


1959

# Conflict of Allegiance

Luther W. Martin

Follow this and additional works at: [http://digitalcommons.acu.edu/crs\\_books](http://digitalcommons.acu.edu/crs_books)

 Part of the [American Politics Commons](#), [Catholic Studies Commons](#), [Christian Denominations and Sects Commons](#), [History of Religions of Western Origin Commons](#), and the [Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Martin, Luther W., "Conflict of Allegiance" (1959). *Stone-Campbell Books*. 248.  
[http://digitalcommons.acu.edu/crs\\_books/248](http://digitalcommons.acu.edu/crs_books/248)

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by the Stone-Campbell Resources at Digital Commons @ ACU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Stone-Campbell Books by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ ACU. For more information, please contact [dc@acu.edu](mailto:dc@acu.edu).



**WRESTLING  
WITH AN  
IRRECONCILABLE**



**CONFLICT  
OF  
ALLEGIANCE**

**LUTHER  
W.  
MARTIN**



## Neither Party Can Afford a Roman Catholic Presidential Candidate

The Roman Church is one of the few religions in Christendom whose complexion is both political and spiritual. It is this peculiar combination that makes the Roman Catholic Church somewhat of a "Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde" organization.

### CATHOLICISM'S USE OF MATERIAL AND TEMPORAL MEANS

That the Roman Catholic Church does not confine her activities to spiritual matters alone is freely admitted, even by her own writers.

The Church, as a perfect society, sovereign and independent, has supreme spiritual authority over her members, legislative, judicial and executive, by divine law. Her authority is independent of the civil authority of the State, and is of a higher order. Though instituted for a spiritual end, the Church has the right to use material and temporal means to secure that end, and in the use of such means as are necessary she has exclusive authority. (Attwater, *A Catholic Dictionary*, 2nd ed., revised; New York: The Macmillan Company; p. 41.)

*Catholics must unite their strength toward the common aim, and the Catholic hierarchy has the right and duty of guiding them.* (Pope John XXIII, quoted in *The St. Louis Review*, Dec. 12, 1958; headline: "Pope on Politics.")

From the foregoing we note: (1) The Catholic Church claims the "right to use material and temporal means" to secure her goal of supreme spiritual authority over her members. (2) She claims "exclusive authority in the use of such means"—either temporal or otherwise. (3) Pope John XXIII insists that "the Catholic hierarchy has the right and duty of guiding" Catholics in their voting and in their choice of elective officials.

Thus, Rome's kingdom is of this world, and she

resorts to political or temporal pressure in an effort to reach her predetermined "spiritual" goal.

### CHURCH AND STATE—AS VIEWED BY ROMAN CATHOLICISM

The relations of Church and State are based on the following principles: (a) Each is a perfect society, supreme in its own domain, the Church in spiritual things, the State in material and temporal things. (b) Each is juridically independent of the other. But because of the nobler end of the Church—the glory of God and the salvation of souls—the State is bound to further that end by refraining from all interference with the Church's legitimate authority and by aiding her positively . . . (c) The Church has the absolute right, independently of the State, to those material and temporal things which are necessary to her spiritual ends, e.g., Church buildings, funds. (d) The Church is a society of a higher order than the State, so that in a conflict of rights over mixed matters the Church must prevail. (Attwater, *A Catholic Dictionary*, p. 97.)

Two facts should be observed from the above quotation: (1) The state is "bound" to further the purpose of the Catholic Church, by "aiding her positively." (2) The Church "must prevail" in any "conflict" between herself and the State over "mixed" matters. Obviously, if the Catholic Church refrained from political, temporal, and material pursuits, she would not "conflict" with the state.

### OTHER RELIGIONS—AS VIEWED BY ROMAN CATHOLICISM

**FREEDOM OF WORSHIP:** The inalienable right of all men to worship God according to the teaching of the Catholic Church. No state can justifiably prevent the exercise of this right; and indeed it has a duty to foster this true worship, and Christ established one form and content of public worship in establishing only one Church, to which all are commanded to submit. . . . (*Ibid.*, p. 201.)

Here again we note (1) Roman Catholicism's concept of religious freedom is the freedom (?) to accept religion "according to the teaching of the Catholic

Church," rather than the freedom of worship granted by the U. S. Constitution, *i.e.*, the privilege of choosing whatever form of worship one thinks best. (2) The state "has a duty to foster this true [Catholic] worship." Such a *fostering* by the state of one religion is completely contrary to the Bill of Rights and the American concept of freedom of worship.

### THE FOUR FREEDOMS—AS VIEWED BY ROMAN CATHOLICISM

*From what has been said it follows that it is quite unlawful to demand, to defend, or to grant unconditional freedom of thought, of speech, of writing, or of worship, as if these were so many rights given by nature to man. For, if nature had really granted them, it would be lawful to refuse obedience to God, and there would be no restraint of human liberty. It likewise follows that freedom in these things may be tolerated wherever there is just cause, but only with such moderation as will prevent its degenerating into license and excess. (The Church Speaks To The Modern World, Doubleday & Co., 1954, p. 80.)*

Notice, please, that the foregoing quotation was published as recently as the year 1954. Originally it was made by Pope Leo XIII. Look at the statement again: "It is quite unlawful to demand, to defend, or to grant unconditional freedom of *thought*, of *speech*, of *writing*, or of *worship*."

Let us now look at the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press, or of the right of the people peaceably to assemble. . . .

It is impossible for any Roman Catholic political candidate to resolve the conflict between the teachings of his avowed religion and that of the Constitution of the United States. "No man can serve two masters."

## LIBERTY TO CHANGE GOVERNMENTS—AS VIEWED BY ROMAN CATHOLICISM

Whenever there exists, or there is reason to fear, an unjust oppression of the people on the one hand, or a deprivation of the liberty of the Church on the other, it is lawful to seek for such a change of government as will bring about due liberty of action. (*The Church Speaks To The Modern World*, pp. 80, 81.)

Two reasons are given in the above for "lawfully seeking to change the government": (1) unjust oppression of the people, and (2) depriving the Roman Catholic Church of her "liberty." This second reason would depend upon the definition given by the papacy as to what constitutes the "restriction of her liberty." Was, for example, the removal of government subsidies from the Roman Catholic Church in Argentina sufficient "deprivation" to justify a "lawful change" of government—*by revolt?*

During World War II, a pamphlet was published by the Paulist Press, entitled, *God In Society*, from which we take the following:

All men of good will must enter the battle for LASTING PEACE. It is the NEW CRUSADE to rescue the *spirit* of man from error, doubt and sin. It is a world-wide battle for truth, justice and love.

There are five stages in this battle. We must restore to the human person his dignity and rights; we must restore matrimony and the family to their God-given place in Society; the dignity and rights of Labor must be respected; our JURIDICAL ORDER must be rebuilt; THE CORRECT IDEA of the State must be brought back to the modern world (sic).

Are we to conclude that the "modern world" is not as correct as the world of the dark ages? Just what does the Roman Catholic hierarchy think it will require to "correct" the government of the United States? Is our government so incorrect that Catholicism is in any way deprived of her liberties?

Another statement in this *God In Society* pamphlet (p. 31) says:

The Papal Peace is radical. It goes back to roots. The roots of Christian [meaning Roman Catholic] Tradition. For 400 years men have tried to follow other traditions. Their failure is written in a welter of blood. The Papal Peace aims at re-making, rebuilding the world on the Christian [Catholic] Tradition.

Now we know! What happened 400 years ago that Roman Catholicism is trying to remake and rebuild? It was in 1517 that Martin Luther first publicly opposed the power of the Roman Church. He was excommunicated in 1521. Subsequently, the German nation almost entirely left the fold of Catholicism. Protestantism was born!

Lest some question our conclusion as to what was referred to 400 years ago, note this further statement:

In the past 400 years the Christian [Catholic] Tradition became the lost horizon. It was first dimmed out by Protestantism. The dim out grew darker and darker until Rationalism, Naturalism, Liberalism, Unbridled Capitalism turned the dim out into a black-out . . . (*Ibid.*, p. 18.)

In addition to Protestantism, it appears that the Catholic Church is also fighting what it terms "Unbridled Capitalism." Are we to assume that Capitalism is not sufficiently "bridled" by the Democratic system of government—our American free-enterprise system?

In case the reader thinks that we have selected some isolated radical booklet from which our quotations are taken, let us go again to the *Catholic Dictionary*:

Modern large-scale business could not be developed or continued without the system of capitalism; but it is the destroyer of all small industries and of independent individual responsibility and control. The capitalist system is not in itself unlawful, but easily becomes the cause of abuses which the Church unequivocally condemns. (Attwater, p. 73.)



Remember that we are citing Catholic Church approved publications, from which it is evident that a Roman Catholic cannot honorably and loyally serve both his espoused religion and the United States government as it now exists, and upon which this nation stands!

## THE DEADLY PARALLEL BETWEEN COMMUNISM AND CATHOLICISM

The theory that the political, economic and personal freedom proper to man without distinction of class can only be maintained when property as the means of production is widely distributed. Distributists hold that large concentrations of wealth or property are bad, and they seek to promote the revival of ownership of land, workshops, etc., by individuals and are generally opposed to monopolies and amalgamations. They hold that the "smaller-holder," small shop-keeper, the peasant and the artist-craftsman are the normal men and that Capitalism (the rule of the money lender) and Industrialism (the rule of the machine) can be deliberately undermined and gradually abolished. Distributism has no religious affiliation but its theory is claimed to be in special harmony with Catholic teaching as to the nature of man and his needs. (*Ibid.*, p. 152.)

The above definition and description of "distributism" is claimed to be "in special harmony with Catholic teaching," which includes the idea that "Capitalism and Industrialism can be deliberately undermined and gradually abolished"! Certainly the Catholic Church delves into the material and temporal realm!

Question: Is not the goal of Communism that of "deliberately undermining" and "abolishing Capitalism and Industrialism"? We assume that Communism would undermine it more abruptly than Catholicism is willing to do. We do not charge that Catholic political philosophy is *entirely* in harmony with Communism. But the two systems are amazingly similar in several respects:

1. Both are un-democratic in structure.
2. Both oppose the separation of Church and State.
3. Both tend to deify their leaders.
4. Both oppose free public schools.
5. Both suppress freedom of thought, speech and worship.
6. Followers of either ideology must pay homage to a foreign temporal ruler—the Kremlin at Moscow, or the Vatican at Rome.
7. Both use violence in the achievement of their goals.

#### VATICAN CONCORDATS WITH FRANCO, HITLER, MUSSOLINI AND PERON

Due to her involvement with the various dictatorial governments of the past and present, the Vatican cannot afford to endorse Capitalism, Industrialism, or even a Democracy!


There is no best form of government. There is no best form of society. Because Americans want the democratic form of government, that does not prove it the best form. Nor does it mean that every other people in the world must adopt it, in order to secure the rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Democracy is not the only right form of government, the only way of peace, the only path of freedom. The way of peace and freedom is the way of justice securing the common welfare; the way of good will expressed in the co-operation of all classes in the State, under whatever form of government the people of the State may choose. (*God In Society*, pp. 13, 14.)

The author of the above statement fails to recognize the import of his last clause—"whatever form of government the people of the state may choose." We have yet to hear of a dictatorship or monarchy wherein the "choice of government" is left to the people. Yet, in a Democracy, that is exactly what the people are privileged to have—the right to choose for themselves.

## CONCLUSION

In view of the exact quotations contained in this treatise, taken from *current* authentic Roman Catholic Church-approved publications, we believe that we have completely established our premise—namely, that neither political party can afford a Roman Catholic Presidential candidate!

Think of the inner turmoil and mental conflict which must plague the public official who is torn between two loves: The religio-political movement through which he has been conditioned and indoctrinated from babyhood, and the country whose Constitution he has sworn to uphold against all foes. Will he, can he, honorably serve his nation? If he conscientiously tries to do so, he will find himself in conflict with the teachings of the Catholic Church! Will he, can he, remain faithful and loyal to the Roman Catholic Church, with the Roman Pontiff as its "infallible" head? Can he faithfully uphold the principles of our democracy? We pity the man who tries to serve two masters!



*Published by*  
**THE FREEDOM PRESS, INC.**  
**P. O. Box 128**  
**Nashville, Tennessee**

10c a copy  
\$5.00 per 100