

THE FRENCH CRISIS: VIEWS OF SOME AMERICAN CATHOLICS

While representatives and defenders in the United States of the Papal policy have freely spoken with reference to the religious situation in France, the more progressive Roman Catholics have, from motives of loyalty and obedience to the Pope, remained silent. A correspondent of *The Outlook* has, however, interviewed a number of Catholics, and among them one of the most distinguished representatives of that body in this country. It is evident that some of them are in cordial sympathy with the Catholics in France who, if not prohibited by the Pope, would have accepted the separation law without opposition.—
THE EDITORS.

ON one subject all American Roman Catholics are practically agreed: they believe in separation of State and Church in the United States. The Roman Catholic Church has prospered in this country under that system. Its faithful adherents have given freely of their money to support Catholic worship and the numerous and beneficent charities of the Roman Catholic Church. As the Protestants point with pride to Roger Williams and the establishment of religious liberty in Rhode Island, so the Catholics point to Maryland and Lord Baltimore and the establishment of toleration in that State. While progressive Catholics favor separation of Church and State as a general principle, Catholics of all schools and tendencies speak with the greatest freedom and satisfaction as to the separation of Church and State in this country. It is not merely that Catholics know that it would be impossible to have anything else; they do not want anything else in the United States.

Nothing could be more natural, therefore, than that many Catholics in this country should conclude that a principle and practice which work well here could work well in the Republic of France.

In this series of interviews it was significant and interesting, from the standpoint of American constitutional government, to find nearly every speaker anxious to make clear at the outset that he accepted this principle.

"We do not want any union of Church and State in this country," said an Irish Catholic. "We have got by that and shall never return to it. It is better for the Church as well as the State."

A convert from Protestantism of the Paulist Fathers order expressed the same idea with equal positiveness. "The Church should have perfect liberty," he said, "to choose and institute its own bishops. Why should the State interfere or have any voice in this matter? For this reason I think the Church in France will be a gainer by the abolition of the Concordat. I do not pretend, however," he added, "to understand all the details of the situation in France. I think the trouble has been not so much in the provisions of the law as in the spirit in which it has been carried out."

A French Catholic gentleman said with a laugh, "I know my countrymen, the French people, and their capacity for excitement. We shall have to wait a little while for things to cool down. When this happens, I have no doubt that some way of adjustment will be found. I accept fully the American principle of separation of Church and State. But in this country we had the advantage of starting right from the beginning, and the question of the distribution of property and the annulment of privileges has not come up. Well," he said, with his complacent smile, "I think it will come out all right in the end."

"It is a little curious," said the Irish Catholic already quoted, "that all this stir should have occurred in a country where the Catholics are overwhelmingly predominant. Why, there is only a handful of Freemasons, after all, in France, and there are less than a million Protestants against thirty-five million Catholics. We cannot charge the Protestants with this disturbance." He added with philosophic assurance, "The

old Church has stood through these centuries and is going to continue, and a few years from now will be stronger than ever."

The persons whom I have just quoted are not in public life. Their names, if printed, would not be widely known. They were all laymen and representative of the general spirit of many Catholic laymen. They consider that the present is a Catholic contest in a Catholic country. They are not disposed to take sides; they discussed the subject with calmness, though not with indifference.

I suspect that most of these Catholic laymen did not even know that they were flatly contradicting the position of the head of the Church and were in a state of unconscious disobedience. Liberal Catholics in this country are in a peculiar position. The Pope, in his encyclical of February last, said: "That the State must be separated from the Church is a thesis absolutely false, a most pernicious error." He even described it as "a great injustice to God."

American Catholics, on the contrary, have, as is stated above, accepted the principle of the separation of Church and State in this country. To a Protestant, therefore, they seem to stand in flat opposition to the Papal doctrine. To get some light on this question the writer went to one of the most prominent leaders in the United States, distinguished alike for his learning, his courtesy, his religious spirit, and his progressive ideals. Without directly answering my question, he said:

"I look at this question from a historic point of view. There was a time when nearly all religions were united to the State. It was the common view, I may say it was the human view, of the relation. Christianity itself became united to the civil power. It went into the life of the barbarians; it made their laws; it molded their institutions; it governed them. The principle of the union of State and Church was a Protestant as well as a Catholic thesis. It is set forth in the declaration of the faith of Calvin, as well as in the doctrines of the Catholic Church.

"There was an established Church in New England as well as in Geneva, but

by and by the principle of differentiation began to work. The civil power gradually began to assume distinct functions of government. It began to punish theft, murder, and all offenses against society. Gradually, by a process of historic evolution, the functions of Church and State have become distinct. Of course there still exists a natural relation between them. The State stands for moral and ethical development, for education; it preserves order and property. This natural and moral relation will exist, but there need not be any legal union.

"Official authority has from time to time opposed certain ideas, but we have always gained more than we have lost by their prevalence. Take Galileo. He was opposed and condemned by official authority when he presented the Copernican theory; but think what we gained by accepting his ideas—a new conception of the world! Take the doctrine of evolution. It was attacked everywhere by Protestants and Catholics alike at first, but it has gradually become widely accepted, and we gain more than we lose by it."

When asked why the Pope did not accept the views of the French bishops who, supported by a large number of distinguished laymen, had reported in favor of accepting the French law, he replied:

"There is a saying in Rome that each Pope is the antithesis of the other. This has been frequently illustrated. The present Pope is a religious man, but he is provincial. He knows nothing of foreign languages or of international life. He is surrounded by a small body of advisers in Rome. Pius IX. condemned the errors of his age, among them republican government. Leo X. accepted the idea of national unity, and made special reservations in regard to the United States. Pius X. has gone back to the position of Pius IX. in condemning the separation of State and Church."

"How do you deal," I said, "with such a doctrine as that of Pius IX.?"

"Oh," he said, "we go round the hill when we get to it. A man born in a foreign country," he added, "cannot completely understand the spirit of our

institutions in the United States. Religion in this country has been stronger and better for this differentiation. We have not yet embodied, absolutely, the idea of separation of Church and State, for we still have chaplains in Congress and in the army and navy; but it is not best to try to be absolutely logical. The best we can do is take an ideal and try as far as possible to live up to it."

While this controversy was brewing, and when the relations between Rome and France were becoming more and more strained, the writer of this article had, at Rome, an interview, two hours in length, with a distinguished Catholic prelate. Of American birth and a firm believer in American institutions, no one is more thoroughly acquainted with all the tendencies presented in the Roman Catholic Church. Himself a thorough republican and a distinguished representative of Catholic education, it was interesting to observe the great equanimity and confidence with which he regarded the gradual victory of republican principles in Europe as well as in America. His views throw light upon the present controversy.

"We cannot expect," he said, "Italian Catholic priests to look at this question as do American Catholics who have been trained under American ideas of freedom and civil government. It has been shown in the United States that the Church has great power and prosperity when separated from political domination. The Church has shown that it can adapt itself as well to a republican as to a monarchical system. The Pope is recognized as the spiritual head of the Church and not as a political potentate. There are many Catholics who do not consider the question of the temporal authority of the Pope as the leading issue in this struggle. It is necessary, in order that the Pope may have perfect independence, that he should not acknowledge allegiance to any foreign power. At present, in the Vatican, he is isolated in a small territory over which he has absolute authority. This small piece of land over which he is sovereign assures the independence of the Pope. For the purpose of establishing the principle, a mile

square of territory is as good as a thousand miles."

In the view of this eminent Catholic the political policies of different governments were different affairs. They were not matters for the Papal intervention, nor did he insist on the necessity of having ambassadors at the Papal court. All that was necessary from the standpoint of an American Catholic was that the Pope should have a little piece of territory in which he could preserve his spiritual independence, free from political interference.

Beyond this the only way the Pope could acquire any more political authority in Italy would be through the acceptance in Italy of a republican form of government and the election by popular suffrage of the Pope to this office. One practical difficulty, however, supposing the country ready for republican government, would be, as viewed by many Catholics, that the Pope would have to recognize and submit himself to the provisions of the political constitution, which course would be in conflict with the Catholic tradition that the Pope must be absolutely free.

This eminent Catholic has not expressed himself publicly in the United States in regard to the situation in France. He has wished to keep wholly out of the field of controversy; but the writer of this article feels confident that he may describe his position as in essential agreement with that of the Bishop of Rouen, and of nearly two-thirds of the French bishops, whom the Pope has refused to allow to form religious societies on the model proposed by the Archbishop of Besançon. While the clerical party in the United States have taken pains to create public sentiment in favor of the position of the Pope, and to send messages from Catholic clubs, it is equally clear that an intelligent and progressive body of Catholics in the United States sympathize with the republican bishops of France more than with the political counselors of the Pope.

The English liberal Catholics have not been backward, however, in expressing their sentiments in this controversy. Robert Dell, in the *Fortnightly Review*, has just written on "The Papal Aggres-

sion in France and its Significance for Other Nations." Mr. Dell is a Catholic, not by inheritance or early training, but by deliberate choice. He became a Catholic for purely religious reasons. "We accepted the Papacy," he says, "as a spiritual and moral, but in no sense as a political, authority; we made no profession of undivided allegiance to the Pope; we gave no pledge to renounce our allegiance to the civil government and the laws of our country at the will and pleasure of any ecclesiastical authority; no such profession and no such pledge were demanded of us. We now find ourselves face to face with the claim of the Pope that his authority is absolute and unlimited; that he can at will annul and set aside laws regularly made by the constituted lawmaking authority; and that if he annuls them or sets them aside we are bound to disobey them."

Mr. Dell declares that the English Catholics "cannot honestly defend the Papal policy in France, or support the French Ultramontanes in the present circumstances."

In the case of English Catholics a point of honor is involved in this matter. In 1826 the Catholic bishops in Great Britain, in a collective declaration, denied that the Pope has "any right, directly or indirectly, to any civil or temporal jurisdiction, power, superiority, pre-eminence, or authority, within this realm;" declared that the allegiance of Catholics to the civil power is "entire and undivided;" and affirmed that they held themselves "bound in conscience to obey the civil government of this realm in all things of a temporal and civil nature, notwithstanding any dispensation or order to the contrary had, or to be had, from the Pope or any authority of the Church of Rome"—the "civil power of the State and the spiritual authority of the Catholic Church being absolutely distinct and being never intended by their Divine Author to interfere or clash with each other."

One of the most significant and important expressions of French Catholic opinion was the "appeal of a group of French Catholics to Pope Pius X." It was published in *Le Temps* of September 2, and attracted much attention

in France. M. Paul Sabatier, the author of "The Life of St. Francis of Assisi," speaks of its literary beauty, the loftiness of its inspiration, its restrained emotion, its overflowing affection, its high French spirit." This is the text of the appeal:

In lifting our voice towards your Apostolic throne, Holy Father, we, who respect even divisions which we deplore, would separate ourselves from those mischief-making Catholics whose blindness has brought us into an abyss. History, which will judge between us and them, will condemn their lack of Christianity as much as their lack of judgment. At the same time we are resolved not to be confounded with those accommodating Catholics whose complaisant language or equivocal silence is not what should be expected from their sense of religion or from a clear-sighted patriotism. We are moved by our love of the Church, of which, after all, there is no more reason to despair in our country than elsewhere. We are equally moved by the sacred interests of France, as noble a country to-day as she has been in the past. And if it be true that the vote of the bishops under the Concordat, when they found themselves confronted by a law of their own country, has drawn from you the cry (intended as a reproach, but which will remain their finest eulogy), "They have acted like Frenchmen!"—know, Holy Father, that the real France, which does not join leagues, or agitate, or intrigue, which thinks and works, was on that occasion absolutely in accord with her bishops.

The most wonderful of all the daughters of olden France, whom our little children invoke on their knees, and whom you will shortly elevate into a saint to be prayed to in the churches—Joan of Arc—was moved to tears when she heard the archangels descended from heaven to tell her of "the great pity that there was for the kingdom of France." Forgive us, Father of all Christians, if we have dared to speak to you, while there is yet time, of the great pity which is at this moment in the souls of the chiefs of our dioceses and the best of the faithful, in the souls of our wives, our daughters, and our mothers, in the souls of all who understand that the concerns of Catholicism are with us bound up with the destinies of our great country, and of a civilization which will never deny the principles of the French Revolution, but which derives its origin from a more distant and a loftier source—from the Gospel and from the very heart of Christ.

Of this noble appeal Mr. Sabatier says: "This appeal will take its place in history, and our descendants will read and re-read it when they want to understand what, at the commencement of the twentieth century, were the aspirations of the younger clergy of France."

MORMONISM

I.—SOME OF ITS REALITIES

BY McLAIN W. DAVIS

LAST summer, on a certain day, a group of tourists who had just been shown about the Temple grounds of the Mormon Church in Salt Lake City, Utah, stood on the east steps of the Tabernacle Building, where so many thousands of tourists stand every year to hear the final words of their Mormon guides. As is the invariable custom, these tourists had been treated with courtesy; they had seen well-kept grounds, a fine organ, the interior of two buildings, and the peculiar exterior of the Temple building proper; they had listened to a very pleasing and plausible presentation of what purported to be the tenets of Mormonism. Like multitudes of others, these tourists were favorably impressed, and one of them addressed the guide with these words, "Why don't they let you alone? I can't see but that you have a right to worship in your own way." Let us answer this query by stating some realities of Mormonism, for the visitor who asked the question had not seen even the outside of Mormonism, much less the inner reality. As tourists do not see the inside of the Temple, so they do not see the inside of Mormonism.

There is conflict in Utah to-day, as there has always been conflict wherever Mormonism has been planted from its inception down to the present time. This conflict is irrepressible and inevitable. No State can exist in peace half Mormon and half American. The reason for this is not far to seek. It lies in the arrogant claims of Mormonism. The Mormon Church claims absolutely to be the Kingdom of God set up on earth, and that all governments except its own are illegal and spurious. The Mormon problem is not a religious but a civil question, dealing with an oath-bound, despotic organization which gives forth the following dictums as law: "The priesthood holds the right to give laws

and commands to individuals, rulers, and nations of the world; to appoint, ordain, and establish constitutions and kingdoms; to appoint kings, presidents, governors, and judges."¹ "The Kingdom of God is an order of government established by divine authority. It is the only legal government that can exist in any part of the universe. All other governments are illegal and unauthorized. . . . Any people attempting to govern themselves, and by laws of their own making and by officers of their own appointment, are in direct rebellion against the Kingdom of God."²

In November, 1889, several members of the Mormon Church applied in the District Court for the Third Judicial District of the Territory of Utah for naturalization as citizens of the United States. Andrew Cahoon, for eighteen years a bishop of the Mormon Church, testified in the proceedings before the court. Being asked by counsel if anything had ever been said about the establishment of the Kingdom of God, Mr. Cahoon answered: "Establishment of the Kingdom; why, that is understood, that it is established by the establishment of the Mormon Church, and that was the Kingdom of God, and all other kingdoms would be overthrown, and this Kingdom would be established on their ruins; the first one to suffer would be the Government of the United States."³ Judge Thomas J. Anderson, in writing his opinion wherein he denied naturalization to nine members of the Mormon Church, based his decision on six conclusions drawn from the evidence submitted, of which the following are pertinent.

The Mormon Church teaches:

First—That it is the actual and veritable Kingdom of God on earth. . . .

¹ Pratt's "Key to Theology," p. 70.

² "Doctrines of the Gospel," by Apostle Orson Pratt, p. 41.

³ Records of District Court for Third Judicial District, Territory of Utah.