

REPORT FROM THE CAPITAL

REPORT FROM THE CAPITAL

REPORT FROM THE CAPITAL

1951

REPORT FROM THE CAPITAL

REPORT FROM THE CAPITAL



BERKELEY BAPTIST DIVINITY SCHOOL

This monthly newsletter is sent free to all editors, executives and institutions. In order to cover cost of production and mailing a charge of \$1.00 is made to all others.

JANUARY 1952

BERKELEY BAPTIST DIVINITY SCHOOL Archives LIBRARY

FOR REFERENCE ONLY

ON THE STATE OF THE VATICAN ISSUE



January 13 the President announced the following: "The nomination of Gen. Mark W. Clark to be Ambassador to the State of Vatican City will not be resubmitted to the Senate. This course is being followed at the request of General Clark. The President plans to submit another nomination at a later time."

Baptists have never voiced opposition to General Clark. Their opposition is based on principle, not persons. They have, however, anticipated General Clark's withdrawal. On December 27 this office sent out a warning release that the Catholic World Magazine had demanded the withdrawal of Clark - apparently because of the Pope's coolness toward a military man for the post - and insisted that the President nominate Barney Baruch, the eminent Jew, perhaps with a view to make opposition look like anti-Semitism. In any event, since the Pope objected to the President's personal representative and wished a full ambassador and now informs of his displeasure of Clark, it would seem the President is bending over backward to please the Pope. Whatever his motive in persisting in this appointment, those who oppose must now redouble their opposition.

PRESIDENT UNABLE TO HELP GENERAL

representative and wished a full ambassador and now informs of his displeasure of Clark, it would seem the President is bending over backward to please the Pope. Whatever his motive in persisting in this appointment, those who oppose must now redouble their opposition.

BERKELEY BAPTIST SEMINARY OF THE WEST

1000 Campus, Seminary Knolls
BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA 94722

74832

To review history a bit it should be recalled that under date of October 29, 1951 the Religious News Service reported from Washington, D. C. that President Truman abandoned his plan to send an ambassador to the Vatican for more than six months after the appointment was refused by Charles P. Taft, Cincinnati attorney and former president of the National Council of Churches.

The White House confirmed that Mr. Taft was asked by President Truman early last year to take the assignment. However, the White House had no comment on Mr. Taft's statement that he rejected it and advised the President against sending such a diplomatic mission.

Religious News Service learned in February 1951 that the President has offered the assignment to a prominent Protestant and that it had been turned down, whereupon, after

a conference with State Department advisers, it was decided to abandon the project for the time.

At that time, Ex-Senator Millard E. Tydings (D.Md) was named as the man whom the President wanted, but when Mr. Tydings denied knowledge of the matter, RNS withheld speculation on names, and reported on February 19 that the President had agreed with advisers from the State Department to drop the subject.

What caused the President to change his mind and nominate General Mark Clark for the post has not been explained by those who were in on the first conference. Apparently they had no advance notice of the subsequent action.

*

The U. S. News and World Report in its November 23 issue analyzed the struggle over Vatican representation in terms of the Roman Catholic vote. It named nine large cities which often swing elections in their respective states, together with the percentage of Roman Catholic population. They are: Boston, 44%; Chicago 41%; Milwaukee, 30%; Detroit 28%; New York, 27%; Philadelphia, 26%; Cleveland, 25%; St. Louis, 21%; Los Angeles, 18%. The nine states in which these cities are located, plus the "solid South", would provide enough electoral votes to win any election, no matter how the other states voted. The only adequate answer would be a widespread awareness among Protestant citizens of the importance of the issue. In this instance it is believed the President erred in thinking the solid South would stand for his proposal. Most of the Southern Senators have declared against it. The churches are addressing themselves to the educational task involved. A committee of the National Council of Churches, with Dr. Franklin C. Fry as the chairman, is planning a united Protestant strategy which includes by invitation churches which are not members of NCCUSA.

*

Since the Senate adjourned until January 8, 1952, no action could be taken until Congress reconvened. Rule XXXVIII of the Standing Rules of the Senate provides that, "Nominations neither confirmed nor rejected during the session at which they are made shall not be acted upon at any succeeding session without being again made to the Senate by the President; and if the Senate shall adjourn or take a recess for more than thirty days, all nominations pending and not finally acted upon at the time of taking such adjournment or recess shall be returned to the Secretary of the President, and shall not again be considered unless they shall again be made to the Senate by the President." The appointment will require special legislation, since the law at this time provides that military personnel must retire before receiving diplomatic appointments.

*

Opposition to the nomination of General Mark W. Clark as ambassador to the Vatican was expressed by the chairmen of two Senate committees through which the nomination must pass before confirmation. Senator Tom Connally (D.-Tex.), chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, said in a prepared statement: "The President has stated that he will again submit the nomination of General Clark to be ambassador to the Vatican. I have already made clear my opposition to that appointment and we (the committee) shall meet that issue when it arises". At the same time, Sen. Richard Russell (D.-Ga.), chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, said that he is opposed to the Vatican nomination. Like Sen. Connally he expressed doubt that it will be confirmed. Opposition by the chairmen of both these key committees considerably diminishes the chances for confirmation of Gen. Clark's nomination at the present session of Congress. Senator Connally now says he is against any envoy to the Vatican.

*

Expressions from individual Senators follow:

Senator H. Alexander Smith (R.-N.J.), has said that he will oppose confirmation of an ambassador to the Vatican because the Church-State issue thereby raised tends to defeat the purpose for which an ambassador would be sent to the Holy See.

Senator Guy M. Gillette (D.-Iowa): "I have always taken the position that I could see no objection to the President's appointment of a personal representative to the Vatican inasmuch as the Vatican is the spiritual head of hundreds of millions of Catholics distributed throughout most of the countries of the world. However, I have always held the further conclusion that the Vatican should not be recognized as a temporal state with the exchange of diplomatic representatives. The nomination of General Clark will be examined by the Foreign Relations Committee, of which I am a member, and I will then have an opportunity to study exactly what type of appointment this nomination seems to establish. Until that time, I shall reserve my judgment."

Senator Wallace F. Bennett (R.-Utah): "I have previously expressed my opposition to the appointment. I hope that the President will not resubmit the nomination to the Senate and will thereby let the issue die. If the nomination is resubmitted, my present feeling is that I shall oppose it for many reasons taught us by the diplomatic and constitutional history of the United States."

Senator James P. Kem (R.-Mo.): "I think that it is unfortunate that the President should have seen fit to have sent the nomination of General Mark Clark to the Senate at the close of the session when there was no opportunity for discussion. His action has had the effect of stirring up religious controversy in our own State and elsewhere. This I regret very much."

Senator John Sparkman (D.-Ala.): "I believe wholeheartedly in the principle upon which our Government was founded and the tradition in which our Constitution was written. If there is any principle thoroughly ingrained in our Government it is that of the separation of church and state. Under such a principle there can be no such thing as a church state. The Vatican is the head of a church and is not a state in the sense that we think of one. I cannot conceive of the establishment of diplomatic relations with any church and I believe to do so would violate the principle of complete separation of church and state. I assure you that I will oppose the nomination of anyone to go as ambassador to the Vatican."

Senator Harry F. Byrd (D.-Va.): "It is my belief that we should always preserve carefully the separation of Church and State. This I conceive to be one of the fundamental principles of our constitutional democracy. It is my intention to vote against the confirmation of any such Ambassador."

Senator Willis Robertson (D.-Va.): "In my opinion, the appointment of an Ambassador to any religious organization, whether it be to the Vatican in Rome or the Southern Baptist Convention with which I am affiliated, violates that fundamental principle which has characterized our form of Government since its inception, and therefore, I could not bring myself to vote for the confirmation of any such Ambassador however well qualified he may be for the assignment."

Senator Zales H. Ecton (R.-Mont.): "It is imperative that the separation of church and state be kept inviolate as provided in our own Constitution, and you may be sure that I will continue to do everything possible to maintain that fundamental principle."

According to Religious News Service, Senator Hubert H. Humphrey (D.-Minn.), told 300 Protestant ministers of the Twin Cities area that there is "only one chance in a hundred" that the appointment of a Vatican ambassador will ever reach the Senate floor.

for confirmation. The Senator also disclosed that "as of this moment" he expects to oppose the confirmation of such an appointment.

Senator Clyde R. Hoey (D.-N.C.), will vote against confirmation of President Truman's nomination of Gen. Mark W. Clark as ambassador to the Vatican. "I am opposed to the confirmation of General Clark because I have never thought that it was essential or necessary that an ambassador be appointed to the Vatican", Sen. Hoey said.

Senator Walter F. George (D.-Ga.): "I am opposed to any formal diplomatic relations with the Vatican State. I am also opposed to any modification of existing law to permit any military man in active service and while in office to accept a diplomatic appointment to any State."

Senator Homer Ferguson (R.-Mich.): "It is my present intention to vote against the confirmation of a nominee to be Ambassador to the Vatican should this issue reach the Senate floor in this session of Congress."

* * *

In response to a letter to each senator from the Baptist Joint Committee, enclosing a copy of our booklet, "The Battle For America -- The Vatican Issue", many letters from them have been received, and promptly. All expressed appreciation of the opportunity to read the booklet, but aside from those on record as above they were non-committal. Not one declared for the ratification of the President's nomination. Although none was asked to commit himself, a number of the senators have made no reply.

* * *

Senator Harley M. Kilgore, (D.-W. Va.): "While I was in Italy I had the opportunity to go into some of the ramifications of this matter very carefully. It seems to me that our American principle of the separation of church and state was never more important than it is today. It is, in fact, to my way of thinking, basic to a democratic government as we in America understand it. I feel strongly that we should take no action which would in any way tend to whittle away or undermine that principle. There are several arguments advanced in favor of such an appointment, such as the value of the Vatican as a listening post, and that such an appointment would not in fact be an abrogation of our principle of the separation of church and state. But let me assure you that I shall insist upon the most careful and thorough consideration of this matter in all its aspects by the Senate before any Senate action is taken on it. To be convinced of the necessity for this move I would have to be shown reasons so clear and conclusive that they would also convince you of the necessity for it."

* * *

Senator Andrew F. Schoeppel, (R.-Kansas): "I do not believe that it was necessary for the President to appoint an Ambassador to the Vatican. We have at the present time an Ambassador to Italy with full portfolio, who should be able to represent all necessary interests between that country and ours, including all phases of the diplomatic relations, if any are needed, with the Vatican. Therefore, I shall not vote to confirm the President's appointment of an Ambassador in this instance."

* * *

TESTIMONY OF EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR ON UMT BEFORE CONGRESSIONAL HEARINGS

Representing the American Baptist Convention, Southern Baptist Convention, National Baptist Convention, Incorporated; National Baptist Convention of America and The Baptist General Conference of America

I do not here attempt to present the separate resolutions concerning Universal Military Training by the several national Baptist Conventions represented by this Joint Committee. Doubtless you have, or will have, the actual documents from them, properly certified. Perhaps you will agree that a summary of the views held in common by Baptists on this subject will be helpful toward ascertaining the attitudes of this large element in the population, consisting as it does of more than 16,000,000 adult members. I rejoice that as Baptists we stand with so many religious, educational, parenthood, farm and labor groups in opposition to UMT. It is likely that some of the arguments against UMT advanced by Baptists will be made by our compatriots, but if so, the fact will only emphasize the extent to which these views prevail among the people.

With the specific provisions recommended by the National Security Commission or those of any bill offered for their implementation, I am not now testifying. Our people reject the Commission's opening contentions as to the need for enactment of this measure. Notwithstanding its denial, it capitalizes on the anxieties of the present crisis to plead for the permanent adoption of this unlimited, discredited Old World plan. It is unfortunate, as well as erroneous, to charge failure of the country to accept this dubious plan in the past was immoral. Nor can we accede to the idea that this militarization of America should be integrated with the structure of our national life.

While our principal objection is to the unjust interference with the normal education and experience of our youth, and to the moral hazards to which they will be subjected in the training camps, we shudder at the enormous cost for the establishment and maintenance of this stupendous system of regimentation of youth for war purposes. According to the Commission's own figures and the additional careful estimates of experts the cost is so staggering that some other less permanent and workable effort for necessary defense should be devised. Actually, we hold to the demonstrated fact that Universal Military Training in the countries which have tried it has tended more often to provoke war than to prevent it. It will be a sad day for free America when it succumbs to the weaknesses and fantasies of a militarized populace.

I must confess, Mr. Chairman, I am made to shudder at the lengths to which militarists are willing to go in order to secure the passage of this long-sought pet measure of theirs. They assume that some of their preconceived ideas are infallible and unanswerable. For example, they put forth the notion that this scheme will prevent war, whereas it never has; that it will reduce casualties, whereas no such proof is to be had; that it will diminish the military establishment, whereas every item of information goes to show it will immeasurably increase it. We protest the irresponsibility of the arguments offered by the proponents and the recklessness of the official military in asking for sustaining funds out of all proportion to the needs of the Nation in other fields. We think the present draft law is sufficient.

I beseech the Committee, therefore, before taking such a momentous step, contrary to the principles which have guided America so successfully for more than a hundred and fifty years, and before embarking on a course fraught with so many threats to our liberties, hazards to our moral well-being and unreasonable demands upon our resources to recommend against thus imperilling our country.

Joseph M. Dawson.

DR. H. G. BENNETT, DEVOTED PUBLIC SERVANT

A Baptist who served his country and the world with a missionary devotion was Dr. Henry Garland Bennett, killed in an airplane accident in Iran, December 22, 1951, while in line of duty. As Administrator of the Technical Cooperation Administration of the Department of State, he brought to his task the best training to be obtained from such institutions as Ouchita College and Columbia University, together with long experience as president of the Oklahoma Southeastern College and the Oklahoma A. and M. College. In his Christian alignment he was unswerving in loyalty and sacrifice. True to all his previous practice of active service in his church, he was assistant teacher of the Broughton Bible Class in the First Baptist Church, Washington, D. C., when he was killed. Mrs. Bennett perished with him in the fatal accident.

* * *

BAINTON ILLUMINATES AMERICAN FREEDOM - A BOOK NOTICE

The Travail of Religious Liberty, by Roland H. Bainton. Westminster Press, \$4.00.

In Part 3 the author discusses "The Freedom of the Individual In The Seventeenth Century". He describes the contributions of John Milton, "The Bard of Speech Unbound"; Roger Williams, "The Seeker"; and John Locke, "The Apologist For the Act of Toleration". The book makes a distinguished contribution toward the understanding of the origins of freedom in America.

* * *

"THE BATTLE FOR AMERICA" SOARS IN CIRCULATION

The 100,000 copies of our booklet, THE BATTLE FOR AMERICA, printed for this Committee by the Southern Baptist Sunday School Board as a gift, has been all but exhausted. Since our Committee has insufficient funds to supply the large demand for the booklet, in quantity orders we are compelled to charge the cost of publication as well as mailing for such orders.

The amount charged will be one and one-half cent per copy in quantities, and postage will vary according to zones. For a single copy ten cents should be sent for postage and handling.

Several papers have reprinted the booklet in whole or in part, notably the Baptist Standard and The Word and Way. The total circulation to date crowds the half million mark, and indication points to a million copies.

* * *

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC PERSECUTIONS IN BOGOTA

A letter to the Executive Director from Edward G. Miller, in reference to an inquiry concerning what might be done by the Department of State about the persecutions of our Baptist Church in Bogota, December 22 and 23, says:

"The Department of State has been deeply concerned because of these latest incidents in Colombia, and our Embassy at Bogota presented a protest to the Foreign Office regarding them on December 27, 1951. The Colombian Government's reply has not yet been received. I can assure you that the Department will continue to follow developments closely, and that our Embassy is doing everything possible to protect the interests of the American missionaries in Colombia."