

tion of His beauty in her, our dim eyes grow accustomed to goodness, until at last they can gaze lovingly upon the full splendor of Christ Himself, who with the Holy Spirit will lead us to the Father. To give Mary apostles who would co-operate in her mission of bringing back to Christ not only individuals but the very social order itself, Chaminade recruited sodalists consecrated to her by promise, "sodalist-religious" consecrated by vow and finally totally consecrated religious, living a community life like that of the primitive Church by uniting harmoniously all categories of apostles—priests, teaching brothers, and working brothers.

Thus, the Marianists, having now taken their place among the century-old American institutes, stand as a living testimonial to the power of consecration to Mary for the active apostolate, refuting by their continued existence and activity the contention that Mary's is a call only to contemplation and therefore that Fatima is opposed to the active life. The ideal of the Marianists as here set forth clearly indicates that consecration to Mary involves a contemplation which springs into action, forming a perfect balance between these two complementary, not opposed, forms of Christian life.

Fr. Chaminade saw the necessity of this consecration for the apostolate a hundred years before the Fatima message. Shall we who have been blessed with this new message, and with the miraculous seal that forms a perfect approach to the modern materialistic mind, overlook its importance for Catholic Action?

Robert Knopp, S.M.

*William Cullen McBride High School
St. Louis, Missouri*

AMERICANISM" REVIEWED BY ABBE FELIX KLEIN

The publication of the autobiographical volume of Abbé Felix Klein this year under the title of *L'Américanisme, Une Hérésie Fantôme* (Paris: Librairie Plon, 1949) gives us a new account of the most notable controversy in American Catholic history. Klein was unwittingly at the center of the controversy and takes this opportunity to review the whole affair and with great satisfaction to make the charges of heresy ridiculous. The controversy has two distinct phases, the story of the controversy in France and the strange adaptation of that controversy in this country.

There were certain tendencies in Catholicism in the United States which laid the foundation for the controversy in this country. These tendencies manifested a certain progressiveness which could properly be called the real Americanism. Its manifestations could probably be seen in the defense of the Knights of Labor, in the attempts to work out a solution of the Catholic school question, in the exchange of civilities with non-Catholics in the World Congress of Religions in 1893, in the condemnation of Cahenslyism and in the general policy of Americanization under the direction of Cardinal Gibbons and Archbishop John Ireland. The "progressive" group of American bishops, led chiefly by Archbishop Ireland and Bishop John Keane, the first rector of the Catholic University, and their friends, were filled with optimism about the future of Catholicism in the United States. Nowhere was this optimism better expressed than in the publications of Archbishop Ireland when he spoke of "The Future of Catholics in America" and on "The Church and the Age." For him, not only was the American ideal the highest ever proposed but it would attain its fullest glory when America had become Catholic. Already Catholicism was making great strides along this path and it was necessary that the Church abandon its old ways of defensive action, go into the outside world, enter into the social and economic problems of the day and show that there was no conflict between democracy and religion or between science and the Church.

beyond the seas to Rome itself. In this country the German bishops did not take too well the rejection of the Memorials of Peter Paul Cahensly, asking for greater German membership in the American hierarchy, and the German press kept up a constant attack on all measures of Americanization. They were joined by Archbishop Michael Corrigan and his guide and protector, Bishop Bernard McQuaid of Rochester, and by Bishop Richard Gilmour and his successor Bishop Ignatius Horstman of Cleveland, who opposed Ireland in the school question and in certain political affairs. In Rome these more conservative prelates had friends in Fr. Salvatore Brandi, S.J., editor of the *Civiltà Cattolica*, Cardinal Camillo Mazzella, S.J., both of whom had lived for some time in the United States, and in Cardinal Francesco Satolli, the former Apostolic Delegate to the United States, who had once been friendly to Ireland but who had returned to Rome with feelings described as unfriendly to the "progressive" bishops. A series of events brought the two groups into conflict in the last decade of the century. Two leaders of the German groups in this country were Fr. Joseph Pohle and Fr. Joseph Schroeder, two German theologians whom Keane had recruited for the first faculty of the Catholic University. In 1894 Pohle had announced his resignation and his return to Germany in a letter accusing the University of American intolerance and of heretical ideas. Schroeder remained but continued to criticize the American bishops. In 1896 the Holy Father, Pope Leo XIII, sent a letter announcing that according to the custom in papal universities Keane's term as rector of the Catholic University should be terminated and a new rector appointed. Keane accepted the letter with great humility and refused at first the offer of an office of honor in Rome. But the enemies of Ireland and Keane began to boast that the letter of the Pope was really a form of criticism of the progressives, and there were rumors that Ireland would next be called upon to resign his see. So persistent was this rumor that Cardinal Mariano Rampolla, the papal Secretary of State, was forced to deny that the Holy Father had any intention of asking for Ireland's resignation.

In the meantime, two other departures of note took place from the University. Abbé George Peries, a canon law professor closely associated with Pohle and Schroeder in their opposition to Keane and Ireland, had sent a threatening letter to Bishop Horstman and

the episcopal committee of the University should they dare to make any charges against him. The bishops immediately demanded his resignation. He returned to France, where he furnished newspapers with accounts unfriendly to Archbishop Ireland and Keane. Subsequently the bishops demanded the resignation of Dr. Schroeder. He demurred and obtained support for his cause in Rome, but the bishops refused to change their decision and he went back to Germany where he was received with honor.

During all this time there was available in the bookstores of this country a biography of Fr. Isaac Hecker, the founder of the Congregation of St. Paul, or the Paulists, by Father Walter Elliot, C.S.P., published in 1891. Although it had the *imprimatur* of Archbishop Corrigan and an introduction by Archbishop Ireland it received no unusual attention in this country. In France, however, it had attracted the attention of Count de Chabrol, who had visited the country in 1867-68 and had met Fr. Hecker. Count de Chabrol had admired greatly both the new country and the saintly Paulist. He was delighted with the biography and suggested to the publisher LeCoffre that it be published in a translation which his friend, Mlle, de Guèrines, of Clermont-Ferrand, had prepared at his request. The publisher agreed to examine the manuscript and sent it to a young clergyman consultant for the firm, Abbé Felix Klein, for his opinion. That was in the early part of 1897.

Klein liked the book and suggested that the translation be improved, some excessive verbiage be taken out and some phrases be replaced with phrases more suitable for the French public. He was too busy at that time to make these changes himself but when the publisher threatened to drop the book, Chabrol and M. Paul Thureau-Dangin persuaded him to undertake the task. The book also needed a preface, since Ireland's introduction was for American readers and Klein prepared a preface of about thirty-five pages. In those pages he pointed out the salient character of Hecker, his spiritual doctrines and his new messages for the modern world. He compared Flecker to Lincoln, yet quoted praise for his spirituality from Pius IX, Archbishop Ireland and Cardinal Newman. He compared Hecker's journal to the Confessions of St. Augustine and the writings of St. Teresa. Further he called him a doctor, a leader, in the new paths which the faithful were called to tread.

Klein said Hecker's Americanism was really not exclusively American. Hecker had recognized the new state of the human mind

in the modern world and had found in his Catholicism the answer to all these new higher propensities of the human mind, Hecker had found the modern solution in the submission of the individual soul to the Holy Spirit. While warning the faithful that there was no difference between the interior direction of the Holy Ghost and the external guidance in the Church, Hecker stressed this individual guidance and liberty. He had praised the Anglo-Saxon adherence to interior virtues. He explained the defeats of Catholicism in southern Europe by their adherence to the defensive ways of the sixteenth century. Instead of the passive virtues of that defensive period there was need of active virtues. "Our age is not an age of martyrdom, nor an age of hermits, nor a monastic age.... Our age lives in its busy marts, in counting rooms, in workshops, in homes, and in the varied relations that form human society, and it is into these that sanctity is to be introduced." "In Father Hecker," Klein said, "we have not merely a man of our own time but a man of the future." The preface was dated June 5, 1897, the vigil of Pentecost. Shortly after the appearance of the translation an essay by Count de Chabrol, "Un Prêtre américain, le Révérend Père Hecker," although already written before the publication, appeared in the *Correspondent* of May 25 and June 10. The book sold quickly and before long a second edition was issued. Within a short time there had been seven editions of the French biography.

The comments on the book were generally friendly. Laudatory reviews appeared in the *Journal des Débats* and *Temps*. *L'Univers* and even German publications praised the book. Then in August, 1897, during the Fourth International Congress of Catholic intellectuals at Fribourg, from Aug. 16 to the 20th, at the ninth session Monsignor Denis O'Connell spoke of Fr. Hecker, praising him for his Americanism. Bishop Turinaz of Nancy had been unable to hear the paper but arriving later at the same session he proceeded to attack the character of Fr. Hecker, charging that he was trying to introduce Protestant ideas into the Church. Abbé Klein felt impelled then to defend Fr. Hecker and to point out that the heresies charged against Hecker, particularly that he believed in the direct submission of the soul to the Holy Ghost, did not constitute the real meaning of Fr. Hecker's teaching. O'Connell's paper was intended to clear Hecker's name from certain false notions that had begun to be attached to him by some reviewers of

the French biography. He distinguished two kinds of Americanism, one which concerned political affairs, and in this O'Connell praised the ideals of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. The other was ecclesiastical, and concerning that Americanism O'Connell pointed out the liberty of the Church in the United States as compared to the enslavement of the Church in countries where Church and State were united.

It so happened that there had been a controversy going on in France for sometime concerning the proper relations of the Church to the French Republic. Pope Leo XIII in his letter to the French bishops, *Au milieu des sollicitudes*, in February, 1892, had given support to those who favored greater co-operation with the Republic. That same year Archbishop Ireland, coming directly from Pope Leo, had spoken in Paris in June praising the growth of the Church in democratic United States and urging greater co-operation by the Church with the spirit of the age. Thus the word "Americanism" had already acquired a meaning unfriendly to the more conservative members of the French hierarchy and clergy, and it was not long before this group began a full scale attack on the life of Hecker and the errors of Americanism. In the van of this attack was the ex-professor, Abbé Peries, writing under the name of St. Clement, and Abbé Charles Maignen, a priest of the Congregation of the Brothers of St. Vincent De Paul, who had fought the progressive French Catholics, especially Count De Mun, under the name of Martel. The articles appeared in the conservative journal, *La Vérité Française*, in the spring of 1898.

In the meantime, Abbé Klein had been told by his friend, M. Ollé-Laprune, that Père Coubé, S.J., would preach at the Church of Saint-Sulpice on Sunday, Nov. 7, 1897, on a subject that would be of interest. After speaking of St. Charles Borromeo the speaker attacked four groups of persons who seemed to endanger the Church. They were: those American bishops who had participated in the Parliament of Religions at Chicago, those who had accepted the article of M. Brunetière on the failure of science, M. George Blondel, who advocated a new apologetics, and Fr. Hecker with his Americanism. The following Sunday, Père Gaudeau, S.J., preached a similar attack in the Church of Saint-Clotilde. The next Sunday, Nov. 21, another Jesuit attacked the same errors in

Sacré Coeur. The controversy began to occupy space in religious periodicals in France, Belgium, Switzerland, and even Rome.

When the series of articles in *La Vérité* had been completed they were gathered into book form and published under the title, *Le Père Hecker est-il un Saint?* The book was divided into four campaigns. The first two included the Parliament of Religions in Chicago and the attempt by Abbé Charbonnel to have a second congress in Paris in 1890. Charbonnel left the Church when permission for this second congress was refused, proclaiming himself an "Americanist." The third campaign was the publication of the life of Hecker. The fourth campaign was entitled "Under the Walls of Rome." The book was based only partly on the biography of Hecker. It used Klein's preface, some other writings of Klein, a few passages from the writings of Ireland, Keane and O'Connell, the writings of Charbonnel and added useful passages from the French version of the biography, which thus acquired a meaning at variance with the ideals of Fr. Hecker. Maignen was attacking the democratic clergy. He accused them of proposing a new apologetics which would limit external submission to the Church, of advocating a dangerous liberalism in dealing with non-Catholics, of proposing a complete separation of Church and State, of opposing the practice of evangelical virtues and the vows of religious orders and of preferring the active virtues over the passive and natural virtues over supernatural virtues. Failing to get an *imprimatur* for his book from the Cardinal Archbishop of Paris, Maignen obtained it from the Master of the Sacred Palace, Fr. Albert Lepidi, O.P.

Abbé Klein was taken ill at this time and consequently did not answer his critics and, he tells us, when he began to recover his friends entreated him not to lower himself to the level of his attackers by making an answer. The controversy was getting so intense that Cardinal Richard of Paris wrote to Klein asking him not to issue any new editions of the biography. Archbishop Keane and Cardinal Gibbons protested to Pope Leo XIII the granting of the *imprimatur* to the book by the Master of the Sacred Palace but do not seem to have effected too much, except with Cardinal Rampolla, who was their friend. The next move of the conservatives was to send the biography to the Congregation of the Index to have it placed on the Index of Forbidden Books.

In the meantime the controversy in France raged hotter and

hotter. Abbé Klein, in his autobiography, notes that the word Americanism in the conservative press began to mean every kind of radical doctrine. The liberal press, such as the *Correspondent*, answered in kind. In Belgium, Père A. J. Delattre, S.J., published an attack entitled *Un Catholicisme Américain* and finally Fr. Hypolite Martin, the Jesuit Superior General, published an attack in *Études Religieuses* on July 20, 1898. Abbé Klein notes that Fr. Martin was a Spaniard and felt bitterly the effect of the Spanish-American War. In Rome Fr. Salvatore Brandi, S.J., published *Américanisme, riposta a un articolo dell' "Opinione" sul P. Hecker*, in which he criticized *Opinione* and other liberal papers of Rome for their favorable comments on the life of Fr. Hecker. Maignen's book was translated into English but could not find an American firm to publish it. It was printed in England and offered for sale by Arthur Preuss of the *Review* of St. Louis, who had been a constant critic of Ireland and the Americanization programs.

The controversy had become so bitter that the Holy Father appointed a commission to study the matter. The commission was headed by Cardinals Satolli and Mazzella, who had been in America but who were known to be unfriendly to the progressive group of bishops. Brandi's pamphlet had indicated that a condemnation of the doctrines could be expected. Soon similar word reached the United States. This news came as a surprise to Archbishop Ireland, who had been assured of the contrary, and he hastened to Rome. Cardinal Gibbons sent a cablegram to Rome protesting any condemnation, but the message arrived too late. The Cardinals had given the Pope an unfavorable report. The Holy Father took their report under consideration and softened it sufficiently to indicate that the doctrines were not attributed to any actual persons and issued it on Jan. 22, 1899, under the title, *Testem benevolentiae*. Rampolla wrote to Gibbons that his protest had arrived too late and that the Pope had been forced to act to prevent a more serious division within the French Church.

The letter indicated that on the occasion of the publication of the French biography of Hecker certain doctrines had arisen which the Holy Father thought should be condemned. The main error was that in the new age the Church should relax her former severity and make approach to the Church easier, now that the Vatican Council had made the Church secure by the decree of papal infal-

libility. Based on this false premise certain other false doctrines were being proposed, such as, that external guidance of the Church should be set aside for direct intervention of the Holy Ghost in this new age; that greater importance should be given to natural virtues as better fitted for the problems of the age; that, dividing virtues into active and passive, active virtues were needed in the new age; that the vows of religious were alien to the modern world; and, finally, that the Church must devise a new method for winning back those outside the fold. The Holy Father did insist that he in no way wished to condemn the political theories, laws or customs of the United States.

Abbé Klein immediately submitted to Cardinal Richard. In his new account Klein expresses the thought that his hasty submission made it appear that he felt guilty of the heresies. Actually, he felt that the charges were phantom heresies raised up by the conservative French clergy to offset the effect of American Catholic progress and the trend toward co-operation with the French Republic. Archbishop Ireland, although he later admitted that he did not enjoy the trend of events, publicly thanked the Holy Father for the letter, saying that at no time had he ever held the doctrines condemned in the Apostolic letter. Keane wrote in a similar manner. Gibbons wrote that no Catholic instructed in his religion held the doctrines condemned, but did not give his letter to the press. Abbé Klein published in his autobiography a letter received from Bishop Thomas O'Gorman of Sioux Falls in March, 1900, in which O'Gorman says that there were at that time fourteen other archbishops in the United States besides Ireland. Three, Feehan of Chicago, Hennessy of Dubuque, and Bourgade of Santa Fe, did not reply to the Pope's letter. Four thanked the Pope for his solicitude but did not indicate that the doctrine existed in the country. They were Elder of Cincinnati, Chapelle of New Orleans, Christie of Portland and Ryan of Philadelphia. Ryan of Philadelphia said it could scarcely be found in the country. Four expressly denied that it existed in the country: Riordan of San Francisco, Kain of Saint Louis, Williams of Boston and Gibbons of Baltimore. Only two indicated that the doctrines existed in the country: Corrigan of New York and Katzer of Milwaukee. The New York letter indicated that the heresies existed in germ but that the letter would destroy them. Although sent in the names of all the bishops of the

New York province, some of the suffragans denied that they had signed it. The Archbishop of Milwaukee claimed that the denial of the American bishops that the heresy existed among them was a Jansenistic denial. The *Civiltà Cattolica* published only some of these letters and subscribed to the theory of the Milwaukee archbishop.

In this country at the next meeting of the archbishops a motion was made by Archbishop Ireland to investigate the charges of the Milwaukee prelate but in the vote that followed the presiding vote of Cardinal Gibbons prevented any action. Archbishop Katzer was absent. In France the attempt of the conservatives to claim that the Pope had condemned the democratic tendencies of the day was denied by Pope Leo XIII in a letter to Archbishop Servonnet of Bourges, dated May 25, 1899. Klein does not carry the controversy beyond the condemnation. Archbishop Ireland returned to favor with the Holy See but neither he nor Archbishop Corrigan ever attained their much desired cardinalates. Abbé Klein does not give much attention to the American phase of the controversy but he does show quite well that the European controversialists over Americanism were at war not over the Church in the United States but actually over the Church in western Europe.

THOMAS T. McAVOY, C.S.C.

The University of Notre Dame
Notre Dame, Ind.

Protectors of the Roman Basilicas

As the Lateran Basilica has been taken under the special protection of the kings of France, and that of St. Paul's is said to have owned the English monarchs for its patrons, so the church of St. Mary Major was identified for centuries with his most Catholic Majesty of Spain. One visible sign of this connection may still be seen in the richly-panelled and ornamented roof. It is gilded, we are told, with the first gold brought from America and presented to Pope Alexander VI by Ferdinand and Isabella.

—Fr. Thurston, S.J., in *The Holy Year of Jubilee* (Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1949), p. 205.