

THE UNION SEMINARY MAGAZINE

NO. 3—JAN.-FEB., 1895.

I.—LITERARY.

REPLY TO BISHOP SPALDING ON CATHOLICISM AND APAISM.

Another periodical ground-swell of public feeling against the Catholic Church is on the rise. It has happened before in this country ; it has happened in other countries—not only in those which are recognized as Protestant, but in those which are recognized as Catholic. It has happened in Mexico ; it has happened in France ; it has happened in Italy ; it has happened in Germany ; it has happened in England. A great English statesman in a once celebrated pamphlet called out by the Vatican Council said* : “To quiet-minded Roman Catholics, it must be a subject of infinite annoyance, that their religion is, on this ground more than any other, the subject of criticism ; more than any other, the occasion of conflicts with the State and of civil disquietude.” “All other Christian bodies are content with freedom in their own religious domain. Orientals, Lutherans, Calvinists, Presbyterians, Episcopalians, Non-Conformists, one and all, in the present day, contentedly and cheerfully accept the benefits of civil order ; never pretend that the State is not its own master ; master no religious claims to temporal possessions or advantages ; and consequently never are in perilous collision with the State. Nay, more, even so I believe it is with the mass of Roman Catholics individually. But not so with the leaders of their church, or with those who take pride in following the leaders.” “The

*Gladstone on the Vatican Decrees, pp. 9-10-11.

ed universal monarchy. The Rome of the Middle Ages claimed, and abandoned nothing, retracted nothing. Modern Church of Rome has a feeling of uneasiness, has more nothing." In this country a feeling of uneasiness has more than once risen to a public and wide-spread expression. The recent movements which are dubbed by the queer name, *Apaisism*, root themselves in a similar feeling. In an article in a late number of the *North American Review*, the Bishop of Peoria assails these movements, and endeavors to show that there is no justification for them. Let us follow his argument and see if its various specifications justify his conclusion: the people

1. He sets out with the protestation that the Catholics of America are good citizens and without reproach. He cites the charter of Maryland which secured religious liberty to a Catholic colony, and under a Catholic proprietary. He boasts of this as the first charter of religious freedom ever established for an American State. He says the mass of American Catholics have done their duty to the State in peace and war as fully as any class of citizens whatever. He claims they have done more than any other denomination for education, for the orphan, the aged, the sick and the fallen. He protests that no justification for the public uneasiness and the public movements about Catholicism is to be found in any act or attempt of the Catholic church of America. Whatever controversy there may be as to other times and lands, her course here has been one of honor, of peace, of beneficence."

Now Bishop Spalding is guilty of the logical blunder of misapprehending the question in making these statements. They might all be admitted to the full extent in which he makes them, and the ground of suspicion of the Catholic church as such not shaken at all. The question is as to the authoritative doctrine of the Catholic church, not as to the conduct of the Catholic people. Men are often inconsistent with their avowed religious principles; they are often disobedient to their religious laws and leaders. The question is what the Church may exact of the people on peril of their salvation. The issue is grounded on the relations which the Catholic church claims to the civil State, and the nature of the obedience exacted of the people under its control. If, as Bishop Spalding asserts, no forfeiture of common right in the Catholic citizen has been wrought by any act of the Catholic church in America, has no forfeiture of confidence among their Protestant fellow citizens been worked by the Catholic church in the Vatican Coun-

cil of 1870, by the acts of the Church in its great seats of authority which demand the obedience of the faithful in all the world? Bishop Spalding is thoroughly aware that the decree of the Pope and the Vatican Council has elevated the claim of the Pope to absolute infallibility, not merely in matters of faith and morals, but in all that concerns the government and discipline of the Church into an *Article of Faith* to be received and obeyed, *salva fide atque salute*. That opinion which was for centuries merely an opinion in the Church is now an *Article of Faith*. That *Absolutism* which was disputed fiercely for centuries between two powerful parties in the Church has been finally established as an article of the highest binding authority. Every Catholic is now bound under peril of his eternal safety to obey whatever order an infallible authority defines as his duty. His duties to the State are now definable for him at the discretion of the Roman Pontiff, as guided by his infallible and universal authority. He can no longer claim to settle the question of his own civil allegiance, or his own political conduct, *except so far as the Holy See chooses to permit*. On these very grounds of intolerable tyranny, the Liberal Catholic party in Europe and in the Vatican Council itself, strove to prevent the adoption of the scheme of infallibility. Now, the question is whether these unchangeable and authoritative decrees of the supreme central power in the Church do not forfeit the confidence of the American people in those of their fellow-citizens who are under the most solemn and responsible bonds to obey those decrees when called upon to do it? They *must obey or rebel* against the Church, which is to them the controlling force over their eternal well-being. Bishop Spalding reflects severely on the masses of his Catholic people. He says that "Catholics generally are only Catholics in name," which if true, might lead to the hope that the Vatican decrees may be shorn of their claws in this country. But we do not believe that imputation: the Catholic people are loyal to their Church, and will obey its decrees in the end. Moreover, if they should rebel for a time, we remember with elevated eyebrows, how the recalcitrant Bishops of the Vatican Council, who fought so manfully and voted at last against the perilous scheme, were compelled to submit to it. If the power of the Holy See and the Council could compel the gallant Archbishop of St. Louis and the prelates who agreed with him, to receive and confess what they did not believe to be a truth and to obey what they

did not believe to be a lawful definition of duty, small work will be needful to coerce Catholic laymen into submission. If a man is a real believer in the claim of the Church to condition his everlasting well being, he will obey the requisitions which the Church makes upon him. We have small hope that the Absolutism of Rome can be defeated by the will of individual Catholics. But whether defeated or not, these enormous exorbitances of priestly power are claimed as Articles of Faith by the Church, and nothing can obscure her responsibility for them. It is vain for Bishop Spalding to say that it is futile to attempt to commit the American Catholics of the nineteenth century to the deeds and utterances of the Middle Ages. The American Catholics of the nineteenth century are bound to receive the Articles of Faith decreed by the Vatican Council and Pío Nono. That decree has stamped the Encyclical *Quanta Cura* and the Syllabus of that dangerous Pontiff with infallible authority. All the most outrageous claims of Mediæval Popery are reasserted in that fatal syllabus and its associated papers, and raised to a higher authority than they ever bore before; for they are stamped with an *acknowledged* infallibility, and are required by a divinely given authority to be both believed and obeyed. Nay, more the decree of 1870 investing the Pope with infallibility, and defining his claim to universal obedience, not only in matters of faith and morals, but in government and discipline, has a retroactive effect. It stamps infallibility on certain acts of all past Popes. The claim of infallibility has been asserted by many in the long list of Pontiffs. The decree of 1870 confirms the claim as having been always asserted rightfully, and all attempts to resist or qualify or combine it with the authority of Oecumenical Councils, or the assent of the Church dispersed, or in other words not assembled in council are condemned as unlawful. It stamps as "infallible" and obligatory the most audacious claims of Mediæval Popery. It confirms the Bull *Unam Sanctam*. It establishes the Bull *Cum Ex Apostolatus officio*. It gives permanent authority to the Bull *In Coena Domini*. It gives full effect to the Encyclical, *Quanta Cura* with its appended Syllabus. The Bull, *Unam Sanctam* of Boniface VIII., A. D. 1302, teaches that the Church possess two swords, the spiritual and the temporal; that the secular power is to be judged by the spiritual power, but the supreme spiritual power is to be judged by God only; and that every human creature is sub-

ject to the Pope by reason of sin. Archbishop Kenrick, of St. Louis, says of this Bull: "No man can deny that the purpose of Boniface in that Bull was to claim for himself temporal power, and to propound this opinion to the faithful to be held under pain of damnation." This opinion was long strenuously repudiated in the Catholic church. It can no longer be repudiated. The Bull of Paul IV. Cum Ex Apostolatus officio, granted full authority to the Pope over nations and kingdoms, who judges all and is judged by none: pronounces heretical or schismatic princes are irrevocably deposed, deprived of all rights of government forever, and incur sentence of death; and denounces forfeiture of dominion and property on all princes who give any aid, even the services of common humanity, to any such heretical or schismatic prince. This Bull was afterwards confirmed by Pius V. The Bull "In Coena Domini issued by Urban VIII., 1627, after the exertions of centuries by his predecessors and confirmed by one of his successors curses all heretics and schismatics, and all who favor or defend them; curses all who appeal from a papal decree to a future General Council; and encroaches on the independence of States, by the imposition of taxes, in the exercise of judicial authority, and the punishment of criminal clerics by threats of excommunication if these things are done without express papal permission." This Bull was annually published in Rome on Maunday Thursday for two hundred years. The famous encyclicals of Pius IX., prominently the thrice famous Quanta Cura and its appended Syllabus, are all endowed with infallible authority. In these papers the Roman Pontiff deliberately places under a ban, which is to be revered and obeyed by the faithful, all that distinguishes the advanced spirit and progress of the present age. It condemns every characteristic principle of American institutions. It condemns the freedom of speech. It condemns freedom of religion. It condemns the freedom of the press. It condemns the freedom of scientific investigation, and requires it to submit to ecclesiastical guidance and correction. It denies the rightful foundation of civil government in the will of the people, and holds the only lawful foundation of civil States in the authority and imprimature of the Church in her head. It condemns the education of the people in all schools not under the control of the Church. It condemns the doctrine of the independence of the State. It condemns the union of Church and State as

between every other church than its own, and holds that to be obligatory. Among these condemned errors are all the cherished principles of the American system. Is proof demanded upon these points? It is easily furnished. If any reader wants reliable testimony let him consult the authorities cited by Mr. Gladstone in his celebrated pamphlet, or let him examine the encyclicals and the several syllabuses of Pius IX. Let him look into the Bull *Unam Sanctam*, the Bull *Cum Ex Apostolatus officio*, the Bull *In Coena Domini*, and judge for himself. In the Encyclical *Quanta Cura* and the Syllabus appended, Pope Pius IX. condemns the following fundamental principles of the American system of government and civil society:

1. The great foundation of government in the will of the people. He gives command to all bishops to "teach that kingdoms rest upon the foundation of the Catholic faith."

2. It is a fundamental principle of the American system that *civil government is established solely for the benefit of the people*. The Pope teaches that "the royal power has been established not only to exercise the government of the world, but above all, for the protection of the Church."

3. It is a fundamental principle of the American system that *the State is independent of the Church, and the Church of the State*. The Pope teaches that the Church, by the institution and command of her Divine Head, is empowered to exercise "her salutary influence" on, not only individual men, but nations, peoples, and sovereigns, even to the end of the world. He approves "that mutual co-operation and agreement of counsels between the priesthood and governments, which has always been propitious and conducive to the welfare both of Church and State." The Syllabus condemns as an error to be repudiated by the faithful, that "kings and princes are not only exempt from the jurisdiction of the Church, but are superior to the Church in litigated questions of jurisdiction." The Syllabus condemns as error that "in the case of conflicting laws between the two powers, the civil law ought to prevail." The Syllabus of March 8th (or 18th), 1861, quoted by Mr. Gladstone, condemns as error "the assignment to the State the power of defining the civil rights of the Church."

4. It is a fundamental principle of the American system that *freedom of speech* is the right of the political freeman. The Pope, Pius IX. quotes with approval and confirmation the

Encyclical of Gregory XVI. in which he denounces the liberty of all citizens in which they are authorized "to publish and put forward openly, all their ideas whatsoever, either by speaking, in print or by any other method." He quotes Augustine with approval saying, "if it is always free to human arguments to discuss, men will never be wanting who will dare to resist the truth."

5. The *Freedom of the Press* is another settled principle of American System. This is condemned in the Encyclical of Gregory XVI in 1831, and the Encyclical of Pius 9th, in 1864. Quoted by Gladstone. The syllabus appended to the Encyclical Quarta Cura contains these words in a sentence also embracing "the civil liberty of every mode of worship" and condemning them "the full power given to all of orally and publicly manifesting their opinions and their ideas of all kinds whatever."

6. The *Freedom of Religion* is another of the fundamental principles of the American System. This priceless liberty of obeying the dictates of individual reason and conscience, in construing the truth revealed by Almighty God, in his Word and Works—under full responsibility to Him but under no responsibility to any other power, is authoritatively condemned by the Infallible authority. The right to *employ force* is unequivocally claimed to coerce the freedom of conscience and worship. Proposition 24 of the Syllabus of Pius IX unequivocally condemns as error the denial that "The Church has not the power of availing herself of force, or any direct or indirect temporal power."

7. The *Right of Public Education* is one of the prominent principles of the American System. The Syllabus in its 45th proposition unequivocally condemns as dangerous error the claim of the State to the entire direction and control of the public schools.

8. Finally—for we must limit the citation of the gross and mortal assaults on modern ideas of the Infallible Pontiff, under whom more and more sweeping changes, were wrought in the unchangeable Catholic faith, than by any other Pontiff in the long list of his predecessors. He assails the lawfulness of all marriages not sacramentally celebrated—thus pronouncing all the marital relations of Protestant Christendom as invalid. The Syllabus—proposition 73, condemns as error the opinion that "A merely civil contract may, among christians, consti-

tutes a true marriage ; and also the opinion that "it is false, either that the marriage contract between christians is always a sacrament, or that the contract is null if the sacrament is excluded."

This citation is sufficient. Bishop Spalding claims that the American Roman Catholic Church is liberal, broad and tolerant. Is the American Catholic church obedient to the decree of Pio Nono with the assent of the Vatican Council of 1870, or does it accept or reject the claim to use force to propagate the Catholic Creed, and secure obedience to the authority of the Vicar of Christ? If it is so obedient is it remarkable that the American people should feel uneasy that so large a portion of the population should feel bound to obey the behests of a foreign ecclesiastical prince, in a claim so atrocious. If it is not submissive to this new Article of Faith, are not American Catholics in peril of their souls? Surely there is ground to suspect that the Catholic church of America is patient, broad and tolerant, just because the circumstances of the case compel the authority, which they are bound to obey, to make no other requisition upon them at present. The Protestants of this country are not likely to forget the language of an American Roman Catholic newspaper, *The Shepherd of the Valley*, of November 23rd, 1851, more than forty years ago, which have a significance since the Decree of the Vatican Council it did not have when uttered." If the Catholics ever gain—which they will surely do, though at a distant day, an immense numerical superiority—religious freedom in this country is at an end." The writer, while disclaiming religious intolerance in a certain sense, defines his views as meaning that "the State will then take its proper place as ancillary to the church, and the foundation will be laid for a legislation which shall restrain the propagation of certain doctrines." Now when first uttered, this expression of an American Catholic, was no more than an allowed opinion in the church, like the highly endorsed Ultramontaniam of Orestes Brownson in his Review. Liberal American Catholics could then repudiate it, and protest against the church, as such, being held responsible for it. But now *the church is responsible for it*: the sentiment expressed has become an *Article of Faith*. Is there no improved basis for the suspicion of the American people in this change in the definition of the faith?

Again, Bishop Spalding assails the Apatist associations as

unreasonably jealous of the attempts of the Catholics of this country to control, as far as possible, the public schools of America as instruments of Catholic propagandism. Finding it an embarrassing business to secure the public school funds to support their denominational schools, the adroit turn was taken to endeavor to get the public schools themselves under Catholic control. Catholic teachers were introduced as far as possible. These teachers appeared in the school-rooms in their official dresses. All the strong personal influence of skillful teachers on their scholars was turned to the propagation of Catholic ideas. Where no direct attempt could be ventured, indirection was found to be effective. All the influence, as far as it could be developed, was in the line of a Catholic propaganda. Now if Bishop Spaulding could detect a regular system of effort to make the public school funds and the public schools the instruments in this indirect and subtle way, of propagating Presbyterian views and extending the Presbyterian church, would he not be able to detect something illegitimate and censurable—something to provoke public jealousy and a just public indignation? Would he be surprised if a public movement was aroused to put an end to it? The parallel is easily interpreted. Is not the Bishop somewhat *mistaken* in saying there is *nothing in the policy and conduct of American Catholics to excite public feeling*? But more than this: Since this article was begun, the writer has received a copy of a speech by the Hon. Wm. S. Linton, of Michigan, delivered in the House of Representatives of the American Congress, as recently as June 7th, 1894. It was delivered on a specification embraced in the Appropriation Bill. The proposal was to appropriate a certain sum of money for the current and contingent expenses of the Indian department. Among these expenses were the costs of certain denominational schools among the Indians. Some of these schools had been organized as mission enterprises by Methodists, Presbyterians, Episcopalians and Congregationalists. But it appears that within the last two years there had been a general waking of these branches of the church to the impropriety of receiving government appropriations for denominational Indian schools, and all of them have promptly declined to receive any more unconstitutional appropriations of public money. They have discovered their fault and renounced it as christian law required them to do. The Catho-

lic church has also been largely engaged in this same illegitimate business. They have received more public money than all other denominations combined. They decline to retire from this profitable alliance with the United States government. They have established a regular organized bureau in Washington city to seek the extension of these government subsidies for their denominational purposes. The following figures from Mr. Linton's speech deserve the attention of the whole American people. They deserve consideration at the hands of Bishop Spalding when he asserts again that American Catholics and the American Catholic church as such have given no umbrage to the American people. The total amount of public money expended in these Indian schools is \$3,767,951 from 1886 to 1893 inclusive. Of this sum the Catholics have received \$2,366,416. The total amount received by all other denominations is \$1,401,535. The sum required to pay the contract Catholic schools for the fiscal year ending June 30th, 1894, is \$276,115. Catholic schools specially appropriated for by Congress \$114,330. As specimen instances take the following selected list.

St. Boniface Boarding School, Banning, Cal.	\$12,500.
Holy Family Boarding School, Blackfeet Agency,	12,500.
St. Paul's Boarding School, Clontarf, Minn.,	15,000.
St. Ignatius's Mission School, Flathead Agency,	45,000.
St. Peter's Boarding School, Montana,	19,440.
Acoma Day School, New Mexico,	750.
Taos Day School, New Mexico,	600.

These samples ranging from the lowest to the highest are significant: They show that the Romanist Propaganda in this country will put the cost of even the smallest of their missions on the public funds of the American people, if they can, rather than support them themselves. If any protestant denomination should do this they would be justly censurable. Is the Catholic without blame in doing it? Yet further it is said that the Germans generally and among them the German Catholics are opposed to becoming unified with the American people. They insist on having the public schools in which their children are taught at the public expense, taught exclusively in German; the English language is tabooed. Is there no cause of offence in this to the American people? Is it wise to develop a foreign nation in the heart of the Republic? Who can tell whether the Catholic creed is not directly taught

in these schools under cover of a foreign language, at the expense of the public funds? We have hypothetically admitted that the assertion of Bishop Spalding might be true, that the Catholic church and the Catholic people of America might be without reproach and still not be free from suspicion by reason of the articles of Faith made binding on them by the Vatican Decrees of 1870. But the facts just stated indicate very clearly that the Catholic church and a portion at least of the American Catholic people are not so completely free from all just suspicion as the Bishop of Peoria supposes. As long as the Catholic church continues to make the public funds of the United States support their propagandist mission schools, instead of supporting them with their own funds, they may expect to be suspected: they may expect to be resisted. As long as a regular bureau is established in the capital of the Republic to maintain and extend this policy of subsidizing the public treasury to support the Catholic propaganda, so long may it be expected that the public indignation will rise higher and higher until the grievance is abated. The American System forbids the union of church and state in any form. The Syllabus of the Roman Pontiff has infallibly defined that the union of state and any other church is unlawful, but that the union of every state with the Catholic church is obligatory. Fidelity to the obligations created by this definition will lead the faithful to endeavor to realize this union as far as possible; if not in one shape then in another. But it will be a dangerous experiment in this country in any form. The rising storm is seen in the growing "Apaism" of the day. The American people do not intend to have their cherished institutions overthrown, and remoulded in the image of the Syllabus of Pío Nono. The third and fourth chapters or sections of the *Constitutio Dogmatica Prima de Ecclesia Christi Edita in Sessione Tertia* of the Vatican Council have established the most extreme absolutism ever contended for by ultramontane or jesuit as an Article of Faith. It creates an empire strictly absolute and universal. It realizes the fanatical and foolish conception of a universal Monarchy, armed with authority to require the submission of every state and the obedience of every individual in the whole world. The regulation of all human conduct in this world is supported by the still more fearful claim to lay down the terms which condition the eternal well-being of every member of the human race. The sanctions of eternity

sustain the fabric of earthly power. It makes a Vice-God of the Roman Pontiff. Bishop Spalding pronounces all those minds to be sadly *retarded*, among Protestants, who retain the old conceptions of mediaeval Popery. The Vatican Council and the audacious Pontiff who controlled it have fully renewed the warrant to retain them. Many of the brightest lights of modern Catholicism have construed them as having the same effect in breathing life into the mediaeval absolutisms which it was vainly hoped had been antiquated forever. The fatal policy of 1870 has justified the Protestant suspicions of the past, and made them obligatory forever. Woe be to any nation that shall now be subjected to the ascendancy of the Catholic faith and the Catholic church, unless the catholic people can find some way to control the exorbitances of ecclesiastical zeal and protect the inalienable rights of mankind from oppression. Can they do it if they will? Will they do it if they can? Are they to be expected either to will it or do it, so long as they believe their own salvation to be conditioned by absolute obedience to the definition of their *faith and duty* by the Infallible Head of their church? How can the catholic people of America be expected to resist successfully the demands of the Holy See and the Roman Court, when the American Hierarchy were unable to prevent the appointment of a Papal Legate for this country although they were almost if not altogether unanimous in their opposition to it? Bishop Spalding tells us that from the beginning the American Bishops when consulted strongly opposed the founding of such an institution here." The Archbishops were almost unanimous in the same view, yet Monsig'nr Satolli was sent. The instance illustrates the complete subjugation of the episcopal authority in the Catholic church since the Vatican Council, "Like priest, like people." If all the departments of the church are thus equally under bond to all the new as well as the old articles of faith, what guarantees can the American Catholic church or people give to the American State and the American people that they are trust-worthy members of the Republic, and that the principles of the American System are in no peril from the presence and from the expected ascendancy of the Catholic institutions? Such guarantees are needed since the Vatican Council, as never before.

C. R. VAUGHAN.