

Cath. Ch. in U.S.A. - Anti-Cath.
Mov.

BX
1770

Shall Rome Make America Catholic?

Has the "Christian Herald"
Heralded Facts?

Excellent Article from the Marian
By J. P. McKEY, C.M.

CONTAINING LETTER
ON
SOCIALISM
By the Apostolic Delegate

IMPRIMATUR:
†THOMAS D. BEAVEN,
Bishop of Springfield

Price, 3 cents a copy; if mailed, 4 cents
100 copies, \$2.00; 500 copies, \$9.00; 1,000 copies, \$17.00

ST. VINCENT'S MISSION HOUSE
SPRINGFIELD, MASS.

"SHALL ROME MAKE AMERICA CATHOLIC?"

Has the "Christian Herald" Heralded Facts?

Since last October the "Christian Herald" of New York City has been running a series of articles on "Shall Rome Make America Catholic?" All the charges can be summed up, we think, in the charge that the editor makes in one of the October numbers, column first of page 1034:—

"It was pointed out (in a former issue of the Herald) that this project of Catholic conquest was not a spiritual one, nor was it confined to the utterance of a single Cardinal, but was expressed everywhere in Catholic pulpit and press and even in Papal allocutions, the latest being that of Pius X, which declared it to be a duty to bend every energy 'public, social and political' toward making this country the 'first Catholic country in the world.'"

OUR COMMENT.—If this means anything it means that it is the intention of the Catholic Church to use political means in the making of America Catholic, and that this intention is expressed everywhere by the Pope, Cardinals, priests and Catholic press. Similar statements are crowding almost all the Protestant and the Socialistic papers at the present time. The "Christian Herald" is a representative Protestant paper, possibly the most influential in the country. The people that read it and whose opinions are shaped by it are not the class that pollute their minds with the obscenities of the "Menace" or of "Watson's," or that believe the "convent horrors," or "image worship," or the "bloody oaths of priests and Knights of Columbus." So that when one sees in a paper like the "Herald" contributions, to run for a year, regarding the "political chicanery" and "pernicious political activity" of the Catholic Church, contributions that come from Protestant Bishops and ministers of various religious beliefs, it makes

one wonder on what ground can a fair-minded and intelligent American base his charge?

With this wonder we wrote on November 6, last, to the "Herald's" editor, Mr. Geo. H. Sandison, calling his attention to the editorial quoted above, and asking him on what occasion did the present Pope so speak of the political conquest of America, and to give us the name of one Cardinal, one Catholic priest and one Catholic paper that spoke so. We received no reply. On November 29 we sent a registered letter, seeking the same information. Still no reply. On January 30, we sent another registered letter. His reply came under date of February 1. For the sake of clearness, we shall number the questions and his answers, and add our comments thereto.

QUESTION No. 1.—On what occasion did Pius X say that Catholics should bend every energy "public, social and political" to make America Catholic?

ANSWER OF SANDISON.—"In an allocution on November 9, 1903, Pius X said, according to the 'Civiltà Cattolica,' 1906, Vol. IV, p. 9: 'It is our duty to direct **all men without exception** according to the rules and standards of morality, in private life, and in **public** life, in the social order and in the **political** order; and thus to direct not only the governed, but rulers as well.'"

OUR COMMENT.—Pius X certainly did so speak,—to direct all men, no matter who they are or what they are, or where they are, or in what business they are engaged; all men, whether they be kings or presidents, statesmen or petty politicians, to **DIRECT** them, **TEACH** them. And direct them according to what standard? According to the standards of politics? No; according to the

standards of **morality**. To **direct** all men of the world to be moral,—even in their politics to be moral, is altogether different from Mr. Sandison's charge, which was that the Pope instructed Catholics to use politics to make all men of the world Catholics, including Americans. Do not Mr. Sandison and all that contribute these anti-Catholic articles to his paper wish to **direct** all men to be moral? Mr. Sandison does not mention where the Pope says that Catholics should use **politics** to make men moral, or Catholics.

QUESTION No. 2.—Name one Cardinal who said that this conquest was not to be a spiritual one,—that Catholics are to use political means to make America Catholic.

ANSWER OF S.—“Cardinal O'Connell's speech at Lowell, Mass., May 1, 1910.”

COMMENT.—The Cardinal's speech lies before us as we write. We wish that Mr. Sandison had specified just what in this speech spoke for the political conquest, even remotely. We have read and re-read it, tried to make ourselves take the stand of an honest Protestant reading it, and in it we can find nothing that an honest Protestant would not admire, though he might not accept. The Cardinal speaks of “adherence to Catholic principles,” “loyalty to the Church,” of Catholics following “their Divinely appointed leaders.” He says that “every movement involving Catholic interests should have the Catholics' whole-souled support;” that there should be “unflinching loyalty to Church and **State**;” that the “Pope is the **spiritual** head of the greatest institution the world has ever known;” that “the Papacy is the greatest **moral** power in all the world;” but he says nothing about using political means to make America Catholic. If the Cardinal had said or insinuated that the Catholics should follow their Divinely appointed leaders in things political; or that the Pope was the **political** head of the Catholics in this country; or the Papacy was a political power in this

country, or was seeking such, we could see how an honest American Protestant would disagree with the Cardinal. But he says nothing of the kind. And the other things that the Cardinal says of Catholics and Catholicism, the sincere Protestant would say of Protestants and Protestantism,—Mr. Sandison would say that they should give “adherence to Protestant principles,” “loyalty to Protestant churches;” that Protestants should follow “their Divinely appointed leaders;” and that “every movement involving Protestant interests should have the Protestants' whole-souled support.”

QUESTION No. 3.—Mention one Catholic paper that has advocated the political conquest of America.

ANSWER OF S.—A. “The editorials in the ‘Boston Pilot’ of May 7, 1910, set forth the qualifications demanded of candidates for public office who wish the support of the Federation of Catholic Societies.”

COMMENT.—The Catholic editor is commenting on Archbishop O'Connell's speech aforementioned, and on its unfair treatment by the “Boston Transcript.” He remarks that “nominal Catholics would never be elected to serve the interests of real Catholics: let those who want them elect them * * * If the Catholics of those countries (France, Spain and Mexico) had been taught their duties towards the Church and State, as the Archbishop is now teaching the Catholics in this diocese through Federation, M. Diaz and the bloc would not be tyrannizing over the destinies of the Church in Mexico and France.”

It is extremely difficult to see how any mind can read into those lines the thought that the Catholics are planning a political conquest of America; impossible to see how a fair mind can read such a thought therein. It is still more impossible for a fair mind to see just where the Catholics have “declared” that they are planning so. The editor simply avers that real Catholics will not elect to civic office nominal Catholics to represent their interests: “let them that

want them elect them"—that if French, Mexican and Spanish Catholics had been instructed in their duties to Church and State, they would not now be robbed of their rights. The Catholic Church's "interests" in this country are its "rights" (not its privileges: it is seeking no privileges): real Catholics will not elect to civic office nominal Catholics that will not safeguard these "rights." The "rights" are that freedom shall be allowed to religious worship and that no religious test shall be held as a qualification for civic office. If you say "By this very fact you Catholics are making a religious test: 'The brand of a man's Catholicity determines the fact whether he shall have the Catholic citizens' support,'" we reply "The brand neither of a man's Catholicity, nor a man's Protestantism, nor a man's Judaism, nor a man's atheism determines whether he shall receive the support of Catholic citizens; but where Catholic rights are at stake, the rights guaranteed him by the Constitution, you cannot expect him to choose a nominal Catholic (a Catholic but in name, not in practice) to represent those rights. A Catholic false to his conscience in things of faith will be false to his conscience in things of State. The Catholic man's religious rights will be better guarded by the conscientious Protestant or Jew." In matters where the rights of Protestantism are at stake would Mr. Sandison elect to represent those rights the un-conscientious Protestant that would not guarantee those rights given by the Constitution? The Catholic is simply upholding the Constitution, Art. VI: "All executive and judicial officers * * * shall be bound by oath or affirmation to support this Constitution." The oath of the un-conscientious Catholic can no more be trusted than that of the un-conscientious Protestant. But there is nothing in all the foregoing to indicate that Catholics are plotting the political conquest of America.

ANSWER OF S.—B. "The reports of the Conventions of the Federation of

Catholic Societies testify to fruitful activities in many states."

COMMENT.—This is rather vague. Why not specify what Conventions, and in what resolutions or actions in those Conventions? Again, "fruitful activities" are not the same as "political efforts" to make America Catholic; but we can rightly infer that Mr. Sandison wishes us to understand "fruitful activities in political efforts." But the charge being but general, the refutation needs but to be so.

The National Secretary of the Federation, Mr. Anthony Matre, writes us under date of Feb. 7: "I have been connected with the American Federation of Catholic Societies since its inception, and have been its National Secretary during all these years, and do not know of a single instance where the Federation has taken part in partisan politics. Let any one that asserts otherwise furnish the proof."

On our desk are the Federation's Constitution, its Platform, its Principles, and the statements of some of its founders. The Constitution, Art. XV, says: "Partisan politics shall not be discussed in any of the meetings of the Convention of the Federation, or subordinate body of the Federation, nor shall this body or any subordinate body thereof **indorse any candidate** for public office."

Its Platform declares: "It is not a political organization, and does not control the political affiliation of its members; it asks no favors or privileges, but openly proclaims what is just and fair."

Its Principles (pgs. 13 and 14), drafted by Archbishop Messmer, read: "The second American principle * * * is that religion should not interfere with politics * * * We do not want politics brought into religion, or religion brought into politics, if you speak of politics in the common sense of the term, when it is simply a question of parties and party elections * * * What we want are the men; and I would rather vote for a good honest Protestant than for a poor Catholic. But if the axiom 'No religion in

politics' means that the law of the land shall have no regard to the eternal laws of God * * * those eternal laws of morality, then I say that we must have religion in politics, for morality is religion."

Would not Mr. Sandison say the same? There is nothing here to indicate that Federation is fruitfully active in things political, much less that it is trying by these activities to make America Catholic.

Bishop McFaul, speaking at the Federation meeting, New Orleans, November, 1910, said: "Some affirm that the Federation is a political organization, and, therefore, dangerous to the welfare of Catholics and Catholicism. Now, I defy any one to read the literature of this movement and establish that proposition. * * * Oftentimes our Representative in State Legislature or in Congress cannot give us the justice he desires, precisely because we do not encourage him. On the other side, he has the petitions from all the bigots,—and none from us."

These are the sentiments of the founders of Federation. There is question here of rights guaranteed by the Constitution; but not even by innuendo is there a hint that Catholics should use political means to make America Catholic.

ANSWER of S.—C. "In a book of instructions sent out by the Ohio Catholic Societies last fall, the voters were informed as to the wishes of the Hierarchy on each amendment submitted for adoption."

COMMENT—We have studied the book referred to, as well as the comments made thereon by some of the Toledo and Columbus papers. It is **not** a book of "instructions" but of "suggestions." The voters were **not** informed as to the wishes of the Hierarchy. Archbishop Moeller did address the members of the Staatsband; but he is no more the Hierarchy than Mr. Sandison is the Protestant church. Moreover, the Archbishop did **not** inform the voters as to his wishes how they should vote,

though we could see nothing treasonable if he had done so. While reminding the members of a Staatsband that theirs was not a political society, he told **them** to do their duty, and told **every** voter to consider carefully before God what was for the best interest of the people. Would not Mr. Sandison advise every voter to do the same?

The book of "Suggestions" was **not** addressed to the Catholics of Ohio, as Mr. Sandison would have us infer, but was addressed to all the voters of the whole state. Ohio was facing a crisis: forty-one amendments to the State Constitution were to be submitted to the voters. Many of the amendments were in fact, or in tendency, or in both, Socialistic,—the Initiative and Referendum, the denial of the parents' right to have their children educated in what schools the parents wished, the taxation of churches and charitable institutions. A Protestant minister, the Rev. H. S. Bigelow, scattered broadcast two pamphlets of Socialistic tendency, and clamored for a majority of half a million votes thereon. The Rev. Washington Gladden and other prominent citizens wrote to the daily papers advice how to vote. Archbishop Moeller told the men to do their duty as they saw it before God. And the Catholic Societies wrote a pamphlet on "Suggestions to Voters." That is the whole story. Now, what the Rev. H. S. Bigelow and the Rev. Washington Gladden had a right to do, would Mr. Sandison say that the Archbishop and the Societies had no right to do? Were not the latter American citizens as well as the former? If the Protestant ministers had a right to advise according to their conscientious convictions, had not the Catholics the same right? The "Suggestions" tended to preserve to Protestants their American rights as well as to Catholics; tended to save the Protestant churches and charitable organizations from taxation as well as the Catholic; tended to preserve to the Protestant parent as well as to the Catholic parent the right to have his

child educated as he thought best. That Catholics understood that these "Suggestions" were only suggestions can be seen from the fact that although the Catholic Societies suggested to vote "No" for Women's Suffrage, many Catholics voted "Yes."

In all these things there is not the slightest hint that Catholics are using political means to make America Catholic, but using American means to keep America American.

QUESTION No. 4.—Name one priest that has said that the conquest of America is to be, not a spiritual one, but a political one?

ANSWER of S.—A. "Two sentences taken from a sermon by Father Phelan in the 'Western Watchman,' June 21, 1912, which contained more matter of the same kind."

COMMENT.—Then Mr. Sandison quotes ten sentences instead of two. It is easier, however, to get Mr. Sandison's objection from ten sentences than from a whole speech, or book; but it would have been still easier had he given us but the two, and easier still had he told us how he read into the ten or the two the idea that Father Phelan advocated political means to make America Catholic. But we will honestly try to take two sentences that embody the thought of the ten, and of the whole sermon, the two that are italicized (not by Father Phelan, but by the Protestant paper from which Mr. Sandison is quoting) and see what charge can be made by them: "The Pope is the ruler of the world * * * We think more of the Church than we do of the United States."

We have read the whole sermon several times, but we can honestly find in it nothing that advocates or insinuates that Catholics are to use political means to make America Catholic. He says that the Pope is the ruler of the world, but nothing about him being **political** ruler thereof. He says that Catholics think more of the Church than they do of the United States. Yes, the truth is

that Catholics think more of their Church than they do of their country. Does not Mr. Sandison think the same of his church, or does he think more of his country? Does not the Church teach truths eternal, the State but things of time? Are not eternal things to be preferred to things but temporal? Are not the eternal verities of the Bible preferable to the temporal verities of the Constitution? If the State should make a law harmful to his creed, would Mr. Sandison accept the State's decree and not fight for the rights guaranteed by our present Constitution? The Constitution guarantees him the right to "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness" in this world, not in the next. It is declared that the Constitution "shall be the supreme law of the land," (Art. VI) not of Heaven. Does not Mr. Sandison recognize that there are two laws, one of the State and one of Heaven, that they do not conflict, that they are in two different spheres, that these two laws are enunciated in Jesus Christ's "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's"? Does he not recognize that the things of God are higher than the things of "Caesar"? But if "Caesar" should forget the limits of his jurisdiction, and try to regulate the things of God, does not Mr. Sandison admit, must not every Bible-lover admit that the Godly would rather die for God than live for "Caesar"? In such an emergency would not Mr. Sandison say to "Caesar" in the words of Sts. Peter and John (Acts 4, 19), "If it be just in the sight of God to hear you rather than God, judge ye"?

The explanatory words of the priest are: "We love the Church more than we love our fathers and our mothers, more than we love our children. Why? Because we are children of the Church of Jesus Christ; and He says, 'Unless you leave father and mother, sisters and brothers, kinsfolk and acquaintance for My sake, you are not worthy of me.'" This explanatory sentence was sup-

pressed likewise from the garbled report of the sermon in the "Baptist Forum," September, 1912. Does Mr. Sandison take the report from the "Forum," or does he reject the words of Jesus Christ?

That we have read nothing into the sermon but what any unbiased mind sees therein can be proved from the non-Catholic "Independent" of New York City, Aug. 17, 1912. The "Independent" is never weary of attacking the Catholic Church; but of this same sermon it says: "It is good strong language, and, *mutatis mutandis*, it is true; and we should say the same * * * He could say nothing else. As Christians we hold that the Church is the highest power for good in the world, its highest blessing, its supreme guide; and we love it more than we love our country, and would sooner die for it."

There is this in the sermon; but of political means to make America Catholic, there is nothing.

ANSWER of S.—B. "See Bishop McFaul's speech in Indianapolis, in 1907."

COMMENT.—We wrote to the Right Rev. Bishop on February 4: on February 9, he replied, "It is an unqualified falsehood that I ever in public or in private advocated the political conquest of America by Catholics. I said, however, that if non-Catholics continued to practice race-suicide, the Catholics alone would be the future Americans; and this is undeniable."

ANSWER of S.—C. "The facsimile letter of the Apostolic Delegate published in the 'Protestant Magazine' for January, 1913, tells the voter that he must put the interests of the Church before any particular party."

COMMENT.—On February 4, we wrote to the Apostolic Delegate, and on February 17 came the reply. We publish the letter in full:

Apostolic Delegation,
Washington, D. C.,
February 17, 1913.

Rev. and Dear Father:—

The letter that you addressed to me

on the fourth of this month was duly received. It was with surprise that I learned from it that the "Christian Advocate," a Protestant paper of New York, has been running a serial upon the intention of the Pope, Cardinals, Bishops and (Catholic) Societies of this country to gain the political control of this country.

My surprise became greater when I found that the whole scheme, which is nothing more than a production of the imagination, is based on an expression of mine contained in one of my letters, that has been falsely interpreted and maliciously abused.

The account of the case, in which the expression was made, is as follows: In the early part of last year, a certain Mr. T. P. Cary of Palestine, Texas, addressed a letter to this Delegation in which he asked whether "he could go to confession and Communion," because this had been refused to him on account of his being a Socialist. In various other letters that he afterwards wrote to this office, he most strongly declared that "it was in the Catholic Church that he was born" and that "it was in it that he hoped to die;" that "he never has and never will cast his vote for any person or party that finds it necessary to assail religion;" that "the religious futures of himself, wife and children are the most serious and important things of all," and that "he was ready and willing at any time to surrender his life for the Catholic faith that was within him." After these grand and solemn promises he asked me, "Must I surrender my political freedom to the Church to be a Catholic?" I answered this question with the following letter:

Dear Sir:

In your letter to me dated June 10, you say that the religious future of yourself, your wife and your children are the most serious and important things of all. Now, you must remember that if the Catholic Church condemns doctrines that are pernicious to the good

of the faithful, she does it only in order to defend and protect the religion of her children. Hence, you should submit to the decision of the Church even at the cost of sacrificing political principles. For your guidance I may mention to you the fact that Socialism, besides being a political party, is also an anti-Christian sect. In order to convince yourself of this, you have only to read what Socialism teaches regarding religion.

With regards I am,
(Signed)

Mr. Cary, upon the receipt of this letter, contradicted his previous assertions of willingness to die for his faith, etc., by showing himself dissatisfied with my answer to his question, and by sending it, together with a copy of his own letter to me, to the Miner's Magazine of Denver, Colorado. The editor published both of them in the issue of October 3. In making his observations, he remarks, whether out of ignorance or malice I know not, that "Socialism deals with the economic questions and has nothing to do with the religious belief of the individual."

In writing my letter to Mr. Cary, I had before my mind the principles that the leaders of Socialism advocate against religion in general, and against the Catholic Church in particular, as well as the present struggle that is going on between Socialism and the Catholic Church in Europe. I had not, however, as yet read the statements made about Socialism in its relation to religion by Mr. Ben. S. Henry, who for some time was a Socialist leader and the business manager of the "Citizen," a paper owned by the ex-Rev. G. R. Lunn, the Socialist Mayor of Schenectady, N. Y. Since then, I have found that he affirms precisely what I had written in my letter. I shall quote a few of his words for you:

"Another important reason for my total disgust is that to study Socialism and become saturated with its teachings

and follow out its doctrines leads absolutely to a disregard of the holy teachings of the churches and synagogues, and those early religious teachings received from our mothers. I believe in God; and **my experience and study in Socialism convinced me absolutely that it is impossible for a person to be a sincere Christian or Jew and be a sincere Socialist. How anyone can be a sincere Catholic and a sincere Socialist is beyond my understanding. Socialists are opposed to religion on principle, and must necessarily place obstacles in the way of religious progress.**"

It was only natural that the Socialists should take offence at my words, and attack my letter; but by so doing they have merely shown that I had hit the nail on the head.

With regards to the accusation of the Protestants, it is utterly beyond me to comprehend how they could make my letter a ground for their charge that the Church is endeavoring to gain the political control of the country. Perhaps it is the expression, "Hence you should submit to the decisions of the Church even at the cost of sacrificing political principles" which they are abusing for this purpose. Their interpretation of it, however, is unjust. This expression is to be explained by the light of the context and with due reference to this one particular case of a Socialist. I was not speaking of political principles in general, but about the principles of Socialism in particular, which, according to the confession of Mr. Henry, are essentially anti-religious and anti-Catholic. If then they put another interpretation on my words different from this, they give evident signs of their bad faith. Such bad faith will become much more apparent in them if we consider that Catholics all over the world, and particularly Catholics here in America are free to follow any honest political party they choose without the least fear of interference on the part of the Pope or of the Bishops or of the priests.

The only policy that the Catholic Church has ever known has been that which leads to the salvation of souls. In pursuance of this end she has always opposed herself and continues to oppose herself to any principle or party that is destructive of religion and society. The good effects of her action are felt not only by the Catholics, but also by the Protestants themselves, who should, therefore, be grateful to her for them instead of continually assailing her as they do.

I have been extensive in my answer to your letter, Rev. Father, because the matter was an important one, and seemed to merit the time that it has taken from other duties of mine. With respect and best wishes I am,

Sincerely yours in Christ,
JOHN BONZANO,
Archbishop of Melitene,
Apostolic Delegate.

Nothing can we add to the letter. It denies that it is the wish of the Catholic Church to use political means to make America Catholic; it affirms simply that Catholics cannot ally themselves to any party (educational, religious, social or political) whose tenets, in the confession of the recognized leaders themselves, are destructive of religion and society. Would not Mr. Sandison say the same thing for Protestants? Or would he?

To sum up.—Mr. Sandison stated it was expressed **everywhere** by Catholic pulpit, priests, press, cardinals and Pope that Catholics were to use political means to make America Catholic. There are in the United States 17,600 priests and 320 Catholic papers. Literally, "everywhere" would mean that **all** these priests and papers had expressed themselves for the political conquest of America. But of course, he did not mean it literally. But if "everywhere" meant anything at all, it meant that at least the majority of these priests and papers had so expressed themselves. It would not have been too much to have asked him to come within 50 per cent. of proving his assertion. He had 17,920

sources from which to furnish the proof. Certainly, it would not be much if we had asked him to come within 10 per cent. of proving his assertion by furnishing 1,700 of these sources. How little it would have been if we had asked him to furnish proofs from 800 of these sources,—to come within 5 per cent. of his assertion. But we asked him to give only one-fiftieth of one per cent. of a proof of his assertion, and he has given us none. He has taken almost three months to gather the proofs, and he has proved—nothing, nothing regarding his assertion. But he has proved something else. He has proved for us:

1—That Catholics are encouraged to be loyal to Church and State. (Would not Mr. Sandison encourage Protestants so to be?)

2—That Catholics place the spiritual above the material; the laws of the Bible, and the laws made by God, above the laws of land, made by man. (Does not Mr. Sandison do likewise?)

3—That Catholics claim that they have the right to teach all men the ways of morality. (Do not the Protestant Churches claim the same right?)

4—That Catholics claim that their Church is the greatest institution in the world. (Do not the Protestants claim the same for their churches?)

5—That Catholics claim that the Pope in matters spiritual is the head of the Church. (Do not the Protestants claim that their ministers and Bishops are, in matters spiritual, the heads of their respective churches?)

6—That Catholics should follow in matters spiritual their Divinely appointed leaders. (Do not Protestants believe in things spiritual they should follow Divinely appointed leaders?)

7—That Catholics do not wish religion brought into politics, nor politics brought into religion. (Do Protestants wish otherwise?)

8—That Catholics insist that for the holding of civil office they shall not be included because they are Catholics, but that they shall not be excluded because

they are Catholics. (Does not Mr. Sandison insist on the same things for Protestants?)

9—That Catholics prefer for civil rulers conscientious Protestants or Jews to un-conscientious Catholics. (Does not this preference meet with Mr. Sandison's endorsement?)

10—That Catholics wish to guard their rights guaranteed them by the Constitution. (Does not Mr. Sandison wish the same for Protestants?)

11—That Catholics vote and hold civil offices. (Do not Protestants the same?)

12—That Catholic laymen and clergymen sometimes advise others how to vote in order to secure their rights. (Do not Protestant laymen and clergymen advise so, too?)

We would like these questions answered "Yes" or "No."

Mr. Sandison has proved for us these twelve things, but he has not proved that the Catholics are trying by political means to make America Catholic. In fact, by some of the above proofs (Nos.

1, 6 and 8) he has proved just the contrary. If he wishes to understand what is the Catholics' position in the matters he is handling, let him read in this issue of the Marian the article on "Pope and Politics." But we ask him is it fair to twist words into meanings that the context does not warrant? Words are weak things, after all; but they are wonderful, and the honest man will not distort the wondrous gift of God. Is it American to use the power of the press to foment discord among our citizens? Is he a Christian Herald when he trumpets calumnies against 15,000,000 of his neighbors? For he has, wittingly or unwittingly, calumniated 15,000,000 of his Catholic neighbors. If he has done it unwittingly, he will apologize to those neighbors, and will close his columns to these calumnies. If he has done it wittingly, it would be well for him to study, and to "herald" the commandment: "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor."

J. P. McKEY, C. M.

Pope and Politics.

All sane ones outside the Catholic Church are willing to tolerate all the doctrines of the Church, except the doctrine, as they call it, of the temporal power of the Pope. They may say we are foolish in believing the Real Presence of Our Lord in the Blessed Sacrament; but they are willing to let that pass. They say we err in giving so much honor to the Blessed Virgin; but after all, they say, it is but a harmless idealization of purity in woman kind. They say it is degrading to personal manhood to kneel before a fellow man and confess the most secret sins of the heart; but, yet, they admit, the consolation of so relieving the mind of the sin-burdens, and the counsels received in the confessional, should work for the betterment of the

individual and of society. But that Catholics should believe in the temporal power of the Pope, that free Americans should offer allegiance to a foreign potentate,—this is past endurance! In the words of the demented Lear, "That way madness lies."

Examine dispassionately the whole doctrine of the temporal power. A difficulty is never solved by dodging it; the doctrine of the Church is never helped by trimming it down to fit the exigencies of every case. It is better to state the doctrine clearly, strongly, so that those that do not accept it may at least understand it.

There is present need of clear explanation, because of the widespread errors that are flooding secular and religious

papers. At every national election, the cry of "Pope and Politics" offers many a theme for partisan pens. Around the election of 1908, the Lutheran and Baptist conferences wrote a letter to President Roosevelt, that no Catholic true to his church could be true to his country. Before the last election a nation-wide campaign was raised against the Catholic Church, the basis of complaint being the same,—a true Catholic and a true American, they claimed, were incompatible terms.

It was said that word had come from Rome to "Make America Catholic."

No such word did come; but without doubt, the Pope and every priest here in America are trying to make America Catholic, just as every sincere Baptist is trying to make America Baptist, every sincere Methodist is trying to make America Methodist. "But," it is objected, "Rome is using different means, un-American means."

She is using no other means than her Divine Founder used,—moral suasion, teaching. She is heeding the behest of Jesus Christ, to make not only America Catholic, but the whole world so: "Go teach all nations whatsoever I have commanded you."

The rebuttal comes, "That is just what the Catholic Church is not doing,—she is using political means, she is trying to have the Pope dominate our country. The temporal power of the Pope will, if we should let it, bend our necks; the flag of the Vatican will supplant the flag of the free upon our national Capitol."

The, possibly, most influential Protestant paper in the land is the Christian Herald of New York City. It has been running a series of articles from last October on "Shall Rome Make America Catholic?" It remarked that this conquest was not to be a spiritual one; that American Catholic cardinals, pulpits, priests and press have openly declared to the contrary; that the present Pope in an allocution had publicly said that Catholics in America

should use every effort, political and social, to make America Catholic.

COMMENT. Catholics do not believe that the Pope has any divine right to interfere with our country in things purely political. They believe that he should have some temporal power in his own Papal States. There certainly was a special reason for setting off the District of Columbia from the other States. It was to secure the free exercise of the powers of the President and of Congress over all the States. The Pope should have enough temporal power so that he may exercise without molestation his spiritual power throughout the world. You recognize that you should have some temporal power in your own homes, so that you may be free to keep your children honest, obedient and pure; but you also recognize that you have not, do not wish to have temporal power over your neighbors' house next door; his home is his castle: he must exercise that power over his own. Our land is one big home. We have rules that regulate the Constitution of that home; we exercise those rules by our politics. What more right has the Pope to rule our politics than we have to rule the domestic regulations of our neighbors?

We reply: The Pope has no right to interfere with our politics. He has a right to interpret for us the meaning of the Ten Commandments, the meaning of the Bible, the obligations of the moral law: this right is given him by Jesus Christ. To the first Pope, St. Peter, He said, "To thee do I give the keys of the kingdom of Heaven;" (not of earth). This claim of spiritual power Pilate heard as he leaned from his judgment chair and said to Jesus: "Art thou a king?" "Aye, thou sayest it, that I am * * * My kingdom is not of this world." Of that spiritual kingdom beyond the stars did Jesus deliver the keys to the first Pope. No Pope from Peter to Pius X ever claimed by divine right any political power over a foreign country.

"But there you show your ignorance

COMMENT.—In 1789 William Pitt, the English parliamentarian, asked six of the leading Catholic universities of Europe if the Pope claimed civil power in England, and the six universities replied in substantially the same words: "Neither the Pope, nor the cardinals, nor any body of men, nor any other person of the Church of Rome has any civil power, authority, jurisdiction or pre-eminence whatsoever in any kingdom." In 1791 the Archbishops of Ireland, that they might allay the pretended fears of the anti-Catholics of England, asked for an authoritative decision from the Pope; and the Pope, through the Congregation of Cardinals, replied in practically the same terms: That the Pope may interfere in things political in England is an "old calumny," a "slandorous reproach," that the Church never taught "It is lawful for the Bishop of Rome to invade their (the rulers') temporal rights," etc. ("An Historical Review of the State of Ireland" by Francis Plowden, Vol. IV, Appendix, pg. 27.—Butler's "English Catholics."—Hergenrother's "Catholic Church and Christian State."—M. Affre's "Suprematie Temporelle du Pape," pg. 508.)

Catholics are taught to obey their lawful rulers; they fight against one another in things that are civil; they agree only in things that are spiritual. In the Revolutionary War it was Catholic

Canada that fought against Catholic France, and remained true to Protestant England. In our Civil War one-tenth of the Confederate soldiers were Catholics, and as many could be found in the Union ranks.

"But what would happen if the Pope again should become the great political power of Europe, and should master all the fleets and armies of Europe to subdue us to the papal flag? What would Catholics in this country do?"

COMMENT.—If, by an impossible supposition, the Pope should man army and fleet to storm our coast, do you know what Catholics here would do? You would have two million Catholics in the American army ready to die to resist the Pope's invasion; you would have thirteen million Catholics in their homes praying for their sons, brothers and fathers in the field; you would have forty-five thousand Catholic nuns upon their knees before the Tabernacles beseeching the God of armies to strike the guns from the Roman emissaries; you would have seventeen thousand priests in the front ranks of the army fighting till they died for the Constitution of the United States. We would be loyal Catholics still; we would say to that Pope: "We shall render unto God the things that are God's. Yes, but we will render also unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's."

Why this Cry?

While conscientious ministers are warning that the land is veering paganwards,—that the pace of the combined church membership before 1910 kept pace with the population, but since has lagged half way behind; while the Protestant religious statistician, Dr. H. K. Carroll, is lamenting the "distinct disappointment" of the Men and Religion Forward Movement after its expenditure of a million dollars; while the Protestant Dr. Robertson Nicol is writing that in

England the Catholic Church alone is "in a condition that warrants self-congratulation;" and Dr. Horton in India is endeavoring to swell church membership by having all the Protestant denominations to accept one another's converts; while ministers in this country to fill their churches are forced to the sad expedient of theatrical advertisement, sensational sermons, free lunches, moving pictures and vaudeville shows, and still unable to move the 56,000,000

Americans that are un-affiliated with any church; while in the last forty years 5,000,000 married people here professed to break what God had bound; while we have with us now more than a quarter million people that have forsaken their marriage vow, and maybe quite as many that are living in unlawful, though not illegal, adultery; while in the year that has gone 200,000 in the land have heard their bonds snap and fly in the face of their 70,000 children; while the little ones are taught all the mysteries of life but none of death, all of earth but naught of Heaven, all of chicanery and crime but naught of conscience and Christ; while Godless brows, self-garlanded with pride, are ripping the Bible to tatters, and ministers are decrying the fact that Protestantism, after having repudiated an infallible Pope, would set up the infallible "Paper Pope" of the Scriptures; and still withal, while all Protestants and Catholics are praying for church unity; while we are paying \$3,173,000,000 yearly to guard the country against crime; while Socialism is supplanting the mandates of the Creator with the mandates of the creature,—the laws of God, with the lust of men; while through the land murder stalks with its red hand snatching a life at every hour; while a quarter million shameless women with fair faces and foul hearts are feeding in brilliant vice halls on the bestial carcasses of manhood; and countless poor are gasping for life in shops and mills and sunless alleys:—is it not strange that in all this crimson crime, this wreck of home and happiness, this scene of sins and shames and sorrows,—is it not strange that the "Christian Herald" of New York City should say in its editorial of November, 1912:—

"WE SHOULD WELCOME SUCH FRATERNAL CONCORD AMONG THE VARIOUS PROTESTANT DENOMINATIONS AS WOULD INSPIRE ALL TO PUT THEMSELVES OFFICIALLY ON RECORD CONCERNING THE AGGRESSIONS OF ROME. * * * OUT WITH YOUR FLAGS, BRETHREN OF THE DE-

NOMINATIONAL PRESS, AND LET THE WORLD SEE WHERE YOU STAND?"

Why this cry? Why the "fraternal concord" against this Church? If they cannot unite with it in things of faith, cannot they unite with it in its fight against Socialism and divorce, Godlessness, free-love and crime? There is more work to be done in a year than all the churches will do in a century. Socialism and divorce, Godlessness, free-love and crime are the common enemy within our gates. Why strengthen the enemy by weakening the influence of this one church? The Socialist Berger says that this one church is the only great organized opposition against his creed. The Protestant editor of the Deshler (Ohio) "Flag" in a recent issue speaks of "the air of sacredness" that pervades the Catholic Church,—and the beauty of its marriage ceremony being fit for the brush of an artist. "No wonder," says he, "there are so few divorces among the Catholics! These people realize the solemn vows they are taking. * * * We cannot call to mind now that we ever knew of a case of free love among Catholics. * * * If this ceremony will cause men and women to live together till parted by death; if the Catholic faith will cause man and wife to be honest and true to each other, then, in the name of God, what is the matter with our Protestant religion?" And the Rev. W. J. Geer (Protestant) quoted in "Western Catholic," January 17, remarks, "How many times have I heard the remark, 'If the Catholics get the upper hand again, they would persecute the Protestants' * * * The Catholic Church never has and never will claim the right to compel people by force to become Catholics. Her only methods are those of persuasion, instruction and example. * * * Was it ever enacted in any Catholic country that any one that refused to attend Mass should be heavily fined? Was it ever enacted in any Catholic country that no Protestant children should inherit land until they conformed

of history. Did not many a pope through the Middle Ages claim the right to interfere in things political? Did they not, like Warwick of England, make and unmake kings? Did they not release people from their allegiance to their sovereigns? Did they not divide newly discovered lands among contesting monarchs? Did they not hand over whole countries to certain rulers? Did they not command contending armies to lay down their swords and listen to the decisions of Rome? Did not Gregory VII depose Emperor Henry IV from the German throne, call the German princes together to elect a successor, and would have done so had not the cruel, corrupt, blasphemous and hypocritical monarch crawled before the papal throne and asked for forgiveness and for the restoration of his sceptre? If all this was not interference in things political, what is?"

We answer that these things were interference in things political, but we say these popes had no divine right to interfere in these things political; they had a human right, and this human right came from a human source. The source was the people; it was they who gave this right; it was they who could take it away. The popes were dealing with men and with times far different from our own. The Church took the barbarian hordes, civilized, humanized, Christianized, Catholicized them. The Church stood as an undying power amid the death agonies of the old empires and the birth cries of the new. She was at the cradle and the coffin of un-numbered kingdoms; she was the one unfailling light amid the darkness, storm and stress of restless ages. Might was right; the weak people gasped under the heels of the strong; the political map of Europe was ever changing like the sands of ocean shore.

"We know to-day who are our kings,
But know not whom to-morrow brings."

Dynasties changed almost as often as the moon; emperors willed their power to sons, and the sons found their fathers'

thrones were tottering things, crushed toys of ambition's game,—pride's beautiful vessels but storm-wrecked hulls drifting mast-less, helm-less on ruthless tides of time. All thrones were but transient bubbles blown from a restless people, and burst full oft as blown,—all thrones save one, the throne of St. Peter. That was permanent. Christians were practically all Catholics then, and Catholics believed then as they do to-day that the power of the Pope would last till nature lit her funeral torch at the death bed of the world. The transient appealed to the permanent,—to the permanent spiritual power of the Pope. The nations gave to it a temporal power to be judge among them in their disputes. To this power they appealed; by this power the popes made and un-made kings, divided lands among the disputants, released people's allegiance from unworthy rulers. But no pope ever claimed that he had this power by divine right, and Catholic nations never believed he so held it. Hence we see Catholic nations in these days battling against the Pope, and still retaining sincere belief in his spiritual supremacy.

To-day we have the Hague tribunal, whereunto nations appeal for settlement of their disputes; and after the founding of this tribunal, founded principally by American genius and money, we find Europe on tiptoe, ready to spring each nation at its neighbor's throat. In those days of half-civilized nations, the papacy was the Hague tribunal, before which nations laid their grievances. And in those days the papacy, despite the fact that it had far greater odds to contend against, had immeasurably greater success in settling quarrels than has the present Hague tribunal in our effete civilization with its pens scratching the beauties of peace, and its swords scarring the images of God, and its men dividing neither night from day, nor Sunday from the week in the building of its battleships.

"But the Pope has never disclaimed this temporal power."

to the Catholic faith?" The very pagan, Dr. Anezaki Maraha, speaking not long ago to his pagan audience in Tokyo affirmed that this church has more authority than any other, has more interest in the people, and that the Pope is absolutely necessary to the progress of civilization. In the "Fairest Argument" (John F. Noll, Huntington, Ind., 1912), a book of five hundred pages, there

are found several hundred of intelligent Protestant witnesses defending every single point of Catholic belief. With such Protestant intelligence arrayed against the "Christian Herald" Fair Protestants will see that it is thoroughly un-Christian for the "Christian Herald" to herald sensations for the sake of sales, rather than truths for the salvation of souls.

A Word About the Marian

(Subscription, \$1.00 a year.)

This tract is taken, with permission, from the "Marian," an excellent magazine published quarterly by the Vincentian Missionaries at Opelika, Ala. The "Marian" has attained such a high standard of journalism that its articles are quoted by Catholic and secular papers throughout the country. It has been remarked that its editorials remind one of the writings of the late lamented Father Lambert.

Besides a variety of interesting reading, the chief merit of the "Marian" consists in its courage and tact in refuting slanders against the Church. The "Marian" of July, 1912, contained an article entitled: "The Menace; Shown to be a Journalistic Venomous Reptile."

This article was copied by periodicals all over the country.

Finally the article, with permission of the Author, was printed in pamphlet form by the Central Verein, 307 Temple Building, St. Louis, Mo. This Society circulated 130,000 copies of the pamphlet. The "Menace" is a dead letter wherever this pamphlet is distributed.

The same pamphlet was published also and is being distributed by the Catholic Universe, Caxton Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A prominent writer for several Protestant papers, on becoming a reader of the "Marian," became a Catholic, gave up writing for all the other papers, and

is now contributing articles to the "Marian."

A great field lies open before the Church in the South. Thousands have lost their faith through lack of churches and priests. Renegades and unscrupulous ministers, by false teaching and anti-Catholic literature, take occasion to slander the Church in localities where there are no priests to defend her. The Catholics are so intermingled with Protestants and are scattered over such immense territories, that, in most parts of the South, there are not enough of them together to support a priest. Bishop Allen, of Mobile, has assigned to three Vincentian Missionaries a territory larger than the whole State of Connecticut. Their work is difficult because the Catholics are poor and scattered; and, of course, no contribution is asked from non-Catholics who attend their missions in goodly numbers. The non-Catholics of the South are well disposed to listen to the truth when it is presented to them by those representing the Catholic Church. Hence the necessity of missionary and magazine work.

The "Marian" is contributing its quota in doing battle for the Church in the very stronghold of her enemies.

The small profits of this pamphlet will be sent to the Vincentian Missionaries at St. Mary's Mission House, Opelika, Ala., where it was written for the "Marian."

A FEW USEFUL BOOKS AT POPULAR PRICES

JESUS OF NAZARETH

The Story of His Life Simply Told

By MOTHER LOYOLA

"No one can read it without loving God more, and, therefore, becoming better."—*Cardinal Gibbons*.

"I hope it will be adopted by our Catholic schools."—*Archbishop Christie*.

"Teachers in Catholic schools and colleges will contribute much to the religious formation of their pupils by putting this volume into their hands."—*Archbishop Ireland*.

"I have gone through it from cover to cover, and in closing the book to-night, my first act is to tell how much I would desire to see it in the hands of all our Catholic people as a treasure-trove of their homes."—*Bishop Beaven*.

"It is charming."—*Bishop Fox*.

"I like it very much. I will ask our Mission Band to recommend it on their missions."—*Bishop Tierney*.

"Mother Loyola's latest work, 'Jesus of Nazareth,' crowns all her works."—*Bishop Grace*.

"I most cordially recommend the admirable book, 'Jesus of Nazareth, the Story of His Life.' The study of the life of Our Lord is the most important and sanctifying of all studies; for 'This is eternal life, that they may know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent.' John xvii. 3."—*Archbishop Ryan*.

Price, 72 cents (postage, 11 cents); six copies and upwards, 57 cents per copy; 25 copies and upwards, 48 cents per copy.

THOUGHTS FOR ALL TIMES

By MONSIGNOR VAUGHAN

"The human heart is captivated more readily and more effectually by love than by fear.

"It is true that 'the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom,' yet it is only the *Beginning*; for love is the *Completion* of wisdom: 'perfect charity casteth out fear, because fear hath pain, and he that feareth is not perfected in charity.' 1 John, iv. 18.

"After giving convincing proofs of the *intensity* of God's love for us, the Right Rev. Author beautifully explains the consoling principle of God's *personal* and *concentrated* love for each one of us *individually*; for St. Paul says: 'He hath loved me, and delivered himself for me.'"—*Cardinal Gibbons*.

Prices, same as for Jesus of Nazareth.

SHORT ANSWERS

FATHER LAMBERT'S LATEST WORK

Father Lambert, editor of New York *Freeman's Journal*, has just revised a popular little work on the plague of irreligion—"Short Answers to Common Objections Against Religion." The

original work is from de Segur, but Father Lambert has adapted it to American conditions. His name is a guarantee for the character of the book. No controversialist would dare to cross swords with Father Lambert.

The book is a little storehouse, where one readily finds the right thing to say in answer to flippant flings at our holy religion.

Price, 15 cents; \$7.50 per 100.

IS ONE RELIGION AS GOOD AS ANOTHER?

By REV. JOHN MACLAUGHLIN

American edition, edited by Rev. L. A. Lambert, LL.D.

Price, 15 cents; \$7.50 per 100.

THE CAUSES AND CURE OF UNBELIEF

By REV. N. J. LAFORET

Edited by Cardinal Gibbons, with a chapter by Most Rev. P. J. Ryan, D.D., LL.D.

Price, cloth, 60 cents; paper, 30 cents; 50% off to clergy and religious.

QUESTIONS ON VOCATIONS

Do you know what your vocation is? If not get a copy of Father Downing's booklet. It explains what a vocation is and will help you to know yours. Read the following letter.

Dear Father Downing:

Please send me 50 copies of your excellent booklet, "Questions on Vocations." I showed the sample copy to Father Coppens and asked him to give his opinion of it. When he returned it, he said: "Father, it is the best book on vocations I ever saw. It deserves the widest circulation, and will do a vast amount of good."

F. G. DINNEN, S. J.

From Messenger of the Sacred Heart.

Prices of "Questions on Vocations": 9 cents a copy; 100 copies, \$4.90; 50 copies, 3.00; 25 copies, \$1.75; 10 copies, 80 cents. If sent by mail, 2 cents per copy extra.

DRINK AND ITS REMEDIES

ARCHBISHOP RYAN'S APPROBATION

My Dear Father Downing: It gives me great pleasure to add my commendation of the Temperance Catechism by Rev. J. A. Cullen, S.J., to those of the many prelates who have already very highly recommended this excellent Total Abstinence Manual.

† P. J. RYAN,

Archbishop of Philadelphia.

Twenty other Archbishops and Bishops, both of Ireland and America, have highly recommended this little book.

Price, 12 cents per copy; \$6 per 100.

For these few books, address: St. Vincent's Mission House, Springfield, Mass.