

## VII. Interactions with the World

### H. Church and State

#### a. General

504.

Editorial, *The Catholic Telegraph and Advocate*, October 20, 1860

#### **European Emperors as Patrons of Religion.**

One of our city cotemporaries, spoke, not long since, of religion dying out in Jerusalem, Antioch and Alexandria, and being revived in Rome under the patronage of the emperors. We were struck with the idea, and wondered what could be our neighbor's theory of European modern history. We have tried to recall the history of imperial patronage of religion, and find it as follows: Up to the year 315, the Roman emperors made persecution of the Church their chief duty. They patronized her with fire and sword, and dungeons and exile. In the beginning of the fourth century, Constantine patronized the Church, because the Christians were the support of his throne. He professed himself a Christian, and disclaimed all right to interfere in ecclesiastical matters of any kind.

His successors used her to secure their power in all manner of ways. Sometimes their cry was hostility to her, and alliance with some heretical faction; at others they were all piety and submission to her decrees. The emperors successively fomented the Arian, the Nestorian, the Eutychian, the Monothelite heresies; the schisms of Peter the Fuller of Alexandria, of Acacius in Constantinople and of Photius and Michael Cœrularius. They sanctioned the conciliabula of Rimini, Ephesus and others. They exiled Athanasius, Hilary, Pope Liberius, St. John Chrysostom. They put to death Pope St. Martin and St. Ignatius of Constantinople.

After the Western Empire was shattered, they set up an exarch in Ravenna, who, while he left to the popes the burthen of negotiating treaties, and averting wars, meddled in all the faction fights of Rome, and plotted confusion at the election of every pontiff. During nearly four centuries they left the popes alone to withstand the overwhelming tide of Goths, Vandals and Huns, that poured resistlessly over Italy from the north; and their last act of patronage was the begging embassy of Alexis Comnenus to Pope Urban, invoking the Crusades in support of the empire.

As to the patronage bestowed on the Church by the modern western emperors, the student of history will smile at the idea. Founders and supporters of dynasties, who begged their crowns of the popes, are not the givers, but the receivers of patronage. Charlemagne "gave" Pope Adrian the country of which his predecessors had had charge three hundred years, only in the sense that he agreed not to add it to his conquests; and the pope gave him his crown.

Charlemagne was no doubt good: but in his time piety was a good investment

## 505 - European Politicians against the Church

for crowned heads. Later still, the patronage of emperors towards the Church has consisted chiefly in usurping her prerogatives, robbing her revenues, and warring on her chief pastors.

Had the Church depended on the emperors she would have been annihilated long ago; and if they do not depend upon her they will be annihilated not long hence.

505.

Editorial, *The Catholic Telegraph and Advocate*, November 3, 1860

### [European Politicians against the Church.]

If European politicians did not insist on mixing up religion in their political movements, an American Catholic would take no more interest in the news each steamer brings from Liverpool, than in the civil war in China. As such, Catholics have no interest in the King of Naples, the Emperor of Austria, or any dynasty of them all. The Church owes them nothing, and needs nothing from them. If it were a mere contest of the aristocracy against the kings, such as we denominate a "struggle for liberty," we would be quite indifferent about the result. If it were a contest between the railroad, machine-building, gas-light, ventilation, hot and cold bath men against the conservatives of ancestral blunders, we should say "Viva Garibaldi and Napoleon!" If it were a question of clean or dirty streets, of street railroads or foot travelling, of percussion caps or flint-locks, of steam-mills or windmills, of leather shoes or wooden shoes, of pianos or bagpipes, we should hoist the banner of progress, and see wit in *Harper's Weekly*.

But the real question at issue in Europe is: Shall the civil power or the Church direct the consciences of men? The state has the control of temporalities to the fullest extent. It desires to go a step farther and assume jurisdiction over the souls of men. This is what combines parties the most antagonistic in interest, against the pope at the present time. Mazzini, Louis Napoleon and Count Cavour, agree in believing that the civil power ought to control not only the bodies and property, but the minds of men. They differ only in designating, each himself, as the civil power. In proof of this we appeal to facts. Is not tyranny--that tyranny which consists in gagging the press--in proscribing opinion--in arbitrary taxation--in capricious imprisonments--in oppressive conscriptions--just as rife in France, Sardinia and Naples now as it ever was? What are the "reforms" in Sardinia, but instances of oppression? The abolition of religious festivals, the secularization of theological seminaries, the proscription of works of moral theology and canon law not approved by the civil power, the robbery of ecclesiastical property, the exile of bishops, the prohibition of Catholic publications--what are these but evidences of the determination of the European conspirators to usurp the dominion of the very souls of men?

## 506 - Lecture on the Encyclical *Quanta Cura*

Mazzini wants the People-god. The French emperor and Cavour want the Napoleon-god. Mazzini would annihilate the pope and be alone supreme. Napoleon wants to act as god, with the Holy Father for herald and ceremonist.

True liberty and justice cannot exist apart; and the Church is the only stay of justice.

506.

Lecture, *The Catholic Telegraph and Advocate*, March 1, 1865

*The encyclical discussed in the cathedral on February 26, 1865 by Bishop Rosecrans had been issued on December 8, 1864. It condemned sixteen propositions touching on errors of the age.*

### Lecture on the Encyclical *Quanta Cura*

Last Sunday, after Vespers, the Right Rev. Bishop ROSECRANS delivered the following lecture which we beg to recommend to the careful attention of our readers.

After a few prefatory remarks, the substance of which were, that he had commenced to deliver a series of lectures, to continue through the holy season of Lent, on piety, but deviated from the series for the purpose of explaining the different points of the late Encyclical of the Holy Father. Our readers will find no "glittering generalities," nor matter foreign to the subject in this logical, lucid, and intelligent exposition of the great Encyclical of Pope Pius IX. He said:

I appreciate and feel as keenly, perhaps, as any of you, the jar which some points of the Encyclical occasions to the mind of the American. If I did not I would not undertake their explanation. You understand, of course, that I would accept it as authoritative teaching, even if I could not know how to reconcile it to my cherished ideas--because the Vicar of Christ is the mouthpiece of Him who has "the words of eternal life," and besides him I have none "to whom I can go." But it is a satisfaction to be able, from an intimate knowledge of the precise issue between the Church and the infidel party of Italy and France, to see that it does not conflict with the notions of genuine freedom and just government which form the political creed of the American citizen.

To understand the theoretical or doctrinal issue between the Church and the infidel rulers of Europe, you must have a clear idea of the practical one. It is hard for an American to conceive of a finished country where the number of physicians in a village, and the price of bread, are regulated by law; where license to marry is not given without an examination into the pecuniary projects of the bridal party; and nobody has a right to be born until the government has provided a place for him, should he live, and funeral expenses, should he die. Here, we have so much room that there is no routine. If a city boils over, so to speak, the population finds a place on the prairies, and

no harm done; but there, the agitation would be revolution. I do not say that the people of those countries are governed more than the public weal demands, but they are governed a great deal more than you or I would wish to be governed. Now, this settled routine may be pleasant enough to those who have as much rank and fortune as they desire, but it is tedious and irksome to the others. The most discontented class of all is that of young noblemen, and a class called educated middle class men, who have talents and aspirations without money or prospects, for whom government must provide.

For ages property has been accumulating in the hands of religious orders, in the shape of lands, tenements, altar ornaments, pictures, statues, libraries, and the like. Of course each generation of the religious spent the actual proceeds of their property on their own necessities and those of the poor, but the property remained in fee to the order, and naturally increased, until, as in the days of Henry VIII. in England, it is now an item of importance in the eyes of the minister of finance. And this property, including the Papal States, is the practical issue between the Pope and the governments. To seize it, however, by open robbery would be dangerous to the rulers as the people are all Catholics. So the minds of the people must be educated for its seizure, by the promulgation of false doctrines, and that brings us to a statement of the theoretical or doctrinal issue.

The Church has always defended the right of property in others, and, of course, could not relinquish it in herself. What people had given to God and to the poor, she claimed must remain such forever. She might, after the example which St. Paul commends, "suffer the robbery of all her goods with joy;" but she would not allow her children to call it anything else but robbery.

Put the case of the operation of this robbery clearly to yourself in one instance. Your sister or daughter has a religious vocation; that is, desires to dedicate her life to God, like Anna of old, in a life of seclusion, prayer and good works. You furnish her with a dower from 200 to 2000 dollars, and see her safe within the convent walls. The next morning you read an edict of the government secularizing the house in which you placed her, and seizing upon all its property and revenues for the benefit of the government. Would you not look upon the proceeding as an outrage, and its authors as richly deserving the excommunication pronounced by the Council of Trent against the plunderers of ecclesiastical goods?

The generative element of the government or court theory was the desire in the ministers to get this property, and excuse themselves before a Catholic people for seizing on it.

To this end they laid down a maxim that government has nothing to do with religion or religion with government, and religion could not, consequently, forbid government the robbery. Now, taken by itself, and as we Americans understand it, the

sentence government has nothing to do with religion, is a generality which from one point of view is true. What we mean by it is that government has not the right to define for people of various religious views which they shall adopt; and in this sense it is perfectly true. What they mean by it is, government composed of Catholics, ruling over Catholics, among whom there is but one religious belief, is not bound, in conscience, by the principles of Catholic morality. Observe, there is no issue about the extent of the power of government. The Pope does not claim a wider, and the court a narrower, jurisdiction for the government. There is no question of more or less liberty for the people in the adoption of religious opinions, or maintenance of them. The whole question is on the right of rulers to disregard conscience in their treatment of public affairs.

On this point, some explanation is needed for an American audience to be able to appreciate the state of the controversy. Doubtless, to the masses of Europe, liberty means very nearly what it means to the masses in America. But to the leaders of the movement, especially in Italy, it has a far different meaning from that which we attach to it. We mean by liberty the freedom of the individual to enjoy life, free thought, and speech, and his rights of property, unmolested by any one's caprice, and subject only to just laws, impartially administered. They mean by liberty enfranchisement from the control of all authority now recognised (including God's), and substitution instead of it, of the will of the people as supreme law. They allow no more freedom to the individual, nay less, than the governments they oppose. Where they succeed in establishing supremacy, the censorship of the press, and the secret police over private conversations, are kept in active operation; only the religious press and catechetical instructions are muzzled, instead of licentious publications, and incendiary speech. Old taxes are kept up, and new ones laid; and the principle advocated is that all property, all laws, and all thoughts belong to the state, that is, to the people. Those things I am now saying are not denunciations. They are plain matters of fact, which any one can verify who will take the trouble to look into what are called revolutionary publications, either Italian or French. Those among us who enlist our sympathies for the masses in Europe do well; but those who think that the cause of the peoples and of true freedom are represented by the fomenters of revolution are deeply deceived.

Those men are as open absolutists as the governments they oppose. They hold that the state has the right to distribute property as it pleases, to regulate families and break them up, to control children and assign their education and employment for life at its pleasure; nay, to dispose of life, according to its caprice. They grant to the state the ownership of the subject as kings claimed it against the persevering remonstrances of the Church; but they try to make the doctrine popular by calling the state the people, as if a power which is tyrannical in one man is not equally so in a multitude.

Now, when we speak of the interference of the government with religion as

wrong and unwholesome, our idea is that it is wrong and unwholesome to concede so much power to the government, by fundamental law. We do not need so much governing; and as our rulers have no better means of knowing the truth than we have, it will be enough for them to find it out, obey it, and save their own souls, leaving ourselves and our pastors to take care of us.

But this is not what is meant in Europe by government interfering with religion. Far from it. The rulers, observe, are all true Catholics, and intend to remain so. They would set a political earthquake in motion that would engulf them did they avow themselves otherwise. They maintain that they have a *right*, as rulers, to interfere in what concerns religion. They claim the right even to keep the Pope's Encyclical, which I am now discussing, from the people, except as they choose to present it, expurgated. They exercise daily the right to dictate what shall be taught in schools, even of philosophy, theology, and ecclesiastical law; to declare what bishops and priests shall be permitted to officiate in churches; what books and newspapers shall circulate among the people, and what be suppressed; what days shall be observed as holidays, and what be abrogated. But while claiming all this power and more, they deny that in its exercise they are bound to respect the teaching of the Church, of which they profess to be obedient children; that is, that they are bound by conscience in their public acts. Thus, for example, the Council of Trent, which they believe in, pronounces excommunication against the plunderers of Church property. They maintain that, as rulers, they can plunder Church property without incurring excommunication, because religion has nothing to do with government or temporal matters. Again, there are laws of the Church which in homage to God, and in tenderness to the poor, prescribe the cessation of labor on holidays. The temporal rulers claim the right to abrogate these by direct legislation, yet remain all the time good Catholics, because to abstain from work and traffic is a temporal concern, in which the Church has no right to interfere. In other words, they maintain as the basis of their theory of government, that society--not mixed society, such as we have in America, but a society, painfully compact, like that of France and Italy, where all are of the same blood and one religion, and where government claims the right to interfere with everything--has an end totally distinct from the end of the individuals composing it, totally independent of the laws which govern them, independent of subjection to God, of obedience to the Church, of regard for right of citizens to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; independent of all things save the material force of the popular will. Let us make the case our own in American society. Individually, we believe that Congress should make no law concerning religion or the free exercise thereof. Now, could we, as voters, believe and act otherwise without sin? Could we, as legislators, make a law interfering with the rights of conscience, holding all the time as private citizens, that no such law can be just and legitimate? Can any one do as a public man, what as a private man his conscience condemns? Yet he could if

society had any aim independent and separate from the aim of the individuals composing it. As a private citizen he could believe in the Bible; and as a legislator he could vote to have all copies of it burned; believe in marriage and vote for "Free Love;" believe in education, and vote to suppress all schools; yet never cease to be an upright and conscientious man all the time!

I am conscious that, in thus stating clearly the position of the Italian revolutionists towards the Church, and making them so plainly in the wrong, I am provoking incredulity. For you will say, if, in their eagerness to grasp Church property, the enemies of religion assume a theory so absurd and so contrary to all true notions of equity and freedom, how is it that they can get the sympathy of so many American and English writers, who ought to be informed on the matter? Sure enough, how is it? How is it that men, who really love justice and hate oppression, can look on and see bishops exiled, priests imprisoned, and newspapers suppressed, monks and nuns robbed and turned loose upon society as beggars, and voluntary alms-giving forbidden, yet imagine that the power which oppressed is the party of liberty--is animated by the spirit of American freedom--and the oppressed and exiled are the allies of despotism? I have often thought, "How is it?" and could never find any other explanation for it than religious prejudice, more unjust to strangers than it can dare to be here at home. But you will say, the Italian anti-Church party advocate liberty of conscience and of worship as the right of every man; and this is both American and true doctrine. It is true they are one language, but not in our sense. We mean by liberty of conscience, the right of every man to believe what he has proof of, and practice what seems to him to be duty, without interference by the government; that is to say, we simply deny the jurisdiction of the State in matters of belief and conscience. We never dream of saying that any one has the right to take up with any doctrine he pleases, or following any line of morality or immorality he chooses, even before God. We say a man does wrong who clings to error, or practices impiety. But the wrong is to himself, and the judgment belongs to God. But when they assert liberty of conscience, they are setting forth a corollary of their general theory, not denying the jurisdiction of the civil power. "Conscience is free" means for them not "conscience is out of the jurisdiction of civil courts," but conscience, that is each man's notion, is above all law, is law to itself--above God's revealed law, above what sane men have always admitted as natural law, and of course, above all ecclesiastical and civil law. Hence, whatever a man feels like doing is right for him. He may speak or write truth or falsehood, he may praise vice or virtue, purity or impurity, he may lie or tell the truth, accuse or vindicate the innocent, and if he only utters what he pleases, he does right and his liberty must be proclaimed and guaranteed by the state. This is the "unbounded liberty," the "*omnimoda libertas*," which the Pope calls "frenzy." Its logic is pantheism. For in pantheism man is God, and God is, of course, law to himself. Again, when they defend what the Pope censures as "the impious and

absurd principle of *naturalism*," they seem to use one language; when they say that "the welfare of the State, and political and social progress, require that human society should be constituted and governed irrespective of religion, just as if it did not exist, or as if no real difference existed between true and false religions," but they have not one meaning. Our meaning is, taking society as we find it--with us, divided on religious views--it is proper to make one nationality out of what elements of unity we have, and not undertake to legislate where we are without authority, namely in the matter of religion.

Their meaning is, finding society--as they find it--united in the belief of the Catholic religion and in reverence for the ordinances of the Church, it is better to remodel society and legislate as if the popular belief, and their own, were a delusion. We say, abstain from all legislation in the matter of religion. "Congress shall make no law concerning religion, or the free exercise thereof," because men's minds are divided on the subject, and their consciences must be respected. They say, legislate on that, as on every other subject, and govern as if men had no consciences at all, as if there were "no difference between true and false religion." Thus, for example, all the people, and the rulers, too, unite in respecting the commands of the Church to abstain from meat on Fridays. Yet it would be better, according to their theory, to forbid the sale of any supplies but meat on Fridays; as if religion did not exist.

Again, all the people, and the rulers, too, believe in the laws of the Church annulling the marriage of blood cousins, of divorced persons, and the like. Yet it would be better to make laws declaring such marriages valid, even while all continue to believe them invalid, that is to "constitute and govern society as if religion did not exist."

Let the principle be stated of a nation like ours, which is not, in the strict sense of the word, a society, but an aggregate of societies, bound together by many ties, indeed, but not by religion, that it must be governed irrespective of sectarian religion, though not of justice and the fear of God and every Catholic--the Pope first--will subscribe to it most heartily. In the other sense, in which it is said a society of Catholics ought to be ruled as if Catholicity were false, or did not exist, it is manifestly false.

And here let me call your attention to the difference between the idea suggested to us by the phrase Catholic religion and that in the mind, both of the Pope and those he censures. Our idea, at first thought, is that the Church against which the revolutionists of the XVIth century *protested*, as distinguished from the Protestant Church. But they mean by it, the true religion of Christ, or even more generally, every system having the worship of God, the sanctification and salvation of souls for its object. Hence, when they say that society must be governed as if the Catholic religion were not true, they mean that men must act, in temporal matters, as if there were no God, no judgment, no heaven, no hell, and make wealth and pleasure their last end, and supreme good; and these are not logical deductions from their principles from which they recoil, but



avowed maxims in which they glory.

Another censure of the Encyclical seems to jar with our established notions. I mean the condemnation of the principle that the civil power is not bound to enforce the laws against the violators of the Catholic religion, unless in so far as the public safety requires. This censure does not mean that religion is to be propagated by civil penalties, or that civil penalties must be enacted against non-Catholics, because, as I have said, "Catholic religion" is taken for "Christian religion," and for the system which takes care of souls and saves them. But supposing laws to be in existence against the profanation of churches, plundering of shrines, forcing workmen to labor on Sundays and holidays, and such like, as they do exist in the kingdom of Victor Emmanuel, and supposing the government claimed the right to enforce them, then the government would be bound to execute them, or not, not by considerations of expediency, but of eternal justice. In other words, rulers are responsible to God for their public as well as their private acts, and will go to hell like other people, if they make white black, evil good, and darkness light. Suppose a jury of twelve men were convinced of the innocence of the party tried before them, could they declare him guilty out of considerations of public expediency without laying perjury on their souls? The case is precisely the same. The King of Sardinia has laws which he considers just, yet he claims the right to execute them or not as policy may dictate.

Another censure is of the proposition that the Church has no right to enforce her laws either directly or indirectly by temporal penalties of any kind. This, an English paper thinks, smacks of the Inquisition. Yet it does not smack of the Inquisition as Americans understand that institution--that is, a fierce, persecuting, bloody, relentless, secret tribunal--which the Roman Inquisition never was. It only claims for the Church the right to be a society, and regulate its own conditions of membership. Every little debating society has its system of fines for non-attendance, disorderly conduct, &c. And this is all the power the Church claims. She has nothing to do with those who are outside. But within she has a discipline, and claims the right of enforcing it by such means as, according to her judgment, are just and efficacious. Thus she deprives delinquent clergymen of their benefices, and punishes disorders among the laity by public censure and excommunication, all of which are temporal penalties. And this seems to me, beyond question, just and legitimate.

What the propagators of the condemned proposition mean by it is that the Church must submit to every wrong without resorting to any means of defending herself. An ecclesiastic must be slandered without resorting to the temporal means of writing and publishing any vindication of himself--must stand still and be robbed without calling in so temporal an agency as the city police against the robber--in a word, must follow, literally, the evangelical injunction for the impunity of every ruffian who feels like smiting him on one cheek, or taking his cloak away from him. This an

individual may do, if he chooses, and be perfect. The Church could not, for she must adhere to her just rights, she must stand up for justice to herself as well as to others, and, if necessary, suffer persecution for it.

I am aware, also, that to Americans the tone of the Encyclical seems strained and harsh, and the epithets applied to the propositions and their authors violent and exaggerated. To me it seems sad, like that exclamation of the Redeemer, "Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the Prophets and stonest them that are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathers her brood under her wings, and ye would not?" How else *can* it be, but sad? Twenty years ago the Count Cardinal of Mastai was raised to the Pontifical throne, and his advent was hailed as the opening of a new era. Ever since then he has been sacrificing himself for the good of his people; and to-day he loves them as none but a king and a father who has none but them to love. And when he sees those in power among them looking coldly and suspiciously on him, and rushing recklessly on the evils against which he warns them, how else can his warning be than sad? and the words, with which he condemns as irreclaimable those he would fain embrace as children, than full of sorrow? Yet, though his language is strong, it is not exaggerated, and his epithets are words of truth and soberness; neither more nor less. The men he calls impious openly scoff at God, and unblushingly avow the disregard of justice and truth which he imputes to them.

As Archbishop Spalding in his late able pastoral well remarked, the Pope in this Encyclical stands before the world as the champion of truth and justice. He does not speak as the leader of a sect--the rival of the Episcopalians and the Methodists, who belong to one soil and language. He does not speak as the feeble ruler of a worn-out city and a few dirty villages, an obstruction to Victor Emmanuel's Prime Minister's ambitious plans, but as Vicar of the King of Kings he talks to the world about him, and so [to] generations unborn; and his testimony, which shall stir the hearts of men when Victor Emmanuel and his kingdom have been forgotten on the earth, is "There is a God who is Master of us all--princes and people, priests and statesmen--whom alone we must adore and serve in public life and private life. There is a kingdom set up by Christ Jesus on the earth, of justice and truth, and this kingdom must and will rule the hearts and lives of men, bearing aloft to salvation those who yield willingly to its sway, grinding to powder those who oppose it."

His testimony is not against rational liberty, or the elevation of the masses, or right progress, or true freedom of thought and speech. It is not against any noble aspiration or pure thought, or kind impulse of any Catholic or non-Catholic on the face of the earth, but it is against open, conscious, reckless infidelity and atheism, which no right minded American cares about defending. That is all. There is no renewal of mediæval ideas in it, no sighing after any state of things that ever yet existed, but simply and solely a condemnation of infidelity--whether in government, philosophy,

## 507 - Tax Support for Catholic Schools

legislation, education, social or private life. It would be far wiser in us to heed the warning than to cavil at the monitor. Unbelief, with us, has not the malice it has in Europe. But it is destroying souls, and undermining the framework of society even here. What will fortunes be worth if, a few years hence, the lawlessness prevails generally, among the people, which is used in amassing them?

Ten days ago a Convention assembled in Indianapolis with a view to getting the people of the United States to vote themselves a Christian people. It would be far better to leave out the voting, and labor to make us a Christian people indeed. Let bitterness and hate be laid aside, and the truth be sought in humility and sincerity of heart, not in convention and public meetings, but in study and prayer. Then, as individuals, we will save our souls alive, and as a nation prove the truth of the declaration of Holy Writ: Blessed are the people whose God is the Lord.

### **b. United States**

**507.**

Editorial, *The Catholic Columbian*, June 19, 1875 (6)

#### **[Tax Support for Catholic Schools]**

The *O. S. Journal* is not attacking Catholics,--he is defending our glorious common schools against ecclesiastical aggression. "The Catholics want the State of Ohio to furnish them the means to propagate their sect"--and the editor of the *Journal* is moved thereby. Now Catholics want nothing more than they petitioned for twenty years ago. They want to educate their children according their own notions of education, and, as they have to pay taxes for the support of schools, they humbly beg for permission to allow their own money to go to the education of their own children. They do not expect the permission soon but they hope that a time will come, some day, when they cry "Catholics would be pleased with that," will not stifle the common sense of the people of Ohio.

**508.**

Editorial, *The Catholic Columbian*, Aug. 28, 1875 (5)

#### **The Papal Conspiracy Dug Up Again**

This conspiracy was first discovered in the time of Christ's life on earth. He was arrested as the ringleader of it and crucified by the advice of such wise statesmen as were to the Jewish people what Gladstone is to Great Britain, and Hayes to the State of Ohio. These statesmen "saved the country" at that time, and when Titus came to Jerusalem the people, buying camel's dung in the provision market, felt thankful to them. Nero, and those other statesmen emperors of Rome, discovered the conspiracy

## 509 - Republic Founded on the Open Bible?

also and put it down with bloody hand--and when the Northmen swept over the lands cultivated by the empire, like locusts over a Western wheat-field, they got their thanks. Since then many other wise statesmen have detected the conspiracy, "saved" their respective countries, and got a warm place for retribution. Still the conspiracy goes on. Age after age the swarms of statesmen discover and crush it. But just as they have stamped it out, they sink into unlamented graves and the conspiracy appears once more. The Divine author of this conspiracy said to the assembled statesmen who "brought false witnesses against Him," "I have spoken to you openly, and have said nothing in secret. Ask those who listened to Me." So say we Catholics to the statesmen who are clamoring through the country--"He said that tribute should not be given to Caesar"-- against us now. Ask those who hear our teaching, ask the decrees of councils and of Popes, ask the instructions uttered every Sunday and holiday in each Catholic church, ask the multitude of Catholic books that are on sale in every Catholic book-store what is the doctrine? What are the designs of the Catholic Church--the aim of the "priestly conspiracy?" They need not listen to lying apostates or read in calumnious essays of our enemies. Dare you circulate Catholic books among the people whose votes you ask, on the plea that you are going to save the country from Popery? You dare not. The conspiracy of the priesthood through the world is to save the souls of men, by teaching them the doctrines of the Son of God; by administering the Holy Sacrament; by inviting all to a holy life; in a word to carry out His designs Who came that men might have life and have it more abundantly. There is our "open confession," gentlemen of the statesman class, make the most of it.

509.

Editorial, *The Catholic Columbian*, Dec. 4, 1875 (1)

### **[Republic Founded on the Open Bible?]**

Rev. Heberton says that the American Republic was founded on the "open Bible." Yes, Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Jefferson, Charles Pinckney, and most of the leading men in it were noted for opening the Bible! Nay, it is said, the father of his country, though he "could not tell a lie," was given to quoting the 119th Psalm. The debates in the constitutional convention in Philadelphia, and the correspondence of people concerned in it, in those times, do not suggest much meditation on the "open Bible."

Let brother Heberton stick to plain reality. We are the greatest nation on earth. But we must not try to be great for magnanimity in leaving all religions free, and, at the same time, boast of fostering only one. This "roaring like a sucking dove," has been out of repute since Bottom's time.

510.

Editorial, *The Catholic Columbian*, May 16, 1878 (2)

**[The Infallible State]**

What is to be said to a writer who uses the following argument in favor of compulsory education? "Ignorance is a crime against the State. Therefore the State has a right to punish and remove it and therefore the right to compel children to attend school." This claims more infallibility for the State than was ever claimed by the Church. Ignorance is no crime against society. It is a misfortune, but not so prejudicial to the state as conscienceless[ness]. If Garfield and Colfax and Belknap and Robinson had known less, this country would have been better off. Likewise Tweed, and perhaps Tilden.

511.

Editorial, *The Catholic Columbian*, June 5, 1875 (1)

**[State vs. Church]**

"Are the claims of the Roman Catholic Church dangerously antagonistic to the principles of Republican Government?" is the way they put the question in Athens, Athens county, Ohio. Dan Matthews No. 21 takes the negative of the question.

Even in Athens they might know that the Church is being stripped of every temporal thing she owns, except in a very few countries. The danger lies in the temptation to robber rulers to lay hands on everything given to the poor, the sick and the orphans. When a poor man gets a loaf of bread there is danger that some lazy thief may steal it.

512.

Editorial, *The Catholic Columbian*, Dec. 18, 1875 (1)

**[Taxing Charity]**

We occasionally hear people speaking about "Church property enjoying the protection of the law and paying no taxes." The last *Sunday Morning News* had an article recommending to the different states the adoption of General Grant's views on this subject. The *Cincinnati Commercial* used to vent wisdom of the same kind, before the new Constitution of Ohio was buried, at the election last year.

Of course anything that will discredit and discourage the practice of the Christian religion is agreeable to the secret society conspirators, against our Lord, from Italy to Peru. But those who are not initiated, whether they believe in Jesus Christ or not, will easily comprehend these two plain points:

## 513 - Proposed Taxation of Religious Property

1. It is not the government which protects religion, but religion which upholds the government. Free government, especially, has its existence in the conscience of the people. But without religion, without belief in our accountability to God, there would be no conscience, and hence no government. Darwin says we were once gorillas, and the secret society advanced thinkers would make us gorillas again, if they had their way.

2. Church property consists of buildings for worship, hospitals, orphan asylums and schools. Charitable people stint themselves to benefit the public and honor God by their erection. Once built, instead of yielding income, they have to be kept up by further efforts of charity. Where is the justice of taxing them? You build an hospital; call the poor into it; nurse, feed, clothe, beg for them, lodge them, get medical attendance and medicines for them; and along comes a statesman of the Ulysses breed and says, "Sir, this is property. This house is worth money. That dose of castor oil you are administering is value, protected by the laws of the country. Pay tax on it, therefore."

A few country people club together and build a house of worship, open to every one who chooses to enter it. Instead of being commended for their kind efforts to benefit others, they get notice that they are expected to pay the government for the "protection" they got while spending their money in its erection. For a government to tax charity is a tyranny both odious and suicidal.

**513.**

Editorial, *The Catholic Columbian*, January 8, 1876

### **[Proposed Taxation of Religious Property]**

Our revered President was kind enough to give a reason for taxing the property of religious societies, in his annual Message.

This condescension on his part has evoked the expression of the same reason in many journals whose controlling editors evidently belong to the same secret societies, with his Excellency.

This is the reason: If you do not tax the hospitals and orphan asylums, the church buildings, bells, clocks and surplices, they will accumulate until there will be *spoliation*. There has been spoliation all over Europe. In England the abbeys were suppressed. The hospitals became hotels and private property, the poor voted for their own losses, and found out too late the difference between a *hospitium* and a poor house.

In Germany "the spoliation" was done by the degenerate nobility, and fallen ecclesiastics adhered to their measures in numbers sufficient to make the Protestant Reformation.

In France, "the spoliation" was the work of open atheism and immorality. It was

done thoroughly, however, but the Church survived.

It has been done in Spain, and is being done in Italy, now.

There is danger of spoliation as these statesmen say. There is danger of robbery wherever there is property. But the spoliation of charitable property does not come from its not being taxed. It comes, as other robberies come, from the unjust greed of robbers. Other property--of corporations and of private citizens--is not spared because it is taxed, but it is defended by force.

The policy proposed, therefore, is urged on the principle of the benevolent bandit who advises his friend, "Do not carry money with you on your journey in my neighborhood, for fear I may waylay and rob you."

**514.**

Editorial, *The Catholic Columbian*, April 25, 1878 (1)

#### **[Taxing the Foundation of Society]**

The assumption of the open infidels that "Church property is protected by the government" (and therefore ought to pay taxes to the government) is sheer insolence. It takes for granted that all religion is false, and that all believers in religion know it to be false, but adopt it "under the protection of government," as a means of amusement and luxury. Religion is the support of society, as every nation, barbarous or civilized, in all ages, has acknowledged. All government rests on conscience and conscience is the teaching of religion. So that when the state exacts no tribute from religion, it simply acknowledges that there may be truth in faith, and that believers are to be treated as if they were sincere, and might be right. You already tax the poor man's cow; but if in addition to that you strive to tax the poor man's conscience, you add to his burthens. A decent church is not a productive property, but a steady drain on the purses of those who build and maintain it. What impertinence then to class it with property that yields profit and makes its owner richer. Is it dishonest for an orphan asylum to shirk taxation? Is it cheating for any institution which upholds the state, to not weaken its resources on that which it upholds? The man who would quarry stone of the foundations of his building to repair the superstructure would be a fool. In the same manner would the legislator be treated, who would hamper religion by laying a tax on it, for religion is the foundation of all government, and on that foundation it must depend for its stability.

515.

Editorial, *The Catholic Columbian*, May 30, 1878

**[Taxing Private Colleges]**

In the Senate of the United States Mr. Thurman, "in explanation of his amendment," said, "It was intended to exempt from taxation the Columbian College, Georgetown College, and other educational institutions."

"Mr. Ingalls opposed the amendment, and argued to the effect that it would be to exempt two million dollars worth of property from taxation, the most of which was controlled by Catholics, though it made no difference to him whether they were controlled by Catholics, Swedenborgians or Mormons. He opposed it upon the principle that the institutions, [are] conducted for purposes of gain, and in no sense could they be regarded as public institutions."

It is politicians of this stamp that will repress, if possible, all real charity in the country. A body of men, learned, pious, self-sacrificing, give their lives to the cause of education, in virtue and learning, of the young, asking in return only "board and clothes," and it is proposed to tax the buildings, grounds, laboratories and libraries, which they have gathered together to make their teaching effective. Such a policy would call every enterprise private gain which is not public property.

**c. Italy**

516.

Editorial, *The Catholic Telegraph and Advocate*, October 16, 1852

**Piedmont and the Holy See.**

INTERFERENCE OF ROME WITH THE INTERNAL AFFAIRS OF GOVERNMENTS.--Most of our readers are doubtless aware, that for two years past, negotiations have been pending between the Sardinian Government and the See of Rome, and that as yet no measure giving mutual satisfaction has been proposed. They know also, that in consequence of the failure of these negotiations, the Papal Nuncio has retired from the Sardinian States. The source of difficulties between the two courts has been frequently misrepresented by the public press and been made the subject of much declamatory abuse, against the tyranny of the Pope and his unjust interference with a people just moulding its institutions in a republican form. We have thought it not amiss therefore to make known the precise state of the question between Piedmont and Rome in order that our readers may see whether or not the Pope is unjustly meddling with the affairs of a foreign power--or whether he is only discharging a duty imposed on him at the peril of his soul by his office of universal pastor.

Piedmont professes to be a Catholic nation. It professes faith in the doctrines,



and obedience to the canons of, the Catholic Church. Yet even while making profession of its Catholicity it seeks practically to deny some of those doctrines and to violate those canons. Shall the Holy Father--the guardian of the Faith--the executor of the canons be silent while this is being done?

For instance: It is Catholic faith that marriage is a sacrament--that the ecclesiastical is the only power which can judge of its validity or annul it as to some of its effects. Piedmont wishes to reduce marriage to the level of a civil contract--to give to the civil magistrate the right to make and unmake it--to control it. Shall the Pope not protest against this?--Shall he not say to the ministers and law-makers of the Sardinian Court-- "You cannot remain Catholics and do this--you cannot deny the faith in any point and yet remain children of the Church?"

Again: Ecclesiastical immunities are protected by innumerable canons of the Catholic Church. Beginning from the fourth century scarcely a pope or a council but has forbidden under the severest spiritual pains any attempt on the part of any lay-men to control ecclesiastical property or to pretend any right to own what is consecrated to God.

Moreover, in Piedmont, these immunities are protected by solemn treaties, between the Sardinian Government and the Holy See. Nevertheless, Piedmont, in violation of her profession of obedience to the canons of the Church, in violating her faith plighted in the concordats--attacks ecclesiastical immunities--abolishes the ecclesiastical courts--blots out of the calendar festival days established by the Church--lays its hand on property long ago left by pious men in legacy to God, and yet wishes to be considered Catholic.

Can the Holy Father permit this without sending forth his warning from the watch-tower of Jerusalem?--Shall he not cry out first to his erring children to stay their sacrilegious hand--and next to the perplexed world, spectator of so daring rebellion, to protest that it is done without his consent--against his will? Shall he not make known to Christendom that these men follow their course *not* because Catholic doctrines are changed, *not* because the canons of general councils can be set aside at the caprice of any civil power--but because those men are not Catholics--because their professions of attachment to the Church are hypocritical--because infidels at heart--their clamors for the faith are only a vile sham, to gain favor and power from a faithful though misguided people?

The Pope is not interfering with Piedmont. Piedmont is interfering with the Pope. Piedmont is depriving him of rights, which are his by the very constitution and nature, of the Catholic Church--his by solemn treaty repeatedly acknowledged--his by every guarantee of the law and every principle of justice, and he only protests that he will not consent to the spoliation. Who is right? Who unjustly interferes?

517.

Editorial, *The Catholic Telegraph and Advocate*, August 20, 1859

**[Ecclesiastics in the Government of Rome.]**

The editor of the *New York Express* has gone to Rome, and is weekly sending home old stereotype lies concerning it, as though they were the fruits of his personal observation. These lies are published again, throughout the country, by such papers as the *Cincinnati Gazette*, for instance, and palmed off as real information.

Now it is a pity that the conductors of public journals can not make themselves somewhat acquainted with the outlines of geography, and the literature current on the topics they choose. Yet it seems they will not. Only a few years ago, the *Gazette* published an account of a mariner's "compass" which St. Paul is recorded, in the Acts of the Apostles, to have "fetched" from Troas. And now he is republishing, as "acknowledged facts," the stories so recently refuted by Mr. Maguire, in his letter on Rome, published in book form in this country, and before by many others. One is, that all offices in the Roman States are absorbed by ecclesiastics. Now the facts are as follows:

Thus, for instance, the Cardinal Secretary of Foreign Affairs has the magnificent salary of £282! Seven nuncios, or ambassadors to foreign courts, have each, for the support of their respective establishments and their own income and expenses, but £1,480. The minister and Secretary of the Interior each receive £214. [It goes on in this manner, the typeface being somewhat smaller than normal seeming to indicate that a source, such as the mentioned Maguire, is being quoted.] ...

It may be true that even this small proportion of ecclesiastics is larger than desirable, were the organization of the government to be effected on abstract principles. Not that they do not perform their public duties efficiently and economically, but because it is a pity to see clergymen in posts to which no danger or sacrifice is attached. When the Jews asked Samuel the Prophet for a king, they freely declared that it was not any injustice which he had practiced towards them, but only a desire of change that actuated them. So, now, in the Roman States, it would perhaps be as well that the clergy could be freed from those offices which they undertook, at a time when none but themselves were prepared to bear the burthen of them. When Gregory the First first engaged in embassies, and other public duties attendant on the case of the Italians, there was no Mazzini or Kossuth, to contest the dangerous and unprofitable position. But now the cares of state seem desirable to many. If, consistently with the independence of the pontiff, and the preservation of private rights, these cares could devolve on the miserable demagogues who disturb the public peace, we would say, let the people be ground under the rule of the factionists until they learn their true interests.

Had our own politicians, so accustomed to fat offices and paying contracts, the administration of Roman affairs, the revenues of the whole state would not pay for the public printing. During the *regime* of Mazzini, in 1849, although new sources of revenue were opened in the robbery of churches, yet a few months sufficed to reduce the government bills of credit to sixty cents on the dollar, and a few months more would have brought on irredeemable bankruptcy.

It is true that, in the management of governmental affairs in Rome, there are many awkward, old-fashioned forms; but the Italians themselves are awkward and old fashioned, and will be, so long as their climate and soil make them indolent, and careless of material prosperity. A loose lazy way of attending to temporal things is suited to the people, and, defective though it be, it will hardly be exchanged for a better. If the minister of public works would employ the lazy swarm that pulls grass in the public squares, on railroads and wharves, and let people see the beauty of making fortunes and losing them every few days, and of starving when they cannot find work, perhaps the present administration would be improved, to the better satisfaction of the discontented. Let it be tried.