

more than faith would ask, and can be seen and felt? The beautiful Convent of the Holy Cross, where every accomplishment is taught under the auspices of Mary; the fine College, where the youth of the Territory, when they ask for intellectual bread, will not receive a stone; the spacious, well-appointed hospital, where consecrated virgins assuage the anguish of every sufferer, whether Greek or barbarian, bond or free; the children of two religious congregations teaching the young in Zion itself; the bishop and clergy revered by a people who, in earlier days, would have stoned them, as well as by their own loving flock,—surely a glorious response to prayer. Verily, the finger of God is here. This is the change of the right hand of the Most High.

---

#### THE ENCYCLICAL "SAPIENTIÆ CHRISTIANÆ."

**T**HIS latest encyclical of our Holy Father, Leo XIII., aims at bringing human life, in its private and its public relations, into conformity with the precepts of Christian wisdom. To the greater number of well-instructed Catholics it has doubtless seemed a plain, paternal exposition of very familiar truths. Yet few utterances of the great Pope have evoked so much hostile criticism from the Church's adversaries. Strange that there should be such a divergence of view concerning what may be called the commonplaces of Christian duty. It is an evidence that this lesson on Christian wisdom was not a work of supererogation; that there is sore need of looking to the fundamental principles of human conduct, if human life is to be kept from going astray and human society from drifting to disaster.

The encyclical may be summed up as follows:

The whole of man's life should be influenced by the consideration of his last end, which is God.

This is evidently true of man as an individual; it is, of necessity, equally true of man as a citizen, for between different sets of duties there cannot, logically, be an incompatibility. Civil society is not an end in itself; the interests which it guards and promotes are secondary to man's real destiny and should be directed thereunto.

A good citizen should be ready even to die for his country;

much more so for the Church, his spiritual country, the city of the living God, in which we are "fellow-citizens with the saints."

If temporal rulers assail the Church, they do wrong, and it is wrong to obey or abet them in their evil-doing. "We ought to obey God rather than man."

In our days, men absorbed in material pursuits neglect the spiritual, spurn the supernatural, scorn religion, and assail the Church. In this it would be shameful for Christians to co-operate, or even silently to acquiesce.

In face of these assaults, Christians should, in the first place, study thoroughly the doctrines of religion and their rational foundations, for nothing is so prejudicial to Christian wisdom as ignorance of it. Then, casting aside sloth and human respect, they should assert and defend the truth, by word and by example.

But, in order that individual zeal may not infringe upon the common order and the unity of the faith, all must be careful to speak and act wisely by speaking and acting in harmony with the Church, that is, with their bishops, and, above all, with the Sovereign Pontiff.

The Church, being the divinely appointed teacher of all nations, irrespective of their differences in race, customs and civil institutions, respects and honors all forms of government, asking only that religion and moral discipline be respected.

But no one must attempt to draw the Church into party strife, or to identify her interests with any fleeting form of political administration. When the rights of religion are assailed, Christians, whatever be their political differences, ought to unite for her protection.

The Church must desire that the spirit of the Gospel pervade all legislation as well as all life. Hence, if candidates for legislative or executive offices are known to be inimical thereto, the Church could not consistently countenance them, nor Christians vote for them. When men profess openly, as many now do, their hostility to religion and the Church, Christians would be sluggards or cowards who would not oppose them by every legitimate means.

Sin, error and dissension make a people miserable. Let Christians shun them and strive for virtue, truth and mutual charity and concord. And as the essential foundation of Christian society, let them carefully see to the Christian education of the young in Christian schools and in Christian homes.

Such is, in substance, this encyclical on Christian wisdom. Regarding man as an individual, it asserts spiritual duties and rights against materialism, and Christian truth against infidelity. Regarding man as a citizen, it asserts his right and duty to defend

by legitimate means the Christian religion and the Christian Church against all who unjustly assail them.

To minds destitute of religious belief and blind to spiritual realities, the whole argument of the Pope will, of course, be foolishness, his lessons and warnings an impertinence. With such men we have no controversy; we can only apply to them that word of our Lord: "Let them alone; they are blind." Catholics and all Christians have simply to see to it that the aggressiveness usually characteristic of infidelity be not permitted to trample on the rights of faith and conscience.

Very differently do we estimate the criticisms of Christian believers, whose anti-Catholic training naturally gives them a distorted view of Catholic teaching, and inspires them with mistrust of Catholic purposes and aims. With these we are not only willing, but anxious, for the sake of truth and charity, to compare views in all candor and all friendliness. We have no apology to make, for we know that our cause is that of truth and justice. But we have explanations to give and facts to present, which they need to hear who are not willing to judge unjustly.

These critics blame the Pope for advising Catholics to use their power as citizens for the defence of the Church and the advance of the interests of religion. They say that this aims at theocracy, and threatens the rights of non-Catholics. Let a brief, candid statement of Catholic principles and historical facts be our answer. For the sake of clearness, let us begin at the beginning.

Most of the current misapprehensions of Catholic teaching have for their source incorrect notions of liberty, right and law. We will first glance at these.

Man has the *natural liberty* to think, speak and act as he chooses; in other words, he has *free will*.

But man has not the *moral liberty* to think, speak and act as he chooses. His thoughts, his words, his acts, are subject to the moral law. He has *no right* to direct his intellect except to the true, nor his will except to the good. It would be absurd to suppose a right to what is wrong. Thus the difference between *free will* and *right* is manifest.

Next, as to *legal liberty*, we easily perceive that it cannot be as wide and unlimited as free will, since law and authority aim at hindering free will from encroaching on public order and individual rights. On the other hand, law and authority have their limits, since they can neither command all that is good, nor hinder all that is evil.

The limits of law and civil authority will necessarily be wider or narrower according to the circumstances of the people in question. In some countries, law must be content with protecting or

enforcing certain essential principles: in others it may go farther. In America, for instance, the unity of marriage is efficaciously protected; not so its indissolubility; Sunday-observance, in various degrees, is enacted as to external order, but not as to religious celebration. In general, when, in any country, a certain principle is generally admitted and held as important, this principle will naturally have the sanction of the law. But if the principle comes to be generally rejected or contested, then legal sanction will be inefficacious and inopportune, and will disappear, together with the institutions to which it may have given rise.

Now, in the estimation not only of Catholics, but of all consistent Christians, Faith, being the light which shows man his duty and guides him to his destiny, is a matter of supreme importance and necessity. Hence, he who tries to destroy faith in the soul of his neighbor, is more guilty than he who strives to harm him in person or property. This is a truth which no Christian can doubt. Let us, then, suppose a people generally and profoundly convinced of this truth; they will naturally demand of the public authority that this supreme good should, like inferior goods, be protected by the law. Such was the popular conviction in the Middle Ages. No wonder, therefore, that the laws provided for the protection of religious belief and morals.

To-day, the people of America are profoundly convinced that the unity of marriage is the foundation of society, and it is in conformity with this public conviction that laws have been enacted against the Mormons. Still more profoundly were the nations of Christendom in past ages convinced that the Catholic Faith was the basis of society; is it any wonder that they passed laws to foster it in the minds of the people and to hinder its being undermined or corrupted?

But, let us suppose a people among whom this general conviction of the essential importance of faith does not exist, from among whom it has gradually passed away; then its legal enforcement or protection becomes impossible, and no wise man will demand or expect it. Recourse must then be had to a system of mutual toleration. And this holds true of all matters of public interest. For example, the right of individual property has hitherto been regarded as essential to social order; but let us imagine a people among whom some form of Socialism has come to generally prevail, and, by the very fact, the legislation previously protecting the rights of property passes away, and the tribunals that have enforced it come to be regarded like the tribunals of the Inquisition.

As a system of intolerance is natural to a people strongly united in faith, so a system of mutual toleration and liberty is natural to a people divided in belief. The Church approves both the one

and the other system, according to the circumstances of the people; and not less sincerely does she approve the system of toleration among a divided people than she has approved the system of intolerance among nations quite united in faith. The acts of the sovereign pontiffs, not less than the teaching of the weightiest theologians, show that a system of religious liberty may be approved even among a people whose majority are Catholics; nay, that Catholics are allowed to bind themselves by promise and even by oath to maintain such liberty. It will suffice to cite a few documents of evident clearness.

The French Republic established full liberty of worship, and all succeeding governments in that country have guaranteed the same. This has not hindered the Holy See from permitting the bishops of France to swear fidelity to the government. (See Art. VI. of the Concordat of 1801.)

In Napoleon's oath of coronation were these words: "I swear to respect and to cause to be respected the laws of the Concordat and liberty of worship." Question was raised as to the meaning of this clause; but all difficulty was removed by the declaration that the oath to respect liberty of worship, and to cause it to be respected, was not meant as a judgment on religious truths, but only as a measure of civil toleration and protection.—(Dispatch of Cardinal Consalvi, August 30, 1804. See the diplomatic correspondence exchanged on this occasion, in the *Analecta Juris Pontificii*, April, 1883.)

The charter granted by Louis XVIII. contained the following clause, Art. V.: "All profess their religion with equal liberty and receive for their worship equal protection." The question was raised in France whether Catholics could swear allegiance to a constitution containing this and other similar articles. The Holy See was consulted; the French ambassador declared that the king "had to assure to all his subjects the full exercise of their religion, and had guaranteed it to them by the charter and by his oath to observe the same; but that this oath in no way went contrary to the dogmas or the laws of the Church, he, the ambassador, being authorized to declare that it referred only to what concerned civil order." Upon this declaration Pius VII. authorized the oath of obedience to the constitutional charter and the laws of the kingdom, though embodying, as we have seen, the provision of equal religious liberty and freedom of worship.

At the same epoch was promulgated the fundamental law of the kingdom of the Netherlands, formed of Catholic Belgium and Protestant Holland. This law contained the following articles: "Liberty of religious opinions is guaranteed to all. Equal pro-

tection is granted to all religious communions existing in the kingdom. All the subjects of the king, without distinction of religious belief, enjoy the same civil and political rights, and are eligible to all dignities and employments." Here again difficulties were raised as to the licitness of swearing allegiance to such provisions; but these difficulties were removed when the government declared that, in swearing to protect all religious communions within the kingdom, protection was guaranteed only as to civil order, but with no intention of approving, directly or indirectly, their religious tenets.

The Constitution of Louis Philippe, August, 1830, provided like that of Louis XVIII: "All profess their religion with equal liberty and receive for their worship the same protection." Once more the Bishops of France consulted the Holy See as to the licitness of swearing allegiance to it; and although the Constitution suppressed the State religion and granted equal freedom of worship, yet Pius VIII. permitted the oath of allegiance to it, on the sole condition that it be clearly understood that the clause implied no approbation of doctrines, but referred only to what concerned the civil order.

The kingdom of Belgium was established in 1830. Its Constitution contains the following articles: "Religious liberty, liberty of worship, liberty to manifest one's opinions in any manner whatsoever, is guaranteed. No one can be compelled to take part in any manner in the practices or ceremonies of any form of religion or to observe its days of rest. Education is free; all preventive measures are prohibited. The press is free. All powers emanate from the nation." This Constitution, considered with reason the most liberal in the world, met with no opposition from the Catholics of Belgium; it met none from the Holy See. When, later on, some doubts on the subject arose, Cardinals Sterkx and Deschamps, Archbishops of Malines, demonstrated the licitness of the oath of allegiance. This attitude of the Belgian bishops was approved by the Holy See; and it is a well-known fact that Leo XIII. has most explicitly recommended the Catholics of Belgium to maintain and defend their Constitution. The following passage from the letter of Cardinal Sterkx so clearly answers questions raised and suspicions insinuated in our country to-day, that it is worth while to give it entire. He quotes from the Prince de Méan, Archbishop of Malines, who thus addresses the Belgian Congress in 1830: "The people whom you have been chosen to represent and to make happy are almost entirely Catholics; they have ever shown themselves devoted to the welfare of their country. In laying before you their needs and their rights, I have no thought

of asking for them any privilege; perfect liberty, with all its consequences, is the only object of their desires; this is the advantage which they desire to share with all their fellow-citizens." Then the Cardinal continues: "I make bold to predict, with no fear of being belied by events, that the Catholics will never ask for the suppression of the liberty granted to the dissenters. They could have limited that liberty in 1830; they could even have suppressed it entirely. If the thirteen priests who took part in that congress, with their numerous friends, had chosen to combine, they could easily have passed a system of intolerance. If they did not, it was because justice, charity, love of the public peace, loyalty, made it their duty to maintain the rights which the dissenters had acquired by long and peaceable possession. Now, it is evident that this duty will become daily more imperative, and that it will never permit the Catholics to exclude the dissenters from the enjoyment of the common liberties. Their religious convictions will always make them regard the dissenters as in error; but they must always recognize that the dissenters, as Belgian citizens, possess acquired rights to the enjoyment of their religious liberty. They will the more willingly acknowledge these rights, because the dissenters, though separated from the true Church, are not the less their neighbors and their fellow-citizens. It is therefore a great wrong to insinuate the fear that their liberties will some day be taken from them. Still less reason is there to fear that the Catholics will some day use to the injury of the dissenters the right of repressing abuses committed in the exercise of their liberties; for this repression must always be confined to acts constituting an offence against social order or the rights of others." These words of the noble Cardinal Archbishop of Malines are re-echoed by every Catholic of America to-day, in answer to the gratuitous and false insinuation that, if they became the majority of the American people, they would encroach upon the religious liberties of their Protestant fellow-citizens.

France, fertile in revolutions, published another Constitution in 1848. The preamble declared: "The republic must protect all citizens in their religion," and Article VII. was as follows: "Every one professes his religion freely, and receives from the state equal protection in the exercise of his worship." This Constitution occasioned no difficulty with the Catholics or with the Holy See.

This series of citations could easily be extended, but those here given must abundantly suffice. And to seize their whole import, it is necessary to recall the doctrine of the Catholic Church in regard to oaths. It is not allowable to bind one's self by oath to anything that is not *certainly licit*; a political oath must be given

in the sense of the power demanding it, without equivocation or interior reservation; the oath, once taken, must be religiously observed. Now, we have seen that Catholics can swear allegiance to a constitution which guarantees to all citizens freedom of worship; one thing only being insisted on, namely, that it is not allowed to confound civil toleration with dogmatic toleration or with indifference as to doctrines and approbation of error.

It is, also, to be borne in mind that in the Pontifical Acts above mentioned, it was a question of nations almost entirely Catholic, with but a small minority of dissenters, like Belgium; it was the religious liberty of the dissenters that was guaranteed. Now, what is permitted in the case of countries almost entirely Catholic, is, *a fortiori*, permitted in countries where religious differences are more numerous, and where the dissenters form a larger proportion of the citizens. Hence Cardinal Manning's declaration in his reply to Gladstone: "If Catholics were in power to-morrow in England, not a penal law would be proposed, nor the shadow of constraint be put on the faith of any man. We would that all men fully believed the truth; but a forced faith is a hypocrisy, hateful to God and man. If Catholics were in power to-morrow, not only would there be no penal laws of constraint, but no penal laws of privation."

As a practical conclusion and enforcement of this part of our subject, let it be noted that no instance can be shown, within this century of religious liberty, of a country where the Catholics, having come to power, persecuted the Protestants; whereas, in Protestant Germany the Catholics have been subjected to persecution twice within fifty years. And in our own country, the example of Maryland must not be forgotten. On the 21st of April, 1649, the Council of Catholic Maryland passed the following statute: "And whereas the forcing of the conscience in matters of religion hath frequently fallen out to be of dangerous consequence in the commonwealth where it has been practised, and for the more quiet and peaceable government of the province, and the better to preserve mutual love and amity among the inhabitants, no person within the province, professing to believe in Jesus Christ, shall be anyways troubled, molested or discountenanced for his or her religion, or in the free exercise thereof." Protestants flocked to Maryland and became the majority. They disfranchised the Catholics; they proclaimed "liberty of conscience," but excluded from its advantages "Popery, Prelacy and licentiousness of opinion," and put in force a system of penal laws.

In the face of these undeniable facts, it is neither logical nor honest to assert that the "Four Liberties," as they are termed in



Belgium, stand in any danger from actual or possible Catholic ascendancy, or that any peril of the sort is menaced by the exhortation of Leo XIII. that Catholics, in exercising their rights as citizens, should not forget their duty as Christians.

"But," it is argued, "even granting that the Pope does not counsel encroachment upon the rights of Protestants, and that Catholics do not meditate any such injustice, does he not, however, advise resistance to laws which the Church considers contrary to her interests, and is not this an insubordination which no state can tolerate?" It seems almost incredible that such an argument could be advanced in the nineteenth century, and yet it is the staple of most of the adverse criticism passed on the encyclical. It might reasonably be hoped that, after the victory of conscience over despotism, of religious liberty over state domination, which was the triumph of Christianity over heathenism, no sensible man would be found to advocate state supremacy in religious matters. If anywhere the avowed enemies of religion come into power, and enact laws to enslave religion, violate conscience, and contradict God, can there be among the inheritors of the Christian martyrs any one to counsel blind obedience to their behests? And if, with his heart wrung by just such spectacles, the supreme Pastor of the Christian Church speaks to his children such words of exhortation as the fathers and mothers of the martyrs addressed to their sons in the days of old, is he blamable for so doing? And if, thanks be to God, times are changed, and Christians are able not only to die rather than obey laws against conscience, but to use their legitimate power as citizens to have those laws abrogated or amended, who that believes in liberty will blame them for so doing or censure the representative of religion who bravely encourages them to it? To cry out "*rebellion!*" in such a case, as the Italian radicals and others with them have done, is to side with those who long ago cried out: "To the lions with the rebels who refuse to burn incense to Cæsar and to Jove!"

Germany enacts the Falk Laws, sending to prison or to exile every bishop and every parish priest who will not swear to the religious supremacy of Cæsar, leaving at one sweep a thousand parishes without a pastor, and millions of souls without the ministrations of religion, because neither pastors nor people would fall down and adore the state-god. Can any one, not blinded by prejudice, be found to say that they ought to have obeyed Cæsar rather than God, to have humbly accepted state control over conscience and religion, just because the state demanded it? All honor to the Catholics of Germany for having viewed the matter differently and for having acted according to their reason and their

conscience! All honor to them for having stood up bravely for the rights of religious liberty, shunning both extremes of insurrectionary violence and of tame submission, and asserting their just rights in legal ways till they won the victory for conscience and for freedom! They present a spectacle in which not only the Church, but humanity, may well glory. They are a noble example to Christians elsewhere, who groan under persecution; and the Pope, instead of being blamable, is worthy of all praise for holding up the example to spur out of shameful cowardice or sloth the degenerate Christians who tamely submit to having religion insulted and to being robbed of their Christian inheritance.

In our country we have no fear that the wheels of our civilization will ever be so rolled backward that religious persecution will be attempted. Hence, from the depths of our hearts we proclaim our devotedness to her institutions and our trust in her future. But should it, by any possibility, come to pass that the old colonial penal laws against Catholics and Catholicity should be re-enacted, will any American, worthy of the name, dare to say that it would be the duty of Catholics silently to submit, no longer to practise their religion, no longer to teach it to their children, but submissively to acquiesce in the dictation of the party in power? We venture to consider this incredible; to believe that all true Americans will agree that it would be both our right and our duty to stand firm in conscience, and to use every legitimate means to oust the party of tyranny, to abolish the unjust laws, and to restore the reign of equal liberty. Such assuredly would be our course; and this is precisely what Leo XIII. counsels for countries where the advice is but too sadly needed. But we reiterate our conviction, that in our country, no matter how some fanatics may desire it and agitate for it, the good sense and the justice of the American people will ever render such a state of things impossible. Hence we keep calm while the fanatics rave, and are sorry if any sensible non-Catholics sympathize with them, and waver not in our trust that America will be, till the end, the tomb of oppression, the inviolable home of civil and religious liberty.

This letter of the Holy Father is a cry from a heart wrung with anguish at the contempt for religion, the disregard of conscience, the trampling on vested rights, the tyranny against the Church, which to-day disgraces much of what once was Christendom. This is a reaction from the spirit of faith to the spirit of heathenism. But it cannot last, because it is wrong and based on falsehood. Prejudice and passion cannot always blind men, nor even worldly interest lastingly prevail against the power of truth. The attempt either to coerce conscience or to disregard it, to treat the Christian Church as its Divine Founder was treated, to make the spiritual

order subservient to the material in the government of the world, to depose God from His throne and put the state-god in His place, must fail, must pass away as the last struggling remnant of heathenism and barbarism. It has reached a temporary ascendancy, because too many Christians become unmindful and unworthy of Christianity. But it is a usurpation of untruth and of violence, and it must pass. And they that now uphold it must pass with it into disgrace and oblivion, or return to the Author of our liberties, the immortal Prince of Peace. Of Him and His Church, and all who machinate against them, we can repeat the words of the psalmist: "They shall perish, but thou remainest. And all of them shall grow old like a garment, and as a vesture thou shalt change them and they shall be changed; but thou art always the self-same, and thy years shall not fail."

---

### IS THE DREAM OF A UNIVERSAL REPUBLIC TO BE REALIZED IN OUR DAY?

**T**HE throne of the Brazilian Emperor has been overturned; and the vast and rich country over which he held sway is now under republican rule and governed by republican institutions. No crowned head can now be found in America. The nineteen nations that occupy this continent, from dusky Hayti to our own brilliant galaxy of Anglo-Celtic commonwealths, are all republics. And with the exception of those territories, comparatively small and unimportant, where colonial dependence from Europe is still in existence—and even, in some instances, within the limits of the latter—no spot can be marked upon the map of the whole western hemisphere where popular government is not recognized, and where, at least in principle, if not in practice, the government is not administered in the name of the people, for the people, and by the people.

Mr. Andrew Carnegie may write with dithyrambic inspiration and high patriotic rhythm the well-deserved praises of "Triumphant Democracy," and the echo of his voice can be heard, with sympathetic ears, by all the rulers of this continent. No more masters in America! The people is sovereign, and the chosen individuals upon whom it has been made incumbent to administer the govern-