THE SPANISH PEOPLE, FIRST TITLE, First chapter, Sixth Clause:

The profession and practice of the Catholic Religion, which is that of the Spanish State, will enjoy official protection.

Nobody will be molested because of their religious beliefs or the private exercise of their cult. No external ceremonies or manifestations will be permitted except those of the Catholic Religion. (15)

One can very easily see that what is expressed in this document amounts to nothing more than what is advocated in official Catholic circles.

In conclusion, a series of questions and answers, the answers being given by the Reverend Doctor Charles Macksey, sometime Professor of Ethics and Natural Right in the Gregorian University in Rome, will be offered for consideration. Their obvious content and implication needs no comment from anyone so revealing are their purpose. Their source is from the Catholic Encyclopedia, which Marshall quotes: (16)

Does the jurisdiction of the Roman Church cover matters belonging to morals as well as to faith?

The goal, then, of the Church is the perfect supernatural happiness of man; its proximate purpose, to safeguard the internal moral order of right and wrong; and its external manifestation, to care for Divine worship and minister to man the supernatural means of grace.

Where the question is not purely spiritual or moral, but mixed with other elements, who shall decide whether it belongs to the jurisdiction of the Church or the State?

In case of direct contradiction, making it impossible for both jurisdictions to be exercised, the jurisdiction of the Church prevails, and that of the State is excluded.

Through whom is the jurisdiction to be applied?

All the above is matter of principle, argued out as a question of objective right, and it supposes that the jurisdiction is to be applied through the respective subjects of the same. (i.e. the subjects of the Church

and the State)

Who are the subjects of the Roman Church?

The juridical subject of the Church is every human being that has validly received the Sacrament of Baptism.... not every subject of the Church is a member thereof... Hence, these validly baptized Christians who live in schism, or...profess a faith different from that of the Church,...are not members of the Church, though as a matter of objective right and duty they are still her subjects.

Is a State which is made up of citizens partly Roman Catholics and partly those of other beliefs, subject, in objective truth, to the jurisdiction of the Roman Catholic Church?

...A mixed State, one, namely, the constituents of whose moral personality are necessarily of diverse religions, practically lies outside the reach of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, since the affiliation of some of the constituents could not make a subject of the Church out of the moral personality constitutionally made up of elements not all of which share such affiliation. The subordination here indicated is indirect: not that the Church does not directly reach spiritual and mixed matters, but that in their regard it directly reaches only its immediate subjects and indirectly through them the State which they constitute.

Does the Roman Church claim the right to command her members who form part of the State in securing the fulfillment by the State of civil duties owed by the State to that Church?

If...the physical persons constituting the moral person of the State are the subjects of the State are the subjects of the Church, they are still, in this joint capacity, subject to her in like matters, namely, in the fulfillment of all civil duties of the State towards (Roman) religion and the Church. The Church, because of the uselessness of her insistence, or because of greater evils to be so avoided, may waive the exercise of this jurisdiction; but in principle it is hers.

What are the civil duties which the Roman Church claims the State owes it, and which, as a matter of objective truth, the Roman Church ought to obtain from the State?

In principle, as a matter of objective duty, the State is bound to recognize the juridical rights of the Church in all matters spiritual, whether purely so or of mixed character, and its judicial right to determine the character of matters of jurisdiction, in regard, namely, to their spiritual quality.

Do the juridical rights of the Roman Church as a matter of objective right and of theory, demand that the State shall further and protect the Roman Church as the only true Church and religion?

The State, furthermore, is bound to render due worship to God, as follows from the same argument from the natural law which proves man's obligation to external worship, namely, that man must acknowledge his dependence upon God and his subjection to Him in every capacity in which he is so dependent, and therefore not only in his private capacity as an individual but also in that public, corporate capacity whereby he and his fellow citizens constitute the State. Due worship, in the present economy, is that of the religion of Christ, entrusted to the care of the Church.

Do the juridical rights of the Roman Church as a matter of objective right and of theory, demand that the State shall further and protect the Roman Catholic Church in any claim it may make over the moral instruction of children?

The State must also protect the Church in the exercise of her functions, for the reason that the State is bound to protect all the rights of its citizens, and among these their religious rights, which as a matter of fact would be insecure and fruitless were not the Church protected. The State is even under obligation to promote the spiritual interests of the Church; for the State is bound to promote whatever by reaction naturally works for the moral development of its citizens and consequently for the internal peace of the community, and in the present condition of human nature that development is necessarily dependent upon the spiritual influence of the Roman Church.

Does the Roman Church, then consider that the union of Church and State is desirable, and that as far as possible or expedient it ought to be secured in preference to the existing separation?

Between the Church and a non-Christian or a Christian, but non-Catholic, State a condition of separation, as

meaning a condition of indifference of the State towards the Church, is to be expected, as the foundation of the specific obligations involved in union are wanting. Such a separation for a Catholic State would be criminal, as ignoring the sacred obligations of the State. (This is another way of saying that if union be not possible, it will not occur; if union be possible, it should occur. A.G.R.)

That this body of statements contains many glittering and ambiguous statements the application of which would mean the destruction of the political democracy as it is known in the United States, and that these same statements contradict and abrogate the provisions and principles of the Constitution of the United States, is painfully obvious upon the most cursory reading.

References

Chapter IV

1. Marshall, op.cit., pp. 280-281, #6
2. Ibid, pp. 280-281, #7
3. Ibid, p. 281, #8
4. Ibid, p. 281, #9
5. Ibid, pp. 281-282, #10
6. Ibid, p. 282, #11
7. Ibid, p. 282, #12
8. Ibid, p. 282, #13
9. Ibid, p. 282, #14
10. Ibid, pp. 287-288
11. Ibid, pp. 288, #32
12. Ibid, pp. 288-289, #34
13. Ibid, pp. 127-128
14. Freedom Of Worship, The Catholic Position, Connell, pp. 3-7
15. A copy of this document can be obtained from the Spanish Embassy, Washington 25, D.C. The quotations are from my own copy; there is no pagination.
16. Marshall, op.cit., pp. 46-54

Suggested Collateral Readings

Separate Church and State Now, Joseph Martin Dawson, op. cit. Chapter IV. V, VI, VII, VIII, IX, X and especially XI.

Catholicism And The American Mind, Winfred Ernest Garrison, op.cit., Chapter II, V, XI.

Our Fathers Faith And Ours, David S. Schaff, op.cit., Chapters XXVIII.

Part II

Introduction

Part II will discuss the Church's social philosophy. In these concluding chapters the Church's philosophy in this particular area of significance will be examined in the order which seems most appropriate: The Church and Society, Education and Science. It will be observed that the last chapter in this section, as in Part II, is in the form of a summary but which will cite such additional material as seems appropriate. In this last chapter the problem of the general welfare-state versus the Roman Catholic viewpoint will be discussed.

Chapter V

It will be the purpose of this chapter to indicate the collision between the precepts of the Roman Catholic Church and the general needs of society such as is known in the United States today. It will be observed that many things which will have been said in this and in the following chapters are much the same as what has been said in previous chapters. This repetition arises from the very nature of the subject matter because it is found that the philosophy which underlies the one concept is the same which permeates many other situations which, at first glance, appear not to be similar.

It is thought best to begin this discussion with some pertinent statements taken from the pronouncement entitled: SECULARISM, a statement issued on November 14, 1947 by the Bishops of the United States and signed as members of the Administrative Board, N. C. W. C. (1)

Secularism, or the practical exclusion of God from human thinking and living, is at the root of the world's travail today.

Secularism, its impact on the individual, blinds him to his responsibility to God. All the rights, all the freedoms of man derive originally from the fact that he is a human person, created by God after His own image and likeness. In this sense he is 'endowed by his creator with certain unalienable Rights.' Neither reason nor history offers any other solid ground for man's inalienable rights. It is as God's creature that man generally and most effectively recognizes a personal responsibility to seek his own moral perfection....Without a deep-felt conviction of what sin is, human law and human conventions can never lead man to virtue.

Secularism has completely undermined the stability of the family as a divine institution and has

given our country the greatest divorce problem in the Western world. In taking God out of family life, it has deprived society's basic educational institution of its most powerful means in molding the soul of the child. Artificial family planning on the basis of contraceptive immorality, cynical disregard of the noble purposes of sex, a sixty-fold increase in our divorce rate during the past century, and widespread failure of the family to discharge its educational functions are terrible evils which secularism has brought to our country.

In no field of social activity has secularism done more harm than in education. In our own country, secularists have been quick to exploit for their own purposes the public policy adopted a century ago of banning the formal teaching of religion from the curriculum of our common schools.

In the rearing of children and the forming of youth, omission is as effective as positive statement. A philosophy of education which omits God, necessarily draws a plan of life in which God either has no place or is strictly private concern of men.

Secularism breaks with our historical American tradition. When parents build and maintain schools in which their children are trained in the religion of their fathers, they are acting in the full spirit of that tradition. Secularists would invade the rights of parents, and invest the State with supreme powers in the field of education; they refuse to recognize the God-given place that parents have in the education of their children.

The Christian view of social order rejects the postulate of inexorable economic laws which fix recurring cycles of prosperity and depression. It lays the blame for instability in our social structure on human failure rather than on blind and uncontrollable economic forces. It faces the plain fact that there is something gravely wrong in our economic life and sees in secularism, with its disregard of God and God's law, a potent factor in creating the moral atmosphere which has favored the growth of this evil.

The Christian view of economic life supports the demand for organization of management, labor, agriculture and professions under government encouragement but not control, in joint effort of avoid social conflict and to promote cooperation for the common good.

In the international community there can be only one real bond of sane common action---the natural law which calls to God, its Author, and derives from Him its sanctions. It is true that positive human law which comes from treaties and international conventions is necessary, but even these covenants must be in accord with God-given natural law. What may seem to be expedient for a nation cannot be tolerated if it contravenes God's law of right and wrong.

Secularism which exiles God from human life clears the way for the acceptance of godless subversive ideologies---just as religion, which keeps God in human life, has been the one outstanding opponent of totalitarian tyranny.

The tragic evil is not that our Christian culture is no longer capable of producing peace and reasonable prosperity, but that we are allowing secularism to divorce Christian truth from life.

The Statement of the Catholic Bishops attacking Secularism as an evil appears in the New York Times of November 21, 1948, and in its essential features is the same as the above pronouncement. The one significant thought which sums up the thesis of this statement, appears as follows: (2)

The inroads of secularism in civil life are a challenge to the Christian citizen---and indeed to every citizen with definite religious convictions. The essential connection between religion and good citizenship is deep in our American tradition. Those who took the lead in establishing our independence and framing our Constitution were firm and explicit in the conviction that religion and morality are the strong supports of national well-being, that national morality cannot long prevail in the

absence of religious principle, and that impartial encouragement of religious influence on its citizens is a proper and practical function of good government.

So much for official Church pronouncements on the ills of society.

It is clear that the distillate of these two pronouncements amounts to this: society is ill because it will not accept God and His law. That in very general terms this condition obtains at this present time is axiomatic but the difficulty with these and similar pronouncements is just exactly what is meant by the terms used. Obviously the word 'religion' is construed to mean Catholicism as it has been demonstrated before that Catholicism does not tolerate freedom of religious practice or inquiry; if it goes through the motions of doing so, it does so by toleration only---only as a temporary modus vivendi and not on the basis on an inherent right. The Rev. Dr. Connell brings this out very plainly in his shocking pamphlet previously referred. The fact still remains that no one has the inherent right to intertain any ideas contrary to Catholic doctrine; if he should do so; he has no inherent right to do so; if he persists in his "error" although he be sincere in his 'error', he does so because of an "invincibly erroneous conscience" and not because he has an inherent right to the free and responsible exercise of his conscience. What is being defended here is the right to disagree and not whether or not the subject matter be right or wrong.

This intransigent and truculent arrogance leads to much obstructionism of the part of the Church especially when plans are proposed which would run counter to the medievalism and traditional conservatism of the Church. For example, when President Truman ordered a group of distinguished scholars to compile a report on the present and future needs of higher education, so that more persons could receive more educational benefits (it having been shown previously that this need constitutes an acute one) presumably by Federal assistance to states, the two Catholic members were the only dissenters. They did so on the insular grounds that unless Federal assistance were to parochial (Catholic) schools, too, they would not approve of such a plan. This dissenting group maintained that the philosophy of education as embodied in the President's Report was "essentially naturalistic," and that it tended to substitute democracy for religion. What these gentlemen really meant only they did not quite dare say it was that the philosophy of this Committee was unacceptable because it would not favor the Catholic Church. It went on to accuse the New Democracy as amounting to the "incipient stages of totalitarianism." Father Gammon, S. J., President of Fordham at the time this Report came out, said that there is danger:

in spreading our national culture perilously thin and calling it 'democracy of education.' It consists in swelling the number of incompetents in American colleges and calling it 'equality of opportunity.'

Obviously no issues here are discussed but vague and general

sweeping emotionalisms the validity of which can be seriously questioned.

At the present moment, the Catholic Church is fighting with all the weapons of propaganda at her command the recommendation of many population-specialists in American-occupied Japan that Birth-control information and facilities be made available to the population at large.⁽³⁾ There is ample reason to believe that Japan is not capable of supporting in a manner compatible with decency her present population, let alone any appreciable increases. One finds the same obstructionism in other countries such as Latin America and particularly in Puerto Rico. In a reprint from Human Biology, February, 1948, Volume 20, Number 1, is found a very pertinent analysis of some of cultural aspects of birth control in Puerto Rico. This article bears careful reading but this statement can be quoted to bear out the discussion at hand:⁽⁴⁾

The Catholic Church, although it does not seem to be much of a force in the community, nevertheless continues as a potential source of interference in any widespread birth control program.

In a recent issue of the noted Catholic paper The Register⁽⁵⁾ there is a statement made by Cardinal Spellman to the effect that the Barden Bill, which would allocate federal funds to the states for aid in education but with the express provision that these federal funds be used only for public schools, would discriminate against Catholic

children. Here is what the Cardinal said:

The Catholic School is an American school, equal in right with the public school because our theory of democratic government protects the inalienable rights of the human person to freedom of religion, freedom of education, freedoms that assure to every American the privilege of religious education for himself and his children... May God forbid that we in America follow in the foot-steps of the masters of blind bigotries and hates now holding within the iron-clasp of their merciless, grasping hands, the regimentation of education and the fate of civilization.

It is true that Catholic children will be denied many privileges if federal funds are made available to public and not to parochial schools. The point which Catholics overlook is that it is the arrogant, and dangerously un-American and anti-constitutional theology which is taught in Catholic schools that is the cause of this problem of separation of Church and State. It is the arrogant claim of Catholicism that it and only it should be considered the guide of the whole of mankind which sincerely frightens sincere and responsible liberal-minded people. So long as freedom of thought is defined by the Catholic Almanac as: (6)

Liberty to think the truth. In our day the expression has come to mean liberty to think as one pleases; this is error. Our rational natures demands that we think only the truth, whatever the impact of outside forces or our own appetites.

there will always be a fear that the Roman Catholic Church will try to demonstrate in fact what she freely admits in theory---that she alone should be the ruler of men.

In the realm of the use of Atomic Energy in the most recent war, there appeared no clear cut definition on the ethics of such a weapon. One senses the helplessness of the Church's situation when John Hersey quotes Father Kleinserge, a Jesuit Father in Japan at the time of the Hiroshima atomic blast, as writing in his report to Rome: (7)

Some of us consider the bomb in the same category as poison gas and were against its use on a civilian population. Others were of the opinion that in total war, as carried on in Japan, there was no difference between civilians and soldiers, and that the bomb itself was an effective force tending to end the bloodshed, warning Japan to surrender and thus avoid total destruction. It seems logical that he who supports total war in principle cannot complain of a war against civilians. The crux of the matter is whether total war in its present form is justifiable, even when it serves a just purpose. Does it not have material and spiritual evil as its consequences which far exceed whatever good might result? When will our moralists give us a clear answer to this question.

The last line of this quotation is touchingly naive. As if any moralist could possibly justify the use of a weapon from which, in an atomic war, there is no possible place to hide. (8)

It will be interesting to read just exactly what will be the decision of Rome on the ethics of this new terror and the justification of its use in the most recent war.

In Pope Pius' Encyclical Letter Quadragesimo Anno or Reconstructing The Social Order, is found the Papal answer to the ills of our society. Among other things it recommends a syndical and corporative organization of workers according

to skills. It will be the business of these syndicates to obtain the best possible conditions of work and pay for the workers belonging to these groups because the State will have granted to this syndicate monopoly powers in this regard. The corporations, in turn, will direct the actions of these syndicates. Strikes and lockouts will be outlawed, and in the event that both parties cannot agree to some amicable settlement of a dispute, public authority will be forced to intervene. Beneath all these high-sounding plans lurks the one assumption which is found at the bottom of all Catholic pronouncements: the activating principle of this particular scheme as well as others has to be the Roman Catholic Church. In the light of what has been demonstrated up to this point, it is not difficult to see just exactly what would happen to our economic system were this Papal system to prevail. The first and foremost change which would be made would be the one which would make the Roman Catholic Church the official protector of our economic hierarchical structure based on the rule of one's presumed betters. This would mean an end to any freedom of religion because the profession of Roman Catholicism would necessarily be a condition of membership to these syndicates. The Pope hastens to assure readers that membership in these syndicates would not be compulsory; there would always be the dubious freedom to starve! From this stage the next would speedily come: these various syndicates and corporations would be staffed by clerical supervisors and

then the trap would be sprung.

The one characteristic which makes it difficult to answer these and other like papal documents is that so much of what they say is true. For example, what the Pope says about the abuses of laissez-faire are largely correct in so far as these observations go. It is agreed that the working man should have not only a living but also a saving wage, that he should have all the necessary social benefits, especially those which he needs but which he cannot afford--- all these claims are true and have been made by other persons long before many of the Popes made them. The problem is in the method of accomplishing these ends, and that is why many people are very suspicious of the well-intentioned solutions of the Popes which, when analysed and checked, would amount to a theocracy of the worst kind.

The fallaciousness inherent in this and other like pronouncements is this: a situation exists which is obviously causing great distress; the Pope makes a pronouncement which offers solution to any given problem; since the Pope is generally recognized and believed as having the humanity of the world at heart, his solution carries great weight and given a sufficiently powerful and well-organized Church, the likelihood of this solution being actually put into effect looms large especially when that Church has succeeded in obtaining for itself much preferential legislation which in the opinion of many violates the principle of the separation

of Church and State. However, more will be said of this particular controversy later.

The same criticism which is leveled against the Quadragesimo Anno can be leveled at another one of Pius XI's Letters of the causes and remedy of the most serious depression of our history. What did this Letter say? All that it proposed was a return to religion (Catholicism, obviously). The one distinct impression which one gets from reading this dictum is that the depression is the result of man's disobedience of the laws of God. If what is meant by the laws of God is just those broad ethical principles on which most men agree, that is one thing. As a matter of fact, it is true that the depression as well as the two subsequent wars were a result of man's defiance of the laws of God or the Tao of C. S. Lewis. (9) But the God of the Pope is the God of Roman Catholicism and that is where the difficulty begins. To those not familiar with the specific doctrines of the Church on the freedom of religion, expression, assembly, speech, and what is too often lost-sight of, the freedom from religion as well, all these Papal dicta seem very reasonable and appear to come from a man who has an affectionate and paternal care for all humanity. That he may be so disposed is not being questioned here; what is being questioned is that all Papal pronouncements carry with them, either directly or indirectly, the understanding that what is being proposed is the only true solution simply because the Church says so and feels that the

world ought to submit to Papal direction. Such sounds intolerant and harsh but such follows from the facts.

In The World Society, A Joint Report (10) is to be found:

..a statement of the principles and foundation of a just peace as understood by a group of American Catholics interested in the restoration of law and order for all nations and peoples.

This document represents the work of five committees of the Catholic Association for International Peace. An examination of the list of the names making up the various committees of this Catholic Association For International Peace serves to graphically illustrate the point which forms the focal point of this chapter; of the total number of persons connected with this organization, sixty-two of them are religious, including some clerics of national and international Catholic reputation. Some of the policies advocated would be sound under a regime non-Catholic as well as Catholic. But the prime conditions for this 'peace' are under the heading of International Moral Principles. Obviously, no international order is possible without some agreed system of international relations based on the most commonly agreed ethics. That assertion is so obvious that it is a waste of time to assert it, yet one would think that such an observation was original with the Pope. This obvious sectarianism becomes more apparent when it is noted that what is now known as international law had its genesis in Christian (again that vague word; Catholic

is intended, obviously) tradition and teaching. In the section entitled Ethical Norms Directing World Society, is found the following disturbing advocacy:

A realistic moral and political philosophy of world society is needed to indicate the principles which must guide and direct a world Commonwealth of Nations. A Christian international ethics, taking its inspiration from the numerous encyclicals of the Popes on matters of international relations, may be found in a number of publications of the C.A.I.P. This ethics teaches that a world organization must respect the rights of nations, as nations must safeguard the rights of families and citizens. (11)

That this statement is true in so far as the general truth is concerned cannot be questioned. That the exclusive claim to a particular Church as being the only possible basis for any successful international ethics is being most seriously questioned by those who see in such doctrinal exclusivity a threat to what they believe to be their fundamental and inherent right, the right to disagree responsibly with any organization which would deny this freedom.

In conclusion, it is thought worth while to quote the seven benefits which accrue to society as listed in a well-known pamphlet entitled Religion--Does It Matter?, by the prolific Catholic writer and college professor, the Reverend Doctor John A. O'Brien, PH.D., LL.D. of The University of Notre Dame: (12)

First, religion ennobles the relations between man and man by teaching that we are all the children of God and therefore are all brothers.

Secondly, religion elevates and ennobles the

family life.

Thirdly, religion provides society with the most effective sanctions for the observance of law and the fulfillment of duty.

Fourthly, religion is the champion of social justice.

Fifthly, religion promotes the stability of government.

Sixthly, religion brings into existence the institutions of character, mercy, and philanthropy which pour such a mighty stream of healing and benediction upon society.

Seventhly, and lastly, religion is the mother of education, enlightenment, scientific progress, and the most zealous worker for the outlawry of war and the organization of international institutions for the stabilizing of the peace of the world. (13)

At the outset, with each of these assertions there is a short proof that the assertion is so. Even with these "proofs" there is the underlying current that the only conceivable religion is Catholicism despite the obvious conclusion that these general seven assertions would hold true for any religion worthy of the name. Obviously the Rev. Dr. O'Brien does think that by "religion" is meant Catholic religion because this same religion denies the inherent right of other religions to exist. It is the practice of using a general term like 'religion' in a particular sense with the implicit understanding that the generic term has no validity in Catholic theology, and that, therefore, "religion" and the Catholic religion are one and the same, that makes this form of discussion extremely difficult especially for the uninitiate.

It constitutes a subtle way of being arrogantly intolerant of all opinion but one's own. It is therefore clear that such insular thinking, especially when translated into the area of social needs, is not compatible in any manner with the spirit of liberal American social democracy.

References

Chapter V

1. Pamphlet issued by the National Catholic Welfare Conference.
2. New York Times, November 21, 1948, p. 63
3. The Register, July 3, 1949, National Edition Denver, Colorado.
4. Cultural Aspects Of Birth Control In Puerto Rico, a reprint from Human Biology, February, 1948, Vol. 20, No. 1 Margaret N. King
5. The Register, July 3, 1949, p. 6
6. American Freedom And Catholic Power, Blanchard, p. 294
7. Hiroshima, John Hersey, Bantam Books, New York, 1948, pp. 116-117
8. No Place To Hide, David Bradley, Bantam Books, New York 1949
9. The Abolition Of Man, C. S. Lewis
10. The World Society, A Joint Report, The Catholic Association for International Peace, 1312 Massachusetts Avenue, N. W. Washington, D. C. The Paulist Press, New York
11. Ibid, p. 10
12. Religion - Does It Matter? O'Brien, pp. 54-61
13. Ibid, italics are Father O'Brien's.

Suggested Collateral Readings

Separate Church And State Now, Joseph Martin Dawson, op. cit. Chapters IV-VIII, X-XI

Catholicism And The American Mind, Winfred Ernest Garrison, Chapter V

Will America Become Catholic?, John F. Moore, Harper & Bros., New York, London 1931, Chapter I

Our Fathers Faith And Ours, David S. Schaff, op. cit. Chapters XIV, XXIX, and XXX

Chapter VI

It will be the purpose of this chapter to examine the claims of the Roman Catholic Church in the field of Education and determine whether or not the same motif exists in this area as has been found in other areas in which the Church declares her competence.

This Encyclical speaks as follows, using the convenient summaries from Marshall. (1)

The Church

Education belongs preëminently to her, by reason of a double title in the supernatural order, conferred exclusively upon her by God Himself; absolutely superior therefore to any other title in the natural order.

Upon her magisterial office of teaching Christ conferred infallibility.

In faith and morals, God Himself has made her sharer in the divine magisterium and granted her immunity from error; she is the mistress of men, supreme and absolutely sure, and she has inherent in herself an inviolable right to freedom in teaching.

By necessary consequence she is independent of any sort of earthly power, both in the origin and in the exercise of her mission as educator, not merely in regard to her proper end and object, but also in regard to the means necessary and suitable to attain that end.

She is guardian, interpreter and infallible mistress of the divine law.

With full right she promotes letters, science and art, in so far as helpful to Christian education, founding and maintaining schools and institutions adapted to every branch of learning.

It is her inalienable right to watch over the entire education of her children, in all insti-

tutions, public or private, not merely in regard to the religious instruction there given, but in regard to every other branch of learning in so far as religion and morality are concerned.

Her mission to educate embraces every nation, without exception, and all men, whether within or without her membership, and there is no power on earth that may lawfully oppose her or stand in her way.

The Family

The family holds directly from the Creator the mission and hence the right to educate the children, a right inalienable, a right in anterior to any right whatever of civil society, and therefore inviolable on the part of any power on earth.

Children belong to the family before they belong to the State. The State has not an absolute right over their education. (2)

However, in the next breath Pius XI says (3)

We renew and confirm the declarations of Pius IX and Leo XIII, as well as the Sacred Canons in which the frequenting of non-Catholic schools, whether neutral or mixed, namely those which are open to the Catholics and non-Catholics alike, is forbidden for Catholic children, and can be at most tolerated, on the approval of the Ordinary alone, under determined circumstances of place and time, and with special precautions. Neither can Catholics admit that other type of mixed school, (least of all the so-called "ecole unique" obligatory on all), in which the students are provided with separate religious instruction, but receive other lessons in common with non-Catholic pupils from non-Catholic teachers.

Marshall continues the Encyclical's statements of the authority of the State as follows: (4)

The State

The function of the State is twofold, to protect and to foster, but not to absorb the family and

the individual.

To protect in its legislation the prior rights of the family, already described.

To respect the supernatural rights of the Roman Church.

To begin by encouraging and assisting the initiative and activity of the Roman Church and the family.

Beyond this to educate in civic and political duties, and a certain degree of physical, intellectual and moral culture; but to respect the inherent rights of the Roman Church and of the family, and not to force families to make use of government schools, contrary to Christian conscience, or legitimate preferences.

The Roman Church may absorb the family and the individual; the function of the State is to protect and foster both, that they may both be absorbed by the Roman Church. The rights of the family in education are wholly subordinated to the Roman Church, and the duty of the State is to protect that subordination by legislation. The supernatural rights of the Church are to be respected and therefore recognized by the State in legislation. Lastly, while the State should not force families to make use of public schools, contrary to conscience or legitimate preferences, the Roman Church should so force them to make use of parochial schools. These necessary conclusions from the Pope's argument are its own refutation.

While the previous paragraphs are very important in indicating the official position of the Church with regard to education, this present discussion will limit itself to the examination of the last paragraph. That such a doctrine is actually believed and taught is beyond understanding.

This paragraph is full of contradictions and obvious inconsistencies. For example, the Pope says in one place that the right to educate belongs preëminently to the family

and that this right is inviolable; then it says that the Church may absorb the family and that the State should co-operate by appropriate legislation so that it might be absorbed by the Church. The State should not force families to use the public schools but the Church may force families to use the parochial schools. The full implications of this entire Encyclical are that the modern democratic State as it is known today would have no being; as a matter of objective right, the Roman Church would have to completely absorb it. Clearly, such conclusions constitute a source of concern for those interested in the dignity and freedom of the individual, especially when the Church is waging such an effective campaign to obtain federal subsidization for its schools but not surrender one iota of control over them.

In this matter of separation of Church and State, the role of the public school looms large. It is precisely because groups like Protestants And Other Americans United For The Separation Of Church And State feel that the steady demands and gains which the Catholic Church has obtained so far in state and federal subsidization of parochial schools constitutes a real danger to American democracy that they have been so out-spoken on this issue. The following statement sums up the position of this body on this thorny question: (5)

Our operations, therefore, are not inspired by any religious differences, but by a common conviction concerning the religious liberty of all

faiths. The internal differences which distinguish one church from another have no place on the political level. Their consideration belongs in the public forum which the Constitution has provided for freedom of conscience and the free exchange of opinion. Here all the churches have liberty to worship as they desire, to propagate their own faith, and to maintain such organizations for this purpose as they deem expedient. In the open forum of religious liberty they may meet one another in co-operation or in controversy.

Essentially, in Protestant terms, this means that the Constitution expressly prohibits any union of Church and State by the provision of the First Amendment which applies only to the Federal Government, and by the provision of the Fourteenth Amendment which applies only to the States.

The Catholic position on this question can be found in a recent book written by the Reverend Doctor Wilfrid Parsons S. J., entitled The First Freedom, from which pertinent passages will be examined: (6)

It is to be noted, however, that this American principle of liberty and equality of religions before our state, based on its temporal nature, does not mean that it may not confer its temporal benefits on the faithful of those religions, provided it confers them equally and with due regard to their liberty. It is here we see the hollowness and falsity of a theory of separation of church and state which would command the state to withhold its temporal benefits from the adherents of religion merely because they are religious. When the state does this, it is not fulfilling its destiny of caring for the total common good of its citizens. Separation in that sense works actual harm to the state itself, which is thus made to do only a part of its total duty, the temporal common welfare of all citizens without regard to their particular condition in life.

Here Dr. Parsons quotes the Reverend Doctor John

Courtney Murray, S. J., in which Father Murray, in a series of articles in the America, discusses this question, mostly in reply to Dr. Charles Clayton Morrison, recently editor of the Christian Century, who took the position that the designs of the Roman Catholic Church constitute a real threat to the separation of Church from State, a concept upon which this country was founded: (7)

Then the confusion begins. Imperceptibly it is assumed that the First Amendment is a theological document---a sort of dogmatic decree that lays down a rule of faith. Thereafter it suddenly appears that the First Amendment implicitly "established" as the obligatory belief of the American people, the doctrine that all churches are simply voluntary societies, of equally human origin and of equal value in the sight of God, each of them offering to man an equally good way to eternal salvation. In other words, it appears that the First Amendment canonizes Liberal Protestant ecclesiology in an extreme form, and anathematizes as un-American all dissenters.

Again, to quote Father Parsons:

It ought to be obvious that the kind of theocratic thinking involved in the state of mind described so acutely in this quotation has nothing in common either with any tenable theory of the state or with the actual progress of the American state as we know it. Yet, it is this attempt to read a theological, not a political, meaning into an Amendment to the Federal Constitution that has bedeviled this whole question. The whole effort of the Founding Fathers, the legislatures, and the courts up to the dissents in the Jersey bus-fare decision, has been to establish the liberty and equality of all religious believers before the state. To make the First Amendment a servant of a particular Protestant sectarian position is a monstrous distortion of both historical and political fact. The whole point of the First Amendment was that it was not theological, and that it forbade the American government to be a theo-

logian.

The Reverend Doctor Parsons goes on to say that this theory of Church and State has had many phases. He avers that in the eighteenth century, this theory of Church and State (which Catholicism very cleverly equates with secularism today, A.G.R.) appeared in the guise of Deism which claimed that, although God existed He did not reveal Himself in any form beyond that which man could discover for himself.

Therefore organized religion amounted to nothing more than an invention of man. Thomas Jefferson, continues Father Parsons, was the chief exponent of this religion during the American Revolutionary era. In the nineteenth century, however, this theory of religion took on a more radical tinge when John Locke and others averred that religion was essentially a private matter, and that, consequently, churches were nothing more than voluntary organizations. Father Parsons claims that Jefferson and others incorporated this principle of religious relativism into our Constitution with considerable success. Father Parsons continues, to use his own words: (8)

In its new form, however, the theory was still a theory of the church and not of the state. It meant that the state---the United States---looked on all forms of organized religion with indifference, and consequently, by virtue of this theological principle, religion is entitled to equality before the state, along with no religion at all, or the denial of religion, atheism. It was actually to pronounce between two parties a theological controversy.

Reduced to its simplest elements, this controversy amounts to no more than this; the Protestants feel that re-

ligion is a private matter, and that all churches have a valid right to exist and preach their doctrines so long as they do not threaten the existence and safety of the general welfare.

The Supreme Court in its decision in the case involving the United States said, with particular reference to the Church of Latter-Day Saints, that the court recognized the power of the State to curb the practices of any religion if its practices threatened the safety and general welfare of the community. By implication it also said that this doctrine could be applied to any group whose practices were obnoxious to the community even though that group claimed for itself the status of a religion. (9) Now, the Protestants feel that the First and Fourteenth Amendments were conceived to protect the embryonic United States from the same clerical domination which had characterized many of the countries of Europe at that time. In as much as most of the leaders of American political life at that time had been educated in the European educational traditions, it can be seen that they did not wish for any union of Church and State in any degree. That is not to say that these men did not want the benefits of religion; they did but they felt that the government should assume by law a position of neutrality; officially neither opposed to religion nor for it. If the Constitution officially recognized any religious preference, it would deny one freedom for which this country of ours was founded; if it made antireligion

a policy, it still would be denying that freedom of religion because then, men would not be actually free to exercise their consciences if such as their disposition not to recognize the need for religion.

The basic Roman Catholic position is that is false the freedom of choosing a religion or not choosing a religion. If Catholicism recognized this principle, its own position would insecure because than Catholicism would be considered as good or as bad as any other religion. This, obviously, the Church can never do; men must choose only one religion, the only one which God Himself revealed; all others are false. Also, if the Church should accept this doctrine of freedom to accept or reject any religion, such would make the Church's position on tolerance of other religions very tenuous. Catholicism tolerates the presence of other religions merely as a modus operandi, an expediency which may be changed at some future date when the Church feels that she is sufficiently powerful to do so. That Catholics laugh at this statement makes it no less true if the facts which are at the basis of this statement have any validity at all.

Now it is not denied that there ought to be some care given to religion in public schools inasmuch as, for some pupils, such would be the only moral and ethical teaching they would ever receive. The difficulty arises when the time comes to teach religion---what religion? Shall it be Catholicism which the Roman Church frankly admits should be taught, or shall

it be Protestantism and if so what brand? Roman Catholicism is not the only offender in this matter of religious exclusivity, Protestantism in its various breakdowns and Judaism are equally guilty; they all want their own particular religious brands exclusively taught.

Now the Catholics averr that to say that the Constitution is indifferent to any religion or that it implies that one religion is as good as another, amounts to reading into the Constitution a 'Protestant ecclesiology' as Father Parsons puts it, and such would therefore be clothing the First Amendment with a theological mantle, something which the Founding Fathers did not intend. The Catholic solution to this knotty problem is Distinction and Co-operation; both entities are distinct, the Church and the State and both have their respective responsibilities and disciplines, means and ends. Both ought to co-operate to the best interests of the country as a whole. That is all very simple, deceptively simple until the question is asked: co-operation and distinction on whose terms? Who is to decide competence in an area when both claim jurisdiction or in an area where one and the other are at irreconcilable odds. How can there be Co-operation and Distinction when there exists such opinions and pronouncements as these:

Pope Gregory XVI, Encyclical Mirari vos, (15 August, 1832), translation:
 And out of this most corrupt fountain of indifferentism there flows this erroneous opinion or rather madness (deliramentum) that the freedom

of conscience of each individual ought to be asserted and vindicated. (10)

From A Reply to Archbishop's Attack upon Protestants and Other Americans United for the Separation of Church and State by Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam: (quoted from the official Spanish catechism used in all religious instruction in Spain); (11)

'The principal errors condemned by the Church are thirteen' and among the thirteen are Protestantism, Liberalism, and Masonry. In question and answer form, the catechism states the position of the Church.

- Q. What are the freedoms which liberalism defends?
 A. Freedom of conscience, freedom of worship, and freedom of the press.
- Q. What does freedom of the press mean?
 A. The right to print and publish without previous censorship all kinds of opinions, however absurd and corrupting they may be.
- Q. Must the government suppress this freedom by means of censorship?
 A. Obviously, yes.
- Q. Why?
 A. Because it must prevent the deception, calumny and corruption of its subjects which harm the general good.
- Q. Are there other pernicious freedoms?
 A. Yes. Freedom of education, freedom of propaganda, and freedom of assembly.
- Q. Why are these freedoms pernicious?
 A. Because they serve to teach error, propagate vice, and plot against the Church.
- Q. Does one sin gravely who subscribes to a liberal newspaper?
 A. Yes...Because he contributes his money to evil, places his faith in jeopardy, and gives others a bad example.

Bishop Oxnam goes on to quote essentially the same doctrines to be found in the Manual of Christian Doctrine (12);

Q. What more should the State do than respect the rights and liberties of the Church?

A. The State should also aid, protect and defend the Church.

Q. What then is the principal obligation of the heads of States?

A. Their principal obligation is to practice the Catholic religion themselves, and, as they are in power, to protect and defend it.

Q. Has the State the right and the duty to prescribe schism or heresy?

A. Yes, it has the right and the duty to do both for the good of the nation and for the faithful themselves; for religious unity is the principal foundation of social unity.

Q. When may the State tolerate dissenting worships?

A. When those worships have acquired a sort of legal existence, consecrated by time and accorded by treaties or covenants.

Q. May the State separate itself from the Church?

A. No, because it may not withdraw from the supreme rule of Christ.

Q. What name is given to the doctrine that the State has neither the right nor the duty to be united to the Church and to protect it?

A. The doctrine is called liberalism. It is founded principally on the fact that modern society rests on liberty of conscience and of worship, on liberty of speech and of the press.

Q. Why is liberalism to be condemned?

A. 1. Because it denies all subordination of the State to the Church;
2. Because it confounds liberty with right;

3. Because it despises the social dominion of Christ and rejects the benefits derived therefrom.
(pages 132-133)

The following is taken from A Full Catechism of the Catholic Religion, from the German of Joseph Deharbe S. J., (13), questions 64 and 65:

64. If the Catholic Church is to lead all men to eternal salvation, and has, for that purpose, received from Christ her doctrine, her means of grace, and her powers, what, for his part, is every one obliged to do?

Every one is obliged, under pain of eternal damnation, to become a member of the Catholic Church, to believe her doctrine, to use her means of grace, and to submit to her authority.

65. Who teaches us this obligation?

Jesus Christ Himself, in these words (Matt. xviii. 17): 'If he will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as the heathen and publican'; and (Mark xvi. 16): 'He that believeth not (the Apostles and their lawful successors) shall be condemned.'

Hence the Catholic Church is justly called the only saving Church. To despise her is the same as to despise Christ; namely, His doctrine, his means of grace, and His powers; to separate from her is the same as to separate from Christ, and to forfeit eternal salvation. Therefore St. Augustine, and the other Bishops of Africa, pronounced, A. D. 412, at the Council of Zirta, this decision: 'Whosoever is separated from the Catholic Church, however commendable in his own opinion his life may be, he shall for this very reason, that he is at the same time separated from the Unity of Christ, not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him' (John III. 36).

Substantially the same doctrine is to be found in

Catholic Religion, by the Reverend Charles Alfred Martin,
wherein is found the following: (14)

One must bear in mind the different kinds of union with the Church, in order to understand the truth, that outside of the Church, there is no salvation. Those who would be saved must have the will to do all that God has ordained for salvation---consequently the desire of being a member of His true Church. If one who professes a false religion is saved, he is saved not through his false religion, but only inasmuch as he is (however unconsciously) a member of the true Church. Christians who through no fault of their own, are separated by heresy or schism from the body of the Church, may be in the soul of the Church. The will to do all that God has ordained for salvation is compatible with external but unconscious separation from the Church; therefore one who is in error through invincible ignorance (bona fide) is capable of perfect contrition. The case is different with him who is knowingly in error (mala fide) so long as he persists in thus acting against his conscience.

It is to be noted, especially in this passage, the familiarity of the concept 'invincible ignorance' and the convenient provision for unconscious membership in the Church. It will be remembered that this same doctrine was discussed in the pronouncement of the Reverend Doctor Connell. It will also be noted in this passage the clever equating of 'conscience' and Roman Catholicism. Any one, therefore, willfully denying his conscience, cannot be saved. The freedom of the human conscience is categorically denied, although it must be admitted that the denial is an extremely sophisticated one.

To avoid the accusation that this investigation is taking advantage of old material (which, nevertheless has ecclesiastical approbation), the following passage in the very

newest revision of the Baltimore Catechism, A Catechism Of Christian Doctrine (15) is examined and found to teach the same doctrine demonstrated above:

166. Are all obliged to belong to the Catholic Church in order to be saved?

All are obliged to belong to the Catholic Church in order to be saved.

- (a) The principle, "It makes no difference what religion a person practices so long as he leads a good life," is deceptive because it attaches the same importance to the teaching and practice of a false religion as it does to the teaching of the one, true religion revealed by Christ and taught by His Church. No one can be saved without sanctifying grace, and the Catholic Church alone is the divinely established means by which grace is brought to the world and the full fruits of Our Lord's Redemption are applied to men.

167. What do we mean when we say, "Outside the Church there is no salvation?"

When we say, "Outside the Church there is no salvation," we mean that those who through their own grave fault do not know that the Catholic Church is the true Church or, knowing it, refuse to join it, cannot be saved.

- (a) "Outside the Church there is no salvation" does not mean that everyone who is not Catholic will be condemned. It does mean that no one can be saved unless he belongs in some manner to the Catholic Church, for the means of grace are not given without some relation to the divine institution established by Christ.

168. Can they be saved who remain outside the

the Catholic Church because they do not know it is the true Church?

They who remain outside the Catholic Church through no grave fault of their own and do not know it is the true Church, can be saved by making use of the graces which God gives them.

- (a) Those who are outside the Church through no fault of their own are not culpable in the sight of God because of their invincible ignorance.
- (b) Persons who make use of the graces God gives them, even though they are not members of the true Church, actually have the desire to become members inasmuch as they wish to use all the means ordained by God for their salvation.

Et cetera

Again it will be noticed the one single motif through all of these extremely disturbing quotations: the free and unfettered use of the human conscience is so constricted by microscopic distinctions and provisos that for all intents and purposes no one is free to freely use his or her conscience in matters in which Rome has already spoken. If one is unconsciously in error (who defines it--the one who promulgates it) one is not held liable although one is still wrong (invincible ignorance) but one may never through his own grave fault (who judges that?) differ with the Church in a matter already pronounced.

The relation between the quotations examined above and the educational policies of the Church is not without relevance. It is obvious that were the Church to have the free hand which

she demands as her true right, she would steadfastly deny the freedom of conscience to those under her supervision. Her teaching would be authoritarian because the Church itself is authoritarian in structure and discipline. Such a condition of affairs would not be education as it is known in the United States, and such a state of affairs again collides with the philosophy of education which forms a part of the democratic structure of our society.

Blanchard quotes John Dewey as saying, with reference to this problem, that: (15)

It is essential that this basic issue be seen for what it is---namely, as the encouragement of a powerful reactionary world organization in the most vital realm of democratic life with the resulting promulgation of principles inimical to democracy. We cannot deny that public education needs federal aid in order to equalize opportunity between state and state, and between individual and individual. But it would be a poor bargain indeed to gain material aid at the expense of losing our greatest intellectual and moral heritage.

References

Chapter VI

1. Marshall, pp. 302-303
2. Ibid, p. 304
3. Ibid, pp. 304-305
4. Ibid, pp. 307-308
5. Protestants And Other Americans United For The Separation Of Church And State, A Manifesto, 924 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C., p. 4
6. The First Freedom, Parsons, pp. 103-106
7. Murray, quoted from Parsons, pp. 110-111
8. Parsons, op. cit., pp. 134-135
9. The Late Corporation Of The Church Of Jesus Christ Of Latter Day Saints vs. United States, 136 U. S. 1
10. Marshall, p. 187, #12
11. A Reply To Archbishop's Attack Upon Protestants And Other Americans United For The Separation Of Church And State, by Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam, February 15, 1948, pp. 12-13
12. Ibid, pp. 13-14
13. A Full Catechism Of The Catholic Religion, from the German of the Reverend Joseph Deharbe, S. J., by the Rev. John Fander, Revised, Enlarged and Edited by the Reverend Bishop of Charleston, the Right Reverend P. N. Lynch, D. D., New York Schwartz, Kirwin & Fauss, 42 Barclay Street, p. 145
14. Catholic Religion, the Reverend Charles Alfred Martin, B. Herder Book Co., Saint Louis, Mo., p. 177
15. Blanchard, op. cit., p. 106

Suggested Collateral Readings

The Catholic-Protestant Mind, Conrad Henry Moehlman, op. cit. Chapters VI-VIII

Catholicism And The American Mind, Winfred Ernest Garrison, op. cit., Chapter VI

Separate Church And State Now, Joseph Martin Dawson, op. cit. Chapter I, II, III, VIII, and XI in addition to a very important Appendix

Our Fathers Faith And Ours, David S. Schaff, op. cit. Chapters XXIX, XXX, and especially Chapter IX

For an excellent discussion of the Spanish Catechism controversy, see Chapter XIII, The Catholic Crisis, op. cit.

Chapter VII

In the interests of clarity, it is thought best to define and delimit the term 'science' as this term will be used in this chapter. 'Science' in the sense of this chapter is not a particular science but rather a method of approach. It will be the task of this chapter to ascertain whether or not science in the sense of free inquiry being based on objective and detached investigation and proof, and Roman Catholicism clash at any point.

The general Catholic attitude toward scientific problems can be stated as follows:(1)

In the Catholic institutions of higher learning, due regard being given to the requirements of the natural and divine law, there are no restrictions on the biologist, chemist or physicist in assembling data or in proposing new formulas, regardless of how novel his discoveries may be. The social scientist enjoys the same freedom in gathering data on all subjects, no matter how unpalatable such data may be to those who would not want them brought to light in assembled form... More than this, he is entirely free, within the framework of the Church's social teaching---- which rests on the common good and which in turn is based on human needs----to propose any formula or remedy which he can demonstrate will advance human well-being.

This same doctrine is found in the Reverend Doctor Paul H. Furfey's Fire on the Earth, taken from the chapter on "Supernatural Sociology"; Father Furfey is Chairman of the Department of Sociology in the Catholic University of America:(2)

The Catholic sociologist, then, enjoys complete freedom of investigation in the social field, but he is not allowed to rely upon merely human science as the sole means of procuring individual and social well-being... It is dangerous, then, for a Catholic

sociologist to deal with social problems by the methods of purely natural science if, in doing so, he conveys the impression that this purely natural treatment of social questions represents the complete mind of the Church...We ought constantly to emphasize the fact that no important problem can be solved without taking the supernatural into account.

It is clear from these statements that the limits within which Catholic scientists can operate are already predefined so that for all intents and purposes no real freedom for Catholics exists unless by the term "freedom" is meant freedom to act within an already preconceived sphere. This then is the meaning of freedom from the Roman Catholic point of view.

Therefore, the remaining task for this chapter to perform is to cite specific scientific areas and to ascertain to what extent Catholic scientists are hemmed in by the pre-existing limits set by Rome.

The first area of scientific investigation to be examined will be that which concerns itself with population problems. This is what the Catholic Encyclopedia has to say about this problem: (3)

With supplies increasing in proportion to population, there is no such thing as overpopulation.

The Reverend Doctor Edgar Schmiedeler, director of the Family Life Bureau of the National Catholic Welfare Conference has this to say:(4)

A high birth rate is still the best and most practical way of bettering human generations.

This same Father Schmiedeler quotes, in his tract A Holy War, a Father Thomas V. Moore, "an eminent psychologist

of the Catholic University," as follows:

There can be little doubt that the heredity of intelligence is governed by the law of the regression of the mean, with the exception of rare types of mental defect. If that is the case, moronity has a biological trend to eliminate itself. We need not fear, therefore, that in helping the poor to have children and in caring for them that we are going to spread moronity. If these poor people are of low grade intelligence, the children they bring into the world will be distinctly higher than themselves.

This problem of population control is an outstanding example of the confining limits of Catholic science. The distinct limitations on this problem are already set forth in the Church's condemnation of birth control. Now, birth control and population control cannot be separated, inasmuch as the one constitutes a means for controlling the other. On the subject of birth control, the Church has spoken with finality; it is against the moral and natural law of God because it is a perversion of a faculty primarily intended for the generation of children and secondarily for the allaying of concupiscence. From this there can be no apparent retreat. From the ills and tragedy of overpopulation leading to useless waste of human life the only answer is that such is not lawful.

It is interesting to note what two authorities in population problems have to say on this problem:(5)

If we would avoid the catastrophic nightmares of pain into which we are plunged by negligence of population problems, we must restore the socially beneficial effects of the struggle of individuals; not by restoring the struggle, nor by causing suffering to those who would be eliminated in such a struggle, but rather by reducing the permissible number of their offspring. Again; make the requirements for

individual action appropriate, and world problems are thereby simplified, because world problems are largely made up of the problems of individuals.

As a matter of fact, this book contains as good a refutation of the Catholic position on birth control and population problems as there is to be found anywhere. It is obvious that those who hold to the Catholic position on these issues cannot discuss these problems without injecting theology or just plain naive wishful thinking. A good example of this Catholic point of view is the following:(6)

The Reverend Doctor Francis Connell is answering questions from the floor:

Question: What should be done by the people of the nation where the population has grown too large?

Answer: That is a very practical question. It is a question, in fact, which certainly should be considered at the present time. Some larger nations, not our own, are increasing rapidly because they are not practicing contraception. The answer is this: when a nation increases to the extent of overpopulation it has a right to have its people taken care of in other parts of the world, where there is no congestion. There is plenty of room for colonization, and every nation which has land facilities should be willing to accommodate the people of another nation. Every person born into this world has a right to a livelihood from the earth and from the world in which we live. A person has a right to go to another country if his own is too congested, and if that were done, the world would be a much happier and much more prosperous place.

So speaks the Reverend Doctor Connell. If the limitations on Catholic science which were indicated in the beginning of this chapter are constantly borne in mind, the answer is not so naive if taken from its original frame of reference. The

difficulty, obviously, is in the premises upon which this judgment is based.

On the subject of Psychoanalysis, the Reverend Doctor Charles Bruehl, Ph.D., has this to say:(7)

As a therapeutic method, psychoanalysis has not yet proved its claims to superiority over other methods. Of course, it has affected some cures, but these most likely are not due at all to that which is distinctive of psychoanalysis, but rather to a candid disclosing of the patient's troubles, elicited by the sympathetic interest of the physician, to a general reeducation and reorientation of the mental life, and, to a deliberate and patient training of the will. At all events, it may be laid down as a law that there can be no permanent recovery from nervous disease except through will-training, a matter which the psychoanalyst sadly neglects.

Morally, there seems to be no objection to the psychoanalytic treatment if it is surrounded by appropriate safeguards and if it does not cater unnecessarily to sex curiosity. It is difficult, however, to see how erotic inquisitiveness can be avoided, since the psychoanalyst is stubbornly convinced that every neurosis has its origin in a maladjustment of sex life... It goes without saying that a treatment fraught with so much danger should be applied only by an experienced physician. But even at the best, the promise of success is slight, if we believe the words of Dr. Peterson, who writes in the Journal of the American Medical Association: "I doubt if any persons have benefited by this treatment. It requires months or years of work over each case, and it is very expensive. I have, on the other hand, seen very bad results from the psychoanalysis of young men and women, permanent insanity, and even suicide."

Psychoanalysis cannot be hailed as a new psychology. Its conception of mental life is too mechanical. Its personification of the urges and emotions is suited only to the intellectual level of childhood. It destroys the unity of human personality and makes the continuity of consciousness inexplicable. In this fanciful system, the soul is not the chief actor in psychic happenings, but merely the battle ground that furnishes the scene for the interplay of unconscious forces, the mind looking helpless upon the raging

struggle. For free will there is no room in this psychology. Only one power rules the universe, and that is the unconscious.

It is clear that this pronouncement is a very carefully worded one. It is also an inaccurate one on many counts: Dr. Bruehl carefully selects authorities which will agree with his already preconceived opinions which had to be limited because of the fact that Dr. Bruehl is a Roman Catholic priest; the authorities he cites are only opinions of individuals and need not necessarily be considered final; Dr. Bruehl further takes very skillful advantage of the fact that Psychoanalysis was at that time very insecure, and also that many dishonest individuals capitalized very handsomely on this new science; and finally, Dr. Bruehl fails very conveniently to truly evaluate a new science by assuming that whatever failings that science had at that time were irrevocably endemic to it. Such is an attitude conveniently used by those who have no wish for the progress of that which appears to challenge their cherished biases.

In the realm of Psychiatry, the Catholic Church has not yet made any official pronouncement but if one may judge from the general unsympathetic attitude given it by such clergymen as the Reverend Doctor Fulton Sheen, one may logically and safely conclude that to deny categorically the efficacy of Psychiatry, the Church would not dare. Still, the Church can counter the influence of this therapeutic by equating it to the Confessional, and by not recommending it either in the

Confessional or in church sermons. However, if any priest is pressed hard enough, he will be forced to admit that Psychiatry is useful but must be used under proper safeguards. The safeguards, judging from other experiences with the Church, inevitably consist in conformance to Catholic philosophical psychology. The Roman Catholic Church has a very effective method of dealing with a problem with which it knows it cannot ignore: the Church, in the case of Psychiatry, absorbs and neutralizes it (Psychiatry or any other problem) by fitting it into the framework of Aquinas. As a matter of fact, one Jesuit, also a Doctor of Medicine with specialization in Psychiatry, is working on a text which will "harmonize" the principles of Psychoanalysis with Thomism. One wonders what will happen to Psychoanalysis!

In the fields of Philosophy and History, the scientific attitude is no less mystical and esoteric. It is interesting to note what the distinguished English Catholic layman Christopher Dawson has to say in his book Beyond Politics:(8)

The Church, on the other hand, is not concerned with finding immediate solutions for pressing social problems. The time factor is almost irrelevant, for it is the society of the world to come. It is not, like the State, a social engineer, but the guardian of the waters of life, and its essential task is to keep the sources pure and inviolate. Thus, though the totalitarian State may absorb or eliminate all the secondary activities of the Church, it can never compete with it on its own ground which lies at a deeper level of man's being. No doubt the politician tends to undervalue or to ignore the importance of religion and the reality of religious values. Nevertheless the more of a statesman he is, the more will he recognize that even the State itself

gains more than it loses by the existence of an autonomous society which serves the deepest needs of humanity, and which forms the channel by which supernatural life flows into humanity, transforming and renewing it from within as the divine seed of a new spiritual creation.

This is all very fine but it remains to be questioned whether or not Christianity (does Dawson mean Catholicism here; it would seem so) can remain aloof and not be concerned "with finding immediate solutions for pressing social problems." Why shouldn't it concern itself with these problems? Man does not live in a vacuous existence. He exists in a material world which has a vital short- and long- run importance so far as his stay on this earth is concerned. Christianity or any other religious body has to recognize the fact that such a body must have to function in a materialistic atmosphere which is good, judging from the good life it has provided, although no one would deny that this good life must still be very much expanded. Mr. Dawson would have Christianity (Catholicism) still cling to the other-worldliness of medievalism, a disdain which tends to look down upon this world of ours. Thinking men do not deny the worth of spiritual values or of God or of the life to come, but they also realize that the Church or Christianity has to have care of the environmental problems and conditions which vitally affect her function. As a matter of fact, both of these entities cannot be separated; we are essentially material and we exist in a marked material world. Our whole thinking is conditioned to a more or less degree by this materialism. The task of a church is to take cognizance of this fact and help

man to lift his vision to higher levels and to realize that important as the material may be, it too can be channelled into spiritual directions. The ultimate task of any religion worthy of the name seems to be to provide expression for that urge for recognition and worship of that which reason and observation tells to be outside the powers of the individual. Even the great English anthropologist and student of comparative cultures and religions, Sir Edward R. Tylor, says in his Primitive Cultures that:(9)

The definition of religion must not be such as to require the narrow concepts of the supreme deity or of judgment after death, the adoration of idols or the practice of sacrifices, or of other partially-diffused doctrines or rites, because many tribes could thus be excluded from this category of religion. Such a narrow definition has the fault of identifying religion rather with particular developments than with the deeper motive which underlies them; therefore the definition of religion emerges as the belief in Spiritual Beings.

Here, so far as I can judge from the immense mass of accessible evidence, we have to admit that the belief in spiritual beings appears among all low races with whom we have attained to thoroughly intimate acquaintance; whereas the assertion of absence of such belief must apply either to ancient tribes, or to more or less imperfectly described ones.

Animism characterizes tribes very low in the scale of humanity, and thence ascends, deeply modified in its transmission, but from first to last preserving an unbroken continuity, into the midst of high modern culture. Animism is, in fact, the groundwork of the Philosophy of Religion, from that of savages up to that of civilized men.

Here is a sample of Mr. Dawson's philosophy of history from the same book:(10)

Now it seems to me that the Christian is bound to believe that there is a spiritual purpose in history---

that it is subject to the designs of Providence and that somehow or other God's will is done. But that is a very different thing from saying that history is rational in the ordinary sense of the word. There are, as it were, two levels of rationality, and history belongs to neither of them. There is the sphere of completely rationalized human action---the kind of rationality that we get in a balance sheet or in the plans and specifications of an architect or an engineer. And there is the higher sphere of rationality to which the human mind attains, but which is not created by it---the higher realities of philosophy and abstract truth.

But between these two realms there is a great intermediate region in which we live, the middle earth of life and history; and that world is submitted to forces which are both higher and lower than reason. There are forces of nature in the strict sense and there are higher forces of spiritual good and evil which we cannot measure. Human life is essentially a warfare against unknown powers---not merely against flesh and blood, which are themselves irrational enough, but against principalities and powers, against "the Cosmocrats of the Dark Aeon," to use St. Paul's strange and disturbing expression; powers which are more than rational and which make use of lower things, things below reason, in order to conquer and rule the world of man.

That this pronouncement on a philosophy (?) of history leaves much to be desired in the way of objective and scientific appraisal of the social and cultural dynamics about us, is apparent on the first reading. For a man of philosophy and letters of the alleged stature of Mr. Dawson to claim that human life is nothing more than a constant warfare against unseen "powers" and that history can only be a saga of this hopeless struggle of man against the unknown and the essentially never-conquerable forces of this universe is but to negate all faith in human ~~teleology~~^{teleology} and all faith in the world itself. If this is all that the Roman Catholic Mr. Dawson can offer in the way of a constructive philosophy of history then it is a very

poor one. This does not mean that Mr. Dawson is being made to speak in the name of and for the official Church. No one can do that but the Pope, but, considering the fact that Mr. Dawson is an outstanding Catholic, and considering the fact that his opinions carry great weight among Catholic circles, it is difficult to escape from the fact that Mr. Dawson does not have at least the tacit approval of the Church, otherwise he would not enjoy such prestige in Papal circles.

Even Mr. Dawson's newest book Religion And Culture (The Gifford Lectures delivered at the University of Edinburgh, 1947) is not a great improvement over the above. His thesis is that "we have a secularized scientific world culture which is a body without a soul; while on the other hand religion maintains its separate existence, as a spirit without a body." He further claims that when man dichotomizes his social way of life from spiritual values, his life and world become very unstable.(11) Such is not a new idea by any means. Dawson here essentially repeats himself as he did in the above cited books. The one thing that Dawson is not willing to admit is that man has to find his destiny and that, because of man's inherent spiritual needs, and here spiritual is used in its broadest sense, man has to attain this destiny by whatever ethical means which best suits him historically and culturally. But to claim that man has a right to charter his own course for his spiritual destination is to admit that man has an inherent right to his religious and spiritual autonomy. Such Dawson cannot do and remain within

the pale of Roman Catholicism. However Mr. Dawson is not to be too severely condemned although he does deserve some censure for claiming the emoluments of a philosopher and a man of letters and yet remain so pitifully parochial and insular in his philosophical thinking. His is but another example of a man being forced (in this case, Dawson's authoritarian Catholicism being the force) to fit into the confines of a religious authoritarianism the necessarily fluid dynamics of social development.

In the field of philosophy, in particular, the limits are even more well-defined; in fact the limits are outright prohibitions:(12)

Canon 282 Philosophy and theology shall be taught by the professors according to the manner of the Angelic Doctor, without deviating from his doctrine and principles.

In a special encyclical requiring the whole world Church to recognize Aquinas as the only philosophical guide, Leo XIII said:(13)

We most strenuously exhort you, Venerable Brethren that...you reinstate and as widely as possible propagate the inestimable wisdom of St. Thomas.

It is interesting to note what Pius XI had to say about philosophy and philosophers: (14)

...it is the duty of every philosopher who wishes to be a son of the Church---indeed it is the duty of philosophy itself---never to say anything contrary to what the Church teaches, also to withdraw opinions about which the Church may have admonished him.

In the arena of history, for example, there is a plenitude of citations which indicate that there is a sharp collision between facts as impartially and objectively documented and the

Roman Catholic Church's interpretation of these same facts:

The Church, as such, was not involved in these excesses but they were produced within the Church.(15)

This above statement was made by Jacques Maritain, the French Catholic philosopher recently appointed to a chair of history at Princeton in 1948, with reference to the excesses of the Church and the clergy in the Middle Ages. This same philosopher said elsewhere that Rousseau was:(16)

...a prodigious perverter who gave us that cadaver of Christian ideas the immense putrefaction of which now poisons the world.

This Maritain also said that

the homicidal ideas which issued from the Reformation and (French) Revolution

formed the justification for another of his statements:

It was five hundred years ago that we began to die.

Here is as good a Catholic historian's apotheosis of the past as can be found:(17)

Before the French Revolution, society, with but rare exceptions, was organized on a Christian basis. Political and social ordinances, public and private justice, and institutions, were all inspired by Christian principles...Liberalism, child of that bloody mother the French Revolution, and grandchild of rationalist Protestantism, broke up the framework of the Christian civitas, that glory of bygone days, by proclaiming religion to be but a private affair and relieving the government of any duty in its regard.

It will be news to constitutional scholars that the Declaration of Independence, according to the 1948 Catholic Almanac, is largely derivative of Catholic inspiration:(18)

A study of its philosophical principles reveals them to be derived from the traditional stream of Catholic

philosophy. These principles when found in the works of non-Catholic writers are but a borrowing of Catholic doctrine.

Two outstanding Catholic churchmen whose philosophy and thought contribute to the excellence of the Declaration of Independence are St. Thomas Aquinas and St. Robert Bellarmine.

...A comparison of sections of the Declaration of Independence with selections from the works of these two renowned Catholic theologians, reveals a striking similarity of thought and identity of political principle.

The whole area of cures, relics and the like is as unscientific and deceitful as is the Hierarchy's assertions of its devotion of science. On the lower levels of comprehension, for example, the devotion of relics is encouraged and exploited but yet the Catholic Encyclopedic Dictionary says the following:(19)

No Catholic is formally bound to the positive veneration of relics but is forbidden by the Council of Trent to say that such veneration ought not to be given.

This encouragement results indirectly in the positive belief in the efficacy of these relics, and yet their authenticity cannot be assured. That their efficacy cannot be denied is an indication of the Hierarchy's reluctance to loose so fruitful and advantageous a hold on the simple and uninformed faithful.

The general area of apparitions and supernatural appearances has been exploited to a degree that is offensive to the sensibilities of sincere intellectuals. It has always puzzled men of science that the astronomical manifestations which are claimed to have occurred as part of these apparitions are never recorded in scientific journals, yet is alleged that 'thousands' are witness to some celestial or solar phenomenon. (20) In a

broadcast describing the miracle at Fatima, the Reverend Doctor Fulton Sheen said, in 1947, that:(21)

We are not concerned about proving the authenticity of these phenomena at Fatima, for those who believe in the realm of the spirit and the Mother of God need no proof, and those who reject the Spirit would not accept it anyway.

It is interesting to note that the preface to the Song of Bernadette contains much the same sentiment; perhaps it is just coincidental that these two thoughts are so much alike. Those who believe have a right to demand a reasonable basis for their belief; those who demand proof before they would believe are exercising their inherent intellectual rights. The obvious difficulty with clichés such as the above is that they sound very important, yet when they are subjected to analysis they become untenable. The Monsignor makes the very convenient assumption that faith does not need rational proof and that those who would demand this proof, if this proof were possible, would not accept it anyhow. This form of argument seem always to be used in a situation which can neither be proved nor disproved, as in a case of a miracle. Who can truthfully say that the "cure" could not have been affected by autosuggestion or other psychological means when it is admitted by all responsible psychologists that the mind in its broadest connotation is still very much of a mystery? Such is not true and, further, constitutes an insult to those sincere persons who keenly feel the ethical responsibility for the use of their intellects.

In the general area of Evolution, the Roman Catholic

Church still remains adamant in the face of embarrassing information to the contrary. Catholic scientists can believe in Evolution if they wish but they are required not to teach it as a fact but only as a hypothesis; they must further teach that the soul was specially created at some time during this evolutionary process and that all of mankind descended from Adam and Eve, the first parents, according to Scripture.

Here is what Dr. William Agar in his Catholicism and the Progress of Science has to say concerning the limit beyond which the Catholic scientist may not go in compromising with secular science:(22)

...the Catholic view of man...precludes the acceptance of evolution of man as a whole from animal life,

but that a Catholic may believe in the theory which teaches:

the scientific theory...that life has developed from life with change and specialization from simple beginnings up to the manifold types now existing.

With respect to Euthanasia and Eugenics the Roman Church is no less adamant and truculent. Both of these procedures are alleged to be against the laws of God and the natural law. Both of these suggestions are equated to the abuses of these procedures as seen in Nazi Germany. The only arguments marshalled by Catholics are plans for these movements which are admittedly unwise, that is unwise in the sense not that the objective is worthy but that the specific implementation is faulty. It is just for this reason that these faulty plans are exploited to the fullest by the Catholic opposition, the inference being that if these are wrong, all are wrong. The obvious fault with this

kind of thinking is that it conveniently neglects to include worthwhile and safe plans. Here is an example of this emotionalized thinking:(23)

Euthanasia is founded on the principle that destruction of life is preferable to pain and suffering. Inculcate that principle and you engender a destructive fear of pain and suffering. Students and scholars will shrink from the pain of work; women will dread the anxiety of childbearing. "Why should life all labor be?" Fear and dread of pain are often worse than the actuality. Why not end life at the first appearance of fear?

What I do want to emphasize is the cheapened regard for human life, based on materialism and atheism, which has become widespread under the impulse of a false, unscientific, and immoral liberalism. This is fact one. Fact number two is the growing hatred, contempt, fear and snarling opposition to the Catholic Church by those liberals who see clearly that Catholic philosophy and Catholic dogma alone stand in the way of their propaganda.

Is not denied that such powers would have to be carefully safeguarded, just as other great and potentially dangerous powers have been safeguarded. The courts recognize this problem and so do other thoughtful persons but The Catholic Church still remains stubborn because of fear that at least some of the faithful might come to the conclusion that the Church does not want to be displaced as the final arbiter of man's bodily and spiritual destiny.

This chapter has attempted to demonstrate that the Roman Catholic Church and science in its broadest sense are at complete loggerheads because Catholicism regards every advance of science as a threat to its hold on the minds of those unfortunate not to be in a position to question her claims. The Church is fearful lest the uneducated learn that many things which the

Church claims to be true are not so and can be demonstrated not to be so. The Church is afraid of progress and light which will show her up as being essentially medieval in her thinking and practices. It is not to be inferred that eventually civilization will outgrow the need of religion. That is looking into the future; that, no man can do. What is intended in this attack on the scientific policies of the Roman Catholic Church is this: responsible opinion indicates that the need for religion in man is fundamentally recognized. (Tylor) The problem is, therefore, that man should educate himself so as to profit from religion intelligently, religion which has many positive values to offer but not a religion which would enslave man and eventually, if allowed, the whole world.

The world needs the kind of religion as the late Rabbi Joshua Loth Liebman outlined in his Peace Of Mind, a book which has a definite message to give. Dr. Liebman's religion is not the childish and self-effacing kind of religious self-abnegation; it is a noble and inspiring faith, a faith which does not purport to arrogance and exclusivity, a faith which is willing to cooperate with any discipline of man which will better prepare man for his spiritual role in this universe. In Dr. Liebman's religion, science would go hand in hand with religion, each aiding the other and both, consequently, contributing to the greatest experience of man, the knowledge and the feeling of the oneness with God.

References

Chapter VII

1. Blanchard, op. cit., p. 231
2. Ibid, p. 231
3. Ibid, p. 231
4. Ibid, p. 231
5. Human Breeding And Survival, Burch and Pendell, Pelican Books, New York, 1947 p. 120
6. Shall We Have Children, The Ethical Aspects of The Planned Parenthood Movement, The Paulist Press, New York, 1947, p. 30
7. Psychoanalysis, Reverend Charles Bruehl, Ph.D. The Paulist Press pp. 15, 16
8. Beyond Politics, Dawson, pp. 91, 92
9. Primitive Cultures, Tylor
10. Dawson op. cit., pp. 121, 122
11. Religion and Culture, Dawson
12. Blanchard, op. cit., p. 232
13. Ibid, p. 232
14. Ibid, p. 232
15. Ibid, p. 235
16. Ibid, p. 235
17. Ibid, p. 235
18. Ibid, p. 235
19. Ibid, p. 224
20. Ibid, pp. 223-228
21. Ibid, p. 228
22. Ibid, p. 229 Also of. The Origin of Man, O'Brien

23. Mercy Killing Is Murder, Ignatius W. Cox, S.J., Fordham University, New York, p. 14. Cf. also So Called "Mercy" Killing and Legalized "Mercy" Killing, both by the Rt. Rev. Msgr. Robert E. McCormick, J.C.D., Presiding Judge of the New York Archdiocesan Ecclesiastical Tribunal, The Catholic Information Society, 214 W. 31st St., New York 1, N.Y. Our Fathers Faith and Ours, David S. Schaff, op. cit., Chapter XXVI

Chapter VIII

It has been the task of this Part of demonstrate that a very definite conflict exists between the Church and society in general as we know it. This term 'society' was conveniently broken down into some of its component parts in order that the criticism levelled against Catholicism might the better be substantiated by specific examples.

This collision of powers assumes its most evident form in the present struggle of Church and State, particularly in Europe. In Hungary, for example, the opposition of the Communists against the Roman Catholic Church has assumed the proportions of unmitigated violence and cruelty. Yet, in the American Perspective of March, 1949, there is an excellent article about this problem in Hungary. (1) It will be noted that the author's name is XYZ: in other words, for obvious reasons, he or she wishes to remain anonymous; it will be further noted that the sympathies of the author appear, (and this word is used advisedly because it is only a speculation,) to be pro-Catholic but of the variety of the liberal sort. Obviously, the Church has little use for 'liberal' Catholics. This article certainly cannot be called anti-Catholic in any sense. Assuming that this author has played down many of the objectionable features of Roman Catholic royalist interference in the affairs of Hungary, what must be the true conditions as observed by one less prejudiced? It is clear that the present conflict between the Church and State in Hungary has been going on for centuries;

it is only now that this unfortunate situation has jelled and the Communists have very cleverly exploited it for its fullest worth. Western Europe had its chance at the end of World War I to raise the standards of living in Europe but Western Europe and the United States failed. The Communists are now taking to their advantage just exactly what we failed to take to our advantage. If appearances are any indication of events to come, all of western Europe will live to regret this failure; it is happening now.

Perhaps one of the most outstanding but least publicized examples of the conflict between Church and State is the following:

In 1921, the Island of Malta, a British colony, and with a population made up mostly of Catholics, was granted a Constitution by the Letters Patent of the British Imperial Government. The Governor is appointed by the British Government, and the Governor appoints the Ministers and also the head of the Ministry. The Senate consists of ten special members, two appointed by the Roman Catholic Hierarchy, two by the nobility, two by the University, two by the Chamber of Commerce, and two by the Trades Union. The remaining seven general members of the Senate, as also the thirty-two members of the Assembly, are elected by popular vote. All the fullest liberties are granted, including those of religion, conscience, and assembly. No religious qualifications for public office are required but extraordinary powers are reserved to the Imperial Government.

It appears that under these conditions that the following incident occurred.

It seems that Lord Strickland, President of the Council of Ministers, had on various occasions incurred the ire of the Hierarchy by his actions as head of the Constitutional Party.

One particular day, three Bishops of the Church of England visited the Island of Malta and were given accommodations in the throne-room of the Governor which was the former palace of the Grand Master of the Order of Malta, which building belonged to the people of Malta. Lord Strickland suspended Parliament in order that it might pay its respects to the visiting Bishops. The Vatican took violent exception to these courtesies, and in a letter to the British Minister at the Vatican, February 23, 1929, Cardinal Gasparri, the Papal Secretary of State said that the incidents were not only "particularly displeasing" but also were "offensive" presumably to the Catholic majority of Malta, because such a courteous treatment of the visiting Anglican Bishops constituted "a formal and official favoring of the Anglican creed."

At the same time this particular incident was happening, another more grave situation arose which the Vatican considered the climacteric of Church and State affairs.

This new difficulty arose from the assertion on the part of the Holy See that it had the power to command a friar and a British subject, the Reverend P. Guido Micallef, to leave Malta against his will and go to another country. It seems that

Father Micallef's only offense was a personal disaffection for his superior, a one Father Carta. Father Micallef refused to obey the order of his superior to leave Malta.

Lord Strickland was very outspoken of the right of the ecclesiastical authorities to deport a British subject against his will. The Government of Malta did nothing to aid the ecclesiastical authorities in carrying out the deportation of Father Micallef. On February 23, 1929 the Vatican sent the British Government the following note: (2)

...that the Holy See has learnt, with deep regret and surprise, what has taken place in Malta in connection with the measures adopted towards the Franciscan friar, Guido Micallef.

For grave reasons of ecclesiastical discipline, the lawful Superior of the said religious, the representative, that is, of the Head House in Rome, had ordered Micallef to withdraw from Malta to another friary of the Order outside the Island.

The latter, however, did not leave and found a pretext for his disobedience to the hierarchy of the Church in the orders of the local Government authorities who prevented his departure and furthermore sought to justify before the public their attitude by alleging political motives which do not in fact exist.

The British Government averred that no obstacle was being placed in the way of Father Micallef's departure, and that no little public interest was being stirred up by the actions of a foreigner, one Father Carta, in ordering a British subject to leave British territory against his will. The British Government claimed that whatever vows the monk may have taken, his essential rights as a British subject were none the less valid. Thus the Imperial British Government, in sustaining the actions

of Lord Strickland, repudiated the Vatican claim of the power to deprive a British subject of his civil rights.

This controversy went on, each side claiming new grievances. The British Government claimed that the Maltese Catholic priests were participating too actively in local politics, and therefore asked the Vatican to restrain the actions of its priests. This the Vatican refused to do.

The Vatican, on the other hand, accused the Government of Lord Strickland of being anti-"Catholic" (when the man was a good Catholic himself but who had the courage to disagree with the Pope, hence his anti-Catholicism), accusing Lord Strickland of favoring Masonry, (always a convenient accusation) insolence toward the Vatican, and other vague charges. For his courageous stand, Lord Strickland was pronounced out of favor with the Holy See, and the Government, in turn, protested this action as interfering with the affairs of the colony.

On May 1, 1930, the Maltese Roman Catholic Bishops issued a Pastoral Letter in which attention was called to an approaching State election. This Letter said: (3)

Know, therefore, as Catholics:-

1. You may not, without committing a grave sin, vote for Lord Strickland and his candidates, or for all those, even of other parties, who in the past have helped and supported him in his fight against the rights and the discipline of the Church, or who propose to help and support him in the coming elections.
2. For even stronger reasons you may not present yourselves as candidates in the electoral list proposed by Lord Strickland or by other parties who propose to support him in the coming election.

3. You are also solemnly bound in conscience in the present circumstances to take part in the elections and to vote for those persons who, by their attitude in the past, offer greater guarantee both for religious welfare and for social welfare.
4. In order, then, to prevent abuses in the administration and reception of the Sacraments, we remind our priests that they are strictly forbidden to administer the Sacraments to the obstinate who refuse to obey these instructions.

Obviously, this Letter precipitated a civil crisis because it forbade, by purely ecclesiastical mandate, the exercise of civil rights which were the right and heritage of all Maltese citizens, Catholic and non-Catholic alike. The Catholic people were in a very serious difficulty: it was a sin not to vote, yet it was an equally grave sin to vote in the manner expressly condemned by the Letter, the penalty being the loss of those Sacraments upon which their salvation, so they thought, depended. This action led to numerous instances where Maltese Catholics were refused absolution in the Confessional so long as they professed any allegiance to Lord Strickland. (4)

This serious state of affairs continued to such an extent that the Maltese Government suspended the elections in the Island, blaming the necessity for such action on the actions of the Vatican. An attempt to assassinate Lord Strickland occurred but it failed. Maltese citizens wanted a Te Deum chanted in thanksgiving for the escape of Lord Strickland but this request was refused.

On May 16, 1930, the British Government asked the Vatican to renew negotiations on the basis that the episcopal authorities

would permit the citizens full freedom to exercise their voting privilege as they saw fit; this was refused on the part of the Vatican which averred that the Bishops were within their rights in so doing, and that both the Church and State, although two separate powers, came from the same source, Jesus Christ.

(Attention will be called to this argument met many times elsewhere in this investigation: the equating of the Roman Catholic Church and Jesus Christ; the one as the only and exclusive representative of the other). Thus the entire civil structure of Malta was virtually paralyzed by the conflict between the claims of the Roman Catholic Church and the Imperial British Government. Marshall expressed this difficulty very graphically when he says: (5)

Such is the civic paralysis which has come about in Malta through the assertion by the Pope of his right to deprive a British subject, professing the Roman Catholic religion, of the civil liberty guaranteed him by the law of the land, and through the utilization by the Roman Catholic Hierarchy of the confessional and the Sacraments to coerce the action of Roman Catholic citizens in an issue which the Holy See holds is religious and of the Church, but which the British Government holds is political and of the State. (6)

The question arises as to the relevance of this episode in Malta and the theory and practice of democracy in the United States. It is believed that there is a very timely relevance.

It is noted in the Papal Bull Unam Sanctam, issued by Pope Boniface VIII, the following doctrines: (7)

We are compelled, our faith urging us, to believe and to hold---and we do firmly believe and simply confess--- that there is one holy Catholic and apostolic church, outside of which there is neither salvation nor

remission of sins;...We are told by the word of the gospel that in this His fold there are two swords,---a spiritual, namely, and a temporal. For when the apostles said "Behold here are two swords"---when, namely, the apostles were speaking in the church---the Lord did not reply that this was too much, but enough. Surely he who denies that the temporal sword is in the power of Peter wrongly interprets the word of the Lord when He says: "Put up thy sword in its scabbard." Both swords, the spiritual and the material, therefore, are in the power of the church; the one, indeed, to be wielded for the church, the other by the church; the one by the hand of the priest, the other by the hand of kings and knights, but at the will and sufferance of the priest. One sword, moreover, ought to be under the other, and the temporal authority to be subjected to the spiritual. For when the apostle says, "there is no power but of God, and the powers that are of God are ordained," they would not be ordained unless sword were under sword and the lesser one, as it were, were led by the other to great deeds....

Indeed we declare, announce and define, that it is altogether necessary to salvation for every human creature to be subject to the Roman Pontiff. (8)

Two doctrines emerge from this pronouncement: one, that there is no salvation outside the Roman Catholic Church, and, two, that the Roman Catholic Church ought to rule temporally as well as spiritually. Taken in its entirety, this document would abolish all private conscience in matters of religion and would inaugurate a rule of the ecclesiastical best. Every freedom which man has torn from the hands of his oppressors would have to be sacrificed and man would be nothing more than a slave. It follows, therefore, that the doctrines enunciated in this document are those same doctrines found elsewhere, as this study has shown. Furthermore, it will be seen that such doctrines, no matter how watered-down they may be now, are in direct opposition to the practice of democracy as that is known in the

United States.

This is what the *Civiltà Cattolica*, the official world-organ of the Jesuits, published in Rome, has to say about tolerance and freedom for non-Catholics: (9)

The Roman Catholic Church, convinced, through its divine prerogatives, of being the only true church, must demand the right of freedom for herself alone, because such a right can only be possessed by truth, never by error. As to other religions, the Church will certainly never draw the sword, but she will require that be legitimate means they shall not be allowed to propagate false doctrine. Consequently, in a state where the majority of the people are Catholic, the Church will require that legal existence be denied to error, and that if religious minorities actually exist, they shall have only a de facto existence without opportunity to spread their beliefs... In some countries, Catholics will be obliged to ask full religious freedom for all, resigned at being forced to cohabitate where they alone should rightfully be allowed to live. But in doing this the Church does not renounce her thesis, which remains the most imperative of her laws, but merely adapts herself to de facto conditions, which must be taken into account in practical affairs... The Church cannot blush for her own want of tolerance, as she asserts it in principle and applies it in practice.

It is very doubtful if the average American Catholic is familiar with the doctrines contained in this and other official Catholic statements. If these facts were known to the public at large, there might result unpleasant public demonstrations. Then the Roman Church would cry 'persecution' when in reality that same Church claims the right to persecute others for the same reasons for which it (the Church) would be persecuted.

The Roman Catholic Church makes great capital about the Encyclical Letters of Leo XIII, particularly the Rerum Novarum, but a close examination of this and other similar documents of Leo XIII reveal one important fact: the social programme outlined

in this Letter does not necessarily call for democratic institutions to implement these social reforms. Since this same Leo XIII also developed the doctrine that the Church is indifferent to all forms of government just so long as these governments respect the freedom and rights of the Church, there is serious doubt if these Letters of Leo XIII are as world-shattering as our Catholic friends would have us believe. Furthermore, the implementation of these social and economic doctrines of Leo XIII and others would be more successful in a paternalistic or totalitarian government, one in which the Church played the major rôle, obviously. The claim that the Roman Catholic Church is not an enemy of democracy cannot be sustained if the Letters of Leo XIII are carefully read. So long as the Roman Church condemns the freedom of the press, religion, conscience, and assembly, as has been demonstrated that she does, there can never be any satisfactory cooperation between the Church and the institutions of democracy in the United States and elsewhere.

In an article entitled Catholics and Socialists, Can They Join in a Liberal Coalition to Save Democracy in Western Europe, which appeared in The Nation of December 11, 1948, George La Piana of Harvard, emeritus professor of Church history, and G. L. Arnold, a British political writer discussed this question. (10) Mr. Arnold took the position that Catholics and Socialists could join together and Professor La Piana very quickly demolished Mr. Arnold's thesis by pointing out that the Church has officially condemned Socialism in all its forms. As a matter of

fact Professor La Piana did not write anything that Mr. Arnold could not have read himself if he had but taken the trouble to do so. The gulf between these two forces is irreconcilable.

In an article in the American Perspective of January 1949, entitled Italy Under De Gasperi, one finds disturbing news about conditions in Italy: (11)

It is not so much Fascism that has returned as the pre-Fascist atmosphere of conservative monarchism---which the aristocrats always preferred to the vulgarities of Fascism. The House of Savoy has gone, but scarcely anyone remarks its absence.

Slowly, by almost imperceptible stages, Italy is moving to the Right. De Gasperi himself, one presumes, is resisting the trend, but the forces of conservatism are gradually overwhelming him.

If so, what is the next stage? A return of full-bloom Fascism, with all the trappings of national pride and expansion, appears most unlikely. Present signs point, rather, toward the clerical-corporative type of state that existed in Austria under Dolfuss and Schuschnigg and as represented today by Salazar's Portugal---a sleepy, traditionalist regime and an indigenous outgrowth of the Mediterranean tradition.

According to The Nation of October 9, 1948, there is an article by a British writer, Colonel Sheppard, in which this observer points out the acute economic and social condition of present-day Spain. This is the same Spain which is governed by a dictator as reprehensible of Hitler or Stalin and yet the Roman Catholic Church refuses to disassociate itself from him. It is significant that every observer going into Spain has not been able to discern the benefactions of Franco in quite the same clarity as do the Catholic apologists. If Spain is held up as an example of the corporate state of the Rerum Novarum of

Leo XIII, and if Portugal is held in like manner, it can quickly be seen what would happen to our own institutions if the Roman Catholic Church ever were able to dictate her social and political philosophy to the American public.

In conclusion, this thought emerges: what is happening in Europe now as well as what has happened in Europe in the past when the Roman Catholic Church assumes control of a nation can happen to these United States. In Paul Blanshard's book American Freedom And Catholic Power, he very graphically illustrates exactly what this whole investigation is trying to demonstrate, by listing three Catholic amendments to the Constitution of the United States. As Mr. Blanshard explains, the items in these three amendments are directly copied from official Catholic documents. The sources of these amendments are fully documented in the notes of his book; it is thought best to reproduce these amendments; seeing is believing:

The First Amendment is as follows:

The Christian Commonwealth Amendment

1. The United States is a Catholic Republic, and the Catholic Apostolic and Roman religion is the sole religion of the nation.
2. The authority of the Roman Catholic Church is the most exalted of all authorities; nor can it be looked upon as inferior to the power of the United States government, or in any manner dependent upon it, since the Catholic Church as such is a sovereign power.
3. Priests and members of religious orders of the Roman Catholic Church who violate the law are to be tried by an ecclesiastical court of the Roman Catholic Church, and may, only with the consent of the competent Catholic authority, be tried by the courts of the United States or the states.

4. Apostate priests of those incurring the censure of the Roman Catholic Church cannot be employed in any teaching post or any office or employment in which they have immediate contact with the public.
5. Non-Catholic faiths are tolerated, but public ceremonies and manifestations other than those of the Roman Catholic religion will not be permitted.
6. The First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed.

The Second Amendment is as follows:

The Christian Education Amendment:

1. American religious education belongs pre-eminently to the Roman Catholic Church, by reason of a double title in the supernatural order, conferred exclusively upon her by God himself.
2. The Roman Catholic Church has the inalienable right to supervise the entire education of her children in all educational institutions in the United States, public or private, not merely in regard to the religious instruction given in such institutions, but in regard to every other branch of learning and every regulation in so far as religion and morality is concerned.
3. Compulsory education in public schools exclusively shall be unlawful in any state in the Union.
4. It shall be unlawful for any neutral or non-Catholic school to enroll any Catholic child without permission of the Church.
5. Since neutral schools are contrary to the fundamental principles of education, public schools in the United States are lawful only when both religious instruction and every other subject taught are permeated with Catholic piety.
6. The governments of the United States and of the states are permitted to operate their own schools for military and civic training without supervision by the Roman Catholic Church, provided they do not injure the rights of the said Church, and provided that only the Roman Catholic Church shall have power to impart any religious instructions in such schools.

7. With due regard to special circumstances, co-education shall be unlawful in any educational institution in the United States whose students have attained the age of adolescence.
8. The governments of the United States and the states shall encourage and assist the Roman Catholic Church by appropriate measures in the exercise of the Church's supreme mission as educator.

The Third Catholic Amendment is as follows:

The Christian Family Amendment

1. The government of the United States, desirous of restoring to the institution of matrimony, which is the basis of the family, that dignity conformable to the traditions of its people, assigns as civil effects of the sacrament of matrimony all that is attributed to it in the Canon Law of the Roman Catholic Church.
2. No matrimonial contract in the United States that involves a Catholic can be valid unless it is in accordance with the Canon Law of the Roman Catholic Church.
3. Marriages of non-Catholics are subject to the civil authority of the state, but all civil laws that contradict the Canon Law of the Roman Catholic Church on marriage are hereby declared null and void.
4. All marriages are indissoluble, and the divorce of all persons is prohibited throughout the territory of the United States: provided that nothing herein shall affect the right of annulment and re-marriage in accordance with the Canon Law of the Roman Catholic Church.
5. Attempted mixed marriages or unions between members of the Roman Catholic Church and non-Catholics are null and void, and the children of such unions are illegitimate, unless a special dispensation is obtained from the ecclesiastical authority of the Catholic Church.
6. Birth control, or any act that deliberately frustrates the natural power to generate life, is a crime.
7. Direct abortion is murder of the innocent even when performed through motives of misguided pity when the life of a mother is gravely imperiled.

8. Sterilization of any human being is forbidden except as an infliction of grave punishment under the authority of the government for a crime committed.

This collision of powers is further in evidence in the technique now being used by the Knights of Columbus in softening some of the more objectionable arrogances of the Church. It is done in this manner: the Knights of Columbus have been running in newspapers all over the country, an advertisement purporting to clear up misstatements about the Roman Catholic Religion by listing a series of statements which are supposed to be inaccurate in matters of general doctrine. On close examination, however, of these misstatements, the following plan emerges: The Knights of Columbus slightly misstate the major criticisms of non-Catholics, and then these same Knights proceed to deny what these original statements are not, the result being that the uninitiate do not see that the original intentionally-overstated statement is essentially true. Attention is drawn from the brashness of this subtle form of putting over extremely offensive doctrines in an indirect manner by denying some less important phase of the original question. In other words, the 'answer' is essentially the over-stated original misstatement conveniently corrected of a purposely over-stated bias. (12)

Paul Blanshard brings out this device very clearly, calling it "the fallacy of irrelevant conclusion." Stated in more clear terms, mathematically, for example, this technique runs something like this: opponents of the Church claim that X is true about the Church but the Knights of Columbus claim that X' is

not true about the Church. It usually escapes most persons that the Knights (the Church in the background, in actuality) ^{assert} that X' is not true and cleverly avoid any mention of X which turns out to be essentially true. It is thought best to give a few examples of this extremely sophisticated technique of casuistry; (13) only the most important as bearing on this investigation will be cited:

1. Catholic advertisement; "You hear it said that Catholics believe all non-Catholics are headed for Hell."

Actual Catholic teaching: Non-Catholics who deliberately reject Catholicism are headed for Hell.

3. Catholic advertisement: "Some think Catholics believe the Pope is God."

Actual Catholic teaching: Catholics owe "complete submission and obedience of will to the Church and to the Roman Pontiff, as to God Himself."

4. Catholic advertisement: "That he can do no wrong."
Actual Catholic teaching: The pope can do no wrong when he speaks as head of the Church in matters of faith and morals.
5. Catholic advertisement: "That they owe him civil allegiance."
Actual Catholic teaching: They owe him civil allegiance in matters of morals, education and priestly rights.
6. Catholic advertisement: "And that he should have the political power to rule America."
Actual Catholic teaching: He should rule America in moral, educational and religious matters.
7. Catholic advertisement: "It is said that Catholics want religious freedom only for themselves."
Actual Catholic teaching: They advocate complete religious freedom for non-Catholics only as a temporary concession in non-Catholic countries, but in Catholic countries they restrict other cults.

8. Catholic advertisement: "That they oppose public schools (as an evil which should be destroyed)."
Actual Catholic teaching: They oppose public schools for Catholic children as an evil which should be destroyed.

9. Catholic advertisement: "And separation of church and state as evils which should be destroyed."
Actual Catholic teaching: They condemn separation of church and state and advocate support of Catholic schools by public taxation.

This is not fancy, by any means, for Mr. Blanshard gives responsible official Roman Catholic documentation for every one of these statements; some of these sources have already been evaluated in previous chapters of this investigation.

It is then clear that there is a very marked collision of powers between the Roman Catholic Church and the theory and practice of democracy as recognized in the United States and as exemplified in the Constitution of the United States.

References

Chapter VIII

1. American Perspective, March 1949, pp. 510-522
2. Marshall op.cit., p. xxii
3. Ibid, p. xxiv
4. Ibid, pp. xxvi-xxvii
5. Ibid, p. xxix
6. This entire narrative is based on Marshall, pp. xiii-xxix
7. Introduction To Contemporary Civilization In The West, Vol. I, Columbia University Press, 1946, p. 21
8. Italics in original
9. Blanchard, op. cit., p. 295
10. The Nation, December 11, 1948, pp. 662-668
11. American Perspective, January 1949, pp. 418-419
12. Blanchard, op. cit., p. 296
13. Ibid, p. 338; 298-299

Suggested Collateral Readings

Our Fathers Faith and Ours, David S. Schaff, op. cit., Chapters VIII, IX, and XXIX
The Catholic Crisis, George Seldes, New York Nessner, 1939. Chapter VI
The Catholic-Protestant Mind, Conrad Henry Moehlman, op. cit., Chapters II, III, V, VI, and VIII
Catholicism And The American Mind, Winfred Ernest Garrison, op. cit., Chapters II, III, V, and XI.

Part III

Introduction

Part III will comprise the Conclusion of this investigation. It is obvious that, from the very first, this thesis has taken a very definite stand with regard to the partisanship in this question of Roman Catholicism and American democracy. This investigation has taken a stand and has attempted to defend it. Obviously, limits of time and space preclude that the same amount of attention be accorded to the Catholic Church's defence of the charge which this work attempts to prove. In order to preserve the maximum amount of fairness in such a discussion as this, there will be included at the end of this investigation, an adequate list of suggested readings which act as defense. For those who feel that "the other side should be heard," these readings will fulfill that requirement. Obviously, these readings will reflect the official Catholic position.

Chapter IX

The conclusion of this whole investigation is this: It is the opinion of this study that the political and social philosophy of the Roman Catholic Church from the time of Leo XIII to the present collides with the theory and practice of American democracy as this is known in the United States: This conclusion is based on the facts and sources cited in this investigation, and also on the careful study of the Encyclical Letters purposely included. All the basic information is contained in the Letters cited in this work. Many of the doctrines are simply restated such as that of no salvation outside the Roman Church, that which says that all must come under the rule of the Pope-both of which can be found in the Unam Sanctam of Boniface VIII.

The conclusion of this study is further strengthened by the obvious fact that the Roman Catholic Church has failed to answer satisfactorily the very specific charges leveled against it by Mr. Blanshard. Mere name-calling and villification does not suffice.

Briefly, this investigation has demonstrated that the Roman Catholic Church is opposed to the following democratic concepts or institutions upon which the main structure of American democracy is built. Appropriate documentation will be supplied by reference to the appropriate error condemned by Pius IX and listed in the same Pontiff's Syllabus of Errors, a complete list of which can be found in Marshall, appendix II:

1. The Roman Catholic Church denies that every man has the right to choose his own religion.

This is condemned in Error 15.

2. Man will eventually find eternal salvation through the observance of any religion.

This is condemned in Error 16.

3. The Church should be willing to come under the supervisory power of the civil government.

This is condemned in Errors 19 and 20.

4. The Roman Pontiffs have erred and strayed from their competence and have usurped the powers of princes.

This is condemned in Error 23.

5. The Church has no force nor has she any temporal power direct or indirect.

This is condemned in Error 24.

6. The whole Church ought to be excluded from dominion over temporal affairs.

This is condemned in Error 27.

7. The Church derives its immunity of its persons from civil law.

This is condemned in Error 30.

8. All the Church courts for temporal causes, civil and criminal, ought to be abolished.

This is condemned in Error 31.

9. The discussion of theological questions is not the exclusive right of ecclesiastical jurisdiction.

This is condemned in Error 33.

10. The State, as the source of all right, cannot be circumscribed by any limits.

This is condemned in Error 39.

11. The civil power has, even when in the hands of infidel sovereigns an indirect negative power over religion.

This is condemned in Error 41.

12. In the event of a collision between two powers, the civil law prevails.

This is condemned in Error 42.

13. The State has the right to arrogate Concordats with the Holy See even in spite of the protestations of the Holy See.

This is condemned in Error 43.

14. The entire government of the public schools ought to be in the hands of the State.

This is condemned in Error 45.

15. Popular schools ought to be free from all ecclesiastical control.

This is condemned in Error 47.

16. Catholics may approve of a secular education which primarily emphasizes the importance of earthly things.

This is condemned in Error 48.

17. The Church ought to be separated from the State.

This is condemned in Error 55.

18. By the law of nature, marriage is not dissoluble and divorce can be authorized by the civil government.

This is condemned in Error 67.

19. The form of solemnizing Catholic marriage is not binding even when the civil power demands another form.

This is condemned in Error 71.

20. Matrimonial cases belong primarily in civil courts.

This is condemned in Error 74.

21. There is some doubt among Christian and Catholic circles about the compatibility of the temporal with the spiritual power.

This is condemned in Error 75.

22. The temporal power of the Church ought to be removed.

This is condemned in Error 76.

23. It is no longer necessary to believe that the Catholic religion is the only religion which the State ought to recognize.

This is condemned in Error 77.

24. In Catholic countries, persons of non-Catholic faith ought to be able to practice their faith by law.

This is condemned in Error 78.

25. Civil liberty ought to include freedom for every kind of worship of whatever form; it even ought to permit indifferentism.

This is condemned in Error 79.

26. The Roman Pontiff ought to come to terms with the spirit of modern liberalism.

This is condemned in Error 80.

The conclusion is inescapable; the theory and practice of democracy as exemplified in the Constitution and the philosophy, political and social, of the Catholic Church from Leo XIII to the present is incompatible. It is the further opinion of this investigation that the Roman Catholic Church constitutes a present threat to the safety of the United States. The opposition to the presidential campaign of the

late Alfred E. Smith was not without considerable justification. Even Mr. Smith was shocked at learning that, strictly according to Catholic doctrine he was speaking and behaving in an anti-Catholic manner when he avowed that his first loyalty would be to the United States and not to Rome. The excesses of that campaign were regrettable but the fact remains that many thoughtful people were seriously concerned as to the extent and kind of pressure which would have been exerted on Mr. Smith by the Vatican had he been elected. This Vatican objective has not been totally unsuccessful judging from the fact that the United States has an official representative in the Vatican. The name given to Mr. Myron Taylor is of little import; the fact that he is there officially representing the United States is the important fact. The Catholicization of America and of the world, for that matter, is not the opinion of a crank; it is the sober and sincere but, unfortunately misguided ambition of Roman Catholicism. It is in that ambition, the proof of which has been repeatedly furnished, which constitutes an acute danger, an acute present danger, to the personality of the United States.

It is felt necessary at this time to re-state more plainly what this investigation has held to be implication; on what thesis is this investigation primarily based? It is this:

Religion as well as other organized bodies of knowledge must have complete freedom of expression and existence. This

does not mean necessarily that all religions are equally right or equally efficacious. Such a pronouncement can only be made by those directly affected by these influences. All religions and all bodies of organized knowledge have a right to exist side by side because the right for their existence is not dependent upon their correctness or non-correctness but solely on the principle of law which avers that these bodies have a right to compete in the public market place of ideas. However, when one of these bodies becomes irresponsible and over-steps the bounds of good taste and becomes irresponsibly dangerous to the common weal, then society through the courts must decide whether or not the activities of such a body should be curtailed. This is as it should be so long as the courts continue to use as their basic premise for formulating and interpreting the law all past workable precedents as well as the ever-developing needs of present society. The philosophy of law assumes, obviously, that the activating principle which gives life and direction to the body-politic continue to come from the electorate--all of the people and not as Santayana would have it--government by the best for all the people. (The New York Times Book Review, August 14, 1949, p. 17)

It is not to be interpreted that this study is necessarily anti-Catholic because it takes Roman Catholicism sharply to task for what are positions incompatible with the theory and practice of American democracy.

The right is not denied to Roman Catholicism or any

other religious body, for that matter, to main a religious discipline to which adherence is expected of those professing such a religious discipline. That is a fundamental right which our Constitution and political way of life afford all those who would take advantage of it. Such a provision also protects those who have no religious affiliation because of our political credo that the right of religious freedom exists for those who wish it as well as for those who see no need for it. However, this absolute quality does not run into the area of irresponsibility as has been indicated before. Whether religion is good or not good does not come under the purview of the freedom-of-religion clause of the Constitution; what is protected by law is the right and the freedom so to do. The courts have repeatedly stated that they are not theological courts. The only time the courts have stepped in the religious area has been when the religious practices of some particular religion constituted a danger to society. The Supreme Court versus the Church of the Latter-Day Saints is a case in point. No one can deny that the Court dealt more than failly with a situation that could have led to a complete disruption of present day society. The Court did not say that plurality of wives could never be because it is very possible that, were a similar case to come before the Court in generations to come, the changes that will have come about may indicate that polygamy may be the acceptable mos.

It is because the Roman Catholic Church persists in the

declaration that no person has an inherent right to choose his or her religion, and that all ought to worship God as the Roman Catholic Church interprets God, and all the ramifications that such an authoritarianism means, that this investigation takes the stand that it does. What is believed is that religion or any other many-sided discipline cannot be made the subject of any partisan legislation in any country where political and social democracy purports to exist; these two assertions are mutually exclusive.

Suggested Collateral Readings

Our Fathers Faith And Ours, David S. Schaff, op. cit.,
Chapter XXIX for an excellent account of the Alfred E.
Smith affair.

Abstract

In order that this problem of the political and social philosophy of the Roman Catholic Church from Leo XIII to the present be more fully understood, it will be necessary to examine and evaluate the political, social, religious, cultural and economic currents of the nineteenth century, although it must be admitted that many of these nineteenth century movements had their naissances in the latter half of the eighteenth century and even earlier.

These currents all stemmed from the Industrial Revolution, a true revolution because of the radical changes this movement caused in Western Europe, primarily, and in the rest of the world after 1815. This revolution had definite causes, some of which were, the great commercial expansion which came about as the result of the colonial establishments of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the scientific expansion which was more of a combination of applying the knowledge which had been accumulating for centuries and using the newly-discovered wonders, and the particular historical rôle England played in this great drama. While this Revolution ushered in new technological worlds, it also was the harbinger of new economic and technological giants which caused untold suffering among those who were too small and unimportant to defend themselves from a new class of economic and financial despots who succeeded in gaining control of the entire economy of a country. This Revolution brought new comforts, principally to those who could afford them; it also

brought added misery to those who wanted and needed these comforts but who could not have these.

It is not strange that the poor and oppressed should want these comforts. It must not be overlooked, too, that the Revolution really intensified the efforts of the "common man" to raise his standard of living. Lastly, it must not be overlooked that the contributions which this Revolution made toward the expansion of what we know as modern capitalism is as much today a problem of social control as it was during the Revolution; the prime difference between these two historical periods is perhaps the degree of awareness of the need for social control.

It will be seen that when Leo XIII ascended the Papal throne, he found the affairs of the world in a confused and tragic state. However, it would appear that Leo XIII and the subsequent popes were over-alarmist because instead of looking upon these movements as necessary advances, perhaps costly and in many instances bloody, in the march of man toward the good life, these popes became alarmed at the new political, scientific, social and cultural way of life; men were seeking answers and were challenging for the first time in many instances the long venerated authorities mildewed with rigid sanctity. The Vatican, accustomed to consider itself the self-appointed and final arbiter of man's destiny on this earth and also the director of man's route to the next, chafed at this new rebellion and used every means possible to stem this rising tide of personal and national self-identification.

To substantiate the conclusion of this investigation that Roman Catholic political and social philosophy collides sharply with the theory and practice of American democracy as it is known and practiced in the United States today, attention has been called to the content of the various Encyclicals in which the following doctrines emerge:

1. All the political liberties which are contained in the Constitution of the United States and expanded by the Courts of the United States are condemned by the Roman Catholic Church unless it be interpreted that these freedoms are to be subject to the authority of the Church inasmuch as the Holy Church exists because of a clear mandate from Christ Himself. Therefore the Roman Catholic Church, out of inexorable logic (the will of God) becomes the only Church and the only repository of the one true Faith.
2. The Church claims for itself complete autonomy and furthermore claims that the State ought not to control the Church in any way whatever; in fact, the Church claims that the State should recognize the Church as the only valid and true Church established by God Himself. The Church claims proof of this assertion in the Scriptures, tradition, and in the pronouncements of the many popes throughout the Church's history.
3. The Church further claims that the world ought to recognize her authority not only in matters of faith and morals but also in every category of life, inasmuch as there are few areas in life which cannot be brought under the purview of faith or morals. The Church flatly asserts that the Pope should rule the entire world, that only the Roman Catholic religion should be allowed to exist and that all others should be proscribed unless tolerated as a modus vivendi and not on objective right, and that the world should return to the Pax Vaticana of the Middle Ages.
4. It is the conclusion of this investigation that these allegations of the Roman Catholic Church would result in the complete abrogation of not only the political and social freedoms as they are known and practiced in these United States, but also of the whole philosophy of the importance and dignity of man the world has so

laboriously conceived and developed since the beginnings of sapiential man.

It is thought advisable to again repeat the philosophy of this investigation in order that some might not interpret this as a tirade against religion in general or in particular.

This study believes that Religion should be left to the private exercise and judgment of the individual, and that no church has the right to claim exclusively to the extent that by reason of this self-asserted singularity all other religions would be excluded.

Further, all religions as well as all other organized and socially-useful bodies of systematized knowledge should have complete freedom of expression and existence. The right here to be guaranteed is not whether one religion or one political opinion be right or not but that of being able to freely express an opinion contrary though it may be to the few or to the many. The rightness or wrongness should be left to the judgment of the individual and should not be made the condition of function or existence. This is not to say that any irresponsible opinion which might endanger the common weal should be allowed full expression. Obviously some control and selection must be applied. This control will come from the courts which have their being in the social need for them and are forever the barometer of the condition of the social and political entity known as society. But it must be constantly repeated that these courts exist solely on the wish and consent of the electorate which is in the final analysis the source of all political power.

References

Chapter IX

1. Marshall, op.cit., Appendix II, pp. 358-369

Suggested Collateral Reading

Separate Church And State Now, Joseph Martin Dawson, op.cit., Chapter I, XI and the Appendix for a very important list of official Roman Catholic documents substantiating the principle criticisms which this investigation charges.

Catholicism And The American Mind, Winfred Ernest Garrison, op.cit., Chapters VI, VIII (this chapter contains an excellent refutation of the oft-mentioned Roman Catholic allegation that the principle political tenets of the American Constitution come from the political writings of the Jesuit Cardinal Bellarmine). See also chapter XI for the implications of Modernism with respect to American democracy.

Will America Become Catholic? John F. Moore, op.cit., Chapters I, VII, XI, and especially Chapter XVI on the Jefferson-Bellarmino legend as well as the alleged Roman Catholicism of George Washington.

Catholicism And The American Mind, Winfred Ernest Garrison, op.cit., Chapter VII for a clear and concise account of the controversy between Charles C. Marshall and Alfred E. Smith. Chapter VIII of this same book gives a factual refutation of the Roman Catholic assertion that Maryland under Roman Catholic auspices was the first and only American colony to afford complete religious freedom.

The following quotation from Garrison's book is included here because it is felt that it succinctly expresses the stand which this investigation has taken:

No more serious error can be made in judging of the spirit, the attitude and the method of Roman Catholicism in the United States at the present time than the assumption that it has been permeated and transformed in some subtle fashion by the spirit of American Institutions. There would have been some justification for such an opinion thirty years ago. There is none now. That individual laymen exhibit modern attitudes, is of course true. But the attitudes of the hierarchy, the "teaching church," are unchangingly medieval, and the pressure of this hierarchy is exercised without cessation upon all faithful laymen---except when some specific object is to be attained by allowing the liberal utterance of a layman to go temporarily unrebuked. p. 243.

Bibliography

Books

Aristotle

Politics, The Jowett translation, The Modern Library,
New York, 1943

Blanchard, Paul

American Freedom And Catholic Power, The Beacon Press,
Boston, 1949

Bradley, David

No Place To Hide, Bantam Books, New York, 1949

Burch, Guy Irving
Pendel, Elmer

Human Breeding And Survival, Population Roads to Peace
Or War, Pelican Books, New York, 1947

Corwin, Edward S.

The Constitution And What It Means Today, Princeton
University Press, Princeton, New Jersey, 1947

Dawson, Christopher

Religion And Culture, (The Gifford Lectures) Sheed & Ward,
New York, 1949

Deharbe, Joseph S.J.

A Full Catechism Of The Catholic Religion; Translated from
the German by The Reverend John Fander; Revised, enlarged,
and edited by The Right Reverend P. N. Lynch, D.D., Bishop
of Charlestown; New York, Schartz, Kerwin & Fauss, 1876

Hamilton, Alexander
Jay, John
Madison, James

The Federalist, The Modern Library

Jefferson, Thomas

On Democracy, Pelican Books, Edited by Saul Padover,
New York, 1946

Bibliography (cont.)

Hersey, John

Hiroshima, Bantam Books, 1948

Lewis, C.S.

The Abolition Of Man, MacMillan Co., New York, 1947

Marshall, Charles C.

The Roman Catholic Church In The Modern State, New and Revised, Dodd, Mead and Co., New York, 1931

Martin, Charles Alfred, Reverend

Catholic Religion - A Statement Of Christian Teaching, B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis, Mo., 1918

Parsons, Wilfred, S.J.

The First Freedom, Declan X. McMullen Co., New York, 1947

Tylor, Sir Edward

Primitive Culture, J. Murray, London, England

A Catechism Of Christian Doctrine, Revised Edition Of The Baltimore Catechism, No. 3 St. Anthony Guild Press, Paterson, New Jersey, 1949

Introduction To Contemporary Civilization In The West, Volume I, Columbia University Press, 1946

Pamphlets

Bruel, Charles, Reverend

Psychoanalysis, The Paulist Press, New York

Connell, Francis J. C. SS.R., S.T.D.

Freedom Of Worship - The Catholic Position, The Paulist Press, New York, 1944

Cox, Ignatius W., S.J.

Mercy Killing Is Murder! Radio Address W.L.W.L. November 15, 1935

Bibliography (cont.)

McCormick, Robert E., J.C.D., The Right Reverend

So-Called Mercy-Killing, The Catholic Information Society,
Legalized Mercy-Killing, 214 West 31st Street, New York,
1947

O'Brien, John A., Ph.D., LL.D., Reverend

Religion-Does It Matter? The Paulist Press, New York, 1944

The Origin Of Man, The Paulist Press, New York, 1947

Oxnam, G. Bromley, Bishop

A Reply to Archbishop Cushing's Attack Upon Protestants
And Other Americans United For The Separation Of Church
And State, February 15, 1948 over Station WMUR,
Manchester, New Hampshire.

Protestants And Other Americans United For The Separation Of
Church And State - A Manifesto, 924 Colorado Building,
Washington, D. C.

Shall We Have Children, The Ethical Aspects Of The Planned
Parenthood Movement, The Paulist Press, New York, 1947

The World Society - A Joint Report, The Catholic Association For
International Peace, 1312 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

Miscellaneous

Charter Of The Spanish People, The Spanish Embassy,
Washington, D.C.

Cultural Aspects Of Birth Control In Puerto Rico, Marguerite N.
King, Reprinted from Human Biology of February 1948, Volume 20,
No. 1.

Newspapers

The New York Times, November 21, 1948

The Register, July 3, 1949

Additional Annotated References
And Readings

The purpose of this additional annotated reading and reference list is the following:

1. It aims to provide a fuller and more detailed background to supplement what in the investigation is, of necessity, limited in scope.
2. It aims to provide a list of Catholic books and other official source-material which provide the official Church position on various questions of which this investigation treats.
3. The explanatory remarks, especially in the case of the Catholic references, are intended to point out the principal fallacy involved in the particular material being summarized. This is done particularly for those not too familiar with the devious dialecticism of Roman Catholic writers. It is not intended that these remarks should prejudice the reader against reading these references even the minimal understanding of the subject of this investigation is not impossible without an understanding of this necessarily selected material.

Part I

Books

Barnes, Harry Elmer

The History of Western Civilization, Volume II, Harcourt, Brace & Co., New York, 1935, Parts I and II, and especially Chapter 19.

Usher, Abbot Payson

An Introduction To The Industrial History Of England, Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston, 1920, especially chapter 10

Wallbank, T. Walter
Taylor, Alaistair M.

Civilization - Past And Present, Scott, Foresman & Co., New York, 1942, Volume I, Chapters 16, 17; Volume II, Chapters 1-6

Part II

Roman Catholic Scholastic Philosophy

D'Entrèves, A.P.

Aquinas, Selected Political Writings, Translated by J. G. Dawson; Basil Blackwell, Oxford, England, 1948

Gilson, Étienne

The Philosophy Of St. Thomas Aquinas, B. Herder Co., St. Louis, Mo., 1941

This book is written by a prominent Frenchman and Roman Catholic philosopher, and, therefore, carries official ecclesiastical approbation.

Meyer, Hans

The Philosophy Of St. Thomas Aquinas, Translated by Reverend Frederic Eckhoff; B. Herder Co., St. Louis, Mo., 1944

This is but a more extensive treatment of the above; it, too, carries official approbation.

Part III

Acton, Lord

Essays On Freedom And Power, The Beacon Press, 1948

Essays on a timeless subject by one of the most learned and distinguished Roman Catholics of the nineteenth century. Lord Acton fought ignorance and authoritarianism vigorously, and his relentless struggle against the narrowness and bigotry was no less effective. However, he was just a little too prominent a Catholic for the anti-democratic Pius IX to excommunicate.

Aquinas, Thomas, Saint

Selected Political Writings, A.P. D'Entrèves, and translated by J. G. Dawson; Basil Blackwell, Oxford, England, 1948

This is a very recent publication featuring translations of Aquinas' various political pronouncements from his Summa, Summa Contra Gentes, and other sources. This is an extremely revealing volume showing Aquinas' penchant for political authoritarianism. That his philosophy and that the political statements found in this particular treatise are totally opposed to the entire spirit and practice of the Constitution of the United States is a sobering fact; that Thomism has been officially adopted by the Roman Catholic Church by Papal decree is even more significant.

Burckhardt, Jacob

The Civilization Of The Renaissance, In Italy, Oxford University Press, New York, 1945

This constitutes the classical discussion of the Renaissance by the outstanding Swiss historian of the nineteenth, by some considered one of the greatest historians of that century. The condition of the Vatican, the religious tenor of the times, and the relation of religion to morality - all these and more are scholarly treated. The implications for modern American democracy are obvious: in essence, the Vatican has not changed in its authoritarianism down through the centuries.

Dawson, Christopher

Religion And The Modern State, Sheed & Ward, New York, 1935

There is little doubt that as a personal and cultural value, the modern state needs the general institution of religion, but Dawson's 'religion' is Roman Catholic and therefore exclusive. Dawson uses the general concept of religion in the specific sense of Roman Catholicism.

Farnsworth, Lawrence

Vatican And The War, A Task For Liberal Catholics, The Counter-Current, P. O. Box , Hanover Street Station, Boston, May, 1946

This exposé of the Vatican activities just prior to and during World War II are listed and analysed. This work is responsibly documented as far as it goes but it should have further documentation, so incredible are some of the allegations therein contained. The story of Monsignor Tiso, as well as that of other clerical fanatics is depressing considering that the Vatican never repudiated this murderer. Equally alarming is the all-pervading clerico-political bargaining. The implications for the United States are obvious even to the most casual reader.

Janelle, Pierre

The Catholic Reformation, The Bruce Publishing Co., Illinois.

This constitutes the first complete history in English of the Catholic Reformation, as The New York Times Book Review puts it. Strictly speaking, this book is the story of the Catholic Counter-reformation. Obviously, this is the official Roman Catholic position.

Maritain, Jacques

The Things That Are Not Caesar's, Translated by J.F. Scanlon, C. Scribner's Sons, 1931

A very sophisticated account of the age-old question of Church and State by one of the most skilled of the present-day Catholic lay-philosophers of France, now teaching in the Institute For Advanced Studies at Princeton. This philosopher, if such must be his designation, makes very frequent use of an extremely subtle form of argumentation, called by logicians, the argument of the thesis and the anti-thesis. The thesis is the Roman Catholic Church and all that that word implies under the 'ideal conditions'-- that is conditions where the Church would hold complete and unrestricted spiritual and temporal power; the anti-thesis represents the conditions as they obtain to-day or

at any time. If the Church is forced to retreat, as in the case of the Rhythm Theory in connection with Birth Control, it does so on the anti-thetical basis and not on its theoretical basis---a basis from which there is no retreat. The anti-thetical basis of adaptability is merely the necessity of the changing times and, so claims the Church, does not involve immutable principles. This theory can be used by the Vatican to retreat from serious political and social blunders as well as concessions such as the Rhythm theory in Birth Control.

Michel, Virgil, O.S.B., Reverend

Christian Social Reconstruction, The Bruce Publishing Co., Milwaukee, New York, Chicago, 1937

This is an illumination on the Quadragesime Anno of Pius XI. This book is informative in a repetitious way because Pius XI was extremely thorough in his pontifical discussion, the subject of which forms the subject of Father Michel's book. Dr. Michel scrupulously avoids any mention of the authoritarian parts of this Letter which constitute the core of Pius XI's political and social thinking. These unpleasant facts are carefully hidden until needed; otherwise the book is innocuous enough.

Plenn, Abel

Wind In The Olive Trees - Spain From The Inside, Book Find Club, New York, 1946

A depressing account of Spain during the period of the ambassadorship of Professor C. J. H. Hayes, professor of History at Columbia University. This book is one of scores which have appeared since the Spanish Revolution. The pictures drawn are ugly and disturbing. The book is too-little documented; too much is left to the chance of memory but there is enough which is common knowledge to satisfy reasonably well the question of truthfulness. This is Spain at Roman Catholicism's worst.

Redden, John D., Reverend
Ryan, Francis A., Reverend

A Catholic Philosophy Of Education, Bruce Publishing Co., New York, 1942

The leading text in this field. This book constitutes a vivid example of how philosophy, psychology and education, as well as other disciplines, become atrophied when they become subject to Roman Catholic theology and philosophy.

A narrow and insular presentation of education from the Roman Catholic viewpoint. It carries official approbation.

Ryan, John A., Rt. Rev. Msgr.

Social Doctrine In Action - A Personal History, Harper and Bros., New York & London 1941

The personal history of one of the better known Catholic political and social thinkers, the late Monsignor Ryan. Father Ryan provides an excellent example of how far a Catholic liberal can go and still not be censured. However, the disappointing fact is that the good Father cannot abrogate the narrow and bigoted doctrines of his Church, such as the denial of the freedom to choose one's religion or no religion at all, and that religions, all of them which do not constitute a danger to the common weal, should have complete freedom of activity and liberty of action. These two, among others, are denied by the Roman Catholic Church.

..... Catholic Principles Of Politics, MacMillan, New York, 1940

The Classical Catholic presentation on this subject; it is more of a treatise as seen through Catholic theological and philosophical eyes. This book, part of which is discussed in Marshall (op.cit.) constitutes an alarming threat to American democracy. The essential Catholic position on this subject is that the temporal arm ought and should be, by objective right, be subjected to Rome. Immediately, the Constitution of the United States becomes null and void, and democracy as it is known and practiced in these United States, disappears; a Vatican despotism, perhaps even a benevolent one but one still utterly foreign to the tradition of these States, comes to power. Bizarre as that may sound, that is exactly what the Roman Catholic Church teaches; that is just exactly what Father Ryan teaches in this book.

Salvemini, Gaetano
La Piana, George

What To Do With Italy, Sloan and Pearce, Inc., New York, 1943

This is an extremely important book on Italy. The Vatican-motif appears throughout but special attention is directed to chapter IV in which the Vatican's rôle in the Fascist regime is discussed and analysed. The Vatican is shown to be an organization wedded to authoritarian conservatism, distrustful and antagonistic to democracy, and willing to

collaborate provided the advantages for so-doing are obviously to the advantage of the Vatican.

Whitehead, Alfred North

The Aims Of Education, Mentor Books, The New American Library, 1929

This book should be compared with Redden and Ryan (op.cit). The comparison between the two philosophers reflects the difference between, on the one hand, education in terms of personal and social utility, and, on the other hand, an authoritarian educational indoctrination which would subject education to the insular limits of a narrow religion.

General Education In A Free Society - The Report Of The Harvard Committee, Harvard University Press, 1946. Introduction by James Bryant Conant.

This discussion is illuminating in that it indicates contemplated changes in the Harvard undergraduate curriculum. This book is also additionally valuable in that it defines a philosophy of education and outlines the place and relevance of education in modern life. An excellent contrast to this liberal educational philosophy is Education At The Crossroads, by the Catholic philosopher, Maritain. The contrast lies in the sectionalism of the latter as compared to the social and personal breadth of the former.

Man's Disorder And God's Design, The Amsterdam Assembly Series, Harper and Brothers, New York.

In this volume is found the proceeds of the First Assembly Of The World Council of Churches in Amsterdam, Holland, August 22nd to September 4th, 1948. Deserving of special mention is Volumes III and IV in which, among other issues, amoral capitalism as well as communism are condemned. These chapters point out how the whole Christian Church (the Roman Catholic Church was conspicuously absent) must take a more active and realistic rôle in man's quest for peace. This must mean redefining the Christian Church in terms of the unsophisticated philosophy of Jesus, at the same time, realizing that this philosophy must be translated in terms of present-day needs.

Addenda

Gilson, Etienne

The Spirit Of Medieval Philosophy, The Gifford Lectures, 1931-32, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1940

This book concerns itself with the thesis that the Middle Ages did give to the world a "worthwhile Christian philosophy" to use Gilson's own words. Since Etienne Gilson is one of the outstanding Catholic lay-philosophers of France, it is to be expected that the presentation is exclusively from the Roman Catholic point of view.

Sheed, F. J.

Theology and Sanity, Sheed and Ward, New York, 1946

This is an apology for the Roman Catholic religion by the head of one of the better-known Catholic publishing houses. It is an extremely sophisticated presentation by one well-versed in the art of apologetics but it fails on two counts; it does not relate the reality of God in terms of the common man; and it defines the psychology of faith in doctrinaire terms, leaving no provision for individual differences and levels of comprehension. It further fails in that it couches in positive terms elements of religious experience which do not completely lend themselves to doctrinaire Sheed explanations. This elusive and quasi-mystical area of religious experience blends so indefinitely into the intuitive process that to attempt to give factual explanations borders on the nonsensical.

Part III

Pamphlets

Bandas, Rudolph, Reverend

Modern Questions, Our Sunday Visitor Press, Huntington, Ind., 1946

This pamphlet discusses the Roman Catholic position on such issues as Euthanasia, Cremation, Private property and the like. These views are based on Christian (Catholic) principles and papal pronouncements. Particular attention is called to the emotional tenor of this whole work, the use of general terms in the particular Roman Catholic sense, and the clever use of the fallacy of assuming to be true that which is being questioned; that is, in discussing, for example, the merits of the various religions, the assumption being that the Roman Catholic religion is the only true religion. By assuming the very question being discussed as being true, all other religions are false by this comparison.

Hass, Francis J., D.D. Ph.D. LL.D.

Catholics, Race And Law, The Paulist Press, New York, 1947

The Catholic position on the race question and its implications to American law. It would seem that the Roman Catholic Church is very slow in dealing with such a serious question as racial discrimination as it obtains in the United States at the present time. If this question is as serious as Bishop Haas would have us believe, it should merit an official condemnation from Rome, so that, at least, segregation be eliminated from Catholic Churches and seminaries.

Harney, John B., C.S.P. Very Reverend

Is One Church As Good As Another? The Paulist Press, New York

The political implications of this statement are serious in the light of American democracy. The thesis of this tract is briefly this: Since God established the only true Church (note the assumption, the very one which is being questioned), since all authority comes from God, governments which derive this authority from God, are obliged to uphold truth (Catholicism) and suppress error (religions other than Catholicism). Therefore, since one Church is not as good as another, the State, under God,

ought to suppress any error which will confuse and lead astray the faithful, that is, the faithful must be protected from the error that all churches have an inherent right to exist and to practice their rites.

Kerwin, Jerome G., Ph.D.

Making Democracy Work, The Paulist Press, New York

This tract is written by a lay-man, a professor of Politics, Chicago University but, nevertheless, carries official church approval. This pamphlet calls for the establishment of a Corporative democracy along the lines established by the late Dolfuss of Austria. This subtle plea for a corporate state would be, obviously, under Papal direction.

Ryan, John A., D.D., Right Reverend

Citizen, Church And State, The Paulist Press, New York, 1941

This statement is in question-and-answer form. The presentation is very smooth, the questions are very general and the answers of Father Ryan are equally general. Embarrassing details are obviously not realized by the questioner, but, these same embarrassing details being known by the one answering, are conveniently avoided. A more recent and outstanding example of this particular kind of question-answering comes in the form of a series of talks entitled Morality And Government, talks given on The Catholic Hour by the Very Reverend Doctor Francis J. Connell, C.S.S.R., S.T.D., Professor of Moral Theology at The Catholic University of America, April 24, May 1, May 8, May 15, May 22 and May 29. This series is worth reading for the convenient loopholes by which the Church seeks to impose her authority. The danger is in the glittering generalities which hide the lurking qualifying conditions to these generalities.

Books

Sturzo, Luigi Don (Father)

Inner Laws Of Society, P. J. Kenedy & Sons, New York, 1944

This is one of the basic statements of Catholic sociology by a contemporary Italian Roman Catholic priest who has been very active in liberal political circles in Italy. Unfortunately, Pope Pius XI did not choose to support this liberal priest in his supprisingly democratic and liberal programme. What To Do With Italy, (op. cit.) discusses the conflict between Sturzo's Popular Party and Pope Pius XI.

Pamphlets

Bruckner, P. J., S. J., Reverend

How To Give Sex Instructions, The Queen's Work, St. Louis, Mo., 1937

Here is a more acceptable version of the Church's position on sex instruction. This instruction should be given in the home (how many parents are capable of giving this instruction?); if this be not possible, then this instruction may best be given in the Catholic School. Sex instruction, according to Catholicism, is overtoneed with exaggerated ideas of purity and impurity. The whole idea and concept of sex is permeated with a fear and a horror. It is suggested that, to get the real emotional and intellectual bias toward this subject which the Church insists on maintaining, the encyclical Christian Education Of Youth of Pius XI (op. cit.) be read, with particular attention to pages 27 to 28.

Connell, Francis J., C.S.S.R., S.T.D., Reverend

Marriage - Human or Divine, The Paulist Press, 1940

The official Catholic statement on Marriage by one of the more well-known Roman Catholic Redemptorist theologians of to-day. The claims of the Church on Marriage do not appear unreasonable until one realizes that the Church demands precedence and unlimited authority over Marriage, even in its social relationships. Full control of Marriage as envisaged by Roman Catholicism would amount to a Roman Catholic theocracy in the United States.

Attention is directed to the encyclical of Pius XI, Casti Connubii, On Christian Marriage for more explicit details which are shockingly undemocratic and which are, further, completely opposed to the most basic tenants of liberalism.

Conway, Bertrand L., C.P.

The Church And Eugenics, The Paulist Press, New York

The Church's position of Eugenics and Birth control, with an additional discussion on Sterilization. Attention is called to the fallacy used in the discussion on Sterilization. This fallacious argument goes something like this: The Church is opposed to this plan; to demolish this plan in the eyes of especially those not too well-trained in the subtleties of logic, the Church, in the case of this particular pamphlet, picks out one plan for sterilization which is admittedly faulty, exposes it as being so, and then concludes with the inference that that one faulty proposal constitutes the only sterilization law possible, conveniently ignoring the fact that better laws could be devised. This same argument was used with great effect here in Massachusetts in connection with the then proposed Blood Test for Marriage. In the hands of skilled dialecticians, this fallacy is unbelievably effective.

Cronin, John F., S.S. Reverend

Communism - A World Menace, National Catholic Welfare Conference, Washington, D.C., 1947

A Catholic statement about Communism which is good as far as it goes. The only way Communism can be effectively neutralized is by removing the basic socio-economic evils of an amoral capitalism which give Communism an opportunity to thrive. The Roman Catholic Church too often stands in the way of this defeat of Communism by its obstructionists tactics with respect to such needed movements as Democratic Socialism, Birth Control and population controls, as well as Euthanasia.

Fee, John D., Reverend

Secularism, Life Without God, The Paulist Press, 1947

Life Without God, in the sense of this statement, means life without the Catholic Church. The arrogance here is very plain and obvious.

Hauber, Ulrich A., Ph.D., The Right Reverend Monsignor

Science And Atheism, The Paulist Press, New York, 1945

Monsignor Hauber crosses swords with one Dr. A.J. Carlson for his article in the Scientific Monthly for August, 1944, wherein Dr. Carlson takes the position that religion and science are opposed to each other, and that religion, in the last analysis, is too unreliable a guide for man. Dr. Carlson believes in "the rejection in toto of all non-observational and non-experimental authority in the field of experience." Monsignor Hauber obviously is championing Roman Catholicism and not religion in general. When Father Connell's pamphlet on Freedom Of Worship (op. cit.) is considered in all its implications, one wonders what would happen to Dr. Carlson were the Roman Catholic Church in sufficient power in these United States. The writer of this investigation is not in agreement with Dr. Carlson, but neither is he in agreement with Monsignor Hauber who would, given the desired circumstances for which the Church frankly admits she strives, deny Dr. Carlson and others like him the privilege of expressing their views, contrary though they may be.

..... Creation And Evolution, The Paulist Press, New York, 1947, Third Edition

The same author of the above discusses the Catholic 'opinion' on Evolution. However, since one is required to believe in the creation of two first parents and in the special creation of the soul, and since one is further required to believe that Evolution has not been demonstrated to be a fact (according to the Catholic viewpoint, obviously), what remains for the Catholic to accept and still be within the bounds of his religion is an 'evolution' which is far more inadequate than scientific evolution which has a considerable imposing body of evidence to prove its position. It must be remembered that facts on anything are never static because of the very evolutionary character of things. Attention is directed to Animal Biology, by Robert H. Wolcott, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1946, chapter LXII (62) for the latest evidential material; attention is also directed to Botany, Principles And Problems, by Edmund W. Sinnott of Yale University, McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York 1946, chapter XIII, for a statement on this subject by an authority. The comparison of these authorities with the 'evidence' which the Roman Catholic marshalls to sustain its position leave much to be desired in the way of scientific reliability.

Larkin, Michael J., LL.D., Reverend

Do We Need Religious Education? The Paulist Press, New York

This pamphlet uses the general term 'religion' in the particular Roman Catholic sense. Instead of discussing the question as it is stated, Father Larkin ends up by saying that religion (Catholic) must be taught in schools and that, obviously, only the Catholic religion. Father Larkin conveniently keeps in the background the specific canonical and encyclical pronouncements on education, which, when read, leave one troubled with the problem of the place of democracy in Catholic educational thought.

Lord, Daniel A., S.J., Reverend

....Speaking Of Birth Control, The Queen's Work, St. Louis, Mo.

This particular pamphlet is included because it exemplifies a particular kind of fallacy, and also because it is a good example of the smear. Father Hall (the Catholic Church) equates prostitution (a socio-psychological problem and not one entirely moral) with women who practice birth control; Father Hall calls these women who practice birth control 'women of joy.' Such an epithet is a gross insult to the many women who practice birth control upon competent advice of physicians and who honestly feel that such is the best way to meet their particular needs.

O'Brien, John A., Ph.D., LL.D., Reverend

Why Not A "Mixed" Marriage? The Paulist Press, New York 1937

A very paternalistic but nevertheless arrogant and sectarian presentation of a frequent problem. Again is found assumptions which are clothed with fact and uses of general terms with particular and specific meanings - meanings most advantageous to the Roman Catholic Church.

.... Why Not Get A Divorce? The Paulist Press, New York

The Roman Catholic Church's stand on divorce is allegedly based on biblical grounds, that is, on her own interpretation of particular statements in Scripture. The Church claims that marriage is indissoluble but there are convenient exceptions to this in the guise of impediments and other conditions which may, if the circumstances warrant it, annul a marriage. The explanation (Catholic) is that the Church merely recognizes that a particular person was never married in the first place; the Church cannot dissolve a marriage once it is lawfully contracted. The convenient loophole is what the Church considers lawful.

.... The Reformation, The Paulist Press, 1943

This is a very dramatic account of this most important era in human history. This is, obviously, the strictly Roman Catholic point of view. The facts as presented are not so much questioned as are the conclusions. Does it follow, for example, that the so-called intellectual confusion which followed the Reformation followed as a direct result of the Reformation or was this confusion more the result of the beginnings of a new orientation in Western thought? The Roman Catholic Church denies that any new orientation took place; it claims that the Reformation, as well as the French Revolution, unleashed evil forces which are causing us so much trouble today. The assumption here is, of course, that the Reformation was an evil thing. The Church smears this movement by making the most of the admittedly unsavory life and reputation of Henry VIII of England. The Church draws a very sharp distinction between the man and his office, particularly in the case of Popes whose personal and political lives left much to be desired, even in the way of the minima of common decorum. However, when the occasion arises, an occasion of obvious advantage to the Church, Roman Catholicism condemns both the man and his work, particularly when the man's contribution is embarrassing to the Church.

Quinlan, John F., M.D.

Whither Ethics In Medicine? The Paulist Press, New York

This is a statement by a Roman Catholic lay-man who is also a physician, about the lack of ethics in Medicine and with side assaults on Birth Control and Sterilization. Dr. Quinlan leaves much to be desired in the way of responsible scholarship when he uses and exploits to the utmost statements which cannot be demonstrated but neither can they be denied, yet these same claims are couched in terms of demonstrable certainty. It is to be hoped that this physician is more thorough in his medicine than he is in his narrow Catholic apologetics.

Ryan, John A., D.D., The Right Reverend

The Christian Doctrine of Property, The Paulist Press, 1923

This is an excellent theoretical presentation of the Church's position on finance-economics but it is weak in that it denies the liciteity of public ownership of the principal means of production and distribution, because

of the previous Papal denials of the source of secular authority as coming from the electorate. Attention is directed to the encyclical of Leo XIII, Christian Democracy for substantiation of the above allegation; the encyclical On Civil Government of Leo XIII should also be read wherein condemnation of the origin of civil authority as coming from the electorate is condemned. This doctrine forms the core of Catholic political thought.

Somerville, Henry

Why The Guilds Decayed. The Paulist Press, 1938

The guild forms an important cog in the socio-economic thinking of Pius XI's Quadragesimo Anno. The Church's explanation of the failure of the guilds is that the failure was due to moral reasons and not because of any inherent inability to accommodate to changing conditions. A quasi-guild system is envisaged by the Popes with and under Vatican direction and blessing would constitute the desideratum of Roman Catholicism; it is recommended that this particular encyclical of Pius XI be read thoroughly as well as the principal tracts and works of the late Monsignor John A. Ryan, D.D. Mr. Somerville is a layman.

Treacy, Gerald C., S.J.

God In Society, The Paulist Press, New York, 1943

This constitutes one of those generalized and emotional appeals for the world to return to God. However, when this pamphlet is read not in isolation but rather in keeping with all that has gone before in the way of doctrinaire Roman Catholicism, the meaning becomes clear; the world must submit to Catholicism or perish; this theme is not new, it is characteristic of all authoritarian philosophies.

The Church And The Social Order, The Paulist Press, New York

This tract constitutes a very clear outline of the Catholic position in the broad field of social economics but it is limited in that the Church refuses to commit itself to any particular kind of government. This position is very useful because then the Church can successfully cooperate with any government so long as that government is willing to cooperate with the Church and give her the absolute freedom she demands. If former Austria, Spain and Portugal are any examples of the type of government preferred by the Vatican, governments which are based on the political and social theories contained in

the Quadragesimo Anno of Pius XI, it would seem that the kind of government preferred by the Vatican is that which is authoritarian, the degree of which is determined by the political and social situation as it obtains at the given moment.

Addendum

Ryan, John A., D.D., Rt. Rev. Msgr.

Original Sin And Human Misery, The Paulist Press, New York, 1942

This constitutes a very sophisticated statement of a problem basic to all Roman Catholic thinking. Attention is called to the myriad of nice distinction which, if examined closely, not infrequently serve as avenues of escape from otherwise awkward positions.

Books

Augustine, Saint

Confessions, translated by F. J. Sheed, New York, Sheed & Ward, 1942

This constitutes a very revealing document of a man's tortured body and soul. It is a saga of a man who finally found himself by a complete identification of self with God. How much of these Confessions was due to the need of mental catharsis and how much of this document is valuable above and beyond that point of catharsis are points of discussion.

Becker, Carl

Modern Democracy, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1941

This constitutes one of the clearest statements of Democracy to be found anywhere--what it is and what it has to do to survive.

Coker, Francis W.

Democracy, Liberty And Property, McMillan Co., New York, 1942

This history of American political thought, in the form of excerpts from original documents, constitutes a convenient survey of the development of democracy in its broadest connotation. It is significant that Father John A. Ryan is listed as a contributor. Unfortunately, the political and economic theories of Father Ryan, reasonable though they may be in and of themselves, these same theories cannot be disassociated from the main body of Roman Catholic authoritarianism. Even bigger intellects than the capable Father Ryan did not succeed in trying to keep a middle course; the famous Catholic theologian and scholar Von Döllinger tried, and was excommunicated. It was fortunate for the good Father Ryan that he was not a crusader.

Howard, George P.

Religious Liberty In Latin America, The Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1944

This book discusses the Protestant viewpoint of the Roman

Catholic Church in Latin America. It points out what little the Roman Catholic Church has done over the years. It also points out the conflict between these two religious bodies for the allegiance of the people. The arrogance and narrow sectarianism of Roman Catholicism is brought out in a passage which Dr. Howard quotes from the Catholic America, in which one Father W. Eugene Shiels, associate editor of the America, distinguishes between 'religious activity' and 'religious liberty.' This is a typical Thomistic distinction. The Roman Catholic Church, as far as non-Catholics go, would allow them (non-Catholics) religious liberty but not the religious activity. They would be given the abstract right but these same dissenters would not be allowed the practical and discernible right to religious activity which is but the objectification of that right. In other words, these non-Catholics are granted the theoretical but not the practical right of religious freedom. According to such a 'distinction' our Constitution would be summarily abrogated because, among other safeguards and guarantees, it provides for the freedom of religion both on the federal and state levels. This American freedom is one of the freedoms which the Roman Catholic Church would deny to all differing from her in matters of faith and morals, two words whose delimitation remains conveniently obscure.

Levi, Carlo

Christ Stopped At Eboli, Penquin Books, New York 1948

This is a saga of one Carl Levi, physician and writer, banished for his anti-fascist activities per order of Mussolini, and exiled to Eboli, a town in Lucania, southern Italy. This town is located in a particularly desolate and depressing part of Italy, so desolate that the townspeople say that Christ never stopped there, so barren was the town and its environment of happiness and contentment. However, Christ did stop at Eboli in the guise of Carlo Levi who brought to this grim and desolate place the fruits of his medical profession as well as the joy of his artistic talents. Levi's characterization of the village priests are excellent examples of what occurs when a Church becomes the official instrument of an authoritarian State.

Lewis, C. S.

The Abolition Of Man, McMillan Co., New York, 1947

Man has a workable moral law, says Lewis, and this law is nothing more than a distillate of the best of the past.

Lewis insists that the only way the world can find and save itself is to recognize the utility of this Tao or world moral law of civilization.

Mill, John Stuart

On Liberty, edited by Alburney Castell, F. S. Crofts & Co., 1947

This constitutes the classical statement of the nature of liberty by John Stuart Mill, the apostle of personal liberty. Mill states here that the individual has a basic right to think and act for himself. It is a protest, this essay, not against internal authority but against external authority. This book forms a sharp contrast to the Roman Catholic theory of personal freedom.

Spinoza, Benedict De

Writings On Political Philosophy, D. Appleton-Century Co., New York and London, 1937

The great apostle of freedom, Spinoza, speaks of political and religious freedom. Man, he says, is to free to choose his own religion or not to choose it as he pleases. The Roman Catholic Church denies this basic privilege and right.

Wright, John J., S.T.D. Bishop (now)

National Patriotism In Papal Teaching, The Newman Bookshop, Westminster, Maryland, 1943

This constitutes the published doctoral dissertation of the now Auxiliary Bishop of Boston, John J. Wright. The Bishop's aim in this dissertation, submitted in partial fulfillment for the degree of Doctor of Sacred Theology from the Pontifical Gregorian University in Rome, is to demonstrate that national patriotism is not incompatible with papal teaching. This book is full of extensive footnotes in French, Italian and Latin, and shows much work and investigation. However, the Bishop ends up with what he started: patriotism is not against papal teaching provided one accepts the basis of papal teaching in this matter; such could not be otherwise. There could never be any conflict between patriotism (subject to papal supervision) and papal teaching because one would be but speaking for the other. The papal references which Bishop cites are in themselves so generally worded that these can be made to mean just about anything which the one using them as references wants them to mean.

About The Kinsey Report, Signet Special, New American Library, 1948

This volume constitutes the opinions of eleven experts who give their views of the significance of the Kinsey Report. The opinions of these men on the role and future of sex form a sharp contrast to the views of the Roman Catholic Church on sex.

Newspapers

For the conventional Roman Catholic argument on the question of the Church and State see:

The Boston Pilot, November 6, 13, 20 and 27.

This paper is the official Roman Catholic newspaper of the archdiocese of Boston. This paper featured a series of articles written by one Father Lord who was formerly chairman of the History department at Harvard and an outstanding convert to the Roman Catholic Church. He is at present pastor of a Catholic Church in one of the small communities outside of Boston. This series of articles constitute an outstanding example of the use of the argument of the thesis and antithesis. These articles contain some very doubtfully accurate material such as that of claiming that Lord Baltimore, George Calvert, founded the colony of Maryland on the basis of religious freedom for all religions. Two sources demonstrate this assertion to be wrong: the original archives of Maryland, volume I, page 244, and Woodrow Wilson's A History Of The American People, Volume I, pages 130-131. In volume II of this same work is found a complaint that Lord Baltimore approved of an oath requiring belief in Jesus Christ as the Son of God and the Trinity on the pain of property confiscation and death. This complaint is in the form of a reproduction of the original document.

Judge Finds No Legal Bar to Religion In Schools, The Pilot, Boston, November 6, 1948

This newspaper features the remarks of Justice Thompson's remarks before the Midwest Regional Conference of the Catholic Press Association. It is regrettable to read of a justice of the Illinois Supreme Court giving his own private legal opinion the force and dignity of law because that is how his remarks will be interpreted by the majority of persons not trained in subtleties of argumentation. This justice does not see any connection between

religious education and the Roman Catholic Church. That is true if one construes religion in its broadest sense and not in its specific sense of Roman Catholicism. But to deny that there is any connection between Catholic education and the Roman Catholic religion is to be pitifully naive. The justice, further, saw no difficulty in religious education and religious instruction in connection with public schools because, according to him, such knowledge is merely cultural and has no connection with the tenets of the particular religion with which this religion is connected.

The Brooklyn Tablet, published in Brooklyn, New York, and The Register published in Denver, Colorado, are two Catholic newspapers of popular circulation. These are the official diocesan mirrors of Roman Catholic opinion in their respective dioceses.

Pamphlets

Allport, Gordon W.

The Roots Of Religion, Advent Paper #1, published by The Church of The Advent, Boston 8, Mass.

This is an invaluable pamphlet in which Dr. Allport of Harvard, through an imaginary dialogue between a professor of Psychology and his student, discusses the need of religion - not any particular religion but just religion. This imaginary discussion (when one reads this discussion it becomes more fact and real than if Dr. Allport merely wrote this pamphlet and then signed his name to it) points out one outstanding observation - according to the findings of Gordon Allport, religion is a personal and intimate need and, further, religion is also dependent upon the intellectual and spiritual growth of an individual. Just as this growth varies with individuals, this religious urge and need is equally personal and highly subjective. Dr. Allport is not speaking for all of Psychology but he is speaking for himself. His position in the psychological world commands some consideration and reflection.

Bonnell, John Sutherland, D.D., LL.D., The Reverend

Science, - The Ally Of Religion, A Series of Three Sermons by The Reverend John Sutherland Bonnell, Minister, The Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church, New York City, New York.

These three sermons delivered by one of the more enlightened ministers and pastoral councilors of our time, offers one of the most intelligent and penetrating presentations of this problem of religion and science. Religion has nothing to fear from Science for religion to Dr. Bonnell means an intelligent faith and not an obsequious and cringing mental surrender. Science merely expresses in specific terms what religion says generally. Science interprets and explains the marvels of this physical world - religion pays homage to the God for marvels which are His handiwork. God's atature is not diminished by science but rather God is complimented by science as it unfolds the secrets of this world by means of the almost limitless ingenuity and intelligence of the greatest of all of God's works, the human body.

Connell, Francis J., S.S.S.R., S.T.D. The Very Reverend

The Source of Civil Authority, delivered over The Catholic Hour, beginning in April 24, 1949 and weekly through May 29, 1949.

These six radio addresses, simple and direct, could have been delivered by such men as Fosdick, Link or any other person with a sense of personal ethics. The difference between these talks by Father Connell and these same talks which could just as well have been delivered by any clergyman is this: Father Connell is discreetly vague and very general in his statements about the source of civil power. Father Connell never is sufficiently clear about the meaning of 'religion' or 'liberty' or 'the laws of God' and other generalities. Father Connell is very careful to conceal the fact that all these concepts have a very definite Roman Catholic interpretation although such may not be at first apparent, especially to those not familiar with Roman Catholicism's penchant for using words in already preconceived senses but under the appearance of generality.

Hauser, Ernes A., Ph.D., F.I.R.I., F.A.I.Ch. Professor of Colloid Chemistry, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, printed by The Community Church, 565 Boylston Street, Boston 16, Mass.

A Scientist Looks At Religion, The Community Church of Boston, March 13, 1949

This address by a very distinguished scientist treats of the problem of Science and Religion, Dr. Hauser believes that religion is very necessary, and that all the accepted religions have a contribution to make. This address will repay reading for its broad and sympathetic

presentation of a knotty problem. It is a plea for religion by a cultivated mind and by one who is humble enough to admit that scientific discoveries are but a form of Divine revelation.

Magazines

Farrell, James T.

The Pope Needs America, Parts I and II, The Nation, May 17 and May 24, 1936

This constitutes a reprint of an old article by one that, in hindsight, has vindicated itself. It is prophetic (in hindsight) of the policies of the Vatican. It contains many trenchant accusations of the Vatican particularly with reference to its role in American and European politics. Farrell claims that the Pope needs America because the Vatican needs the power and the support of American capitalism. The Vatican has no want for Fascism because Fascism, according to Farrell, is only hysterical capitalism trying to save itself from destruction under Socialism or Communism. This was said in 1936.

Oxnam, G. Bromley, Bishop

Church, State, And Schools, The Nation, January 15, 1949

This is a very clear statement of the Catholic position with regard to these three categories. Bishop Oxnam drags out into the light of public opinion the alarming authoritarianism of Roman Catholicism.

Rossi, Mario

Trouble In Italy, The Nation, July 24, 1948

This is an account of the influence of the Vatican on De Gasperi's government and the emergence of the old Italian aristocratic conservatism. The influence of the United States in the critical election in which Communism was defeated is also considered. Most important, however, is the obvious Church and State marriage through the influence of the Lateran Pacts: cf. Attwood, William Church and State, The Nation, August 28, 1948