alienation would cease if there were a relaxation of doctrinal standards has not been realized. Comprehension, once a source of strength to the Church of England, has now become a source of weakness.[21]

Fr. Good relates that the Committee on Unity which reported to the Council seemed surprised that Pope Pius XI, in 1928, made it clear that submission to the papacy is the first condition of unity, and seemed further surprised that there are no signs whatever of any abatement of this demand in the last twenty years. Quite naturally the Committee concluded that the prospects of intercommunion (with the Catholic Church) are unpromising for the present. Fr. Good concludes: "The Lambeth Report of 1948 is a sad commentary on the churches of the Anglican communion. It is a series of doubts, concessions and inconsistencies, and the word 'Comprehensiveness' is put forward as the solution of all difficulties. . . . It used to be disputed whether the Church of England still retained its catholicity of dogma at the death of Henry VIII. We are confident today that its dogma is non-existent."[22]

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.
The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

[21] *The Clergy Review*, XXX, 2 (Aug. 1948), 84.
[22] *The Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, Fifth Series, LXXI, n. 977 (May 1949), 414.

BISHOP SHAHAN ON THE PRIESTHOOD

The world is girdled with holy altars, at whose edge stands an army of priests, chosen for the unbloody but saving immolation of the Lamb. And between them all, and between them and the Lamb, there is a divine solidarity of office. Whatever they may be worth as men, whatever be the insignia of rank and authority, they are all public agents of the Savior, constituted for all men, for all their needs and hopes; constituted forever in the sight of all men, leaders like Moses, priests like Aaron, prophets like David,—nay, themselves daily, in one sublime hour, the symbols and the vicars of Christ in His Passion, Death, and Resurrection.

—Bishop Shahan, in "The Office of the Priesthood," printed in *The Catholic University Bulletin*, July, 1900, p. 296.

THE "CATHOLIC" VIEWPOINT ON INDUSTRY COUNCILS

For the past fifteen years or so, literally thousands of Catholic speakers and writers have been stirring up the millions to consider seriously the contents of the encyclical, *Quadragesimo anno*. We have been boasting that the real answer to our economic problems will be found in the pages of any five-cent pamphlet carrying the message. We have been challenging the world to forsake the social framework within which it has been operating and adopt the principles put forth by the Vatican.

Before we go much further and find ourselves trying to defend a position that may cause us embarrassment, it might be well to take stock and determine what this social doctrine of ours really means and what may be some of the logical consequences.

The underlying thought of the Vocational Group concept is that the workers be organized into their own unions, in each industry; employers be organized into their own freely chosen associations and that the public (presumably to be represented by government) joins with the other two parties in forming Industrial Councils, dedicated to the common good, to work for mutual objectives harmoniously agreed upon by the representatives of all three parties.

Technically, the scope of the Vocational Group extends beyond the limited sphere of industrial life. The popular terminology of "Industrial Councils," however, has been accepted by the Administrative Board of the Welfare Council of the American Hierarchy. We use the term in the sense expressed by the Bishops' Committee in its annual messages.

The purpose of this present article is to create discussion on the subject with the hope that a clarification of some points may result.

It is the opinion of the writer that the Vocational Group concept of industrial society is basic to the doctrine expressed in the encyclical. We do not believe, however, that it is meant to be a blueprint for any one, definite, form of economy. There are no hard and fast lines drawn which must be followed.

Salvo meliore judicio, it is our contention that the teaching contained in *Quadragesimo anno* is a *declaration of principles* which outlines the *nature of industrial society* when it has developed to such a stage that some definite *order* must be established. It indi-

cates the *proper relationships* which must prevail between the parties involved if *stability* is to be maintained. It is not concerned so much with the participation of individuals in industrial relation negotiations, but rather points out how a *properly functioning economy* fits into the pattern of a *properly functioning political order*.

Some have objected to what they call the "monopoly feature" of the Vocational Group set-up. Others insist that the papal proposal is but *one* way of achieving an economic order. Neither dissent seems valid to us.

The first objection, we believe, is based on the assumption that the doctrine of the Vocational Group philosophy and the specific "syndicate" structure cited are one and the same thing. We do not think that they are.

The two topics are treated separately. The first deals with principles. The second merely calls attention to an experiment. The reference, evidently, is to Mussolini's attempt at an ordered industrial society. The Pope admits that certain features of the plan are commendable, but we fail to see a complete "placet" for the plan in the passage. To identify these two sections of the encyclical seems to us a grand mistake.

Ultimately, a *definite* social framework will result from the acceptance and application of the principle. A "plan" must be evolved from it. But *in itself* it can not be so labelled. *The Form is to be determined by the participants.* As the Pope writes: "It is hardly necessary to note that what Leo XIII taught concerning the form of political government can, in due measure, be applied also to vocational groups. Here, too, men may choose whatever form they please, provided both justice and the common good be taken into account."[1]

On the other hand, we do not concur in the opinion that the Vocational Group doctrine is merely a suggestion of *one way* of achieving an economic order. The papal plea does not make any sense to us except on the basis that it lays down the *principles* which must be followed *regardless of what form the practical set-up* is to take when they are applied.

If this conclusion be correct, it places upon us the social obligation to promote the Industry Council concept as the unique and

[1] Cf. the translation of *Quadragesimo anno* in Nell-Breuning's *Reorganization of Social Economy*, p. 424.

Catholic viewpoint for the complete and adequate restoration of industrial society. It implies a rejection of the *status quo* unless it can be shown that our present economy operates on principles that are consistent with and not contrary to the papal doctrine. It is the contention of the writer that the two are not compatible.

The insistence of the encyclical is on the re-establishment of a Vocational Group society. The chief qualifications of those vocational groups or guilds, as noted by Pius XI, are that they

> *are autonomous;*
> *embrace whole industries and professions;*
> *are federated with other constituent groups;*
> *possess the right of free organization,*
> *assembly,*
> *and vote;*
> *that they should dedicate themselves to the common good,* and with *governmental protection and assistance function in the establishment of justice and the general welfare in economic life.*

Study that outline and see if you can reconcile it with what today goes by the name of Modern American Capitalism.

It is assumed, and the propoganda on the subject is profuse indeed, that our American economy is one of free enterprise. Often times there are as many meanings given to the words as there are men who proclaim them. Usually what is meant is that, allowed to function without interference, the action and reaction of supply and demand will, through competition, result in a balanced and just distribution of the fruits of production.

Rev. Raymond McGowan, in one of his syndicated articles pointed out quite clearly that we do not have in America any one unified economic system. It is rather a conglomeration, a hodge-podge of different and often conflicting applications of a variety of principles. There is monopoly and near-monopoly, and the lack of the same. There is government regulation of some industries and the lack of it in others. There are restrictions by law upon some parts of the economy and a contrary policy adopted toward other segments. There is evidence even of free enterprise but not much that is not affected in one way or another by the overshadowing influence of Big Business.

Describe the modern capitalistic "system" as you will, we fail to see how it corresponds in any way to the concept of industrial society put forth in the encyclical, *Quadragesimo anno*.

Aside from the isolated cases of varied co-operative enterprises which you may find, the system as a "system" seems to us to be a negation of the papal teaching.

Where is there any similarity between the Big Business economic set-up now prevailing in America, with its concomitant class-warfare, and the *Order* of industrial society demanded by our Catholic social doctrine?

It is the contention of the writer that we must accept this doctrine of the Church and follow it to its logical conclusion or cease pretending that there is a Catholic position on the subject.

The logical conclusion involves: (1) A repudiation of the status quo; (2) the frank admission that the Church advocates a *limited planned economy;* and (3) a courageous teaching of the subject on the same plane that we preach our doctrine on marriage, education, etc. regardless of popular reaction to the subject.

The question is not: "Can we convince a prejudiced world that this is the correct concept of industrial society?" The real issue is: "What is the meaning of the papal pronouncements and are we going to accept or reject them?"

Our present economic system violates fundamental principles which the Pope insists are necessary for a sound social order. It ignores the very nature of industrial society.

The first basic principle which our Management-Finance controlled economy ignores or violates is the *Principle of Subsidiarity.* The whole concept of the Industry Council philosophy is based on this principle. The primary demand of this principle is that no higher and greater authority should usurp functions that belong to a lesser society.

Capitalism, as it has developed, provides no means for its participants to act upon the principle of subsidiarity. Pushing its burdens back upon the political arm of the government, it has encouraged the State to intrude and encroach upon areas of economic life that rightly belong to private enterprise. The result has been a hybrid mixture of socially unstable institutions as Fr. McGowan has indicated, and the establishment of an economic "system" which

can not be defended by any one who accepts the Christian social doctrine.

Even a cursory examination of *Quadragesimo anno* should convince us of the futility of attempting to defend the so-called principle of "free" enterprise. The need of repudiating it is inescapable.

In *Quadragesimo anno* Pius remarked: "Free competition, though within certain limits just and productive of good results, cannot be the ***ruling principle*** of the economic world. . . . Still less can this function be exercised by the economic supremacy *which within recent times has taken the place of free competition.*"[2] A little later he says: "Free competition is dead; economic dictatorship has taken its place."[3] Previously the indictment read: "This accumulation of power, the *characteristic note* of the modern economic order, is a natural result of limitless, free competition which permits the survival of those only who are the strongest, which often means those who fight most relentlessly, who pay least heed to the dictates of conscience."[4]

These, of course, are but random references to the popular economic error of an "automatic" industrial order based upon a policy of "free" enterprise as a guide and governor of an economy. But, put even these few pieces together, study them in the light of the tremendous economic power now wielded by a relatively few giant corporations as revealed in reports of the Temporary National Economic Committee in 1938 and the task of reconciling American Capitalism with papal social doctrine becomes well nigh an impossibility.

We have been so immersed in our own capitalistic environment, our pattern of thought has been so moulded by the atmosphere in which we have lived that it is difficult for us to envision any other. His Holiness, Pius XI, however, from his vantage point on Vatican Hill is encumbered by none of the prejudicial influences which might sway our thinking.

The encyclical presents papal thought on the subject of industrial society with pointed insistency. And rightly so, we believe, because to a world infatuated with Individualism and tortured by a love of its own patched-up disorders, the Church is publicizing what the *real nature of industrial society* actually is. "For *as nature induces* those who dwell in close proximity to unite into municipali-

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 424-25. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 428. [4] *Ibid.*

ties," says Pius XI, "so those who practice the same trade or profession, economic or otherwise, combine into *vocational groups*. These groups, *in a true sense autonomous*, are considered by many to be, if not essential to civil society, at least its *natural and spontaneous development*."[5]

From this passage the noted interpreter of *Quadragesimo anno* concludes that the union of citizens in civil society and the union of members in the Vocational Groups "appear *natural* to the Pope."[6]

The Bishops' Committee in its 1947 annual message said: "The *Christian* view of economic life *supports the demand for* organization of management, labor, agriculture and the professions under government encouragement but not control, in *joint* effort to avoid social conflict and to promote cooperation for the common good." Pius XI, by analogy, likens the *inducement of nature* toward Industrial Councils to that of citizens to form civil society. The Bishops put it down as the *Christian* view of economic life.

If we understand the papal analogy correctly, Pius is telling us that the idea is not *so essential* that it will be found even in primitive society or in a pioneer industrial world. But as civil society is formed, grows and develops into an ordered and stable State, *so, too must industrial society grow as a social organism*—and for the same reason. The very nature of human society dictates the course of action.

How strong that sanction of nature is or under what specific phase of the natural law it falls, the writer confesses that he does not know at the present time. But that Pius XI puts it in these terms is unmistakable and that Nell-Breuning, the classic interpreter of the encyclical, infers that the Vocational Groups *represent the natural status of a highly developed industrial society* cannot be gainsaid.

In confirmation of that premise might we not also ask the question: "If the Industry Council relationship of capital and labor is not rooted in nature in some way, before there is any thought of a practical application, on what basis can '*autonomy*' be claimed for the groups?" It is in dealing with this idea of industrial "autonomy" and the relationship that it has to the State that the note of insistence comes out clearly:

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 423. [6] *Ibid.*, p. 222.

Just as it is wrong to withdraw from the individual and commit to the community at large what private enterprise and industry can accomplish, so too it is an injustice, a grave evil and a disturbance of right order for a larger and higher organization to arrogate to itself functions which can be performed efficiently by smaller and lower bodies. This is a fundamental principle [The Principle of Subsidiarity] of social philosophy, unshaken and unchangeable, and it retains its full truth today.[7]

The Sovereign Pontiff then remarks: "The aim of social legislation must therefore be the *re-establishment of vocational groups*."[8] The Outline Press translation by Dr. Francis Brown reads: "The social policy of the State must be the re-establishment of the Professions and Industries." *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, June 1, 1931, gives us the original text: "In reficiendis igitur 'ordines,' ars politica socialis incumbat necesse est."

If this concept does not correspond to the "natural and spontaneous development" of civil society, as the encyclical states, and is not so rooted in the very nature of society as to demand a juridical (autonomous) order of its own, why should papal authority so bluntly place the burden of establishing such an order upon the State? Why does Pius link the nature of vocational group society so closely to the nature of the State itself? To our mind, the development of the argument reveals the real nature of industrial society. Nor is it merely an empty, "up in the clouds" expression of a half-formed opinion. It is pregnant with practical significance. It is loaded with social dynamite.

The repudiation of our hybrid "free," monopolistic, government-regulated Capitalism flows directly from the acceptance of the principle of the Vocational Group concept of industrial society. The two are incompatible. If we were to be content merely with a negative attitude of refusing assent to our present system, nothing more than mild resentment might follow. It is when we draw out the doctrine to its logical conclusion that the repercussions come fast and hard.

Carry the contrast of the two philosophies to its logical conclusion and you begin to understand why the immediate and spontaneous reaction to the Catholic viewpoint is frequently one of opposition. If we merely enunciate the principle on the high plane of theory alone (on a plane so removed from reality that it appears

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 422. [8] *Ibid.*, p. 428.

but a vague and illusory ideal), few protests are heard. Reduce it to the level of a practical solution put forth to supplant the disordered conflict and confusion now prevailing, and a roar breaks forth as the listener perceives the gash that is inflicted upon his prejudices.

The reason for the pained expressions and the howl of dismay is not hard to find. This truly radical and daringly different doctrine of the Church runs counter to Modern Capitalism as it has developed in structure and operation. It brings us face to face with the challenge of accepting the papal doctrine and rejecting the modern economic order or shunting the encyclical aside as a weakly-expressed suggestion and complacently conforming our convictions to things as they are.

We maintain that the Industrial Council principle is not in itself a formal, detailed "plan." But the acceptance of the premise leads directly to the necessity on the part of the participants in industrial relations to establish the "form" that the economy will take.

When the Bishops' Committee in its 1948 message says, "Co-operation must be organized; freedom must be ordered," we do not believe that they are using the words metaphorically. They are calling for a realignment of relationships between Capital and Labor which differs from what we have at present. The three participants are to be Capital, Labor, and the Public.

You can not "organize" *co-operation* without establishing a social framework within which the co-operation is to take place. The Industrial Council set-up is to be the framework. You can not *"order"* freedom without placing limitations on the activities of the individual. Nor can you place limitations upon three participating parties without introducing some kind of an agency in which will reside *social authority*.

The content of this organizing and ordering is not some nebulous, negative, vague, or illusory plea for co-operation in general. The objectives are of the stuff that industrial relations are made of—wages, prices, profits, production—the vital elements around which the class struggle now revolves.

As a matter of fact it is at this focal point that the full meaning of the encyclical is revealed. It is here that the Vocational Group concept comes to grips with the contentions of the Free Enterprise Individualists.

Pius expresses the warning in rather strong language. He says:

> Labor, indeed, is not a mere chattel, since the human dignity of the workingman must be recognized in it, and consequently it cannot be bought and sold like any piece of machinery. None the less, the demand and supply of labor divides men on the labor market into two classes, as into two camps, and the *bargaining* between these two parties transforms the labor market into an arena where the two armies are engaged in combat. To this *grave disorder*, which is leading society to ruin, *a remedy must be applied as speedily as possible*. But there can not be question of any perfect cure, except this opposition be done away with, and well-ordered members of the social body come into being anew, *vocational groups namely*, binding men together not according to the position they occupy on the labor market, but according to the diverse functions which they exercise in society.[9]

By the application of the formula of two plus two equals four, what the Pope is saying is this: Bargaining over wages (and the equivalent of wages) transforms the so-called labor market into an arena. The cause of the class conflict must be eliminated. The only way this can be done is by an agency to persuade the two parties to accept an *objective standard* or by a social authority superior to the conflicting parties which will determine a human wage on a principle of justice and in the full light of the common good. The Vocational Group set-up provides for either alternative.

Wages, however, are not absolutes. They are relatives. Their value is necessarily related to prices and production. If you are to eliminate wages from the competitive area of the labor market, so too must prices and production and co-related elements fall under the jurisdiction of the social authority delegated to deal with the problem.

This does not mean a "totalitarian" control of the industrial world. It certainly does not envision complete government control or the relinquishing of the right of private property. It entails an autonomous regulation of the economic order by the management-labor participants themselves. As much of industrial relations must be placed under restriction as is needed to establish *order*, to guarantee *stability* and *to protect the public welfare*. Competition is not outlawed. But it is constrained and confined to definite channels of operation.

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 423.

Unlimited competition is nothing more than the law of the jungle applied to economics. State strictures on the practices of competition gradually can grow into a creeping Socialism.

It is perfectly evident, nevertheless, if you wish to avoid State control and you rule out "no control," there can be but one basis for Order—namely a self-regulated industrial society. That is the final aim of the Church's doctrine. Nothing else makes sense. A human society devoid of authority and order is a contradiction. It is anarchy no matter what other name you might try to give it.

A possible misconception must be anticipated and avoided. It is not as though the encyclical envisions the "mobilizing" of the millions from some far distant place to live and work under a new order by organizing and ordering them into a society alien from what they now know. *The groups are already there. They exist.* Inchoative in some instances; more fully developed in others. But the industries—steel, rubber, textile, auto, communications, etc., by their very existence and the common bond of producing and distributing the same kind of goods which links the parties together—*are already functioning* as social entities. It is in their *functioning*, however, on a *class-warfare principle* as they do at present, that the *natural* relationships have gone awry.

What the Church purposes to do is to *reorientate* the objectives of the participating parties toward the mutual goal of the common good and *to realign the relationships* so that the *proper representation* can be exercised by the three essential partners.

If we are to compete in the arena of public opinion with the Communists and Socialists on the left and propaganda agencies like the National Association of Manufacturers on the right, we must boldly proclaim our doctrine.

In publicizing the Catholic position on industrial society we have, it seems to us, but one of three choices. We can support:

(1) The *status quo*, which is in reality an implicit acceptance of laissez faire as the original principle of the present economy and of its natural consequent, monopoly; it condones *increasing government control* to curb abuses rather than self-regulation as the corrective.

(2) Complete government control, which, of course, is contrary to all that we hold.

(3) The promotion of Industrial Councils on all possible levels, culminating in a *social authority*, autonomous, but within the framework of the political democracy.

We believe the first possibility must be rejected. Despite the comparable advantages of Modern Capitalism in contrast with other existing economies and certain oases of order in the vast desert of economic disorder, we have yet to discover a positive principle of social order to justify it *as a whole*.

If the Industry Council principle represents the *natural* state of industrial society we do not see how one can condone the capitalistic *status quo* any more than one might approve of divorce as normal to domestic society, or aggression and anarchy to civil society.

In origin, the capitalistic *status quo* defies the papal denunciation of free competition as a guiding principle for economic life; the Bishops' Committee, in its 1940 annual message has passed judgment upon it as "predicated on false principles." In its present structure and operation it repudiates the principle of subsidiarity and runs counter to the exhortation of Pius that the "social policy of the State must be the re-establishment of vocational groups."[10] The mongrel mixture of unilateral monopolistic private enterprise and a constantly encroaching government interference contradicts the encyclical teaching on the nature of both Industry and the State.

The second supposition stands self-condemned in the simple stating of its terms.

The third of the three choices enumerated is the only one which can be logically and consistently accepted in the light of the encyclical teaching on Vocational groups. (Profit-sharing and other piecemeal solutions offer no provision to date for the integrating of the disparate but interdependent activities that must be co-ordinated. They are a step in the right direction toward the papal goal. They are not, however, the adequate answer to the problem.)

Once you grant the inevitable conclusion of a *natural* Industry Council economic order you must reject the unilateral domination of industrial society. The relationship of the three parties (management, labor, and government) then must be determined. This

[10] *Ibid.*, p. 422.

is a challenge to our Catholic philosophers which lays out a whole world of research before them.

The taunting query pops up immediately, "What are the specific rights and duties of the participating groups?"

To some, the difficulties inherent in answering that question are overwhelming. Perhaps they are. The limitations of the human intellect on the point, however, do not give us the right to deny, distort or disregard the original premise from which the question naturally flows.

Some tell us that we must first determine the "efficiency" and "workability" of our doctrine before we strenuously advocate it in public. Others shy away from it lest it be not adaptable to American circumstances or prove unacceptable even to prominent capitalists, whose "dogmatic" Catholic lives may be beyond reproach.

We do not recognize this attitude as the traditional procedure among Catholic students. It is not the normal approach to other subjects whose content is derived from right reason and which involves moral implications. Why introduce an innovation in the field of human relations in the economic world?

Many individuals consider divorce as a more "efficient" answer to their problem than monogamy. You will find educators who ridicule the Catholic viewpoint on education. They tell us it is neither practically "adaptable" to American circumstances nor acceptable to the experts in the field of education.

O. Henry, in one of his delightful quips on the foibles of human fancy, remarks, "Tobin was always looking for the 'unnatural' in nature." It may be all very well for O. Henry's Mr. Tobin to seek out the "unnatural" in nature if that be what his avocation in life calls for. The Catholic philosopher and sociologist, however, devotes his time and talent to exactly the opposite viewpoint. His desire is to seek out the "natural" in nature and to reveal his findings to his fellow men.

So intent are we in making known the nature of man and the natural relationships which should exist among men that the Popes have not hesitated to issue encyclicals, the source of whose truth is not based on revelation alone. Whole sections of the social doctrine appeal for their cogency not upon any dogmatic pro-

nouncement but upon truths which can be deduced *by* natural reasoning.

So intimately are the two sources, revelation and right reason, linked that it is quite common to speak of the "Catholic" attitude on some issue or subject even though there is no direct dogmatic basis for the position.

The Vocational Group concept of industrial society, is, we believe, one of those deductions. In the treatment and teaching of the subject, we do not believe that we have any right to look at it merely in the light of how a prejudiced public may react to it. Many practical men, experienced in the field, attest that this is the economic order of the future, if there is to be any free economic order in the years to come. Our present-day students and seminarians are the leaders of the future. Is there any mandate in Catholic teaching that demands that we be always twenty-five years behind the times and the teachings of the Vatican?

The Church is not responsible for either the rise or the development of Modern Capitalism. She has no divine commission to defend it. She may suffer concomitant material losses if the system collapses. But regardless of the present or the future of the "paradise of free enterprise," we still have the duty to promote our own teaching. It is our conviction that we can do so without fear of fallacy, in either the economic or the moral order, because the doctrine has a firm foundation in the natural relationships which should prevail in a properly ordered industrial society.

Quadragesimo anno is twenty-five, perhaps fifty years, in advance of the present generation. The refusal or reluctance of Catholics to study and spread the doctrine, however, will not lessen the time span for its acceptance.

The Socialists of fifty years ago were in a similar position. Their pioneer efforts of propaganda are today paying dividends. If we allow our opportunities to be lost by default, Socialism or Communism will inevitably hold the place in the future which we will have abdicated by indifference to our own doctrine. The very condition of our present economy makes that conclusion appear to be a certainty. If we wish to contribute to the defeat of Socialism twenty-five years from now, we will proclaim our own teaching today.

The one obstacle that stands in the way is that which Pius XI

remarked in the opening pages of *Quadragesimo anno*, as he commented upon the popular reaction to the original Leonine pronouncement. It "was so far and so unexpectedly in advance of its time," lamented Pius, "that the slow of heart ridiculed the study of the new social philosophy, and the timid feared to scale its lofty heights."

Pius himself, however, was undeterred. He went right ahead and wrote another encyclical, this time boldly championing the principle of a vocational group society. It is inconceivable that the Pope struggled to bring forth this immortal message merely as practice in penmanship.

William J. Smith, S.J.
Crown Heights Associated Activities
Brooklyn, N. Y.

The Perpetual Infallibility of the Church

As the unity [of the Church] is perpetual, so is the infallibility. Once infallible, always infallible: in the first, in the fifth, in the fifteenth, in the nineteenth century: the Divine Teacher always present, and the organ of His voice always the same. A truncated infallibility is impossible. To affirm that it has been suspended because of the sins of men, denies the perpetuity of the office of the Holy Ghost, and even of His presence; for to suppose Him present but dormant, is open to the reproach of Elias; to suppose His office to be suspended, is to conceive of the Divine Teacher after the manner of men. And further: this theory denies altogether the true and divine character of the mystical body as a creation of God, distinct from all individuals, and superior to them all: not on probation, because not dependent upon any human will, but on the Divine will alone; and, therefore, not subject to human infirmity, but impeccable, and the instrument of probation to the world.

—Cardinal Manning, in *The Temporal Mission of the Holy Ghost* (New York, 1875), pp. 88 f.

CAESAROPAPISM IN ACTION

Great names appear on the list of those who have fought for the independence of the Church, for the primacy of the spiritual over the material. Athanasius, Basil, John Chrysostom, Ambrose, and Augustine are but a few of the noble men who in the course of their lives have striven to make certain that the members of the Church which Christ founded might enjoy the freedom which was rightfully theirs as the children of God. Each in his own way, in his own time and place, met the challenge of powers which would have subjugated the Church to their own selfish interests; and each for the time, at least, with the help of God promised to those who work for his interests, turned back the onslaught of those powers. Others might or might not in their turn do as much, but these champions won their combats in their day.

Thus, when the Arian bishops, defeated at Nicea and still protesting that decision, cast about for support outside the Church which had decided against them they betook themselves to the court of the Emperor at Constantinople. The aging Constantine fell, to some extent, under their influence and ordered Athanasius, the youthful successor of Alexander at Alexandria, who had fought so strenuously against Arius, to receive him once more into his communion. Careful as he had been, from the time he joined forces with the Christians, not to interfere in matters ecclesiastical, the Roman Emperor, with the long tradition of sovereignty over religion as well as civil affairs behind him and with a preoccupation to preserve the peace of his realm at all costs, did not hesitate to tell the bishop of Alexandria whom he should admit to his communion, regardless of the decision taken at Nicea.

Athanasius, unable to accede to the command of the temporal power in a matter such as this, refused to receive Arius and was promptly sent into exile at Trier in the northwest territories of the Empire. Constantine, however, contented himself with meting out this punishment to a recalcitrant bishop and did not proceed, as his son did later, to put another "bishop" in Athanasius' place. By 337, therefore, the new emperors, adopting a changed attitude, could permit Athanasius to return to his see where he proceeded to rally round him the bishops and monks of Egypt.