



REPORT FROM THE CAPITAL

★ RELIGIOUS LIBERTY ★ BAPTIST PRINCIPLES
★ PUBLIC AFFAIRS

This monthly newsletter is published by the Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs, 1628 Sixteenth Street, N. W., Washington 9, D. C. Subscription price, \$1.00 per year. C. Emanuel Carlson, executive director, W. Barry Garrett, associate director.

September 1960

THE RELIGIOUS ISSUE AS CAMPAIGN PUBLIC RELATIONS

"The psychology of political propaganda is similar to the psychology behind much present-day advertising; in fact, 'public relations' experts are important members of both campaign organizations. Campaigners claim to appeal to man's rational powers. In actual fact, however, they often employ a subliminal approach which appeals to man's irrational powers and therefore makes exploitation possible. For example, both parties appeal to the self-interest of laborers, of farmers, of small businessmen, of large businessmen, of minority groups, of regional partisans, etc."

This is Professor Hugh Wamble's view of the public relations setting of the "religious issue." Readers of the Report From The Capital will be interested in the diversity of public relations viewpoints which informed observers are currently describing.

Professor Wamble's Analysis

In a discussion of the religious issue in politics Hugh Wamble, professor of church history in Midwestern Baptist Seminary, has made the following observations:

"A campaign issue is a subject introduced either by the campaigners or by the electorate, or by both. It is a subject on which there are differences of opinion and sometimes irreconcilable viewpoints. Moreover, these differences have a bearing, directly or indirectly, on the outcome of political problems, in this case the election of a President for the United States.

"There are many factors which have made religion an issue in this campaign. First, campaigners have discussed it and will continue to do so. Republicans will stay rather clear of the subject, lest they lay themselves open to the charge of religious intolerance toward Catholics. (Over a period of several decades the fiction has been created that Catholics are not and cannot be intolerant.) When Republican campaigners refer to religion, they will necessarily adopt a magnanimous attitude, deploring bigotry and urging the electorate not to register votes on the basis of a candidate's religion.

"Democrats will deal differently with the issue. They will bring it up more frequently. Kennedy made

religion an issue in the West Virginia primary. It was the first item to receive attention in his acceptance speech in Los Angeles. Democrats will also say that one's religious affiliation is not relevant to his conduct of office, that religious abuses in other times and places are not relevant, and that any President, including a Catholic, will resist religious pressures and obligations. By constantly bringing religion up for the purpose of censure, Democratic campaigners will keep it before the public as an issue.

"If the former conduct of campaigners is a clue to what we may expect in this campaign, campaigners will exploit this issue in the most feasible manner. Republicans will, and must, repudiate intolerance. As in the West Virginia primary, Kennedy may assume the role of a patriotic American whose obligations to the government are the same as everyone else's, but whose political career is threatened by religious bigots, contrary to the Federal Constitution and the principle of separation of church and state. He has already insinuated, so he may be expected to employ the insinuation again, that a vote against him might be construed as an anti-Catholic vote."

An American Roman Catholic Viewpoint

In his book, "A Roman Catholic in the White House," the Episcopal Bishop of California, James A. Pike, contrasts an American Roman Catholic viewpoint with the traditional Catholic position. He quotes John Courtney Murray, a distinguished liberal Catholic theologian as saying:

"Concretely the present problem concerns the provisions guaranteeing 'the free exercise of religion.' That has become characteristic of the democratic state constitution. At least, this is usually conceived to be the major aspect of the problem. In fuller form, the problem may be stated as follows: Can the church accept, as a valid adaptation of principle to the legitimate idea of democratic government and to the historically developed idea of 'the people' (to which the democratic government appeals for its legitimacy), a constitutional system of church-state relations with these three characteristics:

"(1) the freedom of the church is guaranteed in a

guarantee to the people of the free exercise of religion;

"(2) the harmony of law and social institutions with the demands of the Christian conscience is to be effected by the people themselves through the medium of free political institutions and freedom of association;

"(3) the cooperation between church and state takes these three forms: (a) constitutional protection of the freedom of the church and all her institutional activities; (b) the effort of the state to perform its own function of justice, social welfare, and the favoring within society of those conditions of order and freedom necessary for human development; (c) the effort of the church, through the action of a laity conscious of its Christian and civic responsibilities, to effect that Christianization of society in all its dimensions which will enable and oblige the state, as the instrument of society, to function in a Christian sense."

In concluding about the differences between the traditional Catholic view and the modern "American" view, Pike says: "We hope that there is some way round this dilemma. The American interpretation is much more compatible with the religious views of the rest of us, let alone the general philosophy of American Constitutional life. But, if this 'way round' is available, then we should hope for some firm declaration from the Pope, in effect telling the chief of his Holy Office, Cardinal Ottaviani, that his position is wrong and that certain American spokesmen are right. The argument set forth in Roman Catholic pamphlets and books for the appropriateness of infallibility is that by this means definite answers can be given the Church and the world on important questions. Moreover, with a sharp division within the Roman Catholic Church itself (a division in this country, as well as abroad), this would be certainly a good time for the supposed advantage of the doctrine of infallibility to manifest itself. It would be helpful to all of us in this country, not simply to our distinguished, sincere, and loyal Roman Catholic citizens."

Presbyterian Statement On Candidates

In a statement on the religious faith of candidates the 172nd General Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church U.S.A. said: "Noting the focus of public attention on the religious faith of candidates in an election year; the 172nd General Assembly considers it the duty of all citizens to examine a candidate's position on important issues of public policy, including those related to the separation of church and state; and believes that it is an act of irresponsible citizenship to support or oppose a candidate solely because of his religious affiliation."

In the commentary on the statement the United Presbyterians said:

"Earlier this year a thorough study, Roman Catholicism and Religious Liberty, by Dr. A. F. Carrillo de Albornoz, was published by the World Council of Churches (available for \$1.00 from the National Council of Churches). It delineated a strong drive within the Roman Catholic hierarchy to revise its 'tradi-

tional' position of repressing 'error' where it has the power to do so.

"As two of the articles in June Social Progress suggest, the office of the United States presidency is not comparable--in the scope of its responsibility, the diversity of its constituency, its resistance to pressure groups--to local offices such as school board director, mayor, or city council member. The President symbolizes the national, as over against a local or regional, interest and is expected to represent it. In doing so he has no choice but to appear to act in a nonpartisan way, since he will otherwise be opposed and supported by members of his own party and members of the opposition party in Congress and elsewhere. He does not confront, as may a mayor or a school board member at the local level, a politically dominant religious majority capable of bringing great pressure to bear--even if such a national majority existed, which it does not."

Carlson Gives Freedom Priority

Recently C. Emanuel Carlson, executive director of the Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs, wrote a brief article on the activity that much of the Nation would be interested in during the period between the adjournment of Congress and the election in November. A pertinent section of that article that had to do with the public relations aspects of the presidential campaign is as follows:

"During the next two months speeches and conferences will spread as a rain all over the land. Baptists, like all other citizens, will be discussing many topics with many men who aspire to a larger or smaller measure of political power and influence.

"Some Baptists will be concerned that business and industry shall be free to take advantage of the abundance of would be laborers in their area. In other areas Baptists will be concerned that the laborers shall be paid an adequate wage. Personal and community interests and viewpoints will be expressed by men of many faiths. Out of this welter of discussion will come a more or less clear formulation of the total national interest. This is the democratic process at work.

"It is to be hoped, however, that Baptists in all personal and community situations will be interested in religious liberty. This is the time to find out whether the future legislators and administrators understand the importance of free souls under God. Do they realize how important is the freedom to worship or not to worship, to choose one's own faith and join the church of his choice, to exercise voluntary stewardship unto God and not to be taxed for the support of religious institutions? Do they recognize that these things cannot be unless the churches remain free and independent? Are they aware of the historic tendencies for governments to use churches and their channels for political and national purposes? Are they acquainted with the age-old temptation of churches to ask for support of political authorities?

"Now is the time to talk these things over. They are really more important to our country and to the world than are wages, the location of industries, or the level of taxation."

THE PRESIDENCY AND THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH

By Robert A. Baker
 Professor of Church History
 Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary

There is a great deal of discussion right now about the effect the election of a Roman Catholic President might have on distinctive American principles. Another question is in order. What effect will this presidential campaign have upon the Roman Catholic Church, principally in America but ultimately in Rome?

The Roman Catholic system in its historical development has combined many varying factors, some seemingly antagonistic to one another but brought into harmony by a rigid episcopal hierarchy. That is why the Church presents one facet in Spain, another in the United States, another in South America. Monkish orders are sometimes so individualistic that they appear to rival Protestant denominationalism, but under the strong headship of the Curia Romana they fall into their proper niches.

Despite all such diversity one unswerving rule has characterized Romanism since the Hildebrandine reform. Whether dealing with Africa or England, Cordova or Wittenberg, the papal government has demanded obedience to the fundamental doctrines defined by Rome. Local and incidental variations may be winked at, the theory being that the end involved in compromise will justify the means. This strict obedience has been enforced in various ways; sometimes by dangling a Cardinal's hat before the eyes of an ambitious bishop who is tardy in his compliance; sometimes by diplomatic and friendly coercion through clandestine channels; sometimes by unqualified fiat. The ideal of obedience was set out by Ignatius Loyola, founder of the Society of Jesus, who wrote:

That we may be altogether of the same mind and in conformity with the Church herself, if she shall have defined anything to be black which to our eyes appears to be white, we ought in like manner to pronounce it to be black. For we must undoubtedly believe, that the Spirit of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the Spirit of the Orthodox Church His Spouse, by which Spirit we are governed and directed to Salvation, is the same....

The seriousness of the present campaign for the Roman Catholic Church in the United States may be measured by the vital nature of the things being discussed and the importance of the individuals involved. The areas now being discussed constitute the core of the Roman Catholic system. The flexibility of Roman Sacramental and disciplinary development permits dispensations and exceptions all along the normal channels of life. Parochial and diocesan legislation may vary from country to country. Even conciliar legislation, represented in the general canons of the Church, has varied and has been changed from time to time. However, in the basic nature of the Roman Catholic system there is one area that is sacrosanct and inviolable. Dogmas of the church cannot be changed.

A canon or rule or law can be altered or rescinded, but a dogma is a truth or principle revealed to

the Church by God and can never be changed, a truth as certain and irrevocable as the law of gravity. It is not considered to be a human production but is a divine and immutable principle discovered and enunciated by the Church. An example is the dogmatic definition given by Pope Pius XII on November 1, 1950, in which he declared that the Virgin Mary was assumed bodily into heaven after her death. All Roman Catholics were reminded that they must now believe this pronouncement in order to be saved. This is now a permanent and irrevocable doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church, unaffected by time or geography.

Now, such dogmas were exclusively the work of ecumenical councils until 1870 (with one exception), when Pope Pius IX was able so to control the Vatican Council that by majority vote it clothed him with infallibility under prescribed circumstances and correlatively authorized him to issue dogmatic pronouncements without the aid of an ecumenical council. The decree closed with the statement that ex cathedra definitions of the Roman pope "...of themselves--and not by virtue of the consent of the Church--are irrefragable. If anyone shall presume (which God forbid!) to contradict this our definition; let him be anathema."

Such infallibility was claimed ex post facto for the pronouncements of all previous popes. Six years earlier Pius IX had issued a Syllabus of Errors, an official doctrinal statement which actually was a collection of pronouncements by previous popes supplemented by additional items authorized by Pius IX, in which various heretical views were condemned. Professor A. H. Newman points out that the immediate successor of Pius IX (Leo XIII) asserted that this Syllabus was issued under conditions that made it an infallible dogma. Several of these infallible dogmas are of particular interest because of their place in the contemporary campaign.

The Syllabus infallibly condemns the belief that "...every man is free to embrace and profess the religion he shall believe true, guided by the light of reason..." that "...the best theory of civil society requires that popular schools, open to the children of all classes, should be freed from all ecclesiastical authority..." that "...the Church ought to be separated from the State, and the State from the Church..." and that "...in the present day, it is no longer necessary that the Catholic religion be held as the only religion of the State, to the exclusion of all other modes of worship...."

In other words, if a member of the Roman Catholic Church must believe a dogmatic pronouncement in order to be saved, then he must deny the right of every man to embrace the religion of his free choice, he must condemn the public school system, he must deny the principle of separation of church and state, and he must oppose religious liberty.

It is evident, then, in the presidential campaign now underway that Senator John Kennedy, a devout

Roman Catholic, seconded by his archbishop and buttressed by public statements from many outstanding American Roman Catholic churchmen, is deliberately denying obedience to dogmatic pronouncements of Rome when he asserts that he believes in the American principles of separation of church and state and complete religious liberty for all. If Kennedy and these distinguished American Roman Catholic leaders are willing to deny the dogma of the nineteenth century, what will they do with earlier dogmas which form the basis of the nineteenth century declaration?

From the assertion of Cyprian that no man can have God for his father who does not have the Church for his mother to the pronouncements of the Vatican Council, the doctrinal system of the Roman church is of one piece. The Syllabus of Errors, which Kennedy and others are now declaring to be provincial and anachronistic, represents basically the exact doctrinal spirit developed through centuries of tradition and struggle by the Roman Church. To disavow these pronouncements is to imperil the whole dogmatic structure of Rome.

What is Rome doing in this situation? She has made known her repugnance for these developments. The Vatican newspaper has stoutly asserted that a Catholic "can never overlook the teachings and direction of the Church. In every section of his activities he must inspire his private and public conduct by the laws, orientations, and instructions of the hierarchy." Evidently Rome will remain comparatively quiet awaiting the outcome of the election, hesitating to alienate powerful and rich American Roman Catholic leadership, hoping that the price she must pay will not bankrupt her.

Be careful, Rome: by ignoring or permitting flagrant and deliberate disobedience to dogmatic pronouncements you may certainly enhance the chances of Senator Kennedy to be elected, but you may also be hastening the processes that could lead to the establishment of a separate American Catholic Church. As in 1521 you may win the battle but lose the war.

What is going on in the minds of the rank and file of the Roman Catholic Church in America? Roman Catholics are not blind; this deliberate snubbing of dogmatic pronouncements of Rome will not go unnoticed, regardless of the outcome of the political campaign.

Without really analyzing their situation, many American Roman Catholics are proud of Kennedy for displaying the patriotic American spirit which they admire and want to follow. On the other hand, a casual reading of the American Roman Catholic periodical literature gives such proof that many are quite uneasy about the reversal of century-old Roman Catholic doctrine involved in the positions taken by Kennedy.

Is Kennedy really sincere? Of course, it should be said that nobody should question a candidate's sincerity in an election year. Apart from the sincerity of Kennedy, however, the support of his position by American Roman Catholics in high places has overtones of radical differences between the traditional views of Rome and those of American Romanism.

After the campaign is over, American Roman Catholics will have something to ponder about: disobedience to a dogma. It is a disobedience not casual but vital, not accidental but deliberate. Basically, the relegation of papal pronouncements to European politics of another century would negate every dogmatic pronouncement of the Roman Church and deny conciliar and papal authority.

A loyal monk in the sixteenth century, without meaning to do so, set forces in motion that led to radical reform; would it not be ironic if a loyal son of the Church in the twentieth century, without meaning to do so, should set in motion forces that could conceivably result in another radical reform?

WELCOME, NORTH AMERICAN BAPTISTS

The General Council of the North American Baptist General Conference, Frank R. Woyke, executive secretary, is sending the Report From The Capital to every active pastor in the fellowship. Others already doing this are the Baptist Convention of New Mexico and the Midwest Baptist Conference of the Baptist General Conference.

There was no August issue of the Report From The Capital. There will be two in September, one of which will be a special report on the recent Religious Liberty Conference. The "Report" is published at least 10 times each year.

REPORT FROM THE CAPITAL

Issued by
Baptist Joint Committee
on Public Affairs
1628 16th Street, N. W.
Washington 9, D. C.

Cooperating Conventions
Southern Baptist Convention
American Baptist Convention
National Baptist Convention
of America
National Baptist Convention,
U.S.A., Inc.
Baptist General Conference
North American Baptist
General Conference

Bulk Rate
U. S. Postage
PAID
Washington, D.C.
Permit No. 41353