

"... Hereby know we the spirit of truth and the spirit of error"

The
DISCERNER

AN
INTERDENOMINATIONAL
HERESY - EXPOSING
QUARTERLY

VOLUME III

NUMBER 7

2. Catholicism and American Presidency
3. Should America Elect a Roman Catholic President?
10. Separation of Church and State
12. Is There An American Catholicism?
16. Questions and Answers

July — September 1960

CONTENTS

The DISCERNER

Published Quarterly

Price \$1.00 for 7 issues; \$1.50 for 12 issues;
15 cents a copy (Domestic)

Copyright 1960 by Religion Analysis Service, Inc.
902 Hennepin Avenue, Minneapolis 3, Minnesota
Printed in the United States

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

John E. Dahlin, Chairman

Paul Breggren

George Darby

Dr. Ernest Pickering

Catholicism and the American Presidency

Editor John E. Dahlin

The editorial committee felt that the matter as stated by the above caption is of such utmost importance to every American voter that we should postpone the ongoing doctrinal series in *The Discerner* in favor of the present timely discussion of Catholicism and the Presidency.

We wish to state emphatically that we are not motivated by bigotry. Rather, ours is a deep-seated concern for the future of our country, and it is our belief that the best national interests are preserved by not electing a Roman Catholic President. It should be pointed out that our agency has nothing against individual Roman Catholics most of whom are good citizens and friendly neighbors. We also believe every man has the right to his own convictions and we make no attempt to consider one religion versus another. Our Quarterly advocates full religious freedom, and this includes Roman Catholics who are entitled to every protection under the constitution, the same as all other groups enjoy. What we are concerned about is international system known as Roman Catholicism, and the enormous influence of its hierarchy. The system demands of all its followers *first* allegiance. The numerous papal pronouncements in this regard are clear, and they have not been recinded by any recent pope.

Three major articles are presented for your consideration in this issue of *The Discerner*. Dr. Ernst Pickering provides a scholarly and a well documented article on the subject "Should America Elect a Roman Catholic President?" Rev. George Darby, author, pastor, and evangelist deals with a primary problem involved, namely, the Separation of Church and State. This is a matter which concerns every free American. The editor discusses the pertinent question "Is There an American Catholicism?" Doubtlessly millions of Americans are convinced that Roman Catholicism is fundamentally different over here. Unless they know the truth in this regard many of them may be ready to vote for a Roman Catholic for President.

We urge you readers to consider each article with much thought and without prejudice. And if the discussions merit recognition, as we believe they do, then you should order copies in quantity for distribution among your neighbors and acquaintances, including Roman Catholics.

Should America Elect a Roman Catholic President?

by Dr. Ernest Pickering
Professor, Central C. B. Seminary

Do the moral obligations which a devout Roman Catholic has to his church interfere in any way with his freedom to uphold the United States Constitution and to serve under it? This is the issue that confronts Americans at the present hour.

Certain things should be clearly understood. First, there are many Roman Catholics who are good and loyal Americans. This fact cannot be disputed. Second, Roman Catholics have a right to freedom of worship. America gives freedom to all to worship as they will. Third, many Roman Catholic politicians are very capable office-holders and have served the people well. The issue before us, therefore, is not one of the personal ability or character of Roman Catholic citizens or servants of the state. It is simply a question of whether or not the official Roman Catholic position on church-state relations in any way conflicts with the principle of separation of church and state as guaranteed by the United States Constitution in the First Amendment.

The only way in which this question can adequately be answered is to examine official Roman Catholic documents and pronouncements. The statements of Roman Catholic politicians, and even the public utterances of many Roman Catholic priests and bishops, do not necessarily

reflect the official position of the Catholic Church regarding this issue. Such public statements may be highly colored or may be deliberately misleading in terminology. What is the official position of the Catholic Church? This the touchstone.

I. The Teaching of the R. C. Church on Church-State Relations

In a recent article in a national magazine, James A. Pike, an Episcopal bishop, expressed the opinion that there are "two Roman Catholic views on Church-State relations." He declares there is an "official view" and an "American view." The "official view" militates against a strict separation of church and state while the "American view" allows for it. Such observations are completely misleading and reveal an appalling ignorance of the nature of the Roman Catholic Church. Within the framework of Rome there is no room for opinions which are contrary to the expressed will of the Church and the declaration of its leaders, especially the Pope. The Catholic Church is an autocracy. In matters of faith and morals the Pope is infallible. The doctrine of the church-state is basic to Roman Catholicism, as anyone with a knowledge of its history and practices will readily admit. The official Catholic doctrine regarding church-state relations can be stated in five propositions.

1. The Roman Catholic Church is superior to the state. Pope Gregory VII long ago likened the Pope to the sun, and kings to the moon. "That royal authority is ordained of God, and should remain within its proper limits, subordinate to the papal power, which is sovereign over all."² In other official Catholic book of instruction, bearing the imprimatur of Cardinal Dougherty, the following questions are asked and answered:

"Why is the Church superior to the State? Because the end to which the Church tends is the noblest of all ends.

"What right has the Pope in virtue of this supremacy? The right to amend those laws or acts of government that would injure the salvation of souls or attack the natural rights of citizens."³

It is clear from the foregoing (and quotations could be multiplied) that the Catholic Church views herself as superior to all civil powers. In countries where she has had freedom to do so she has amply demonstrated that this is her belief.

2. The Roman Catholic Church demands absolute obedience from her subjects. There is no voluntary relationship between a man and his God within the framework of Roman Catholicism. Roman Catholics are subjects of an earthly ruler—the Pope of Rome. The Catholic Church possesses almost unlimited authority over her communicants. This power is called "judicial authority" and is defined by a Catholic theologian as "the right and duty of deciding definitely in a given case the true meaning of her own laws and of the con-

formity, or non-conformity of the actions of her subjects with the law."⁴ In other words, the Church decides whether or not the individual Roman Catholic is acting in obedience to the laws of the Church. If not, appropriate steps will be taken to insure that obedience.

To those who are lovers of freedom such autocratic powers in the realm of religion are difficult to imagine. Charles Mackay, writing in the "Catholic Encyclopedia," states bluntly, "The Church has the right to govern her subjects, wherever found declaring for them moral right and wrong, restricting any such use of their rights as might jeopardize their eternal welfare. . . ."⁵ In the light of this statement it becomes impossible for intelligent, informed Americans to believe current political figures when they say that if the Pope or bishop told them what to do they would not obey. The Catholic Church may govern her subjects "wherever found," even in the halls of state. The Church may "restrict" the use of their rights, even for the President of the United States. A Roman Catholic president would be a captive president.

3. Roman Catholics are to disobey state laws if they conflict with Church laws. At first glance some would possibly deny this: yet it is found in the official declarations of Rome. Pope Leo XIII, a strong advocate of papal supremacy, wrote "On the Chief Duties of Christians as Citizens." In this document he said: "But if the laws of the State are manifestly at variance with the divine law, containing enactments hurt-

ful to the Church, or conveying injunctions adverse to the duties imposed by religion, or if they violate in the person of the supreme Pontiff the authority of Jesus Christ, then truly, to resist becomes a positive duty, to obey a crime . . .”⁶ And who decides whether a law is at variance with Catholic dogma? The Pope! A Roman Catholic president would be subject to the will of the Pope. Should the Pope decide that some pending law in the Congress of the United States was contrary to Catholic doctrine, he could instruct a Catholic president to work for the defeat of the bill or to veto it if passed by Congress.

A Jesuit theology raises the issue of possible conflict between the state and the church. What should a loyal Roman Catholic do in such a case? “In case of conflict, that is to say, when in mixed questions, the two authorities, impose upon their subjects who are the same persons, contradictory obligations, the power of the Church should prevail over that of the State.”⁷

4. Roman Catholic statesmen are to give first allegiance to Rome, not their country. Catholic aspirants for the presidency and other offices have publicly declared that their first loyalty is to their country and its constitution. This is false according to Catholic dogma. The following questions are from an official Catholic text and reveal the actual teaching of Rome when viewed apart from political propaganda.

“What then is the principal obligation of heads of States? Their principal obligation is to

practice the Catholic religion themselves, and, as they are in power, to protect and defend it.

“When may the State tolerate dissenting worships? When those worships have acquired a sort of legal existence consecrated by time and accorded by treaties or covenants.”⁸

There is no alternative for a Roman Catholic president. He has no choice. He is a servant of the Pope. He is obligated to give first allegiance to him.

5. The Roman Catholic Church views the doctrine of absolute separation of Church and State as an error. Again the discerning reader must look beyond the public pronouncements on the current political scene. Pius IX in his “Syllabus” denounced as one of the “principal errors of our time” the statement. “The Church ought to be separated from the State, and the State from the Church.”⁹ Shall we believe the Pope or the politicians?

Monsignor George B. O’Toole. Professor of Philosophy at the Catholic University of America has written: “It is clear, then, that no Catholic may positively and unconditionally approve of the policy of separation of church and state. But given a country like the United States where religious denominations abound and the population is largely non-Catholic, it is clear that the policy of treating all religions alike becomes, all things considered, a practical necessity, the only way of avoiding a deadlock. Under such circumstances separation of Church and State is to be accepted, NOT INDEED AS THE IDEAL ARRANGEMENT (emphasis

ours), but as a *modus vivendi*.”¹⁰

There is a very great problem of definition involved as well. What does the Catholic theologian mean by the terms “church” and “state”? His meanings for these are different than the layman would expect. Paul Blanshard has concisely summarized the problem. “Much of the confusion in Catholic discussions of church and state is semantic. The Catholic bishop who discusses church and state uses words in a special sense. He draws definitions from a ready-made world and the words ‘church and state’ do not mean to him the same things that they mean to a non-Catholic, or even to many Catholics. The bishop begins by including in the concept ‘church’ large areas of political, social, and educational life which the non-Catholic regards as part of the normal sphere of democratic government. The bishop, AFTER he has included these special ecclesiastical preserves in the picture of his Church, can honestly say that he believes in some separation of church and state FROM THAT POINT ONWARD.”¹¹ Catholic endurance of the separation of church and state in America has up to this point been a matter of necessity, not conviction.

II. The Aim of the Roman Catholic Church

In a national magazine a Roman Catholic scholar tried to answer the question, “Can Catholics Separate Church and State?” Perhaps the most amusing part of the entire discussion was the question: “Does the Catholic Church in the United States take

part in politics?” The Catholic scholar (with a straight face, no doubt) replied: “No. The Church as an institution does not.”¹² This is an absolute untruth. Witness the turn-around collars at any political gathering. They are many and they are influential. There are priests who do nothing else but work in the field of politics, lobbying for the interests of Rome.

The Catholic Church has two stated purposes which are pertinent to the discussion here. (1) She wishes to make America Catholic. (2) She desires to subdue all “error.”

In “Our Sunday Visitor,” a national Catholic paper, Rev. Richard Ginder made the following comments regarding this objective: “It is heresy to regard the Catholic Church as only one of several equally good religions competing in the marketplace of thought . . . Father Isaac Hecker was only acting under God’s command when he founded the Paulist Congregation to ‘Make America Catholic,’ for God wants to see the United States one day as solidly Catholic as Ireland or France.”¹³ Catholicism is not content with peaceful coexistence. She intends to dominate the world. A Catholic president will be a notable assist.

Charles Chiniquy, a former priest who was for fifty years a Roman Catholic, speaks as an authority regarding the purposes of the Romanists: “Rome is in constant conspiracy against the rights and liberties of men all over the world; but she is particularly so in the United States. Long before I was ordained a priest, I knew that my church

was the most implacable enemy of this republic. My professors of philosophy, history, and theology had been unanimous in telling me that the principles and laws of the Church of Rome were absolutely antagonistic to the laws and principles which are the foundation-stones of the Constitution of the United States."¹⁴

Roman Catholicism will have scored a great triumph if they can seat a Catholic in the White House. Their nefarious purposes will not immediately be evident. Progress will be slow. But it will be a beginning. "It is the purpose of the church to win America to 'obedience to Rome,' effecting whatever changes in our culture and Constitution may be necessary to make this a Catholic state."¹⁵ A Catholic president will be the first step.

In addition to the above-stated purpose it should also be noted that Catholicism views all other religions as errors which should be suppressed in whatever way is expedient. The blood of slain Anabaptists and others of earlier centuries still cries from the ground against the persecutions of Rome. Rome in the saddle is a political tyrant. We have been solemnly assured by leading Catholic prelates that there is no "Catholic vote" as such and that each Catholic may vote as he pleases.¹⁶ This is boldly contradicted by a statement from the "Catholic World" which observes, "The Roman Catholic is to wield his vote for the purpose of securing the Catholic ascendancy in this country. All legislation must be governed by the will of God unerringly indicated by the Pope."¹⁷ At the time of this writing a news broadcast by

Paul Harvey over a national network reports that from Rome has come a direct statement reminding Catholics all over the world that the Pope has the authority to direct individual Catholics as to how they should cast their ballots in a civil election.

III. The Public Statements of Roman Catholics on This Issue

In a published interview Rev. John O'Brien of Notre Dame University declared that the State is concerned with the material and temporal welfare of its citizens while the Church is concerned with their spiritual and eternal welfare.¹⁸ Mr. O'Brien has conveniently forgotten the teaching of his own church that "the Church has the right to use material and temporal means to secure that end, and in the use of such means, as are necessary she has the exclusive authority."¹⁹

Senator John Kennedy, candidate for the Presidency and a Roman Catholic, is on record as saying, "People are afraid that Catholics take orders from a high organization. They don't. Or, at least, I don't."²⁰ But how does Mr. Kennedy interpret the many citations of Catholic authority already given in this study, to say nothing of hundreds of others which could be given?

And what about the much-publicized incident in Philadelphia? Senator Kennedy was scheduled to speak at an interfaith banquet in the fall of 1950. Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish speakers were to represent their faiths. Kennedy was to be the Catholic representative. Two days before the banquet Kenne-

dy cancelled his appearance. Rev. Daniel Poling, instigator of the banquet, tells the story. "Mr. Kennedy telephoned me from Washington and said that he would have to cancel his appearance. His Eminence Denis Cardinal Dougherty of Philadelphia had requested him not to speak at the banquet and not to appear. The congressman's distress was evident as he relayed this information. . . . His speech was prepared, he said, and he would gladly forward it to me, but as a loyal son of the Church, he had no alternative but not to come."²¹ Monsignor Francis J. Lally has attempted an explanation of this incident which solves nothing. It simply proves what has already been stated. A Roman Catholic owes sole obedience to his church. If as a congressman, a bishop can tell him what to do, why not as a president also? A Catholic congressman was not free. A Catholic president will possess no more freedom. "The only freedom Romanism has ever really championed is the freedom to be a Romanist."²²

Conclusion

How will the domination of the Roman Catholic hierarchy possibly affect a Catholic president? In the judicial realm will he be "encouraged" to appoint Roman Catholic judges and justices? In the legislative sphere will he be pressured to exercise his veto power to veto bills unfavorable to Catholicism? Will he, in his executive capacity, curry favor with, and support, Roman Catholic governments abroad? In internal affairs will he favor Catholic-approved bills and appoint pro-Catholic officials?

Rome has put on a lamb's demeanor in democratic America. She is in reality a ravening wolf. In countries where she is allowed to dominate she brooks no interference. She is ruthless in obtaining her objectives. To win the White House of America would be the first step in fulfilling her dreams of a Catholic America. All who vote for a Catholic president will assist her immeasurably.

-
- 1 *Reader's Digest*, 3/60, p. 39.
 - 2 William Cathcart, *The Papal System*, p. 134.
 - 3 *The Manual of Christian Doctrine*, published by the Brothers of the Christian Schools.
 - 4 Aelfred Graham, "The Church on Earth," *The Teaching of the Catholic Church*, edited by George D. Smith, II, 715.
 - 5 Charles Mackey, "State and Church," *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, XIV, 251.
 - 6 Pope Leo XIII, "On the Chief Duties of Christians as Citizens," Jan. 10, 1890.
 - 7 Joseph C. Sasia, S. J., editor, *Christian Apologetics*, II, 517.
 - 8 *Manual of Christian Doctrine*, loc. cit.
 - 9 Pius IX, *Syllabus*, Section 6.
 - 10 Louis Veuillot, *The Liberal Illusion*, translated by Monsignor George O'Toole, p. 10
 - 11 Paul Blanshard, *American Freedom and Catholic Power*, p. 49.
 - 12 "Can Catholics Separate Church and State?" interview with Rev. John O'Brien, *Look*, 2/16/60.
 - 13 *Our Sunday Visitor*, 11/22/59.
 - 14 Charles Chiniquy, *Fifty Years in the Church of Rome*, p. 375.
 - 15 Harold Fey, "Can Catholicism Win America?" reprinted from *Christian Century*, November to January, 1944-45, p. 22.
 - 16 "If A Catholic Is President . . .," an interview with Monsignor Francis J. Lally in *U. S. News and World Report*, 5/30/60.
 - 17 Cited in *Romanism, A Menace to the Nation* by Jeremiah J. Crowley.
 - 18 "Can Catholics Separate Church and State?" *Look*, 2/16/60.
 - 19 Luther W. Martin, "Roman Catholicism, A Political Movement," *Converted Catholic*, 2/57, p. 24.
 - 20 *Redbook*, 11/57.
 - 21 Daniel Poling, *Mine Eyes Have Seen* (his autobiography).
 - 22 Cecil John Cadoux, *Roman Catholicism and Freedom*, p. 151.

Separation Of Church and State

By Rev. George Darby

When Hildebrand, Pope Gregory VII (1073-1085) claimed for himself supremacy over all civil governments, he based this amazing claim upon two documents: the so-called Donation of Constantine which appeared in the 8th Century and the Decretals of Isidore dating from the 9th Century. The first of these purported to be an edict of Constantine the Great by which he ceded control of Italy and the West to the Bishop of Rome at the same time bestowing upon him and the Roman clergy the same powers and prerogatives possessed by the emperor and the Roman senate.

The second document, a code of church laws, said to have been compiled by Isidore, Bishop of Seville, who died in 636 magnified the spiritual and temporal authority of the Bishop of Rome and his clergy.

The spurious character of both the above named documents is frankly acknowledged today by all competent authorities whether Roman Catholic or Protestant. but the colossal claims based upon these forgeries have never been abandoned by the Church of Rome.

Dr. J. J. Dollinger, a leading scholar of the Roman Catholic Church, wrote, "The donation of Constantine and the Pseudo-Isadorian Decretals were imposed upon the church about AD 750 and AD 850. For 700 years they were considered authentic, but about the middle of the 15th Century they were abandoned as spurious. The towering fabric of a factitious papal sovereignty

however, raised in part on their authority remained to crush the spirit of truth and to harass the natural liberties of man." (Janus pages 94-95:105-106).

Since the days of Gregory, the official Roman Catholic position of the church's supremacy to the state has been asserted over and over again. When Innocent III became pope in 1198, he declared, "I sit on high above kings and all princes. Christ has committed the whole world to the government of the popes."

Pope Boniface VIII proclaimed in 1302, "In her (the church) are two swords, the spiritual and the temporal. Both are in the power of the church. The former by the hand of the priest, the latter by the hand of princes and kings, but at the nod and sufferance of the priest. The one sword must be subject to the other; the temporal authority to the spiritual."

Pope Paul IV in 1558 issued a papal bull in which he declared the cruel inquisition to be the chief support of the papacy in Italy and said, "The pope as God's representative has full power over nations and kingdoms: he judges all and can be judged in this world by none."

Pope Innocent X (1664-1655) opposed the peace of Westphalia concluded in October 24, 1648 even though it was desperately needed to end 30 years of bloodshed and violence. "Speaking as the very mouthpiece of God" he said in a papal bull, "We therefore decree and declare that everything herein contained (that

is in the Pact of Osnabruck and the peace of Westphalia) are and forever will be null, void, invalid, iniquitous, unjust, damnable, reprobate, inane, and altogether lacking in force; that no one is or ever will be obliged to observe them even if bound thereto by oath."

In 1864 Pope Pius IX wrote, "In case of conflicting laws enacted by the two powers, temporal and spiritual, to hold that the civil law should prevail is an error."

Pope Leo XIII, who died as recently as July 1903, officially declared, "Over the mighty multitude God has set rulers with power to govern, and He has willed that one of them should be head of all." Again he said, "It would be very erroneous to draw the conclusion that the most desirable status for the church is to be sought in America. It is an error to hold that it would be universally lawful or expedient for state and church to be severed and divorced as in America."

The practical consequences of this claim have been mischievous in the extreme. Europe, for centuries, was embroiled in a succession of intrigues, rebellions, wars, and revolutions resulting in large part from the constant interference of the pope and his emissaries in the internal affairs of one country and another. The Emperor Charles V's Spanish Minister, himself a Roman Catholic, wrote from Genoa in 1527, "I have lived 25 years in Italy and have observed that the pope has been the sole cause of all the wars and miseries during that time."

Nor is it necessary to go back

as far as the 16th Century to find instances of Rome's meddling in the political activities of nations. Late in the 19th Century, the Right Honorable William Ewart Gladstone in his work entitled, "Vaticanism: Answers to Replies and Reproofs" referred to an allegation by a British Peer to the effect that the popes had not interfered in the politics of nations for over 200 years. In answer to that claim, Mr. Gladstone cited six specific Allocutions issued by the pope during the latter half of the 19th Century all of which declared null and void laws passed by the governments of sovereign states.

In the conflict between the Roman Catholic Church and the Mexican government just 25 or 30 years ago, the Roman hierarchy urged the U. S. Government to take a hand in a purely church quarrel. The U. S. Ambassador to Mexico, Honorable Josephus Daniel, was denounced by name and his recall was demanded again and again simply because he refused to interfere in matters beyond his authority. To the credit of the U. S. Government, they rejected the demands of the Roman hierarchy.

In 1938 the Roman Catholic Church criticized President Quezon of the Philippines for vetoing a bill which would have placed national education in the control of the Roman clergy. The president responded with a well-deserved rebuke when he said, "The country is now facing one of the most menacing evils which can confront the government and the peoples of the Philippines, namely, interference by the church in the affairs of state."

In 1942 the Roman hierarchy

sought to influence the U.-S. Government to prohibit Protestant missionaries the free exercise of religious liberties in Latin America.

I wonder if we always remember as we should the Constitution of the United States of America was framed by Protestants. Only one Roman Catholic signed the Declaration of Independence and there was only a handful of Roman Catholic believers in the United States at the time this nation came into being. That is why the Constitution places such a strong emphasis upon the principle of separation between church and state. Had Roman Catholic influence prevailed at the beginning of America's history, the liberty and progress of the past 200 years would have been unknown. Thomas Jefferson, the chief author of the Constitution said, "History, I believe, furnishes no example of a priest-ridden people maintaining a free civil government." It would not be more than simple truth to say that the democratic processes by which this nation has been governed are the product of Protestant principles; principles derived from the Word of God. The framers of the Constitution were very careful to insure equality before the law of all religious systems, the inalienable right of everyone to worship God as his conscience dictates and the forbidding of any special privileges to any religious system.

The Roman Catholic Church has been quite willing to accept the liberty accorded to her under the Constitution but she has never approved of the principle inherent in it of the separation of church and state.

Pope Pius X in his letter to the French bishops at the beginning of this century said, "That it is necessary to separate church and state is a thesis absolutely false, a most pernicious error."

Today in the United States Roman Catholic pressure groups are at work wherever they can enlist the power of the state in an effort to gain preferred treatment and special privileges for the church.

When Roman Catholic governors came to office in such states as Maine, Washington, Iowa, and Colorado, delegations immediately appeared with demands for various kinds of subsidies for parochial schools. 19 states now give free transportation to parochial school students and five states furnish them free text books at public expense. There are more than 2,000 nuns and priests teaching in public schools and on the public payroll in the United States of America as the result of Roman Catholic influence in high places. Thus, quickly does the Roman hierarchy take advantage of any opportunity to use the secular power for the benefit of the church.

It has been estimated that Congressman John W. McCormack, Democrat of Massachusetts and a devoted Roman Catholic, has been personally responsible for legislation which under various categories, has brought public funds of more than 30 billion dollars to the institutions of his church. Someone has well raised the question: if a mere Catholic congressman can do that, what could not a Roman Catholic president do?

The Bible leaves no room for
(Continued on Page 15)

Is There An American Catholicism?

Prof. John E. Dahlin

During the present campaign for the Presidency of the United States, it has become increasingly manifest that many leading supporters of John Kennedy are employing their utmost skill in seeking to differentiate between Roman Catholicism and American Catholicism. If this point can be gotten across successfully, obviously tens of thousands of people may vote for Mr. Kennedy, who earlier were disinclined to do so.

First of all, as one casually looks at the situation there seems to be some kind of distinction between Roman Catholicism, and Catholicism as it is known in the United States. This distinction, while only relative, stems out of the fact that Roman Catholicism is a minority in this country. Throughout all of American history Roman Catholics have been a minority segment of our national population. The 40 million Catholics here constitute a little more than one-half of the total Protestant population of the nation. While Roman Catholics are gaining rapidly in number, still they represent only 22 per cent of our national population. During our entire history Roman Catholics have lived in a protestant pattern of civilization, and it stands to reason that even the hierarchy itself must take some cognizance of this situation, and to some degree at least restrain its program until the time when a majority status is achieved. The Roman hierarchy will not precipitate a dangerous crisis under present circumstances, for it operates on the theory time is on its

side, and a long-range objective is followed rather than attempting to force the issue at an inopportune hour.

No Autonomy in Catholicism

The burden of this article is to point out that there is no distinct American wing of Catholicism. The restraint in Catholic practices over here does not stem from a flexible concept within Catholicism. Roman Catholicism is an international system, and geographical distinctions, however minor, come about through practical necessities and not as a result of an autonomy granted within that system.

In the decade from 1890 to 1900 an attempt was made by a group of prominent Roman Catholics, led by Cardinal Gibbons, and including Archbishops Ireland, Keane and Kain, also Msgr. O'Connell, to Americanize the Catholic church and infuse it with the American spirit of democracy. What were the end results? Pope Leo XIII unconditionally condemned such efforts and hence this attempted innovation was terminated by direct papal action. Here, then, you have a clear evidence that American Catholicism has not been able to get under way in any independent fashion.

On the matter of separation of church and state, the Roman Church has never made a fundamental concession. Mr. Kennedy has spoken, perhaps sincerely, that he adheres to the historic American concept in this regard. His Church, to which he classifies himself as a loyal son, has never accepted as valid the con-

cept of separation of church and state. The idea of such separation, according to Catholic teaching, is only a metaphor, a figure of speech, a slogan, or a shibboleth. In a prominent text book used in Catholic schools in America, we find that text states, "Civil Power or Civil Government must be subordinate to the Church just as the body is subordinate to the soul. According to Catholic law the state owes the Church positive and direct allegiance. The Catholic Encyclopedia (a reliable source from which to quote) states, "In cases of direct contradiction (between Church and State) making it impossible for both jurisdictions to be exercised, the jurisdiction of the Church prevails and that of the State excluded. And from a November 1, 1885 Encyclical of Pope Leo XIII, the position of the Church is laid down unconditionally: "All Catholics must make themselves felt as active elements in daily political life in the countries where they live. They must penetrate, wherever possible, in the administration of civil affairs. All Catholics should do all in their power to cause the constitution and legislation to be modeled on the principles of the true (Catholic) Church." Al Smith, Presidential candidate in 1928, when confronted with these pronouncements by his Church, said, "They are obsolete." In giving such a reply, he may have been sincere, but he did not have a proper historical knowledge of the Roman Church. Let us now get a statement from the highest Vatican sources in 1960, and that pronouncement should be conclusive in this regard.

Official Catholic Position

An editorial appearing in the Vatican City Newspaper, *L'Observatore Romano*, May 17, 1960, and we quote in part: "The Roman Catholic Church established by Jesus Christ as a society with its hierarchy, has full powers of true jurisdiction over all the faithful, and therefore has the duty and right to guide, direct and correct them on the level of ideas and on the level of action . . . The Catholic can never overlook the teaching and the instruction of the Church; in every field of life he must base his private and public behaviour on the guidance and instruction of the hierarchy." Should Mr. Kennedy deny the full authority of his Church over him (he being a Roman Catholic) then, in fact, he is denying his faith. And should Mr. Kennedy defend the authority of the Church over him, he could not fully uphold the Constitution of the United States, which he as President, must swear to uphold and defend. It is the standard set by the Roman Catholic Church which makes it practically impossible for a loyal man of that Church to give priority to the American Constitution. This is the hard and stubborn problem a Roman Catholic must face if elevated to the Presidency.

It should be stated with emphasis that Protestants for the most part are not bigots. But Protestants understand that the Roman Church is completely committed to the doctrine of the union of the Church and State. Its canon law, papal bulls and encyclicals and historic practice all verify this fact. Catholic Schools

teach this, and loyal Catholics must believe this universally. Official Roman Catholic doctrine is changed only when its supreme authority, the Pope, announces ex-cathedra that a new doctrine has been approved. A Catholic President, like all other Catholics, is under obligation to yield to papal official pronouncements. Since the May 17th pronouncement came from Rome (this Presidential election year) Protestants have reason to be more hesitant than ever to support a Catholic for President.

Many official documents produced with the approval of the highest authority of the Catholic Church reveal, that in a completely Catholic state, freedom may be curtailed or denied non-Catholics under Catholic Law. This concept, derived from Pope Leo XIII's Encyclical, "Christian Constitution States", is taught in the important text book, *Principles of Politics*, by Msgr. John A. Ryan, and Father Francis J. Boland under the imprimatur of Cardinal Spellman. Clearly Monsignor Ryan and Father Boland declare, in the 1928 edition (page 136) "The State should recognize officially the Catholic religion as the religion of the commonwealth." Under such teachings as these we ask, Is the Catholic Church basically different in the United States? According to the standard Catholic texts used in their schools here, no such differences are recognized. It really is futile for Rev. John A. O'Brien to argue as he did earlier this year in *Look Magazine* that the Catholic Church is different in the United States. His reasoning is merely a subterfuge used in order to lead American voters

to look away from reality in November.

Catholic Position Inflexible

The sobering fact is that totalitarian principles in the Roman Church in America over here are already distinctly visible in certain areas here, especially where Catholics are enjoying a majority status. The boycott technique is used to whip stubborn opposition into line. In Maine very recently, Mr. Earl M. Hillman was the object of such a Roman Catholic boycott, simply because he had cast the deciding vote in the legislature against granting a state subsidy to the transportation of pupils in parochial schools. The boycott was successful. The dairy business could no longer be operated by the Hillman family. When this kind of boycott is extended to newspapers and business, as has been done in some cases, it brings a certain amount of concern to thinking people. Personally I know many business establishments which have become targets of the wrath of the higher clergy, simply because these firms did not go along, or buckle under the leadership of the church when the clergy sought big funds for certain projects in the community. During the past 15 years Ohio has been administered by two Catholic governors. Already Catholic priests, nuns and sisters, are allowed to be placed on the public payroll, and as these people perform their work, they continue to wear the distinct Catholic garb designating their rank. In such situations, actually American citizens are paying taxes to support Roman Catholic teachers who maintain their peculiar distinction in the educational activity.

Mr. Kennedy Faces Problems

As a good Roman Catholic, Mr. Kennedy if elected President, would not be entitled to attend or participate in leading Protestant assemblies, convocations, or dedicatory activities. Likely he would attempt to summon courage to be free in this regard, but according to Catholic regulations he is not allowed to attend any such functions. These are things which are of concern to many of us. Protestant bodies have no international hierarchy which overshadows the sovereignty of their distinct groups. Some Protestant groups may be even peculiar in both organization and function, but none follow a pattern of recognizing an international hierarchy which demands first allegiance. As a loyal Catholic Mr. Kennedy must also confess his sins before a Roman Catholic priest. It is hard to visualize such a situation, or spectacle, when the chief of state bows down before a fallible

clergyman confessing his sins. Mr. Kennedy has yielded once to the Ecclesiastical power of Cardinal Dougherty in the famous inter-faith banquet at Philadelphia, and according to Dr. Daniel Poling, Mr. Kennedy, in cancelling his earlier pledge to attend, said: "As a loyal son of the Church I have no alternative but not to come." This is the fear of American Protestants, that in a supreme test, Mr. Kennedy as a loyal Catholic would yield to the demands of the international Prince, the Pope. We must understand not many Catholics, not even American Catholics, would risk excommunication by the Pope. Why should we jeopardize our national position by electing a man, whose Church allows no discretion in accepting or rejecting papal injunctions. There is no such thing as an independent American Catholic Church. The Catholic system seeks to maintain ecclesiastical and political supremacy.

Separation of Church and State . .

(Continued from Page 11)

doubt as to the separation in character and function between church and state. The Lord Jesus himself said in John 18:36, "My kingdom is not of this world," and again in Luke 20:25 in reply to the question regarding the paying of tribute, He said, "Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's and unto God the things which are God's." Thus He differentiated clearly between the realm of civil authority and that of the spiritual.

When France was much more a Protestant country than she has ever been since, Pope Boni-

face wrote to Philip the Fair of France this letter, "Pope Boniface to Philip the Fair sends greetings; O Supreme Pontiff, know that thou art subject to us in temporal as well as spiritual things." Philip the Fair replied "Philip to Boniface: little or no greeting. Know thou, O supreme fool, that in temporal things we are not subject to anyone."

If we in the United States would preserve the religious and political liberties which we have so long enjoyed, we must resist with equal vigor any effort to introduce ecclesiastical influence into the political life of our nation. Church and state must remain separate.

RELIGION ANALYSIS SERVICE, INC.
902 Hennepin Avenue
Minneapolis 3, Minnesota



Form 3547 Requested

Pertinent Questions and Answers

Question—What will happen if the Pope eventually “takes over” through Catholic politicians in the U. S. as he has already taken over in Spain, Italy, Colombia and many other Catholic dominated countries?

Catholic Answer—“You ask, if the Pope were lord of this land and you were in a minority, what would he do to you? That, we say, would entirely depend upon circumstances. If it would benefit the cause of Catholicism, he would tolerate it; if expedient, he would imprison or banish you, probably he might hang you. But, be assured of one thing, he would never tolerate you for the sake of your glorious principles of civil and religious liberty.—Pope Pius IX, in the allocation of Sept. 1851

Question—Our Constitution, which men died for, guarantees Freedom of Worship, Freedom of Speech, Freedom of Press, Freedom of Conscience, etc., doesn't it?

Catholic Answer—“But constitutions can be changed, and non-Catholic sects may decline to such a point that the political proscription of them may become feasible and expedient. What protection would they have against a Catholic State?—Ryan & Millar, *The State and the Church*, page 38, 39

Question—What is the official Roman Catholic sentiment on public education?

Catholic Answer—“The rights of the Roman Catholic Church in the teaching of youth comes before the rights of the state.”—Pope John XXIII, *Scranton Tribune*, Dec. 31, 1959; page 17

The question will be raised “Does the Roman Catholic Church still officially believe these teachings?” Let me quote: “But she (the Church) cannot change her teachings. She holds the same creed, she teaches the same doctrine—the same absolute spiritual values today . . .” *Catholic World*, July 1944. And of course, since the Popes claim infallibility while teaching - - their threats to freedom-loving people are authoritative Roman Catholic Dogma as well, and cannot change.

See our Catalog listings on Catholicism