

## CHURCH AND STATE.

“Præterea, libet enim id fateri quod est, sua debetur gratia æquitati legum, quibus America vivit, moribusque bene constitutæ rei publicæ. Hoc enim Ecclesiæ apud vos concessum est, non repugnante temperatione civitatis, ut nullis legum præpedita vinclis, contra vim defensa jure communi justitiæque judiciorum, tutam obtineat vivendi agendique sine offensione facultatem. Sed quamquam hæc vera sunt, tamen error tollendus, ne quis hinc sequi existimet, petendum ab America exemplum optimi ecclesiastici status: aut universe licere vel expedire, rei civilis rei que sacræ distractas esse dissociatasque, more Americano, rationes. Quod enim incolumis apud vos res est Catholica, quod prosperis etiam auctibus crescit, id omnino fecunditati tribuendum, qua divinitus pollet Ecclesia, quæque si nullus adversetur, si nulla res impedimento sit, se sponte effert atque effundit; longe tamen uberiores editura fructus, si præter libertatem, gratia legum fruatur patrocinioque publicæ potestatis.”—Encyclical *Longinqua oceani* addressed to the American hierarchy, January 6, 1895.

SOME persons who have never learned to doubt of their own infallibility, are very fond of declaiming against “Union of Church and State” as against an unmixed evil, and of extolling “Separation of Church and State” as one of the special blessings of modern times. They evidently imagine that they are giving utterance to some axiomatic truths, seen intuitively under the strong light of civilization—to some first principles of ethics, which it were an insult to our cultured age to explain—or, at the very least, to some immediate deductions from the natural law, which no one is permitted to call in question, at the risk of being placed under a social ban. If you venture to suggest a doubt upon the subject they will stare at you, as at an intellectual curiosity preserved by a strange fate since the days of mediæval darkness; or, maybe, they will denounce you to the high inquisitor of vulgar prejudice as holding un-American doctrine and harboring treasonable designs against the liberties of your country.

Yet the truth of the matter is, few expressions in the whole range of human language are more vague and undefined. In fact, on the lips of the crowd they may mean almost anything, and they may mean nothing. The majority come to them only at second hand, and repeat them by rote, with little more than a confessed notion that they are popular and serve as the shibboleth of liberalism.

This circumstance alone is sufficient to arouse suspicion. In this country, as is well known, even the soundest and staunchest Catholics are sometimes praised for their liberalism, because the word liberalism, as used among us, is susceptible of a good mean-

ing. But liberalism, as it exists in Catholic countries, is not the same harmless thing. It is essentially a system of disguises and counterfeits. It has no rules of conduct except compromise, accommodation and surrender. It changes front as rapidly as the chameleon changes color. It has as many *aliases* as the professional "confidence man." It is progress; it is patriotism; it is philanthropy; it is anything you please, except genuine, outspoken Catholicism. It seeks, above all, to follow the tendency of the age, and to float along upon the tide of public opinion. It never scruples to sacrifice the most sacred interests of religion for a temporal consideration. It is a traitor within the camp, always ready to parley with the enemy and sign terms of capitulation, and then to claim the credit of having established peace between the Church and the world. Its whole past history is a record of intrigue, deception and fraud. Before adopting its watchwords and joining in the cry for separation of Church and State, it is important for us to know precisely what we mean.

### I.

The State and the Church are the representatives of the temporal and the eternal. The State is a secular society, whose direct object is to promote man's present welfare in this world; the Church is a spiritual society, whose direct object is to help man to reach his final destiny in the world to come. They are different and distinct from each other, and pursue different and distinct aims. But it does not follow therefrom that they can and ought to be separate and independent of each other, or that they can and ought to pursue their aims separately and independently. Many things that are different and distinct from each other are not destined to be separate and independent. The soul is different and distinct from the body, and yet nature itself shrinks from the separation of soul and body. Even so did Catholics of old shrink from the separation of the Church and the Christian State. The idea of separating one from the other originated with the so-called Reformation, which proclaimed the *emancipation* of human reason.<sup>1</sup>

According to the Reformers, the individual was the sole and all-sufficient judge in religious matters, amenable to no authority, and quite competent to pass upon the law of God, to interpret and expound it, to admit or reject portions of it, according as his "reason" should dictate. The leaders, it is true, confined this principle to revelation. But more logical minds soon extended it to other matters. If Luther, they argued, might discard the Book of

---

<sup>1</sup> Taparelli, *Ord. Rap.*, Introd.

Machabees and the Epistle of St. Jude, why might not his disciples discard other portions of the writings generally considered inspired? Why might they not, with equal reason, reject all revelations and inspirations, if they saw fit? Why not extend this convenient doctrine to the precepts of the natural law as well, and explain them as they thought best? Who would set the limits? The father had proclaimed the principle: "*Our lips are our own; who is Lord over us?*" The sons pushed it to its legitimate conclusions.

If the State accepts these conclusions to the full, holding itself and its members bound by no particular set of religious doctrines and laws, nor indeed by any religious obligations whatever, there will be no common link of union between the secular and the spiritual, between the temporal and the eternal, between the human and the divine. In other words, there will be a total separation of Church and State. If, on the contrary, the State stops half-way, holding itself and its members bound by some religious obligations, without, however, conforming to all the doctrines and laws of the Church, there will exist a common bond in respect to those points which the State accepts; that is, there will be only a partial separation of Church and State. In the latter case there is room for much variety in the relations between Church and State, ranging the whole way from almost complete separation on the one hand, to almost complete union on the other hand, according to the smaller or larger number of points which they hold in common.

A total separation has existed, and perhaps still exists, under some so-called liberal governments of continental Europe and of South America. They are based on avowedly irreligious principles, and, so far from favoring the Church, they do not recognize her as an institution sanctioned by law. Hence they refuse to protect her in her civil rights, or to grant her and the religious orders approved by her the immunities conceded to purely secular corporations. They confiscate and appropriate ecclesiastical property, declare the religious communities non-existent, then ostracize or starve the individual members, and tax them for their very charities and services to the public. They force clerical students into the army, compel the State officials and employees to desecrate the Lord's day, and contrive in various other ways to do violence to the Christian conscience. Their attitude toward the Church is one of secret or of open hostility, persecution, oppression; their set purpose is to crush out Catholicity and, together with it, all religion.

The political creed of these governments was first announced to the world in the words: "The law should be atheistic." All

Europe shuddered at the blasphemy, and when Count D'Althon Sée, true to his principles, proposed establishing a professorial chair, to teach what he impiously styled the "religion of atheism," the death-rattle of expiring conscience changed at once into a cry of horror and dismay. Discomfited, but not destroyed, the advocates of this sacrilegious doctrine disguised it under another name, called it "Separation of Church and State," and re-appeared upon the scene with fairer prospects of success. Before long they gained access, not only to the cabinet of the politician and to the assemblies of the *liberal* Christians, but even to the consciences of some sincerely pious, but misguided and unsuspecting, Catholics. The clergy, as a body, watched the movement with great apprehension; the bishops protested; the Vicar of Christ condemned it. The very first proposition of the encyclical, *Quanta cura*, proscribes the doctrine, "That the best interests of public society and civil progress require, by all means, that human society should be established and governed without any more regard to religion than if it did not exist."<sup>1</sup>

Presented in this form, the doctrine may seem less shocking, but it is quite as blasphemous, and far more dangerous, because more insidious. What matters it whether the State acknowledges no God, or, while it acknowledges one, makes no account of Him? If anything, its conduct in the latter case is more impious than in the former. At bottom it is the very rankest kind of irreligion—a practical application of the epicurean maxim: "Let the gods go asleep above us."

In this country there is not and, let us hope, never will be, a total separation of Church and State. Despite much infidelity, indifference and scepticism among the masses of the population, we have not, as a State or a nation, apostatized from God. Despite much corruption, bribery and dishonesty in high places, there exists a correct public conscience, a strong sense of right, which asserts itself whenever important issues are at stake. In striking contrast with the rulers of some other lands, whose aim is to banish God from the minds and hearts of the people, our chief executive considers it his duty to dwell, in his annual message, upon the blessings bestowed upon the country by the Giver of all good gifts, and to exhort the nation to show its gratitude by public acts of thanksgiving and prayer. And, what is still more refreshing, even in our political campaigns and at the hustings, aspirants to the highest honors which the sovereign people can confer, do not consider it out of place to make a reverential appeal to the religious

<sup>1</sup> "Optimam societatis publicæ rationem civilemque progressum omnino requirere ut humana societas constituatur et gubernetur, nullo habito ad religionem respectu, ac si ea non existeret."

feeling of their fellow-citizens for whose votes they are bidding. Our legislative assemblies are opened with some form of prayer, and the Lord's day is kept holy, at least externally, by a general cessation from labor.

But how deeply rooted in our whole national system is the sense of religious responsibility, nowhere appears more clearly than in our courts of justice. While in many other lands which boast of their free, constitutional government the judiciary are mere tools of the revolutionary faction that calls itself "the Government," and are hampered by a thousand arbitrary, and often unjust, enactments passed by the servile chambers; our highest tribunals go behind the letter of special legislation, and, disregarding the technicalities of the statute-book, decide the most momentous cases solely on principles of equity. Beyond and above the written law we recognize the unwritten law, which is in reality nothing but the natural law imprinted upon the human conscience, as understood and applied by Catholic antiquity. It is a part of our Catholic heritage, handed down to us through English common law, from times when there was the most intimate relation between Church and State and when the canon law of the Church interpreted the civil law of the States. The principles and traditions of those olden days have entered into our national life and habits of thought. They guide and influence the body politic, as well as the people at large. They pervade our national Constitution itself, and distinguish it from those godless paper instruments popularly called Constitutions, though they are nothing but one-sided contracts drawn up for the set purpose of delivering the Church, as well as the nation with all its rights and liberties, into the hands of Free Masons and Jews.

So true is all this that some Catholic writers, and among them the learned and patriotic Dr. Orestes Brownson, have not hesitated to affirm that our social fabric is founded upon distinctively Catholic principles, really at variance with the prevailing spirit of Protestantism. However that may be, Americans as a class admit, without contention, that the general principles of Christianity are deeply imbedded in our national and political life. And if occasionally there arise men who sound a note of discord, they put our people into a state of nervous irritation. Some of the readers of this REVIEW will no doubt remember an anti-Catholic oath-bound society which started a few years ago in a Western city, and was known as the "American Union" or "American Alliance." If not identical with the A. P. A. it was certainly the precursor. One of its many unfounded assertions was that the "Fathers of the American Republic" had dug a ditch, broad and deep, between Church and State, and had provided very effectually that no one

should ever fill up that ditch. Thence the spokesmen of the society drew the most unpatriotic as well as irreligious conclusions, hostile alike to State and Church; and some of them announced those conclusions in language far more offensive than even the *Apapists* have ventured to use. Taken to task by both Catholics and Protestants, they soon subsided, and slunk back into the darkness from which they had sprung.

What concerns us at present is the argument made against them. "The Fathers of the American Republic," it was answered, never thought of digging a ditch, broad and deep, between Church and State; that treasonable work the members of the A. U. are attempting to do. The framers of our Constitution, we are free to admit, were not all professing Christians, but the majority felt, with Washington, that religion and morality are the firmest supports of the State. None of them favored the infidel policy afterwards adopted by the French revolution or wished to divorce the State from the Church. They did not, indeed, show a special preference for any one of the various Christian denominations existing in the country at the birth of the Commonwealth. They could not have done so consistently. Before the State the Episcopalian and the Catholic, the Puritan and the Quaker were all to be equal, because they had all helped to build it up, and the fundamental principles of the Christian religion, common to them all, were to guide the public conscience in the discharge of official duties. For this reason some Protestant authorities have maintained that Christianity, in general, embracing all believers in Christ as the Redeemer of mankind, is the established religion of the land. Certainly this is a somewhat loose conception of an established church. Yet it expresses very well the actual relation between Church and State in this country.

## II.

What Americans object to is not that *partial* union of Church and State which results from the adoption by the State of Christian principles of government, but that *complete* union which implies the establishment of a "State Church." The bare mention of a State Church makes their blood run cold, and conjures up scenes of horror and oppression. And certainly if it were the monster depicted to our youthful imagination, it would merit the execration of all lovers of humanity. But it so happens that the picture is altogether different from the reality. Poetic truth is not always historic truth, and even poetic truth is often shockingly disregarded by those who are wont to be quoted as authorities in this matter.

Most of the information possessed by the multitude is derived

from writers whose first qualification for authorship is a self-complacent ignorance of the subject to be treated. Even a moderate acquaintance with the question now under consideration would make their task exceedingly prosy and prove fatal to success. But so long as they are at liberty to explore the fields of fiction, and to give full play to a morbid imagination, they are prolific and dash off an unlimited amount of ribaldry and abuse—"sound and fury signifying nothing," but far more telling than argument with the classes to which they address themselves. Unlike the reverential judges of the Athenian *Areopagus*, whom St. Paul praises for adoring the God whom they knew not, these men blaspheme what they know not—"quod ignorant blasphemant."

The result is that popular misconceptions concerning complete union of Church and State are almost innumerable. Nevertheless, from the very nature of the case they may be reduced to two heads. There are some—and they are mostly Protestants—who take complete union of Church and State to mean "the usurpation or absorption by the Church of the functions of the civil power." These good folk are perpetually haunted by the spectre of "papal aggression." Gifted with second sight, like a certain historic personage who distinguished "Jesuits" in disguise on the floor of the Senate chamber, they behold the emissaries of the Pope swarming into the National Capital and invading all the departments of State. They perceive the "Court of Rome" extending its "Briarean hands" in every direction, dictating the political action of parties and "plotting against the nation's autonomy." Already they hear the death-knell of our liberties. They quite expect that before long the Pope will "issue new bulls of excommunication against all honest Protestants and absolve Romanists from their oath of allegiance." They see tribunals of the Inquisition erected, and hurdles, racks and dungeons starting up on all sides. They dream of "Spanish Armadas" and "Sicilian Vespers" and "St. Bartholomew's Days." They are sure that the "Papists" are actually arming and drilling numerous companies of young soldiers for a war of extermination against all who will not acknowledge the Pope's right to "universal temporal dominion." In mortal fear lest the days of antichrist be close at hand, they call upon all evangelical Christians to combine in defence of the American principle of "a free Church in a free State."

There are others—chiefly Catholics—who, by way of direct antithesis, can see nothing in complete union of Church and State, except "the usurpation or absorption by the State of the functions of the ecclesiastical power." They take for granted that one condition of complete union is the carrying on of diplomatic intercourse with the Vatican, and this they consider fraught with the

gravest danger to the Church. They deplore that wily politicians and ministers of State invariably take advantage of it to outwit the simple-minded Church authorities. They are sure that the Church will be compelled to concede many dangerous privileges and prerogatives, and that the State will arrogate to itself many more. They foresee that the civil power will gradually encroach upon the spiritual domain until the clergy become mere servants and pensioners of the State, dependent upon the bounty of the public exchequer for their daily bread, and, as a consequence, little in touch with the people, whose eternal welfare will be sacrificed for the sake of a "fat living." They recall the frequent and bitter conflicts on the subject of *investiture* and the royal *placet* and *exequatur*, and they observe that similar conflicts are still going on wherever there exists even the shadow of a State Church. They direct attention to the fact that, on the strength of ancient grants, governments which have utterly broken with Christian traditions continue to exercise the right of "presentation" and "patronage" to the great detriment of souls, even beyond the limits of their political jurisdiction. They argue that in the event of complete union of Church and State one of two things will inevitably happen: either the Church will meekly acquiesce, and the consequence will be that the highest ecclesiastical offices will be filled by creatures of the State, or the Church will resist the pretensions of the State, in which case episcopal sees will often be vacant, and remain so until a candidate is agreed upon who will be sufficiently pliant in the hands of the State. They remark that under such circumstances the best that can be expected from the clergy who aspire to ecclesiastical preferment is that they will pursue a policy of neutrality and subserviency; that so long as they are only in the inferior ranks they will take great care not to declare themselves; that when they have reached the goal of their ambition they will be courtiers and politicians, living in the antechambers of princes and the salons of statesmen much more than in the midst of their flocks. And, while worldly-minded ecclesiastics will enjoy the favor of the great, the worthiest priests, the most active religious, the most zealous prelates will be hampered in their work, opposed, persecuted, exiled. But it is especially at the election of a new Pope that the influence of the secular power is to be dreaded. Even at present, though many of the larger States are wholly indifferent to Church affairs, the interference of some European courts with the papal conclaves is a source of great embarrassment and anxiety. What then might be expected, if complete union of Church and State were universal in the Christian world and all Christian governments tried to make good their respective claims? Among those who would glory most in the



titles of "Oldest Son of the Church," "Protector of the Faith" and "Catholic Majesty" there would be many Frederick Barbarossas and Napoleon Bonapartes, who would contrive "to run the machinery of ecclesiastical government" to suit their own ambitious projects. In this manner, as history shows, the way is paved to corruption, dissension and schism. Save us from the meddling of the secular power; save us from a "State Church."

The Protestant objection is, as we hope to show, purely chimerical. The Catholic objection points to a real evil and a serious danger, but it does not sufficiently distinguish between what is essential and what is accidental, nor between legitimate privileges sometimes wisely granted by the Church and the abuse made of them by the State. The answer to both objections is found in a characteristic saying of the Middle Ages: "Extra chorum cantas, frater"—you are chanting false, brother; you are out of tune; you are singing to another air. Or, to give the force of the words in the modern language of the legal fraternity: "Your objection is not well taken, sir," you are combating a fictitious enemy.

The only essential requisite for complete union of Church and State is that the State be guided in its official acts by the tenets of a certain definite church or creed, and that, in return, it extend to such church or creed a protection and patronage not enjoyed by dissenting sects. This plainly supposes a church, organization or ecclesiastical society of some kind, bound together by organic laws—be its government democratic, oligarchical or monarchical—be its authority vested in councils or conferences, as among the Methodists; in synods or general assemblies, as among the Presbyterians; in single churches or congregations as among the Congregationalists; in convocations, as among some other sects, or, finally, in a hierarchy, as in the Catholic Church. In other words, it supposes an aggregation or body of believers, agreeing or feigning to agree in some faith, or, as Protestants commonly express themselves, agreeing upon a "confession."

If religion is considered as something purely subjective to the individual conscience, without any common articles of belief accepted by all the church members, and, still more, if it is considered as a mere sentiment of the will instead of a conviction of the understanding, a church organization is logically out of the question; because every society must have some basis whereon to rest, or, in the cant phrase of our politicians, some "platform" whereon to stand. Hence, from a default of one of the terms, a complete union of Church and State is intrinsically impossible. It is manifest, therefore, that wherever the principle of private interpretation is strictly adhered to, a State church cannot be established without self-contradiction. For in this case men cannot be

united into a religious society, whose decisions they will all feel bound to respect, either as church members or as citizens; on thoroughly Protestant principles an established church is conceivable only as a sub-department of the State. And here is the true reason why in this country our natural sense of justice instinctively revolts at the thought of a complete union of Church and State. "Americans," to quote Doctor Brownson, "understand this union in a Protestant sense, as it exists in England, Scotland, Denmark, Sweden and, indeed, in all Protestant and schismatical States . . . in which it is not so much a union of Church and State as a subjection of the Church to the State. In these Protestant lands the Church is a State establishment, and its ministers are a branch of the national police. The State determines its faith, its discipline and worship. It holds from the civil power which governs it and whose bidding it is bound to do."

The Protestant notion of a State church is derived from the well-known maxim of the early reformers: "Cujus est regio, ejus est et religio," which means, "He that owns the country owns the church, and he that makes your laws for you, has a right to make your religion for you." Anything more despotic, or more inconsistent with the much-vaunted principles of private interpretation and freedom of conscience, it is hard to conceive. But, then, Protestantism is essentially a mass of contradictions, which have been hitherto kept together in some countries by the aid of the civil power. Notably has this been the case in England. Now, however, the English people are growing weary of State interference in ecclesiastical matters, and, hence, though they are religiously inclined and retain more of Christianity in their constitution than any other people of Europe, they discuss very freely the disestablishment of the National Church. As Catholics we are far from blaming them, yet we are not overjoyed at the prospect, because, if we are to take the experience of other lands as a criterion, we have every reason to fear that disestablishment will eventually lead to political atheism, the canker-worm which has been gnawing at European society until it has left little more than the outward shell and semblance of Christianity.

According to Catholic teaching, the State has no right, of itself, to impose any faith upon its subjects, or to tamper with ecclesiastical discipline; on the contrary, it must guarantee freedom of worship and of church organization, and must govern in accordance with the divine law, as it is understood by the community under its legitimate spiritual superiors, united to the Pope of Rome. When the civil authorities comply faithfully with these conditions, there is perfect union of Church and State in the Catholic sense.

It is scarcely necessary to observe that such a union nowhere

exists at the present day. The nearest approach to it, in recent times, was witnessed in the little republic of Ecuador, under the martyred hero, Garcia Moreno, whose political acts may not all have been sufficiently seasoned with the salt of Christian prudence, but whose motives were unquestionably upright and worthy of that other martyred hero, St. Canute of Denmark, who also fell by the hands of a faction, a victim to duty and love of fatherland. The so called Catholic countries—France, Italy, Austria, Spain—are very far removed from the Catholic ideals. True, if mere numbers are to be taken into account, they are undoubtedly Catholic, because the faithful are greatly in excess of the infidel element which lords it over them and denies them the plainest justice. But, as usual, “the children of this world have been wiser in their generation than the children of light.” While the enemies of the Church were most active, the faithful were listless, and confided their interests to the liberal party, which, like the treacherous wife of Samson, caressed and conjoled them until they had fallen asleep, then shorn them of their strength, mocked them in their disgrace and delivered them, bound hand and foot, into the power of the secret societies. The consequence is that France, Italy, Austria, Spain, with an overwhelming Catholic majority, are now politically atheistic, and do not concede to the Church as much liberty as is guaranteed to her by some heretical countries.

Nor were the relations between Church and State always satisfactory in Catholic times. Instead of protectors of the Church, some Catholic monarchs were among its bitterest persecutors. Indeed, Dr. Brownson does not hesitate to affirm: “The Church is more efficiently protected by the Constitution of the American Republic than she has ever been in France since Philip the Fair; in Germany since the extinction of the Carolingian emperors; in England since the Norman Conquest, or in Spain since the death of Isabella the Catholic; although she is not once recognized by name in the Constitution and the fathers of the republic very likely had no intention of recognizing her at all, for they regarded her as dead, and no longer a danger to their Protestantism or infidelity. There is here a real union of Church and State in our sense of the term, and though not perfect, yet almost as perfect as has ever existed.”

Hence the stern and unflinching Gregory XVI., as well as his milder successor, Pius IX., used to say, if we may believe common report, that there was no quarter of the globe in which he was so much Pope, no portion of his vast spiritual domain in which he was so free in the exercise of his supreme authority, as in the youthful republic of North America. If there is any cause for complaint it is not against the American Constitution, but

against its misapplication and abuse, or rather against the flagrant and unconscionable violation thereof by men with whom liberty means the freedom of wrong-doing and the enslavement of right, and who always have two sets of weights and measures—one for themselves and another for the victims of their persecution. With the Constitution, Catholics are perfectly satisfied. Still, we do not mean to assert that the relations between Church and State in this country are absolutely perfect, nor to extend to the spiritual order the proud boast that “time’s latest empire is her best.” We can conceive a union of the temporal with the eternal so complete that they shall lend a helping hand to each other and in a manner supplement each other.

It is precisely in this sense that the reigning Pontiff, Leo XIII., expresses himself in his encyclical “*Longinqua Oceani*,” quoted at the beginning of the present article. Referring to the good understanding that exists between the United States and the Catholic Church, he remarks: “Moreover—and it gives us pleasure to acknowledge the fact—thanks are due to the equity of the laws which obtain in America, and the customs of your well-ordered Republic. For the Church among you, unopposed by the Constitution and government of your nation, fettered by no hostile legislation, protected against violence by the common laws and the impartiality of the tribunals, is free to live and act without hindrance.” Then he adds: “Yet, though all this is true, it is an error that must be uprooted, to suppose that thence it follows that the model of the most desirable condition of the Church is to be looked for in America, or that it is universally lawful or expedient for civil and ecclesiastical matters to be kept disconnected and apart in the same manner as in America. The fact that Catholicity with you is in a good condition, nay, is even enjoying a prosperous growth, is to be wholly attributed to the fecundity with which God has endowed His Church, in virtue of which, unless men or circumstances interfere, she spontaneously expands and propagates herself, but she would bring forth more abundant fruits if, in addition to liberty, she enjoyed the favor of the laws and the patronage of the public authority.”

Surely this language is both clear and reasonable. It requires no explanation; no sensible man, however little he reflects, can fail to understand it. It requires no justification; no well-meaning man, whatever his religious views, can take it amiss. We are not a little surprised, therefore, to learn that any one should have thought of “explaining it away or slurring it over.” There can be no worthy motive for such conduct. Truth loves to appear in its own colors; it does not apologize for existing; it has an indefeasible, God-given right to exist. Error, on the contrary, seeks

disguises ; it has no rights ; it can, at best, be only tolerated. To suppress one jot or one tittle of Catholic truth, or to compromise in the least with error, is dishonorable, if not even criminal. The "disciplina arcani," observed by the early Christians, was a wise provision for times of persecution ; but it was meant to screen the sacred mysteries from profanation, and not to withhold the truth from the world. In our days there is no longer the same excuse for reticence. On the contrary, it is the greatest folly to attempt to conceal the teachings of the Catholic Church from the world, because any one who wishes will find them fully presented by our standard writers. It is a dangerous policy to mince and minimize those teachings. It acts as a boomerang, which returns with redoubled force upon those who use it. Such a policy was resorted to by some in England when Catholic emancipation was first mooted. They retarded the whole movement, because they asked for emancipation with a restriction, to the exclusion of those whom they considered too "Roman." Such a policy, again, was resorted to by some when there was question of the re-establishment of the English hierarchy. They furnished Mr. Gladstone years after with arguments against "Vaticanism," because they professed to be Catholics indeed, but not "Ultramontanes." Fortunately, every one who claims to be a Catholic must now be "Roman and Ultramontane." Gallicanism, with all its concomitant errors, was forever buried by the Vatican Council. It is time to have done with trimming and truckling to real or supposed prejudices, especially in the United States. Americans love frankness and candor. They want to be told the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. Nothing irritates them more than to find that they have been "taken in." They may not always agree with you, but they will admire you if you speak to them plainly. This the Pope does in his encyclical. He teaches nothing new. He merely repeats what has always been taught in the Catholic schools, viz., that the Church is then most happily circumstanced when it is not only fairly treated but actively favored by the State ; in other words, when the Catholic ideal of union of Church and State is fully realized. Even a partial separation of the two is more or less at variance with man's destiny upon earth and with the designs of the divine founder of Christianity. It is not the normal condition of Christian society. Hence it is "an error that must be uprooted," to hold that in America is to be sought the *model* of the most desirable condition of the Church.

### III.

Yet perfect union of Church and State, though desirable in the abstract, is not always practicable or even consistent with justice and

equity.<sup>1</sup> The Church was indeed commissioned to spread the light of faith everywhere. Her ministers were told to go into the whole world and announce the Gospel to every creature. She received an undivided spiritual empire, according to the prediction of David, "I will give to thee the gentiles for thy inheritance and the utmost parts of the earth for thy possession." Jew and gentile are therefore morally bound to enter her communion and render allegiance to her. But, however clear her title to universal sovereignty over the consciences of men, so long as nations have not enrolled themselves under her standard, they are not her subjects, and consequently union of the Church with the State is simply preposterous. Fancy her dictating to the Roman Cæsars—to a Nero, a Caligula or a Diocletian—and launching against them the thunders of her anathemas! Or fancy those tyrants protecting, favoring and fostering her!

There was, it is true, even in pagan Rome a sort of State religion, but it was an idolatrous religion. It was because the Cæsars believed the prosperity of imperial Rome to depend upon preserving the old superstitions, upon burning incense before blocks of wood and stone, upon listening in breathless silence to the ambiguous oracles of Apollo and his augurs and upon piling the spoils captured in battle on the altar of victory, that they waged against the new religion a relentless war, protracted through three centuries of blood. All the while the State was abusing its authority in the most flagrant manner. Nevertheless the Christians recognized its existence, and, however strong their convictions, however undeniable their right to worship the crucified Nazarene as their God, they bowed in all that was lawful to the powers that were. They believed, they preached, they practised the religion of the Gospel; they confessed the name of Jesus before governors and peoples, before patricians and plebeians; they bled and died, and from their very ashes there sprang up a nation of believers.

And yet the old paganism maintained its hegemony in State affairs. The worship of the mythological divinities was identified with the most intimate relations of private and public life. Jupiter swayed the destinies of gods and men; Vesta guarded the sanctity of the household; Ceres presided over the harvest and the vintage; Bacchus led the banquet and the feast; Mercury protected and promoted commerce; Minerva encouraged literature and philosophy; Thetis decided suits in the halls of justice; Nemesis punished the guilty. In brief, idolatry was the State religion and, by its lying omens, often terrified the emperors into acts of

---

<sup>1</sup> *Cfr.* Manning's Reply to Gladstone's "Vaticanism."

persecution which their better nature abhorred. It was not until Constantine had knelt before the mysterious sign in the heavens—not until the vast majority of the people had embraced the teachings of the gospel—not until the laws of Christian morality had begun to govern the conduct of the community at large—not until pagan principles and pagan maxims had died a natural death—not until the temples of the false gods had been deserted, for want of worshippers, and the altars had ceased to blaze with the fire of sacrifice, for want of idolatrous priests, that Christianity came forward, and without violence, without aggression, without intrigue, but by a natural sequence of events and the power of divine truth, took its place as the State religion, and the Christian Church became the State Church.

Turn we now from the civilized Romans to the savage hordes of the North—to the Britons, the Saxons, the Angles, the Franks and the Danes—and we shall see that everywhere the subjugation to Christian faith and Christian rule was brought about in a similar manner. The blood of martyrs flowed and fertilized the Gospel seeds, and a new generation started into being. The existing national customs were not destroyed, but purified; and by an insensible, providential agency, pagan barbarism was transformed into Christian civilization. The secular power was not interfered with or supplanted, but assisted and supported. Instead of being guided by the natural law alone, the State was guided by the whole law of God, both natural and positive, as expounded by the Church of Christ. “Until a Christian world existed,” observes Cardinal Manning, “there was no *apta materia*. It was only when a Christian world came into existence that the civil society of men became subject to the spiritual direction of the Church. So long as individuals only subjected themselves, one by one, to its authority, the conditions for the exercise of its office [as a State Church] were not fully present. . . . It is only when nations and kingdoms become socially subject to the supreme doctrinal and judicial authority of the Church that the conditions of its exercise are verified. . . . When the whole had become Christian the whole became subject to the divine law of which the Roman Pontiff was the supreme expositor and executive.”

Upon this subject our canonists are unanimous in teaching, with Cardinal Tarquini, that “over infidels, that is, such as have never been admitted by Baptism into the communion of the Church, she exercises no directive power.” They base their conclusion upon Chapter V., verse 12, of the first Epistle to the Corinthians, where the Apostle writes: “What have I to do, to judge them that are without?” Whence they infer: 1st. That a pagan civil society is wholly extraneous to the Church of Christ. 2dly. That a pagan

society, as far as its religion is concerned, is unlawful, because there is but one lawful religious society, and that is the Church of Christ, to which pagan society is extraneous. 3dly. That, therefore, between such a society and the Church of Christ there is a perpetual warfare, waged on the part of the Church by the spiritual weapons of the word—"non gladio sed lingua."

Heathenism is no more; yet, in many respects, the complexion of modern society is as pagan as when St. Peter first bent his steps along the "Via Sacra," to plant the emblem of salvation on the highest pinnacle of the seven-hilled city, or when St. Augustine landed on the shores of Albion, to announce to Ethelbert the glad tidings of the Gospel. Many nations have apostatized from the faith and from Christ. In the words of the Psalmist: "The gentiles have raged and the people devised vain things. The kings of the earth stood up and the princes met together, against the Lord and against his Christ." Countless thousands, even in our large cities, within the very shadow of a Christian temple, are unregenerated pagans, in nowise under the jurisdiction of Mother Church; others, though they have received a doubtful Baptism, have never known or acknowledged her authority. The State has revolted, as a whole and in its public life, from the unity of the Christian dispensation. In this respect, writes Cardinal Manning, it differs *toto cælo* from mediæval society. The ancient world was without the unity of the Church *de facto et de jure*; the modern world is without it at least *de facto*; and this has changed the moral conditions of the subject. The Church never, indeed, loses its jurisdiction *in radice*; but, unless the moral condition of the subject justify its exercise, it never puts its forth.<sup>1</sup>

These few reflections will suffice to convince all fair-minded American Protestants, that their fears of "papal aggression" are wholly unfounded. Upon closer inspection and analysis of the subject, the spectre which haunts them will prove to be nothing but an innocent optical illusion. It is conjured up by inherited prejudice, and will be readily dispelled by a little closer acquaintance with Catholic principles and claims. Briefly, all their objections are met by simply assuring them that, on the part of Catholics, they have nothing to dread from complete union of Church and State; because, in this country, the essential conditions for complete union of Church and State, in the Catholic sense, are wanting, and therefore such a union is absolutely impossible.

But the case is altogether different in a civil society of Christians united in the profession of the same faith. Such a society is distinguished from others in that it consists of the same members

---

<sup>1</sup> Reply to Mr. Gladstone's *Vaticanism*.



as the Church. The same individuals, therefore, are bound by a twofold obligation—an obligation towards the State, whose immediate and direct aim is to promote the temporal felicity of its subjects, and an obligation towards the Church, whose mission is to insure the eternal bliss of mankind. Their study upon earth must be, according to the prayer of the Church, “so to pass through temporal goods as not to lose those that are eternal.”

The Catholic State, therefore, in respect of the Church, is like a circle intersecting another circle, having some points in common, while others lie without its periphery. Some of its political and social relations may be dictated by purely temporal considerations. But many others will have a religious bearing. The peculiar views of political parties about national finances and national banks, about free-trade and protective tariff, about a gold and silver standard, about standing armies and military posts, may be matters of indifference from a religious point of view, but the education of youth, the laws regarding divorce, the licensing of places destined for public amusement, the management of asylums and reformatories, and a hundred other things of a like nature, are all of vital importance to the Christian believer; and upon these his conscience and his Church claim a hearing. Now upon all, or nearly all of these, men like the Rev. Mr. Talmage and the Rev. Mr. Snyder hold opinions widely different from those held by the authorities of the Catholic or the Anglican Church. One denounces as immoral and degrading what another recommends as moral and refining. Yet the State, which is the guardian of public morality, must of necessity take some stand in regard to these matters; and, therefore, whether it will or not, it must conform its conduct to the ethics of the one or of the other. “There can be no political or social problem,” said Proudhon years ago, “that has not behind it a religious dogma.”

Nothing, therefore, is more inaccurate or misleading than the bold and broad assertion, which seems to have become an axiom with certain schools of thought, that the Church has nothing to do with politics, because they lie wholly outside of her sphere. Were politics only the petty wranglings and squabblings of parties quarreling over the spoils of office, the assertion might be allowed to pass unchallenged. But politics, in the nobler and truer sense of the word, deal with the proper administration of public affairs, and the conduct of moral agents, with all their duties and responsibilities, with all their rights and privileges. And in this sense the assertion, that the Church has nothing to do with politics, because they lie wholly out of her sphere, is certainly incorrect. For the Church embraces as her sphere the whole range of conscience and moral obligation; and politics are simply the expression

of the public conscience or of "the conscience of the State," as Mr. Gladstone very appropriately calls it. So long as the general politics of a country are conformed to the moral law, the government will be administered in the true interests of the people. When they have become corrupt, the nation will soon fall a victim to the rapacity of unscrupulous factions. Politics represent the collective morals of society. The ethics which regulate the actions of the individual, the ecclesiastical laws which bind the private Christian in his personal relations with other men, become politics in the government of states. The civil ruler or sovereign is bound by those laws in his official capacity no less than in his private life; and within the limits of these laws, the subject owes his ruler fealty and civil allegiance. Both the one and the other admit the same objective standard or rule of morality. They freely embraced Christianity; but, having once embraced it, they are bound by its laws.<sup>1</sup>

#### IV.

Perfect union of Church and State is, therefore, a necessary consequence of such a condition of civil society as we have just been supposing. It is no longer optional either with the ruler or with the subject, but a stringent obligation resulting from their common religious convictions.

For, the civil society of Catholics, argues Cardinal Tarquini may be viewed under a twofold aspect, viz. : *materially*, in as far as it is a collection of individual believers, and *formally*, in as far as it pursues the specific end of a civil society. And from neither point of view can it be indifferent to the interests of the Church, or deaf to her voice.

Viewed materially, that is simply as a collection of individual believers, attentive to their Christian duties, the social body is bound to have at heart the welfare of the Church, which is the same as the spiritual welfare of all its members; and to listen to her warnings, which are identical with the warnings of their consciences. To be wanting in this respect is a virtual denial of the faith and treason against God, whose will all the citizens recognize in the authoritative utterances of the Church. Men enter her vast spiritual communion, with all their relations towards their fellowmen, the king with his sceptre, the soldier with his arms, the lawyer with his brief, the diplomatist with his mission to foreign parts, the writer with his pen, the scientist with his theories; and in all their relations with others, public no less than private, they are bound by the laws of the Gospel, as interpreted for them by the infallible teacher to whose authority they submit. For the

---

<sup>1</sup> Cfr. Card. Manning, *Four Great Evils*, p. 76.

supreme spiritual jurisdiction of the Church extends over the entire field of faith and morals ; and the end which she proposes to herself is final and absolute, subordinating and influencing all other ends. In a thoroughly Catholic commonwealth, therefore, complete union of Church and State is the natural condition of society ; a severance of that union is a crime, an act of infidelity, a breach of a sacred trust. To that union, as well as to Christian wedlock, we may apply the words of Christ, "What God hath joined, let not man put asunder."

We shall come to the same conclusion if we consider Catholic civil society formally, that is, in as far as it pursues its own specific end as a society. For such a society, as is manifest, must promote the temporal welfare of man, not absolutely but relatively, not independently, but dependently on the eternal destiny for which he was created.

"The end," writes the Angelic Doctor, "which the civil ruler must propose to himself and others is eternal bliss, which consists in the possession of God." And again : "Whosoever is required to do a work directed to something else as to its end, must take heed that his work be adapted to that end. The smith makes a sword, so that it may be serviceable in battle ; the builder constructs a house, so that it may be suited for a dwelling. Since, therefore, the end of this present life is heavenly bliss, it is a part of the ruler's duty so to order the present life of the multitude that it may be a preparation for heavenly bliss ; to enjoin what will aid men to reach their eternal destiny, and, as far as in him lies, to forbid what will prove an obstacle." Now, this eternal destiny the Catholic believes it impossible for him to reach, except in the bosom of the Catholic Church and by obedience to her precepts. For him conscience, religion, and Church are convertible terms ; conscience is only the monitor reminding him of his obligations, religion is the collection of those obligations and of the dogmas underlying them, the Church is the accredited depository, the custodian and the interpreter of those dogmas and obligations. Whether this belief is well-founded or not, whether the human intellect is capable of attaining to absolute certainty concerning religious truth, or is doomed to be forever the victim of doubt, all these are questions belonging to the domain of dogmatic theology, and foreign to our present purpose. Suffice it to remark in passing, that religious truth, once found, obligates the State, no less than the isolated individual ; the judge on the bench and the popular delegate in the council chambers of the nation, no less than the priest in the pulpit, or the sexton in the vestry. "Thou hast confessed the sins of Charles," said Soto to a powerful monarch, "confess now the sins of the emperor."

A Christian sovereign has one set of duties as a private Christian, and another set, not less stringent, as a Christian ruler. "As a private Christian," writes St. Augustine, "he is bound to conform his private life to his faith; as a Christian ruler he is bound to make and enforce such laws as are conformable to his faith. Thus did Ezechias, when he destroyed the groves and shrines dedicated to the worship of idols; thus did the king of Ninive, when he induced all the citizens to appease the wrath of the Almighty in sackcloth and ashes; thus did Nabuchodonosor when he forbade his subjects to blaspheme the God of Israel. . . . When the kings of the earth did not yet serve the true God, but devised vain things against the Lord and against his Christ, impiety could not be prohibited by law; because the laws of the land rather increased it. But now that the prophecy has been fulfilled which says, 'All the kings of the earth shall adore Him, all the nations shall serve Him, who will dare tell the sovereign: 'Take no heed whether your subjects defend or attack the Church of your God; it is not your duty to see if the citizens be religious or irreligious, believers or unbelievers?' As well might you say to the ruler: 'It is not your duty to see if the citizens be moral or immoral.' Or tell me, is it less criminal in the Christian soul to be unfaithful to her God, than in the wife to be unfaithful to her spouse?'"

When God laid the first foundations of human society, He said: "It is not good for man to be alone; let us make him a help like unto himself." Behold here the aim of all society—to give man a help like unto himself, a help conformable to his nature and his needs. Now, is a help conformable to his nature and his needs, if it does not assist him in the prosecution of his last end? And what is his last end, but eternal salvation? Catholic civil society, therefore, cannot prescind from the eternal salvation of its members, whose attainment is the direct object of the Church. In other words, the Catholic State cannot logically disconnect itself from the Church to pursue its own private ends. Even a partial disunion or separation introduces a fatal dualism, which reason as well as revelation must condemn. For, as St. Augustine argues, the happiness of the State rests on the same foundation as the happiness of the individual citizen—"non aliunde beata civitas, aliunde homo." To understand the real malice of this partial separation of Church and State in a Catholic community, or, what amounts to the same thing, of political indifferentism in religious matters, it is sufficient to remember that it cuts off civil society from the benefits of the redemption, which come to us through the true Church as through their channel.<sup>1</sup>

Referring to the advocates of this partial separation, Pius IX.

---

<sup>1</sup> Conf. Card. Hergenroether, *Church and State, passim*.

scarcely anything so conducive to social happiness as a free and unconstrained expression of our inmost feelings, or anything that so mars it as a forced reticence and reserve concerning those things that are uppermost in our minds and that constitute our purest and holiest pleasures. Nor, indeed, is it possible to be so guarded as never to wound the religious susceptibilities of others. He that knows himself to be in the possession of religious truth will seek to communicate it to others, or, at least, he will consider himself called upon to defend it against real or fancied aggressions, and will justly prefer his duty towards his God and his conscience to courtesy towards his fellow-men.

In a community divided upon religious matters it is impossible to avoid bickerings, animosities and strife without falling into what is infinitely worse—absolute religious indifferentism. Need we allude here to the religious wars which have at different times devastated many fair provinces of Europe, or to the scenes which have disgraced even our own brief national existence? Only a few years ago a minister of the Gospel felt inspired to inaugurate a religious war, and to lay before Congress a formal petition to remodel the Constitution with the view of depriving Catholics of the privileges and immunities of American citizenship, and there have existed at various times, and now exist, organizations whose avowed purpose is to disfranchise all that acknowledge the spiritual sovereignty of the Pope. Let us assume, for the sake of argument, that all these persons are *in bona fide*, that they are animated by the purest motives and think that they are doing a service to God; or, if you will, let us suppose that they are enthusiasts, zealots, bigots, religious maniacs; this will only strengthen our position. As a matter of fact, all religious movements not conducted by the true Church of God, usually begin in fanaticism and end in apathy or systematic contempt of all forms of religion. Such, as both history and our own experience testify, has been the logical outcome of the Protestant Reformation. Surrounded by a thousand jarring, wrangling sects, each claiming to be the mouthpiece of heaven, the peace-loving citizen too often ends by being thoroughly disgusted with them all, and, first in public and then in private, gives up the practice of religion and perhaps even the belief in Christianity. Many go further still: disinclined, or unfitted by nature and education, to make a special study of the questions that agitate the religious world, they satisfy themselves that any effort to find the truth must prove abortive, and conclude that not only Christianity but all religion is a huge swindle and imposture.

The State is even more embarrassed than the private individual. It is bound, on the one hand, to safeguard public morality, and yet, on the other hand, it cannot presume to sit in judgment on

questions of Christian morality any more than on questions of Christian dogma. Both belong to the spiritual order, and therefore fall directly under the supervision of the Church. In brief, as Garcia Moreno used to say, the Christian State must be the right arm of the Church. But how can it be the right arm of the Church if the Church is represented only by an ever-increasing number of warring sects? How can it be the guardian of public morality, if the highest ecclesiastical courts return contradictory judgments as to what is moral or immoral? The civil authorities are puzzled where to draw the line, and, despite their best intentions, they run the risk of practically favoring immorality and irreligion. Thus it happens that, wherever the State does not recognize the authoritative decisions of the Catholic Church, the laws affecting public morals are becoming daily more and more relaxed. There may now and then be restraining causes which will temporarily stay the progress of the evil, but the State, as such, is utterly helpless. Separated from the Church, it has no objective standard or criterion of Christian morality, and, therefore, it cannot efficaciously enforce morality. The wider the breach between the secular and the spiritual, the more rapid will naturally be the decline of public morality and, therefore, of public peace and happiness. Hence it is that, in many lands, there goes up from every side the wail of the Latin poet :

Sævior armis  
Luxuria incubuit, victumque ulciscitur orbem."

Pius IX. was right, therefore, when, speaking of Catholic civil society, he condemned the following proposition: "In our age it is no longer expedient to maintain the Catholic religion as the only State religion, to the exclusion of all other forms of worship."

It is scarcely necessary to remark that the word "State religion," as here used by the Holy Father, points to a real union of Church and State in the Catholic sense, and not to a mere semblance of union, such as is still kept up in certain countries in which the State has rejected not only the authority of the Catholic Church, but Christianity itself. Yet, may not some advantages accrue to religion and to society from a purely external union between the ecclesiastical and the civil power, from diplomatic relations between their respective representatives, from concordats by means of which a *modus vivendi* is agreed upon, in brief, from the accidentals of union when the essentials are wanting? Many American Catholics, who judge other lands by our own, will answer emphatically: "No, there can be no advantage in such a sham union. It simply comes to this, that, for the sake of a miserable allowance, paid

by the State out of the ecclesiastical property which it has robbed, the Church is kept in perpetual bondage. The sooner she shakes off her shackles, the better it will be for her. The Holy See will then be free to promote the most worthy persons to ecclesiastical dignities; the clergy, dependent upon the faithful, instead of an infidel government, will labor zealously among them and for them; the laity, in their turn, will take an interest in Church affairs, because they have a share in them, and all will appreciate their religion the more, because it costs them something. Let Catholics abroad learn a lesson from us, and very soon religion will revive and flourish among them."

This reasoning is certainly very specious and, at first sight, appears convincing, but it proceeds on the assumption that the conditions elsewhere are the same as among us, and that what is possible here is also possible there. Now, nothing could be further from the truth. Here the faithful have long been accustomed to give generously to the Church; there, on the contrary, they have been supported by the Church. Here even the common people can easily lay by a little of their earnings; there the masses are starving for want of the necessaries of life. Here the Church is mostly composed of those whose ancestors for generations had to fight for their faith; there the Catholics have not yet learned to defend their rights. Here there is an inherited love of conservatism; there any wild theory, broached by some daring leader, carries away the crowd. Here there is a vigorous public opinion which, as a rule, makes for righteousness; there the fatherly interest of the Sovereign Pontiff seems at times to be almost the only safeguard of religion and Christian civilization.

Whether the diplomatic intervention of the Holy See will suffice for any length of time to restrain the forces of lawlessness and impiety within their present bounds, God only knows. The indications are that, in several countries, the usurpers of popular rights, who have foisted their rule upon the nation, are bent upon bringing about a complete rupture with the Church. Should they succeed in their attempt, there is no foretelling what persecutions may burst upon those unhappy lands. For human perversity has reached its climax. The Vicar of Christ knows this full well and does his utmost to protect his flock from the ravening wolves. If he is forbearing and goes to the very limits of concession and conciliation, it is not for the sake of earthly gain, but for the sake of immortal souls which are in jeopardy. The seeming union between the Catholic Church and the infidel State, kept up by the Holy See, is meant to prevent a real union of Church and State of the Protestant type—that is, a subjection of the Church to the State. For there is no disguising the fact that

the more union of Church and State in the Catholic sense diminishes, the more union in the Protestant sense increases. "A free Church in a free State" is a figment or an imposture of infidel politicians, intended to deceive the unwary Christian. The Church and State are not like two forces moving in parallel lines without ever crossing each other's paths. They rather resemble two planets revolving in their respective orbits, but often coming within the sphere of mutual attraction. They are constantly and necessarily acting and reacting on each other. The only question is whether the spiritual shall preponderate over the material or the material over the spiritual; whether the State shall be the willing auxiliary of the Church or the Church the unwilling slave of the State.

It is not the Pope only who advocates perfect union of Church and State. The bitterest enemies of the Church are quite as pronounced as he upon the subject, only they wish to bring it about in a different manner and for a different purpose. Not to mention the Tsar of Russia, in whose hands the schismatical State-Church is nothing but a powerful political engine, it is well known that Bismarck's day-dream was the establishment of a strong State-Church, of a great national Church, which should unify the various portions of the new empire under the "Kaiser" as pope and the Prince-Chancellor as high camerlengo. What particular set of doctrines was to be taught as of faith divine, whether that of the conservative Lutheran Church or that of the handful of apostates from the ranks of Rome, styled Old Catholics, was a secondary consideration. The main point was that everything should redound to the glory of fatherland. The cardinal principle of the national religion was to be statolatry—that is, adoration of the State, of the great and worshipful Prussian empire and of its tutelary genius, Prince Von Bismarck. "Allah is God and Mahomet is his prophet."

Whether a perfect union between Church and State, in the Catholic sense, will ever again be established, whether a full reconciliation of the secular with the spiritual will ever be effected, it is vain to inquire. "This much at least is quite certain," wrote a learned contributor to the *Dublin Review* years ago, "that they can never come to a sincere agreement unless one or the other of the parties suffer a change of principles and becomes what Scripture calls 'a new creation.' The governments must submit to a baptism, or the Church, by proving unfaithful to God, must relinquish her office of teaching the truth, and, as a necessary sequel, must perish altogether. For the religion of atheism has hitherto not assumed a tangible shape. Only a complete revolution in thought and feeling can give peace to the world. Such changes we see little reason to anticipate as yet; the dawns of



hope that we can trace in the sky are very faint ; nor would we altogether trust them. It is more consonant with the tone of present literature and with social habits and tendencies to hold that a long conflict is still to be fought, and that troubles are likely to thicken in the course of the next few years. But here at all events is a master-key to the problems that so confuse our public life, if we have the skill to apply it.”

R. J. M.

---

### HYPOTHETICS.

**I**F man never conceived ideas other than those forced upon him by experience, it would be difficult to understand the benefit of possessing an intellect at all. Susceptible merely of impressions from without, he would gradually accumulate a knowledge of the present and the past ; but every striving after future progress would be a plunge into the dark, and any real development resulting from the effort would be the product, not of calculation, but of chance.

All there is of advancement, of civilization, all that makes human history worthy of the race, is the outcome of that form of anticipation which we call hypothesis. Without a succession of hypotheses, science would be at a standstill, literature would lose half its treasures, and even the interest of the daily press would begin to fail. We should want a new name for a world consisting solely of facts, and for a race unable to think or act outside the confines of the actual.

Hypotheses are the dolls and Noah's Ark of grown-up mankind. No observant mind can fail to recognize this. Prophecy, even as a mere exercise of imagination, lifts us above the monotony of dull present facts. Let us only imagine how things may go on in the future, and the history of times to come becomes more possible than the history of the past. Hypothesis does not claim to be prophecy, but it possesses even a greater charm. Whole generations of boys, and men too, will be delighted with Jules Verne, because he excels in the production of a novel world by the skilful use of a hypothesis. It has become a favorite mode both of advocating and refuting socialism, to assume its universal acceptance, and picture the state of the world in a hundred years to