significantly by rejecting some men as students and declining to recommend others for ordination. But all of us are aware of the fallibility of our judgments, and although we are well aware of the limitations of all aptitude tests, yet we hope that some more or less adequate objective criteria may be developed to assist our personal estimates.

Our fourth hope is that the seminaries may be put on a sounder financial basis. The Church's key problem is personnel, and in some way it ought to make provision, *qua Church*, for the selection and training of its ministers. Until that happens each seminary must raise funds for salaries, equipment and maintenance from such of the laity as it can interest in its work.

IV

I think it can be said without fear of contradiction that the Episcopal Church's seminaries are in better shape to-day than previously. Most of the teachers are competent scholars, men with the parish experience so necessary in those who are to train ministers, devoted Christians, fine colleagues. The curricula are generally more exacting than formerly, better arranged, more relevant to the work of men who are to minister in twentieth century America. The students are a fine lot of keen, mature men, whom it is a privilege to know and to teach, to whose service in the Church we look forward hopefully; and the elimination of unfit men, though not as thorough as it should be, is certainly more adequate than in years gone by. Much more remains to be done if the seminaries are to fulfill their high function; but by the grace of God they have a wonderful opportunity before them.

Protestant-Roman Catholic Relations in America

BY PROFESSOR WILLIAM J. WOLF, Th.D.

A EUROPEAN analysis of the religious situation in the United States in the nineteenth century would probably have disclosed two facts of interest. First, there would have been the pluralism of American religious life, a towering Babel of sects and creeds mostly the inheritance of old world divisions further sharpened by the influence of the American frontier and complicated by some strange indigenous products. Secondly, there would have been the legal relation of the United States Government to these bodies expressed in terms of non-establishment for any one group. The First Amendment to the Federal Constitution reads: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

This situation shows an interesting turn in the twentieth century. While there are still over 256 denominations listed in the census, the ecumenical movement has achieved such significant progress that now over 80% of American Protestantism is to be found within seven families of churches. At the same time the Roman Catholic Church by immigration, prohibition of birth control, and tireless appeal to the unchurched masses has increased significantly in numbers and tremendously in influence. According to the most recent statistics published by *The Christian Herald*, 60% of those expressing a religious affiliation are Protestants, 33% Roman Catholics, and 6% Jews. Roman Catholic gains in 1947 exceed Protestant increases by 5% to 2.6%. These Protestant movements of union together with the emergence of Roman Catholicism as the largest religious unit have precipitated a situation of tension and mutual recrimination fraught with danger for the future. This article will attempt to illustrate a few of the points of friction, to indicate the official Roman Catholic policy, and to summarize the divergent Protestant reactions to the Roman Catholic programme.

I

Roman Catholicism is pledged to maintain a system of parochial schools. Its hierarchy argues that state support should be granted to them. Already 16 of the 48 states provide tax money for transportation to parochial schools. The New Jersey Parochial Transportation Act was upheld by a 5 to 4 decision of the Supreme Court in 1947. The majority ruled that such assistance constituted a public service expenditure and not a direct subsidy to religion. Justice Jackson dissented on the ground that the distinction was artificial.

" I should be surprised if any Catholic would deny that the parochial school is a vital, if not the most vital, part of the Roman Catholic Church. . . . Its growth and cohesion, discipline and loyalty, spring from its schools. Catholic education is the rock on which the whole structure rests, and to render aid to its church school is indistinguishable from rendering the same aid to the church itself. The state cannot maintain a church, and it can no more tax its citizens to furnish free carriage to those who attend a church. The prohibition against establishment of religion cannot be circumvented by a subsidy, bonus, or reimbursement of expense to individuals for receiving religious instruction and indoctrination."

A number of states allow tax funds to be used for the purchase of text books in parochial schools. The Supreme Court upheld the constitutionality of the Louisiana School-Book Act in 1929. In the last session of Congress the hierarchy lobbied for inclusion of parochial schools in proposed federal aid to state schools.

Some towns such as Dixon, New Mexico, have lost their public schools and Protestant parents have been forced to send their children into publicly supported parochial schools where nuns do the teaching, the children recite " Hail Marys " daily, and pupils are graded academically on their memorization of the Roman catechism. In an attempt to restore public education in North Dakota by excluding 74 nuns and 8 priests who were teaching in the public schools, an

anti-garb law was passed after a bitterly fought initiative referendum forbidding the wearing of a distinctive religious habit by teachers in the public schools. The hierarchy replied by granting nuns permission to wear a modest secular dress.

One of the crucial areas of pressure has been the attempt of the hierarchy to influence the State Department to deny passports to Protestant missionaries for Latin America on the ground that, these countries being nominally Roman in allegiance, such Protestant propaganda would endanger our "Good Neighbour Policy". Fortunately the testimony of many Roman Catholic statesmen in South America in favour of Protestant work took the edge from the argument. The appointment of Myron Taylor as President Roosevelt's personal emissary to the Vatican with what looked to be ambassadorial status on the ground that a "listening post" was necessary during war time, and the continuance of the relationship under President Truman on the ground that it was necessary "to work for peace," has been a source of official protest by nearly every Protestant body in the United States. The ineptitude of the Vatican representation became burlesque when Mr. Taylor sought to have the United States Government represented at the Amsterdam Assembly of the World Council of Churches. Fortunately the World Council leaders refused and Mr. Taylor retreated to Rome wondering why the Mohammedans had not been invited to the meeting!

One of the most recent illustrations of the power of Rome was the banning of the *Nation* from the public schools of Newark, New Jersey and New York City because of a series of articles by Paul Blanshard stating largely from Roman sources their attitude toward medicine and education.

Bishop Oxnam, a former President of the Federal Council of Churches, who has been much concerned about the Roman Catholic problem, has been subjected in the Roman press to a campaign of abuse. It becomes increasingly difficult for Protestant churchmen to bear prophetic criticism against both the red and the black internationales because Roman Catholicism will construe any criticism of their church as sheer bolshevism.

These few incidents, selected as typical examples and by no means comprehensive in scope, dramatize the new power of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States. Like an adolescent come of age, the Roman hierarchy is testing its strength and attempting to realize its aim of converting the United States into a new world centre of power as the old world centre becomes increasingly threatened by Soviet policy in Europe.

II

The only just way to state the Roman case is to quote their own official sources and documents. The basic American text has been John A. Ryan and Millar's *The State and the Church*, which was brought up to date in 1940 by Ryan and Boland's *Catholic Principles of Politics*. It is both new and definitive. It is widely used in Roman institutions and seminaries. It bears the *Nihil Obstat* of Arthur J. Scanlan and the *Imprimatur* of Francis J. Spellman, then Archbishop of New York and now the most influential Roman cardinal in America.

Chapter XXIII contains the heart of the book as regards the Roman view of religious freedom. It elaborates the Roman theory of the state as a commentary on Leo's Encyclical Letter *Immortale Dei* of November 1, 1885. The state derives its authority from God, and because each individual is bound to worship his Creator the state also must make " a public profession of religion." It is denied that a state can be neutral on the religious issue ; the only alternative that is logically sound is the explicitly atheistic state. The authors correctly point out that the United States has never been indifferent to religion and adduce the evidence of public days of Thanksgiving, prayers at the opening of national and state legislatures, chaplains for the Armed Services, and exemption of church property from taxation.

From the argument that establishes the concern of the state with religion the Fathers pass at once by a transition that leaves Protestants gaping to a position of monopoly privilege for their church. " But Pope Leo goes further. He declares that the State must not only ' have care for religion,' but recognize the *true* religion. This means the form of religion professed by the Catholic Church. It is a thoroughly logical position. If the State is under moral compulsion to profess and promote religion, it is obviously obliged to profess and promote only the religion that is true : for no individual, no group of individuals, no society, no State is justified in supporting error or in according to error the same recognition as to truth " (pp. 313-4).

The authors hold that opposition to their logic necessitates one of three positions. First, and this would represent the American Protestant position, it might be argued that truth will establish itself in time if free. This is denied on the ground that old errors still persist, and the argument is supposedly clinched by appeal to the success of the Counter Reformation in destroying Protestantism in those countries in which it could employ the secular arm of the state for persecution. The second position, that of holding all forms of religion to be equally true, is refuted on the principle of self-contradiction. The third position, in which it is held impossible for a state to recognize the true religion, is dealt with thus : " Finally, it is not impossible to know which religion is the right one, inasmuch as the Church of Christ comes before men with credentials sufficient to convince all those who will deliberately examine the evidence with a will to believe " (p. 314).

The argument for monopoly establishment is further clarified by a quotation from Leo XIII's Encyclical on " Catholicity in the United States." " Yet, though all this is true, it would be very erroneous to draw the conclusion that in America is to be sought the type of the most desirable status of the Church, or that it would be universally lawful or expedient for State and Church to be, as in America, dissevered and divorced. The fact that Catholicity with you is in good condition, nay, is even enjoying a prosperous growth, is by all means to be 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 favour of the laws and the patronage of public authority " (p. 315).

The problem of Roman Catholic monopoly in the midst of American religious pluralism next engages their attention. It is a relief to learn that "those born into a non-Catholic sect should never be coerced into the Catholic Church" but distressing to learn that their worship will only be tolerated "if carried on within the family, or in such an inconspicuous manner as to be an occasion neither of scandal nor of perversion to the faithful" (p. 317).

General propaganda directed to others than members of the dissenting sect would, however, constitute an occasion of scandal to the faithful. The state is bound to protect the faithful against this affront to their rights, for "error has not the same rights as truth". "Rights are merely means to rational ends. Since no rational end is promoted by the dissemination of false doctrine, there exists no right to indulge in this practice. The fact that the individual may in good faith think that his false religion is true gives no more right to propagate it than the sincerity of the alien anarchist entitles him to advocate his abominable political theories in the United States, or than the perverted ethical notions of the dealer in obscene literature confer upon him a right to corrupt the morals of the community" (p. 318).

Logic requires the Fathers to refute on two grounds the use of this argument for monopoly and persecution should it be turned around and used by non-Romans against Roman Catholics. "First, if such a State should prohibit Catholic worship or preaching on the plea that it was wrong and injurious to the community, the assumption would be false; therefore, the two cases are not parallel. Second, a Protestant State could not logically take such an attitude because no Protestant sect claims to be infallible. Besides, the Protestant principle of private judgment logically implies that Catholics may be right in their religious convictions, and that they have a right to hold and preach them without molestation" (pp. 318-9).

The authors summarize their entire position in the following propositions: "While its doctrinal premises will be rejected by convinced non-Catholics, its logic cannot be denied by anyone who accepts the unity of religious truth. If there is only one true religion, and if its possession is the most important good in life for States as well as individuals, then the public profession, protection, and promotion of this religion and the legal prohibition of all direct assaults upon it, become one of the most obvious and fundamental duties of the State. For it is the business of the State to safeguard and promote human welfare in all departments of life" (p. 319).

The next section relates this ideal picture of Church-State relations to situations where temporary compromises may be necessary on grounds of rational expediency. In states where large dissenting bodies exist, accommodation will be preferable to the disorder that would rock the state if persecution were resorted to. Also toleration may be necessary if one has sworn to support religious freedom in the Constitution of a state such as the United States. What is needed, however, is a change in such dangerous constitutional guarantees. The earlier edition of the text put the matter quite frankly. "But constitutions can be changed and non-Catholic sects may decline to

such a point that the political proscription of them may become feasible and expedient" (pp. 38-9, Ryan and Millar).

The latest edition is less forthright in statement, but the meaning is the same. "Suppose that the constitutional obstacle to proscription of non-Catholics has been legitimately removed and they themselves have become numerically insignificant; what then would be the proper course of action for a Catholic State? Apparently, the latter State could logically tolerate only such religious activities as were confined to the members of the dissenting group. It could not permit them to carry on general propaganda nor accord their organization certain privileges that had formerly been extended to all religious corporations, for example, exemption from taxation" (p. 320).

The section closes with a hope that Protestants will not now become too anxious over the future destruction of their freedom, remarking that "the danger of religious intolerance toward non-Catholics in the United States is so improbable and so far in the future that it should not occupy their time or attention" (p. 321).

III

The Roman Catholic Church is very guarded in communicating to its own laity the details of this plan, which has received the approval of the National Catholic Welfare Conference and reflects Vatican Policy on the highest level. Many large Roman book stores do not stock the text and if questioned generally refer to it as "a priest's book". Most Roman Catholic laymen are ignorant of its details and generally when confronted with the evidence deny that this could possibly represent their views. It would appear that the hierarchy fears the "Americanism" of its laity, for all its public pronouncements are clothed in appeals to "true democracy" and "American tolerance and fair play."

Wherever in Protestant circles the implications of this strategy are known, reaction has tended to take two divergent courses with many shades of gradation between the extremes. The *Christian Century*, America's most subscribed to interdenominational weekly, has crusaded against the Vatican "ambassadorship" and Roman Catholic "encroachments" on public education for years. The crusade has now reached the point at which its editorial policy advocates so drastic a doctrine of separation of Church and State that in the interests of an iron-clad logic of "separation" it advocates the end to such long-established forms of co-operation between State and Church as exemption of church property from taxation. It feels so threatened by Roman Catholic power that it retreats to a simple *a priori* legalism of "complete separation". It may well be regarded as a triumph for secularism. This has been made clear by its enthusiastic approval of the recent 8 to 1 Supreme Court Decision in the Champaign, Ill, case. The Court pronounced against a system of "released time" for religious education in which representatives of Roman Catholicism, Judaism and Protestantism gave their respective adherents religious instruction if desired by the parents in separate class rooms of the public school buildings. The "released time" technique had become one of the tenuous ways in which it was hoped that the public

schools could be kept from complete "godlessness." Since the Court only reviewed the special type of "released time" in practice in the schools of Champaign in response to a suit carried to it by the atheistic mother of a pupil in them, there may still be other types of "released time" that will meet the test of constitutionality. Those who approve the plan point to its co-operative promotion by Jews, Roman Catholics and Protestants and argue that such co-operation which gives no one group a monopolistic privilege *in practice* does not constitute a situation "respecting an establishment of religion". In 1948 a group "Protestants and Other Americans United for Separation of Church and State" was formed by Dr. Mackay, president of Princeton Theological Seminary, Dr. Poteat, president of Colgate-Rochester Divinity School, Bishop Oxnam of the Methodist Church, Dr. Louie Newton, president of the Southern Baptist Convention, and Dr. Morrison, former editor of the *Christian Century*. A Manifesto was issued condemning the parochial transportation and text-books acts as "breaches in the wall of separation," criticizing proposed federal legislation to aid parochial schools, and denouncing the Taylor mission. The logic behind the Manifesto is "to assure the maintenance of the American principle of separation of church and state upon which the Federal Constitution guarantees religious liberty to all the people and all churches of the republic."

A contrasting point of view has been expressed by Prof. Reinhold Niebuhr in the columns of *Christianity and Crisis*, America's most vital bi-weekly journal of Christian opinion. Dr. Niebuhr argues that Protestants have been so obsessed with the scylla of Roman Catholicism that they are being shipwrecked on the charybdis of secularism. He argues that state-aid to Roman Catholic parochial schools has not necessarily meant suppression of religious freedom in some countries of Europe, and appears to favour greater subsidies to Roman Catholic education on the ground that it would remove the unfairness of "double taxation" whereby Roman Catholic parents are taxed by the state to maintain public schools which their hierarchy forbids them to use and in addition have to contribute for the upkeep of their sectarian schools. Dr. Niebuhr criticizes the use of the word "separation" as not actually found in the Constitution and criticizes the majority opinion of the Supreme Court for their use of the phrase "wall of separation", which again is not found in the Constitution, but is a phrase of Jefferson's.

A substantial group agrees fully with Dr. Niebuhr's criticism of the attempt to solve all delicate Church-State relations by an *a priori* dogma of "separation"; but a large proportion, while thankful for his clear presentation of the principle of "co-operation without monopoly privilege," wonder whether he is not too Utopian in hoping that the Roman Church will not use her position vastly strengthened by state subsidies gradually to deny religious freedom to Jews and Protestants as she stands committed in her official programme. In other words, Dr. Niebuhr's position would be practical if all religious groups were pledged to treat their neighbours as equals before the law, but it is just this comity arrangement which the stand of the Roman Church forces her to repudiate since "error has not the same rights as

truth". Such a group argues against the constitutionality of the transportation and text books acts in that they *actually* tend toward "an establishment" of religion, since only the Roman Catholic Church commits herself to a system of parochial schools. On the other hand, they would argue the constitutionality of the principle of "released time" (quite apart from certain practical ways of setting up the programme) on the ground that the co-operation of all religious groups in the programme prevents monopoly advantage for any one group. They would approve of our system of chaplains in the armed forces and the exemption of church property from taxation, both of which practices are plainly indefensible in any strict logic of "separation".

The *reductio ad absurdum* of the position of the *Christian Century* from a practical point of view can be seen in the situation that would arise if church buildings were taxed. In predominantly Roman Catholic areas Protestant Church property might be assessed at prohibitive levels while Roman property might be given the smallest possible assessment.

An important statement has recently been signed by such leaders as Prof. Bennett, Prof. Calhoun, Bishop Dun, Dr. Fosdick, Dr. Horton, Dr. Leiper, Prof. Reinhold Niebuhr, Prof. Richard Niebuhr, Hon. Francis Sayre, Bishop Scarlett, President VanDusen and others. It emphasizes the danger of secularism and criticizes the recent decision of the Supreme Court. "Co-operation, entered into freely by the State and Church, and involving no special privilege to any Church and no threat to the religious liberty of any citizen, should be permitted."

There are three forces bidding for the conscience of America to-day —aggressive secularism, a Protestantism finding new power in common action, and a Roman Catholicism dedicated officially to the dream of a Catholic State. American Protestantism must bear prophetic witness against the errors of both its rivals, but it finds its most perplexing moral dilemma in deciding which shall be its allies, if any, in this two-front battle.