VOLUME 28 DECEMBER 1988 NUMBER 4

CONTENTS

THE INVESTITURE CONTROVERSY Paul D. Nolting

BOOK REVIEWS:

Prayer, Politics & Power, by Joel C. Hunter
Kingdoms in Conflict, by Charles Colson
The Naked Public Square, by Richard Neuhaus
[Reviewer: Paul F. Nolting]

Presenting The Catholic Faith:
A Modern Catechism For Inquirers, by Frank P. Siano
[Reviewer: Robert Mackensen]

THE INVESTITURE CONTROVERSY*

Paul D. Nolting

* This paper was originally written as a partial requirement for a graduate course in History at the University of Wisconsin–Eau Claire. – Editor.

If it were to happen today, an avalanche of newscasters would descend upon northern Italy. Ted Koppel would be on the telephone arranging the appearance of the two principals on "Nightline." Without a doubt there would be an intense play for world public opinion. Yes, if it were to happen today—if a powerful world leader were made to stand in the snow for three days garbed in penitent's clothes while the nominal leader of ex ternal Christendom deliberated over the merits of pronouncing absolution or not—the world would be interested, for wherever and whenever politics and religion meet in conflict, lives are af fected. People would want to know exactly when and where the conflict took place, who was involved, why it occurred, and with what consequences. Yes, if it were to happen today, people would be interested. But, why should an incident that occurred back in January 1077 be of any special interest today? Why should a conflict between King Henry IV of Germany and Pope Gregory VII merit our attention? The fact that Henry was indeed forced to stand barefoot in the snow for three days, while friends and foes alike pleaded with Gregory within Canossa's walls to pronounce absolution, might arouse a certain amount of curiosity. Such facts lend a quaint if not somewhat mythical quality to the study of history. But of what relevance is the entire conflict, known as the Investiture Controversy, to life today? Is there a reason to dust off the shelves of history and reconsider something which appears to lie solely within the sphere of interest of the medieval historian? The answer to that question is a simple, "Yes!" There are incidents in history which transcend both the individuals they involve and the age in which they occur, for the simple reason that their consequences affect future generations and ages. The Investiture Controversy is one of those incidents. It marked the beginning of a major change in the relationship of the church to the state in medieval Europe, a change which has generated repeated conflicts to the present day. It arose as a direct consequence of society's struggle to determine the basis of authority in the western world and who would exercise that authority. An understand ing of the Investiture Controversy can foster a better under standing of the past relationships of the church and state and the conflicts which involved them both. In addition, such an understanding can clarify the role many

churches are presently at tempting to take within society, especially the Roman Catholic Church, for its political goals and ideals were formed during the medieval period. To that end we will consider the back ground of the controversy, the two principal participants within the controversy, the controversy itself, and, finally, the outcome and effects of the controversy.

I. The Background of the Controversy

The latter half of the ninth century AD saw the dissolution of central authority in western Europe. The fall of Rome in the West left the church as the chief source of political power and stability. The church ultimately allied itself with the rising power of the Franks, and under Charlemagne a degree of centralized power was once again established. However, Charlemagne's descendants did not possess the necessary power or gifts to dominate and defend the kingdom he had established. In 843 the Treaty of Verdun divided the kingdom into three portions with Charlemagne's grandson, Ludwig, becoming the first king of Germany. By the time that his grandson died in 911, Ger many was hopelessly divided.

This division came as a result, not just of weak rulership, but also because of the exceptionally strong opposition offered by the Norsemen and the Magyars, who ravaged much of Ger many during the latter ninth and early tenth centuries. The result of these invasions was the establishment of an entrenched feudal society. Hundreds of individual lords offered knights land in return for military service. Knights in turn fought for those lords while controlling commoners, or serfs, whose alter natives were harsh labor or almost certain death.

Feudalism both helped and hindered the institutional church. It was during this time that the "proprietary church" system was developed. Under this system the individual who owned the land upon which a church was built also controlled the affairs of the church. Thus lay lords controlled both the parish priest and the parish purse. This total dependence upon the local lord led at times to rather serious problems. It was not uncommon for lords to use church funds for their own purposes, thus impoverishing the parish. Unqualified and inept clerics were frequently appointed to oversee such parishes. Should such clerics be married, and many of them were, their positions were then by custom inherited by their sons, many of whom had neither the mental or moral qualifications necessary for the priesthood. In spite of its obvious flaws, however, the proprietary church system was accepted by society to the point that, even when the monastic reforms began in the tenth century, there were very few challenges to the accepted authority of the lay lords. There were some exceptions. For instance, Abbot Abbo of Fleury wrote:

> Let him, who wishes the health of his soul, beware of believing that the church belongs to any save God alone. For He said to Peter, the Prince of the Apostles: "I will give thee My church"; "Mine", not "thine" . . . In truth, dear princes, we neither live nor speak as Catholics when I say "this church is mine", and some other says, "that church is his." (Barraclough 70)

Such opposition helped lay the theoretical basis for the controversies of the eleventh century. But, at the same time, society's acceptance of feudalism, with its layered structure of authority, helped the church. When the external church adopted the same approach towards authority, giving the papacy supreme control of the church, society in general was ready and willing to accept it.

During the tenth century, a series of Saxon and Franconian kings rid Germany of foreign invaders and reasserted central authority in Germany to an extent. Chief among the Saxon kings was Otto I. Otto I (the Great) defeated the Magyars in 951 and was later crowned emperor by the pope in Rome. "As a result of the successful defeat of the Magyars in 951, the role of a defender of the Latin Christian West was virtually thrust upon the kingdom of Otto I" (Ullmann, History 116). Unfortunately for Germany, Otto, as well as his successors, became enamored with the idea of creating a new Holy Roman Empire and so spent the better part of their energies crossing the Alps in an attempt to control the city-states of

Italy. When the pope opposed Otto's policies, Otto deposed him in 963 and forced his successor to sign what became known as the Ottonianum, a compact stipulating that, before a pope could be consecrated, he had to swear an oath of allegiance to the emperor. This, then, became the constitutional basis for the interventions by the Ger man emperors in papal affairs during the next century.

One of the by-products of the increased power of the Saxon kings was the increased use of church officials to serve in the secular governments. Bishops and Archbishops became not only servants of the church, but also servants of the lords and kings. The secular rulers found this advisable for at least two reasons: (1) the clergy were among the only educated members of society at that time; and (2) they supposedly were to be celibate and so would not be in a position to pass on their rights or possessions through hereditary lines as other officials. The result of this practice was a return to stability within the German state. Walter Ullmann writes:

> The most important reason for the internal advance and the domestic stability of the kingdom lay in the firm control which the king exercised in the appointment of high- ranking ecclesiastics, notably bishops and abbots, who in one way or another were wholly dependent on the king himself. The basis of this royal strength was the proprietary church system, which was raised to a major constitutional and social principle. In effect, every important see, church or abbey, had by the tenth century become de pendent upon the monarchy. The ecclesiastics provided a very efficient framework for the execution of royal policy—without these highly educated and capable men it would have been well-nigh impossible to administer and govern so vast a kingdom with any degree of efficiency. (Ullmann, History 116)

During this same period of time, the papacy in Rome experienced its greatest decline in power and morals. Within Rome itself the papacy was not viewed in spiritual terms but, rather, as "a collection agency whereby the pence of Europe might provide the dole of Rome" (Durant 537). The popes were elected by rival factions and were intended to enrich the nobility at the expense of the church. Bribery, murder, and the favor or disfavor of immoral women frequently brought about the rise and fall of many of these men. Pope Stephen VI, for instance, was imprisoned and strangled. Pope Sergius III was reputed to be the lover of one Marozia, who is said to have later secured the election of Pope John XI, her illegitimate son by that same Sergius. Between 955 and 1057, twenty-five different popes reigned, some being elected, others being appointed, and still others being assassinated. Yet, in spite of the popes themselves, it must be said that the authority and prestige of the papacy itself remained remarkably high during this period. The papal ecclesiastical system did function throughout Europe. Edicts were proclaimed; ecclesiastical courts did function. And all of the countries converted to Christianity during this time came under the jurisdiction of the papacy, at least nominally.

The papacy, however, was by no means alone in its problems, nor were such problems confined to the districts surrounding Rome. Three major problems confronted the entire church as viewed by those who wished to reform it in that day. First of all, the selling of church offices, a practice known as simony, was rampant. In France, Guifred of Cerdagne, a ten-year-old boy, bought the Archbishopric of Narbonne for 100,000 solidi in 1016. He occupied that position for 63 years, during which time he certainly recouped his investment many fold. Philip I of France is said to have consoled an un successful applicant for an episcopal see by assuring him, "Let me make my profit out of your rival, then you can try to get him degraded for simony; and afterward we can see about satisfying you" (Durant 541). Secondly, the ideal of celibacy among the clergy was seldom a reality. Throughout Europe priests married, and where they did not marry they kept concubines. In Milan, marriage was publicly encouraged, and the married priests alone seemed to have the confidence of the people, no doubt for good reasons. Thirdly, the practice of lay-investiture under mined the church's control of its clergy. It was universally recognized that secular lords would depend upon the clergy to assist them in governing the kingdoms, but many within the church resisted the thought that kings and princes would invest bishops and archbishops with

the symbols of their spiritual offices.

As time passed, more and more voices were raised in reform. Within the church the most well-known reform movement was headed by the monastery at Cluny, founded in 910, along with its sister monasteries. These individuals called for an end to the immorality among the clergy and those who sought to control society through the clergy.

The members of the Cluniac order were not alone, however. They found very staunch allies among some of the German emperors, in particular Henry II and Henry III. Upon receiving his emperor's crown in 1014, Henry II insisted that the papal officers in Rome and the papal states conduct themselves in a proper manner so as not to discredit the church. Henry II, who sought to regenerate the Christian society, felt that such a regeneration had to begin with the clergy. He himself led an exemplary life and was later canonized. Henry III, who married the daughter of the Duke of Aquitaine, the hereditary patron of Cluny, became an intimate friend of Abbot Odilo of Cluny. Later he would ask Abbot Hugh, the next abbot of Cluny, to be the godfather of his son and heir, Henry IV. Henry III was a very devout man who sought genuine reform within the church and was willing to use his power to further it. Through his efforts only those individuals of the highest quality were chosen to serve in the German church. Soon it became apparent that the German prelates were overall much better than their French and Italian counterparts. When during the 1040s three individuals all claimed to be the pope, Henry III was asked to intervene. He deposed all three men and replaced them with a series of excellent men. The third of these men was Bruno, a cousin of Henry III, who took the name of Leo IX. Leo IX did not want to become pope and, in fact, pleaded with Henry III that he was unqualified for the job. Henry III, however, felt that such humility was much to be desired within the papacy and finally prevailed upon his cousin to accept the position. This Leo IX did, but only upon the condition that his nomination be ratified by the people of Rome, as canon law demanded. When Leo IX traveled to Rome, he took with him a group of very talented and dedicated men who were intent upon reforming the church. Among these men was a young cleric by the name of Hildebrand, who would later become Pope Gregory VII. Leo IX spent only six months of his five years as pope in Rome. During the remainder of his life he traveled throughout Europe promoting the reform of the church and particularly of the clergy. He emphasized that simony would not be tolerated and that celibacy must become the standard of the church. He also opposed lay-investiture, but he carefully chose not to emphasize this matter publicly, in view of the greater moral problems with which he was confronted. He was a serious reformer, and during his period in office he deposed six lay bishops and repeatedly announced disciplinary measures against those who opposed his reforms. He was even said to have been supported by miracles, for when Bishop Sibico of Spires, who had lied when asked about his marriage, took communion as a means of purging himself, he is reported to have been struck with paralysis for the remainder of his life. Leo IX died in 1054, leaving his reform in the hands of his assistants. Henry III, unfortunately, died shortly thereafter in 1056, leaving his kingdom to his five-year-old son, Henry IV, which leads us to the second portion of our consideration—the personal backgrounds of Gregory VII and Henry IV.

II. The Two Principal Participants of the Controversy

Henry IV was born in 1050, the son of Emperor Henry III and Agnes. With a pious and capable father, it appeared that Henry IV had the best of all worlds awaiting him. Unfortunately, his father died in 1056, leaving Henry in the hands of Agnes and Pope Victor II. When Victor, a family friend, died less than a year later, the young king's future became more uncertain.

While Agnes was both pious and beautiful, it would appear that she lacked the abilities needed to train a young king. Henry was a gifted individual. He had a strong body and a quick mind. Unfortunately, he never learned to discipline him self as he might have under his father's guidance. After Victor's death, Henry became something of a pawn in the power politics of the day. He was placed under the care of

Archbishop Adalbert, who overindulged him. When other German prelates be came concerned about Henry's lax preparation, he was invited to a barge on the Rhine, abducted by Archbishop Anno, and then trained more rigorously for a time. Later, at age fourteen, he was returned to the side of his mother and Adalbert, where he remained throughout the rest of the regency.

When Henry was 16 he married Bertha, the daughter of Odo of Turin and Adelheid of Susa. She was a plain girl and considerably older than he. While they had been engaged for ten years, they had never laid eyes on each other. When Henry finally did see her, he refused to live with her and sought a divorce. The pope, however, refused to grant the necessary indulgence, and Henry resigned himself to the marriage. Eventually he fell in love with Bertha, and she became one of his most devoted supporters.

When Henry finally assumed control of his kingdom, he began to reassert the rights and exercise the authority that once had been his father's. This brought him into direct conflict with the newly elected bishop of Rome, Pope Gregory VII. Hildebrand, or Gregory VII, was and remains a controversial figure, to say the least. Peter Daimani, Gregory's contemporary and colleague in the papal court, once called him a "holy Satan!" Since then he has been damned and defended by men of every age. Some Catholic theologians have tended to romanticize Gregory VII by comparing him to Christ—he was the son of a carpenter, they say, and was attracted to priests at a young age. He possessed a single-minded purpose and died at the hands of secular powers (MacDonald 9-10). Such comparisons at best would appear to be somewhat superficial. On the other hand, the attempts of Nazi historians to tie Gregory to a Jewish ancestry in order to discredit his political thinking appear unjustified.

Hildebrand was the son of Bonizo of Tuscany and Bertha, a woman related to a banking family in Rome. He was born during the early 1020s and seems to have grown up in Rome. He himself later wrote that he had been educated, "with piety beneath the wings of the prince of the apostles, cherished in the bosom of his clemency" at the monastery of St. Mary, where his uncle was abbot (MacDonald 10). The Rome of Hildebrand's youth, however, was not a pious Rome. It was a Rome filled with seasoned troops and saucy trollops. It would appear that the power and pomp of the papacy, not its piety, first attracted Gregory. There is no evidence that Gregory prepared for the priesthood, but he did come under the influence of John Gratian, who induced him to begin a study of canon law. This became the only area of expertise, albeit limited expertise, that Hildebrand ever enjoyed. John Gratian, Hildebrand's uncle by marriage, was the archpriest of St. John at the Latin Gate. He later became Pope Gregory VI, the third of three popes ruling at the time, and included Hildebrand in his entourage. When Gregory VI was banished from Rome for simony by Henry III, Hildebrand accompanied him north of the Alps and served him as his private chaplain. While in Germany, Hildebrand continued his study of canon law. Before those studies were complete, however, he was called upon by Pope Leo IX to accompany him back to Rome to form part of the new papal court. Hildebrand would later write, "Yet unwillingly did I cross the mountains with my Lord Pope Gregory, but more unwillingly did I return with my Lord Pope Leo" (MacDonald 23). In spite of his apparent unwillingness, Hildebrand returned to Rome with Leo and assumed a lower post in the area of papal finance.

Interestingly enough, one of Hildebrand's first opportunities to serve as a papal legate came after the death of Leo in 1054, when he was sent to Germany to request a nomination for pope from Henry III. Henry III delayed his nomination for the better part of a year, and it appears that during this time Hildebrand had occasion to spend time with the young Prince Henry IV.

It was after the death of Henry III and under the papacy of Victor II that Hildebrand gained more influence in papal affairs. At this time he became the papal chancellor, and although he was still outshone by the leading cardinals, he did play an important role in the creation of the Election Decree of 1059. This decree created the College of Cardinals and declared that this body alone would fill vacancies on the papal chair. In view of the very weak regency in Germany, little opposition was voiced from north of the

Alps, and it would not be until Henry IV was older that the Election Decree would be challenged.

Throughout the 1060s Hildebrand's stature as a papal legate grew. He developed a close friendship with Abbot Hugh of Cluny, although it must be said that Hugh did not support Hildebrand in later years. Upon one occasion when the two of them were riding along, a whole group of men surrounded Hildebrand because he was the papal legate. Hugh is said to have thought, "Good God, what pride must grow in this man's breast, to be smiled on and served, as it were by the world." Hildebrand is said suddenly to have burst through the crowd, advanced to Hugh and confronted him with the words, "I don't, Lord Abbot, I don't." When Hugh asked, "What don't you do?" Hildebrand replied, "I'm not puffed up as you think in your heart of hearts. The honor they do is not to me, but to God and St. Peter the Apostle, whose legate I am" (Brooks 58).

On April 22, 1073, after the death of Pope Alexander II, Hildebrand, who had served in the papal courts for over a quarter of a century, was proclaimed by the populace of Rome to be the new pope. He took the name of Gregory VII, and now the third portion of our discussion must begin.

III. The Controversy Itself

In order to understand the events of January 1077, it is imperative to understand the situation confronting both Henry IV and Gregory VII in Milan. Milan was an extremely important city in its day. It lay at the entrance to some of the most important trading passes leading north through the Alps. It, therefore, occupied a very strategic geographical position and became very prosperous. Whoever controlled Milan controlled the economic and strategic life of Lombardy and consequently all of northern Italy.

Milan had always been a thorn in the flesh of the Roman curia. Besides its very obvious wealth it had a long ecclesiastical tradition of its own, and it became a center of resistance to papal reform. As noted earlier, most of the clergy in Milan were married. The Archbishop of Milan, Guido, had been appointed to and invested with his see by Emperor Henry III, a very obvious example of lay-investiture. During the 1060s Guido had finally submitted to papal pressure and had begun to reform the church. However, he faced so much resistance that he decided to resign his position. The question was: who would appoint his successor? Traditionally the King of Italy, the German Emperor, appointed Milan's archbishop, but Henry IV had not yet been crowned emperor by the pope. The papacy insisted that it alone had the right to appoint the new bishop. Thus the stage was set for a heated controversy for the right to invest the Archbishop of Milan.

Guido, who opposed papal intervention in Milanese affairs, proposed to Henry IV that he resign secretly and that Henry IV then appoint a sub-deacon named Godfrey, a member of the Milanese aristocracy, to the archbishopric. This Henry IV did with the approval of the conservative, wealthy elements of the city. However, the poorer people in Milan, called the Patarini, sensing an opportunity to advance their cause, sided with the papacy and on January 6, 1072, in the presence of the papal legate, elected a cathedral clerk named Atto to be the archbishop. Serious troubles rocked the city, and even more serious trouble developed between the royal and papal courts. Pope Alexander II formally recognized Atto as the Archbishop of Milan and ex communicated five of Henry IV's counselors, whom he blamed for this outrage rather than the king himself. It was in the midst of these circumstances that Gregory VII became pope.

In accordance with the Election Decree of 1059, Gregory VII sent legates to Germany to receive confirmation for his election from Henry IV. He was, however, in no way willing to compromise the position of his predecessor, which he had in fact help orchestrate. A letter that Gregory VII wrote to Godfrey the Younger of Tuscany reveals rather well both his personal zeal and his planned approach over

against Henry IV:

> Concerning the King—no one can be more solicitous or more desirous for his present and future glory. Moreover, it is our will, at the first opportunity, to confer with him in paternal love and admonition, by our legates, upon those things which we think belong to the advantage of the church and the honor of the royal dignity. If he shall hear us we shall rejoice in his welfare as well as our own, for then certainly he will be able to profit himself, if in maintaining righteousness he shall acquiesce in our warnings and counsel. But if—which we desire may not be—he shall un fairly return hatred for our love, and shall return to al mighty God, by deceiving His righteousness, contempt for the great honor conferred on him, the threat contained in the words, "Cursed is the man who withholdeth the sword from blood," shall not in the providence of God come upon us. Nor indeed are we free, because of favor to anyone, to put aside the law of God, or to draw back from the path of rectitude, on account of human favor, for the apostle says, "If I wished to please men, I should not be a servant of God." (MacDonald 92)

Henry IV, in response to the papal request for confirmation as well as papal demands to end all interference in matters ecclesiastical, confirmed the election of Gregory VII and in some what of a surprising manner stated his humble submission to Gregory VII. It can perhaps be assumed that this response was the result of counselors, who suggested that the imperial crown he sought would be well worth an immediate confirmation. Henry IV wrote:

> While the kingdom and priesthood, in order that they may continue rightly administered in Christ, need always the viceregents (*vicaria*) of His power, it is especially necessary, my Lord and most beloved father, that they disagree with each other as little as possible . . . Alas! criminal and unhappy, partly from the instinct of amiable youth, partly from the liberty of our potent and imperious power, partly by the seductive deception of those whole alluring counsels we have too readily followed, we have sinned against heaven and before you, and are no more worthy to be called your son. We have not only trespassed on ecclesiastical affairs, but we have sold the very churches to certain unworthy persons, embittered with the gall of simony, not coming in at the door, but otherwise, and have not defended them as we ought. But now, since we are not able by our selves without your authority to correct the churches, we seek strenuously both your counsel and assistance, on these and other affairs, and we shall carefully observe your commands in all things. And first of all, concerning the Church of Milan, which by our fault is in error, we beg that it may be canonically corrected by your apostolic labor, and then may the judgment of your authority proceed to the correction of other churches. We shall not be wanting to you by the will of God in anything, humbly begging the same of your paternity, that it may be speedily and kindly with us in all things. (MacDonald 108-109)

Had Gregory VII seized the initiative offered him by Henry IV at this time, perhaps the entire controversy could have been ended. Henry IV could have been invited to Rome to receive the imperial crown that he desired, and Gregory VII could have gained greater control of the church. However, this did not happen, because Gregory VII had embraced a policy which demanded much more than control of the church within society. Gregory VII was proposing a "*societas christiana*" in which every individual and institution, including monarchs and monarchies, would be subservient to the church and thus (in Gregory VII's mind) the papacy. Gregory VII's goal was control of society! This is quite evident in a letter written in 1074 to Turlough O'Brien, the King of Ireland:

> The authority of Christ has founded His church on solid rock, and has committed His rights to the blessed Peter, which church He had likewise constituted over all principalities, power and everything else which is sublime upon earth. (MacDonald 126)

Gregory VII strongly disliked many of the kings of Europe ruling in his day. At one time he described Philip I of France as "no king, but a tyrant— by the persuasion of the devil!" (MacDonald 134). Judging from his relationship with Philip I, it is very likely that, had the problems with Henry IV not developed as they did, Gregory VII would have had a major controversy with someone else. His passionate feelings are revealed in a letter written to Abbot Hugh of Cluny in 1075:

> When I look west or south or north I see no bishops lawful in their appointment, or in their life, ruling the people of Christ by love and not by worldly ambition. Among secular princes I see none who prefers God's honor to his own, or justice to gain. As for those among whom I live, whether Romans or Lombards or Normans, as I often tell them, they are worse than Jews or pagans. (MacDonald 142-143)

During 1074 and early 1075 Henry IV faced grave problems of his own in Germany, where the Saxon princes had united in rebellion against him. Had Gregory VII taken the opportunity to stand firmly on Henry IV's side by giving him the imperial crown, he might have won himself a steadfast secular ally. In stead, Gregory VII attempted to interject himself into secular affairs by offering to mediate between the two opposing sides. It was inevitable, then, for Henry IV, once the Saxons had been crushed, to return the favor by interfering once again in ecclesiastical affairs. In November of 1075 Henry appointed Tebald, a sub-deacon of Milan and his chaplain during the Saxon campaign, to the Archbishopric. In addition he appointed bishops at Fermo and Spoleto. Gregory VII responded with fire, warning Henry IV that he was in danger of excommunication if he failed to withdraw his appointments and continued to interfere in ecclesiastical matters.

Henry IV, flush from a victory over the Saxons and with the support of the German clergy, responded in kind. He called a synod of German clerics at Worms and deposed Gregory VII, declaring in harsh words that he was no longer to be considered pope— words that Henry IV would soon regret:

> Henry, king not by usurpation, but by the holy ordinance of God to Hildebrand, not now pope but a false monk: this greeting you deserve because there is no order in the Church which you have brought into confusion and dishonor. To mention just a few especial cases, you have not only not feared to touch the rulers of the Church, anointed by Christ, archbishops, bishops and priests, but you have trodden on them like serfs. We have put up with this out of regard for your Apostolic See, but you have taken our humility for fear and have not hesitated to lift a hand against the royal power conferred on us by God and have threatened to deprive us of it, as if we have received the kingship from you, as if kingship and empire were not in the hands of God. Our Lord Jesus Christ called us to the kingship, but did not call you to the priesthood. The steps in your ascent were these: by guile you obtained money, by money favor, by favor the sword and with the sword you have mounted the throne of peace, arming subjects against their prelates, giving the laity power to depose or contemn priests. And you have ventured to touch me, anointed no matter how unworthily to the kingship, subject according to the tradition of the holy fathers only to God and not to be deposed save for defection from the faith, which God forbid. St. Peter said, "Fear God, honor the king," and Paul pronounced on one who should preach another gospel the curse of anathema. To this curse by the judgment of all our bishops you are subject. Come down, then, from the usurped apostolic seat. Let another ascend who will preach the sound doctrine of the blessed apostle without the cloak of violence. I, Henry, king by the grace of God, and all my bishops say, "Come down, come down and be forever damned." (Bainton 124-125)

Henry IV and his advisors, however, had completely misjudged public opinion in Italy. They thought that the Italian people would gladly join them in ridding themselves of Gregory VII. This did not occur, for Henry IV became viewed as an aggressor, and Gregory VII, who had been facing opponents of his attempted reforms, was soon surrounded by proponents calling for swift and decisive papal action.

That action came on February 22, 1076, when Gregory VII announced Henry IV's excommunication and deposition in the following prayer:

> Blessed Peter, Prince of the apostles, incline, I beseech thee, thy pious ears to us and hear thy servant, whom thou hast reared from infancy and protected until this day from mine enemies. Thou art my witness, thou and my Lady the Mother of God and the blessed Paul, thy brother among all the saints, that I did not willingly assume the governance of the holy Roman Church. I did not ascend to thy see by rapine. Rather I desired to finish my life in pilgrimage than to seize thy place for the glory of the world. There fore I believe that it is of thy grace and not of my works that it hath and doth please thee that the Christian people especially committed to thee should be obedient to me. The power to act in thy stead was particularly committed to me by God, to bind and to loose in heaven and on earth. In this confidence, then, for the honor and defense of thy Church, on behalf of God the omnipotent, Father, Son and Holy Ghost, by thy power and authority I deprive Henry the King, son of Henry the Emperor, who has risen against thy Church with unparalleled pride, of the governance of all Germany and Italy and I absolve all Christians from the bond of the oath which they have or shall make. I prohibit any one from serving him as king. . . . In thy stead I bind him in the bonds of anathema, that all nations may know that thou art Peter and on this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. (Bainton 126)

It would appear that Henry IV did not take Gregory VII's actions seriously, to begin with. However, as the days of spring lengthened into summer, and the days of summer began to shorten into autumn, it became apparent to Henry IV that he had made a grave error of judgment. Henry IV's enemies, including the Saxons he had only recently vanquished, rose in opposition to him, clamoring for a new king who enjoyed the blessing of the church. The German clerics, having been threatened with excommunication themselves should they continue their support of Henry IV, began to change their allegiance, denying the deposition of the pope and demanding due penance from the king. When the German princes threw their support to Rudolf of Swabia as a possible royal replacement and invited Gregory VII to Germany to serve as a mediator in the matter, Henry IV knew that prompt action had to be taken. Rather than allow Gregory VII to come to Germany, Henry IV decided to travel over the Alps to seek Gregory VII's absolution.

Henry IV set out for Italy just before Christmas 1076, with his wife, his three-year-old son and a few servants. Gregory VII, for his part, had begun traveling north towards the Alps, but had been detained by fierce winter storms in the northern Appenines. When Gregory VII heard that Henry IV was coming to Italy, he questioned Henry IV's sincerity and took refuge at Canossa, the castle of Countess Matilda, a papal supporter. When Henry IV arrived, it was obvious that Henry IV had no intention of harming the pope. For three days he stood outside the castle gates, barefoot and in sackcloth, pleading for absolution. Countess Matilda and Abbot Hugh of Cluny, Henry IV's godfather, urged Gregory VII to forgive Henry IV. A papal letter explaining to the German princes why Henry IV was absolved describes the situation:

> He (Henry IV) came with a few followers to the fortress of Canossa where we were staying. There, on three successive days, standing before the castle gate, laying aside all royal insignia, barefooted and in coarse attire, he ceased not with many tears to beseech the apostolic help and comfort until all who were present or who had heard the story were so moved by pity and compassion that they pleaded his cause with prayers and tears. All marveled at our severity, and some even cried out that we were showing, not the seriousness of apostolic authority, but rather the cruelty of a savage tyrant.
>
> At last, overcome by his persistent show of penitence and the urgency of all present, we released him from the bonds of anathema and received him into the grace of holy mother church. . . . (Hartwig 200-201)

The question arises at this point whether the dramatic scenes at Canossa represent a victory for Gregory VII or Henry IV. It may seem that, in view of Henry IV's apparent submission to papal authority, Gregory VII actually gained the victory, but there is little doubt that Canossa was at the time and ultimately a victory for Henry IV. Henry IV needed Gregory VII's absolution for two reasons: (1) once he was absolved, Henry IV's sup porters could and would openly defend him once again; (2) once absolved, he would have complied with the demands of the Ger man princes opposed to him, so that any rebellion on their part would be unjustified. In addition, the princes of Germany who once viewed Gregory VII as an ally now questioned both his credibility and his spiritual goals.

After January 1077, Henry IV's position grew stronger while that of Gregory VII grew more and more precarious. Henry IV immediately returned to Germany from Canossa to gather his support. Gregory VII, instead of continuing his journey to Germany in order to mediate the dispute between Henry IV and his opponents, returned to Rome with only the promise of his support, and to whom he would ultimately give that support remained questionable. It appeared to those in Germany that Gregory VII would first support Rudolf of Swabia and then Henry IV. Such indeed was the case, for Gregory VII's chief concern was the promotion of his papal goals. He remained torn between rulers, hoping to work with the one who would best support his goals.

In Germany the victory ultimately went to Henry IV, for in spite of the fact that Henry's army never won a crucial battle, Rudolf of Swabia was killed. With his enemies in disarray, Henry IV was able to defeat them all. In January 1080, with the problems in Germany behind him, Henry IV informed Gregory VII that, if Gregory did not restore to him his crown, he would once again depose him from the papacy. Gregory VII responded by excommunicating Henry IV again, declaring that, if Henry IV did not repent by August 1, 1080, he would be struck dead by the Lord. On August 2, however, Henry IV was still alive, and it would appear that it was Gregory VII who this time made the grave error in judgment. Gregory VII no longer enjoyed the support he had possessed earlier. Many people, including such influential reformers as Abbot Hugh of Cluny, had withdrawn their support because Gregory VII had overstepped the bounds of tradition by deposing a king— some thing no pope had ever done.

Henry IV gathered the clerics of Germany and Lombardy in Mainz, where he suspended and then excommunicated Gregory VII. Wilbert of Ravenna, who became Clement III, was elected pope. Henry IV then gathered an army and marched into Italy. Gregory VII took refuge in the castle of St. Angelo but finally was forced to flee, for the Romans resented the fact that he had endangered their lives and their city. Gregory VII sought and received military aid from Guiscard, the leader of the Normans in southern Italy, but his allies became his greatest enemies; for Guiscard and his men sacked Rome instead of fighting Henry IV. Gregory VII, who had returned to Rome with the Nor mans, now sought refuge at the monastery of Monte Cassino, where in poor health he remained until his death on May 25, 1085. He had been deposed by the king he sought to humble and was despised by the Romans he sought to serve. His final words were reported to have been, "I have loved righteousness and hated iniquity; therefore I die in exile." Henry IV's victory now seemed complete. He had been crowned emperor in Rome by Clement III on Easter Day 1084 and so had achieved his goals, but he lived on only to be betrayed by his own son at a later date. He died an embittered man, while attempting to organize an army to retake his kingdom.

IV. The Outcome and Effects of the Controversy

History's judgment concerning the individuals and events of the Investiture Controversy remains controversial. Overall, it seems that historians treat the king more kindly than the cleric, perhaps because religion tends to be more carefully scrutinized than politics. It can certainly be said that the views regarding Gregory VII are more numerous and divided than those regarding Henry IV. Gregory VII is viewed generally as either a saint or a sinner, with little room for any position in between.

In his book, Cathedral and Crusade, Volume 1, Henri Daniel-Rops describes Gregory VII as a reformer. His definition of a reformer is extremely interesting and demonstrates very well one reason for history's divided judgment of Gregory VII:

> The reformer must not seek innovation, but rather a return to the sources of that institution whose interests he claims to have at heart. He should take his stand upon "tradition," in the sense of that which best enables a society to progress while remaining true to the fountainhead of its ideal. Finally, he must not yield to pride; he must preserve humility of heart, submissive always to authority in the persons of the hierarchy, who are responsible before God, who alone may take the initiative, and who alone can bring it to fruition. (153)

Daniel-Rops' definition declares that two qualifications are essential for anyone wishing to be a reformer— a return to tradition and a submissive humility in the presence of authority. It can be and has been argued effectively that Gregory VII possessed neither of these qualifications. While a judgment upon the latter qualification would involve a certain amount of subjectivity, one concerning the former would not. Christopher Brooke summarizes the problem many historians have with Gregory VII:

> Hildebrand may seem to us from this distance of time a harmless fanatic, a dedicated reformer, or even a man of spiritual insight and intense vision; of his devotion and sincerity it seems to me that there can be little doubt. But on 22 April 1073, the day when the people of Rome ac claimed St. Peter's most devoted and distinguished servant as Pope, when Hildebrand became Gregory VII, a new and revolutionary view of the papal office was enthroned in the Holy See; and that is why the interpretation of Gregory VII and what he stood for is still a burning issue in the Roman Catholic Church. (60-61)

What was that "revolutionary view of the papal office" and how did it conflict with tradition? Geoffrey Barraclough summarizes this for us when he discusses the " Dictatus Papae " of 1075, the most important papal document issued by Gregory VII:

> It is here (within the *Dictatus Papae*) that we see how novel and revolutionary Gregory's attitude was. He claimed to be enforcing the old law of the church, but few of his axioms are supported by the authority of the canons. The second proposition, that the pope alone may be called "universal," was flatly contradicted by them. The most famous of all (No. 12), that he was empowered to depose emperors, was equally without foundation, and arose— as contemporary critics were quick to point out— from a total misunderstanding of a letter of Gregory the Great. But even when he remained within tradition, Gregory VII interpreted it in such a way that it had a new sense. Thus, from the dogma of the pope's succession to St. Peter, he deduced that the pope's authority is the authority of Christ. Precisely this deduction both Humbert and Damian had scrupulously avoided drawing; for them "the fullness of grace remained with Christ himself," and he distributed his gifts not to the pope alone, but to many. This subtle distinction Gregory overlooked, because he was not interested in the finer points of theology, but in the practical results; namely the enhancement of papal authority. (85-86)

It is precisely here that Gregory VII departed from tradition and became not a reformer, as declared by Daniel-Rops, but a revolutionary. Gregory VII's concept of the "*societas christiana*" claimed not merely supreme power over spiritual matters within the church, but included the concept of supreme power over all of society. Geoffrey Barraclough is correct when he suggests that Gregory led the church into a "blind alley" by at tempting to bring the state into subordination to the church, which inevitably brought the papacy into politics.

Herein lies the critical consequence of the Investiture Controversy. The Church's primary

purpose has always been the spreading of the Christ's gospel and the renewal of the Christ's people. Had Gregory VII been content to continue the reform of the church, begun by the monastic movements and directed by the papacy under Pope Leo IX in accordance with the true purpose of the Church, the nature of the church from that point on, as well as its relationship with the state, would have been different and without doubt better. Gregory VII's insistence upon ecclesiastical domination of the secular affairs of society, however, pitted the church against the state and the church against itself, with unfortunate consequences for both. While it is true that Innocent III one century later dominated all of European society, that domination did not come without a price, and the price was one of suspicion, resentment and resistance. The relationship of the church to the state became and has remained adversarial, with the consequence that our society is the poorer because of it. In the midst of century-long controversies the church has frequently lost sight of its primary purpose and role in society, while the state has not only rejected the attempts of the church at secular control, but its moral guidance as well, from which it might otherwise have profited.

What do we find today? We find priests and pastors who function better on political platforms than in their pulpits, with the consequence that most people live in spiritual worlds of uncertainty and doubt. We find government officials, seemingly devoid of conscience, passing bills because of pressure groups and taking bribes from defense contractors. While it would be grossly inaccurate and simplistic to trace these woes of society in their entirety back to the Investiture Controversy, it is proper to point out that any institution which embraces an ideology or set of goals which contradict and distort its primary purpose will inevitably experience dissension within its midst, confusion among its membership, and a weakening of its impact upon society. This, unfortunately, was the legacy left the church by Gregory VII. This, unfortunately, Henry IV was ill-prepared and unable to prevent.

Works Cited

Bainton, Roland H. The Medieval Church . Robert E. Krieger Publishing Company, 1985.

Barraclough, Geoffrey. The Medieval Papacy . Great Britain: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1970.

Brooke, Christopher. Medieval Church and Society . New York: New York University Press, 1972.

Daniel-Rops, Henri. Cathedral and Crusade, Volume 1 . Garden City, New York: Image Books, 1963.

Deanesly, Margaret. A History of the Medieval Church 590- 1500 . London: Methuen & Company LTD., 1976.

Durant, Will. The Story of Civilization IV: The Age of Faith . New York: Simon and Schuster, 1950.

Hartwig, Theodore J. The Past Speaks For Itself (Documents in Western Civilization) Volume 2: The Ascendancy of Christianity . Milwaukee: Northwestern, 1984.

John, Eric. The Popes 3 0 F 0 3 A Concise Biographical History . New York: Hawthorn Books, Inc., 1964.

MacDonald, A. J. Hildebrand: A Life of Gregory VII . Merrick, New York: Richwood Publishing Co., 1976.

Peeler, E. F. and A. J. The Chair of Peter 3 0 F 0 3 A History of the Papacy . New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964.

Ullmann, Walter. The Growth of Papal Government in the Middle Ages . New York: Barnes & Noble, Inc., 1962.

Ullmann, Walter. A Short History of the Papacy in the Middle Ages . London: Methuen & Company LTD., 1972.

Walsh, Michael. An Illustrated History of the Popes . New York: St. Martin's Press, 1980.

Book Reviews

HOW CAN CHRISTIANS, WHOSE CITIZENSHIP IS IN HEAVEN, EXERCISE THEIR CITIZENSHIP ON EARTH IN THE POLITICAL ARENA?*

* Presented at the West Central Pastoral Conference of the CLC, held at Lamar, CO, September 20-22, 1988. — Editor.

(In the light of three book summaries and reviews):

1 - Prayer, Politics & Power , by Joel C. Hunter. Wheaton, Illinois: Tyndale House Publishers, Inc. Paperback.

2 - Kingdoms In Conflict , by Charles Colson. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan. Hardcover. $15.95.

3 - The Naked Public Square , by Richard John Neuhaus. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans. Paperback. $8.75.

"Our citizenship is in heaven!" Because that is true, "we eagerly wait for the Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ" (Phil. 3:20). We are "fellow citizens with the saints" (Eph. 2:19) of all ages, living and dead, and so are citizens of that Kingdom which transcends time, knows no boundaries, nationalities, ethnic or linguistic divisions. At the same time we are American citizens, just as the Apostle Paul was a Roman citizen who appealed to the prerogatives of that citizenship (Acts 22:22-29; 25:11). The question is: How can and should we, who are citizens of the eternal Kingdom of God, exercise our citizenship in the political arena as citizens of our country?

This question has become more urgent with the entrance of the evangelical churches into the political arena. Heretofore in American politics it has been the liberal churches, under the aegis of the National Council of Churches, that have wielded almost uncontested political influence. But with the rise of the Moral Majority (now Liberty Federation) under the leadership of Jerry Falwell and the candidacy of Pat Robertson as the Republican nominee for the presidency, the religious right has become involved. Add to this the voices of TV evangelists and the religious lobbies, such as, Christian Voice, Religious Roundtable, the Christian New Right, the efforts and organizations of Tim and Beverly LaHaye (The American Coalition for Traditional Values—ACTV), Christian Women for America (CWA), James Dobson, and the Christian Broadcasting Net work (CBN) with its "The 700 Club," and you have political clout— especially with the religious right being joined to the political right through the efforts of Paul Weyerich combined with the proven fund raising capabilities of Richard Viguerie, the "direct-mail whiz."

Traditionally the conservative Lutheran Church has practiced political quietism. We shun position papers on political issues of the day, refrain from political demonstrations, and avoid political lobbying. Is our posture in line with the New Testament revelation? Liberation Theology hails Jesus as being on the side of the poor and oppressed against the wealthy oppressors. That picture is out of focus. Jesus did, indeed, feed the poor, but He did not miraculously solve all their problems, as He could have. He said, "You have the poor with you always" (Matt. 26:11). He spent a lot of time with wealthy Nicodemus, talking to him about "being born again" and other Kingdom matters without counseling him regarding redistribution of wealth or reform of unjust civic institutions. The New Testament's inspired writers nowhere urge Christians to work for political reform, to run for political office, to strive to make unjust social institutions more just, righteous, and expressive of love. The great social evil of slavery was accepted as a reality. Slaves were urged to obey and submit to their masters; masters were urged to be kind and concerned with the welfare of their slaves, but no demonstration was called for, no strike or civil disobedience recommended to root out this social institution— which in the course of the centuries was eradicated through the leaven of the Gospel at work in Christians who manifested their concerns through their churches and politically. How active is the Christian citizen to be in the political arena and how is that activity to be manifested?

I.

Hunter divides his book, Prayer, Politics & Power , into two main parts: Part I— "Politics and Piety under the Lens" and Part II—"After Analysis, Action." He introduces each chapter with an appropriate quotation. Consider this one from C.S. Lewis: "If you read history you will find that the Christians who did most for the present world were precisely those who thought most of the next. It is since Christians have largely ceased to think of the other world that they have become so in effective in this." That's a genuine paradox. Christians are accused of being "pie-in-the-sky-eyed," which is not an entirely false description, for we have no continuing city here. Yet Christians with such a perspective have done more for this city on earth by virtue of their prayers and their reflecting the love of God in Christ Jesus in their lives through service than those who seek and find their treasures on this earth. But how is this to be done?

Hunter draws attention to a common error among Evangelicals, especially those of the Fundamentalist imprint. They con fuse God's way of dealing in the New Testament with His way in the Old Testament. "God once ruled Israel by law and external government. God now rules His people by grace and internal government" (25). John Calvin forgot that in his efforts to establish the Kingdom of God in Geneva. One feels that Pat Robertson also hasn't learned that difference with his proposals to apply the OT Jubilee laws to our national debt problem. It is not only Norman Lear and his People of the American Way who fear that a Jerry Falwell in power would be an American Ayatollah Khomeini. The law has a powerful way of asserting itself. Witness the problems of the Lutheran Church in Australia over the matter of women wearing hats in the public service and women wearing men's clothing (Deut. 22:5). (See Schulz, Arthur. "Lutheranism Down Under." Journal of Theology 28.2 (1988): 7-18.) Whenever the church manages to get the government to support its program, the law replaces the gospel as the motivating and enabling factor in human behavior. Hunter expresses this truth in sentences like these: "Institutional expression is not without force.", and "Any Christian activity expressed by a governmental institution insinuates force" (37). Yet we are to be involved in politics and government, but we are not to depend upon government for solutions. We are to be involved because Christ so directs us in the words, "Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's" (Matt. 22:21), and because the government requests the participation of all citizens and special interest groups (39-40).

Hunter challenges the belief of many Evangelicals that the solution of the many moral problems in our country would be in electing "Rev. President," a born-again political saint. We had born-again Jimmy Carter. Pat Robertson was rejected by the electorate, as was Jesse Jackson. Colson points out that

Otto von Bismarck-Schoenhausen was "a committed Christian who regularly read the Bible, spoke openly of his devotion to God, and claimed divine guidance in response to prayer," but has been described by historians "as a Machiavellian master of political duplicity who specialized in blood and iron" (Colson 304). Is a Christian ruler the solution? Should Christians work towards that end? Hunter:

> Though leaders were appointed for order in the church (1 Tim. 3), no passage in the New Testament encourages Christians to appoint for themselves a political leader. The leader Christ gives to us to help us speak our cause to the world is the Holy Spirit (John 16:13), not a fallible, flesh-and-blood political leader. The Bible makes it clear that we are not to put too much faith in political leaders: "Do not trust in princes, in mortal man, in whom there is no salvation" (Ps. 146:3). (53)

Hunter diagnoses the problem of governing correctly as being the problem of SIN. Walter Rauschenbusch and the Social Gospel underestimated the enormity of sin. John Dewey diagnosed man's problem as ignorance, not sin, and thought that education was the answer. (Dewey's continuing influence is currently being felt in attempting to solve the drug and AIDS problems through education.) The needed reaction came with Reinhold Niebuhr "who understood the true nature of man" and whose book, Moral Man And Immoral Society, "stands as an important rejection of politics that assume love and reason transcend sin" (77-78). Hunter defines the problem as the self-centered, self-aggrandizing Ego. On the functioning of original sin on Ego Hunter comments: "Original sin begins again every time our own power becomes our focus and our own increase is a delight to our eyes. Original sin proceeds every time we accept a voice that confirms that focus. Our group can easily supplant the serpent" (91). Additional insights:

> Our characters are not transformed, our hearts are not sensitized, nor are our minds led into more truth by government. Only by placing our confidence in God's sovereignty are we able to relinquish our private imperialism "for the country's good." . . . We do not place our reliance upon legislative conquests that control people but do not change them. Faith in God is both the motivation for— and the limitation of— our work. (92)

In Part II—"After Analysis, Action," Hunter lists five scriptural reactions to civil government: Obedience, Repentance, Civil Disobedience, Correction, and Transplanting. Transplanting is a scriptural option; rebellion or anarchy is not. Joseph, at the counseling of the angel in a dream, removed Jesus from the jurisdiction of Herod to Egypt. Jesus instructed His disciples to flee to another city, if persecuted. Hunter applies the transplantation principle to the American Revolution:

> Our own American Revolution looked like pure rebellion, but it was actually the birth of a new nation. The Declaration of Independence clearly separated the people from English authority. The Constitution completed that separation by instituting a legitimate government. After attempting correction, the next step was transplantation by creation of a new governmental authority. Because of the geographic separation, the colonies were somewhat pre disposed toward self-government. In many ways the American people had already begun to form an identity and government separate from Britain. The "taxation without representation" issue was more an evidence of a separate ethos and people than of subjects who wanted more involvement in British government. (107)

Hunter defines the "holy scriptural principle" of righteous ness in the words of Doctors Elizabeth and Paul Achtemeier as "The fulfillment of the demands of a relationship, whether with men or with God." (A study of "righteousness" in Kittel's Theological Dictionary Of The New Testament confirms that definition, in the opinion of this writer.) What are the components of righteousness for "the Righteous American"? Hunter lists Loyalty, Tolerance, Understanding, and Involvement.

Hunter advocates involvement on the part of Christians through what he calls "The Pilate

Program." Pilate "decided to avoid deciding." Next "he did decide, but he did not take responsibility." Hunter suggests, "Perhaps Pilate is not so different from us in his avoidance of the religio-political issues." The Jews demonstrated before Pilate. "Demonstrations are a way to move a particular issue up the value scale of the intended audience, and a way of provoking response." But "improvements may be made because of demonstrations but are seldom made in the midst of demonstrations." The reason is that "emotionalism, rather than deliberation, tends to rule at demonstrations." . . . "Unlike Pilate, we must let their value lie solely in the fact that they have captured our attention." . . . "Pilate . . .was provoked to reaction instead of reason." Hunter also speaks of "identifying the issues in terms broader than religion, as Jesus did before Pilate when He spoke in terms of "truth," a universal term rather than a narrow religious term. "Christ shows us two important prerequisites to witnessing. First, we need to get rid of the counter-attack mentality. . . . The second prerequisite Jesus modeled was His use of nonreligious language." The world simply does not understand our "Christianese." On that day when Jesus stood before Pilate, "the religious crowd missed the truth because they were too focused on religion. Pilate missed it because he was too focused on politics." . . . "The great strength Christians should bring to the American political process is one of depth." (Quotations from 119-141)

At the end of Chapter Eight on "The Pilate Program" Hunter sums up the Christian's "Assuming Responsibility" as follows:

> Get away from the confrontational demonstration— to think
> Overlook a narrow religious perspective
> Observe deep principles rather than shallow politics
> Decide in prayer
> Act
> Tolerate others toward reconciliation (163)

Chapter Nine, "Proper Expression (and Punctuation) in Politics," is summarized by Hunter in these sentences:

> An exclamation point attracts attention to emergency issues. A semicolon looks for some sort of development of the thought it has initiated (e.g., intercessory prayer). A catalytic question hopes for a reaction, as much as an answer, that will change the inner chemistry of our political solutions. [Hunter has an excellent statement in regard to the Christian reaction to God's judgment upon self-destructive man:] In a world of AIDS, teen suicide, and child pornography, we should hurt with the hurting. How unbecoming that some Christians, whose God loves these people more than they love themselves, are eager to offer a bloodchilling explanation of God's vengeance for sin! Consequences of sin may be unavoidable, but sins are still reason for profound sorrow. Many Christians want to know more than they want to care. Until we care, it does not matter how much we know. Unless we proclaim the cause of the hurting, the mission of Christ (Luke 4:18) is still a foreign mission to us. [Hunter also has some in formative statements on the abortion issue:] We live in a society that is in many ways more sensitive to animal life than human life. Anyone who takes an egg from an eagle's nest is liable to a fine of up to five thousand dollars and a sentence of up to five years in jail. Yet a fertilized human egg is not so protected. The Internal Revenue Service recognizes a cattle breeder's expenses for a calf from the date of conception, but our legal system will not give the same protected status to a human baby. (Quotations from 165- 187)

The final chapter moves toward individual action, providing a workbook for political involvement. The entire book presents a course of action for the individual Christian that is in accordance with scriptural principles recognizing the spiritual nature of the Kingdom with its transcendent values but also its mandate to "render unto Caesar" what Caesar demands. In the case of our democracy that means involvement!

II.

Kingdoms In Conflict was written by Charles Colson of former Watergate and current Prison Fellowship fame. The jacket heralds it as "an insider's challenging view of politics, power, and the pulpit," and so it is. Colson capsules his concern in a chapter heading that he has borrowed from Richard John Neuhaus— "The Naked Public Square." Colson: "We live in a society in which all transcendent values have been removed and thus there is no moral standard by which anyone can say right is right and wrong is wrong. What we live in is, in the memorable image of Richard Neuhaus, a naked public square" (225).

Colson is very readable. He illustrates his points with historical, biographical, and personal silhouettes. The Prologue is set in 1998. President Hopkins, elected by the Christian Republican party and under the influence of the Religious Right's interpretation of biblical prophecy, is confronted with the determination of fanatical Jews to blow up the Dome of the Rock, the sacred Muslim shrine in Jerusalem, and build a temple in its place. Fictional? Yes! Impossible? Not with the influence of the Religious Right in Republican politics!

Colson has divided his book into four parts. Part I is en titled "Need for the Kingdom." An account of the suicide of Ernest Hemingway, after a life without the Kingdom, illustrates its need. The conversion of Cable News Network's Jerry Levin in Beirut while in captivity illustrates its power to sustain. From his own experience Colson testifies to the power of the Kingdom:

> In my Watergate experience I saw the inability of men—powerful, highly motivated professionals—to hold together a conspiracy based on a lie. It was less than three weeks from the time that Mr. Nixon knew all the facts to the time that John Dean went to the prosecutors. Once that happened Mr. Nixon's presidency was doomed. The actual cover-up lasted less than a month. Yet Christ's powerless followers maintained to their grim deaths by execution that they had in fact seen Jesus Christ raised from the dead. There was no conspiracy, no Passover plot. Men and women do not give up their comfort— and certainly not their lives— for what they know to be a lie. (70)

Part II of Colson's book is entitled "Arrival of the Kingdom." It's refreshing to find one's own biblical under standing of the Kingdom so clearly set forth by one who is a late-comer to the Kingdom, namely, that "the Kingdom of God is a rule, not a realm." Furthermore, that "the Jews of first- century Palestine missed Christ's message because they, like many today, were conditioned to look for salvation in political solutions." Again, that "another reason that the Jews missed the full significance of the message of the Kingdom of God was that Jesus spoke about a Kingdom that had come and a Kingdom that was still to come— one Kingdom in two stages" (83-84). On the function of the state: "The state is not a remedy for sin, but a means to restrain it" (91). On the difference between church and Kingdom: "The church is not the actual Kingdom of God, but is to reflect the love, justice, and righteousness of God's Kingdom within society" (92). To demonstrate the leavening power of the Kingdom on society through one man, Colson chronicles the efforts of William Wilberforce to outlaw slavery in the British Empire. An excellent insight: "Herod didn't fear Jesus because he thought He would become a religious or political leader. He had suppressed such opponents before. Herod feared Christ because He represented a Kingdom greater than his own" (110). On the continuing temptation of the church: ". . . the church, whose principal function is to proclaim the Good News and witness the values of the Kingdom of God, must resist the tempting illusion that it can usher in that Kingdom through political means." In a footnote Colson quotes James Schall: ". . . if there is any constant temptation of the history of Christianity, from reaction to Christ's rejection of Jewish zealotism on to current debates about the relation of Marxism to the Kingdom of God, it is the pressure to make religion a formula for refashioning political and economic structures" (115- 116).

Part III, “Absence of the Kingdom.” In two chapters Colson traces the roots of World War II. In Germany he traces the heroic efforts of Martin Niemoller and Dietrich Bonhoeffer and the Free Church to combat the Nazis while the State Church capitulated by collaborating with them. On the other side of the channel Neville Chamberlain remained a helpless victim of his Unitarian beliefs in the universal goodness of all men and the conviction that reasonable, fair-minded men could work together to solve any difficulty. His beliefs were reinforced by Nancy Astor’s Cliveden circle of Christian Scientists with their belief in the goodness of man and that evil is but an illusion that can be eliminated by the exercise of the mind. Colson concludes: “The roots of World War II were in a sense theological.

In England and in Germany, the state and the church failed to fulfill their God-ordained mandates. And whenever that hap pens, evil triumphs” (175). 1945, “Year Zero.” On the battleship USS Missouri in Tokyo Bay, General Douglas MacArthur declared to the world: “We have had our last chance. If we do not now devise some greater and more equitable system, Armageddon will be at our door. The problem is basically theological and involves a spiritual recrudescence and improvement of human character. It must be of the spirit if we are to save the flesh” (179). But what has happened? We’ve seen the rise of anti-Kingdom Marxism and the decline of Kingdom principles in the West in the efforts to narrow the influence of religion in America; the elevating of the right to personal autonomy as the cardinal rule of American life; the determination to strip even the thin veneer of religious signs and symbols from culture; the decision of the Supreme Court to base its life or death decision regarding the unborn in “Roe v. Wade” not on transcendent principles but on a new right, the right of privacy, conveniently discovered in the Constitution; the education leadership of a Carl Sagan, whose atheistic creed is “The Cosmos is all there is, or was, or ever will be”; the decline of church attendance in the West; and the emergence of “the health-wealth-success” gospel of the electronic preachers. The result is the naked public square that rejects the wisdom of the ages that religion is indispensable to the concord and justice of society.

Part IV, “Presence of the Kingdom.” “. . . I would still argue that Christianity is the only religious system that provides for both individual concerns and the ordering of society with liberty and justice for all. A creed alone is not enough, nor is some external law” (235). Colson speaks of the “command of God that orders them (Christians) to be the ‘salt of the earth’ and ‘the light of the world’“ as “the great cultural commission of the Kingdom.” The command is not to be salt or light. That Christians are “the salt of the earth” and “the light of the world” is that amazing truth of the Kingdom. The command is to function as what we have been made! Christians are to function as “salt” and “light” according to the Scriptures, but “though 500 million Bibles are published in America each year— that’s two for every man, woman, and child— over 100 million Americans confess they never open one” (243). Christian patriotism may, at times, demand civil disobedience—according to biblical principles. Christians serve best in “little platoons,” e.g., Falwell’s “Liberty Godparent Ministries” for unwed mothers and “Mothers Against Drunk Driving” (MADD). The antidote to Nietzsche’s “will to power” that “fuels political passions in every culture” and which is a political manifestation of “the sin of the Garden” is the Kingdom. “Nothing distinguishes the kingdoms of man from the Kingdom of God more than their diametrically opposed views of the exercise of power. One seeks to control people, the other to serve people; one promotes self, the other prostrates self; one seeks prestige and position, the other lifts up the lowly and despised” (274). How is the Christian to function as salt and let his or her light shine in politics? The currently established American political wisdom is that “one’s religious convictions must have no effect on one’s public decisions” (284). That was enunciated by John Kennedy in his 1960 speech to the Houston Ministerial Association and by Mario Cuomo in his 1984 Notre Dame address. However, “both views— privatized faith and using political power to play God—are deeply flawed” (285). The individual must live his or her faith. Colson illustrated that with his own experiences at Walla Walla in preventing a prison riot and securing reforms. Politics have their pitfalls for the church—that the church will become just another special-interest group, that church leaders may overestimate their own importance, and that the gospel

becomes hostage to the political fortunes of a particular movement. The tale of Benigno and Cory Aquino in Philippine politics is related as an example of "people power." Trust in political systems and ideologies is an illusion. A moving tale of reconciliation in Northern Ireland is related to demonstrate the truth that every Christian cherishes—that the Kingdom is indestructible! In a very readable manner Colson shows what can and does happen when the public square becomes naked and what possibilities are there for society and the Kingdom when its eternal values impinge upon the public square.

III.

Colson borrowed a chapter heading from the title of Neuhaus' book, The Naked Public Square . In "A Word to the Reader" Neuhaus describes his book as "a book about religious politics and political religion." The best example of "the naked public square" is Red Square in Moscow, which is the realization of Mussolini's totalitarian formula, "Everything within the state, nothing outside the state, nothing against the state." That is the threat to our American experiment, our democracy. Neuhaus:

> The naked public square is the result of political doctrine and practice that would exclude religion and religiously grounded values from the conduct of public business. The doctrine is that America is a secular society. It finds dogmatic expression in the ideology of secularism. . . . Central to the story is the claim that the public square will not and cannot remain naked. . . . I set forth the reasons for believing that ours is indeed a period of crisis throwing into severe jeopardy the future of religion and democracy in America. (ix-x)

Our concern is how we, as citizens of the KINGDOM, can discharge our responsibilities as citizens of the USA. As clergy and lay leaders we can, perhaps, best do that by becoming aware of what is going on in our country— its secularization and the privatization of faith that divorces eternal values from political and legal decisions. As Christians who love their country, we should be aware of the historical and political fact that "the democratic proposition (that has manifested itself in our form of government) emerges from and is sustained by prior propositions about God and his ways with the world" (xii).

The backdrop for Neuhaus' study is the recent appearance of new actors on the political scene, the moral majoritarians. As Colson, so Neuhaus has concern about their prophetic eschatology and its effect upon the foreign policy of our country. His evaluation is shared by this writer: "The stature of 'prophetic' leaders, magnified by communications technology of all kinds, is not unlike that of those who in other cultures forecast future events by reading the entrails of doves and rats. Bible study is reduced to a kind of reading of entrails" (15).

In the minds of many, the "separation of church and state" has come to mean the "separation of religion and religiously based morality from the public realm" (20). That would result in the naked public square. Neuhaus contends that "a public ethic cannot be re-established unless it is informed by religiously grounded values, . . . (for) the values of the American people are deeply rooted in religion" (21). For ex ample, "Today's debates about how or whether values are to be taught in public schools would have been inconceivable a hundred years ago" (22). The suggestion that ours is a secular society is of recent origin. "Abraham Lincoln, who has rightly been celebrated as the foremost theologian of the American experiment, talked about America as an 'almost chosen' people" (61). "As late as 1931 the Supreme Court could assert without fear of contradiction, 'We are a Christian people, according to one another the equal right of religious freedom, and acknowledging with reverence the duty of obedience to the will of God'" (80).

> In 1952, in a dispute over students getting off from public school in released time for religious instruction, Justice Douglas, hardly a religiously observant man, wrote, "We are a religious people whose institutions presuppose a Supreme Being" (Zorach v. Clauson). As time went on, however,

> the court's references to religion had less and less to do with what is usually meant by religion. That is, religion no longer referred to those communal traditions of ultimate beliefs and practices ordinarily called religion. Religion became a synonym for conscience. For instance, in cases again related to conscientious objection, exemption from the military draft was to be allowed on the "registrant's moral, ethical, or religious beliefs about what is right and wrong (provided) those beliefs be held with the strength of traditional religious convictions" (Welsch v. U.S., 1970). Thus religion is no longer a matter of content but of sincerity. It is no longer a matter of communal values but of individual conviction. In short, it is no longer a public reality and therefore cannot interfere with public business. (80)

In the Zorach released time case (1952) Justice William Douglas had declared, "We are a religious people whose institutions presuppose a Supreme Being." In the Abington Bible reading case (1963) Justice Clark's majority opinion expressed a significant shift. There was no affirmation that our institutions presuppose a Supreme Being, that people do have religious needs that the state must respect, and that there is need for public encouragement of religion. All that is expressed is that our people do participate in religious observances, but the Court remained neutral as to whether such religious observance is good or bad. The Court also introduced a distinction between religious observance and religious freedom. Historically, religious freedom was thought to be freedom to exercise one's religion, not freedom from religion. Thus "Abington set asunder what had been a unified tradition, as articulated in Zorach and innumerable other statements from our legal and political history" (100-102). Ten years later in the Wade abortion case (1973) the Court ignored any higher religious ethical principle, introduced the new right of privacy into the Constitution, and declared the unborn non-persons. Nine years later (1982) "an Indiana court, adhering to Roe v. Wade, declared that 'Infant Doe' of Bloomington, a handicapped child already born, was a non-person and the court therefore permitted the child's parents to order the hospital to starve the baby to death" (128). Gradually value judgments based on natural or higher law have been reduced to personal interests— nothing more!

The Moral Majority is determined to "turn America around" by restoring old-time values. Jimmy Carter was a "born-again" Christian, but "in deference to 'liberal, feminist, anti-family' lobbies (he) seemed pathetically eager to prove that his faith did not make him a redneck reactionary" (39). Moral majoritarians must beware of the blasphemy of debasing religion by making it an appendage to partisan purpose (44). A reaction to the religious new right has been Norman Lear's "People for the American Way," the "American Way" being defined as everyone being free to do his own thing. This position is usually sup ported by the secular press, which "is obsessed with the Elmer Gantry syndrome" (56). Another player is the mainline ecumenicals (NCC) whose ecumenicity requires them to conduct dialogues with Buddhists and Marxists, but not with "Bible- banging pushers of blood-bought salvation" who are bullish on capitalism (57). Martin Luther King followed the principle of non-violence; Jerry Falwell that of "bellicose toughness in dealing with the Communists." Yet they were similar in this way that both wanted to "disrupt the business of secular America by an appeal to religiously based public values" (78). Both were and are contending against the naked public square which refuses to remain naked. Old-time religious values are being replaced by secular humanism, an ersatz religion, which may be followed by the totalitarianism of the state. But the situation is not hopeless, for "for better or worse, traditional values are very much alive in America" (97). "Religion is by definition a conservatizing institution in society, transmitting the tradition by which rights and wrongs, truths and falsehoods are to be measured" (158). "The state must be supported and judged by the transcendent truth that the church proclaims, and the church must be checked in her propensity to exercise in 'the city of man' a political power that is not rightly hers" (165). "Again, the proposal here is that politics is most importantly a function of culture, and at the heart of culture is religion, whether or not it is called by that name" (190).

Can we support the Moral Majority externals? That depends upon the issue. In pro-life issue we support the position of the Moral Majority, the Catholic Church, LaRouches, the Moonies, and others. On

the prayer in public schools issue we join with liberal Republican Lowell Weicher of Connecticut, the ACLU, and the People for the American Way in opposing the Moral Majority position. What is vital is that we know the issues, become aware of the trends and unabashedly cling to eternal values as set forth in the Bible.

Paul F. Nolting

Presenting The Catholic Faith: A Modern Catechism For Inquirers , by Frank P. Siano C.S.P. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, © 1987, by The Missionary Society of St. Paul the Apostle in the State of New York. Nihil Obstat: Francis J. McAree S.T.D. Imprimatur: Joseph T. O'Keefe D.D., Vicar General, Archdiocese of NY.

I studied this Catholic catechism in order to obtain up to date, factual information about the Roman Catholic teachings, specifically, their doctrine of the Church, because our Sunday morning Bible class wondered: "Since Vatican Council II, does the Roman Catholic denomination still claim to be the only saving church?"

Our local newspaper had recently stated that the Second Vatican Council of 1962-65 "abandoned its demand for a return of all Christians to Rome" and that "Roman Catholicism also dropped insistence that it was the only true church and recognized other churches as sister communities of Christian faith."

My pre -1962 Roman Catholic catechisms state that the Church which Christ founded was not only spiritual but also a society of men commissioned to govern, teach, baptize, etc., . . . that Christ's Universal Church and the Roman Catholic Church are the same group. Their explanation of "Outside the Church is no salvation" is that those who do not join the Catholic Church on account of human respect, riches, honor, etc., cannot be saved.

Had Vatican II changed that stand? An excerpt from *Paul Blanchard on Vatican II* states: "The old principle holds— anyone who knows that the Catholic Church is the one true Church and willingly remains outside of it, cannot save his soul. The Church teaches that one who is not nominally and actually baptized a Catholic may, in some instances, be saved, but that his salvation is, nevertheless, through the Catholic Church."

No doubt Blanchard's statements are correct, but since he is known for his anti-Roman Catholic views (e.g., he opposes their stand on birth control and the mandate that Roman Catholic children must not attend public schools), he cannot be cited as the final word about what Roman Catholics presently teach; but the 1987 Roman Catholic Catechism could be so cited.

Since the book was intended for people inquiring about the Catholic faith, its presentation of various doctrines is more in formal and less detailed than it probably would be for persons who are already Catholics. There are few antithetical statements. Yet, many of their religious errors can be recognized from the following quotations which I have been careful not to take out of context. The underlining in the quotations is mine.

Chapter 1: The Community of the Church. P.8: "Catholics see themselves as . . . the community of people who have persistently followed Jesus . . . belonging to him and each other." P.9: "The Catholic Church is composed of those who come from the first followers of Jesus . . . and . . . their church organization. The Roman Catholic Church traces its roots to the apostolic community in Rome." P.10:

"Today the Roman Catholic Church is in dialogue with all the major protestant churches and also with Judaism and Islam; it has affirmed the Orthodox (Eastern) churches as 'sister' churches." P.11: "They are the Church, the community of Jesus . . . Catholics . . . know God's love in a clear way . . . Catholics see the Church as an essential way of truly finding God."

The above quotes answer our Bible class question. Here the Catholic church identifies itself with the Holy Christian Church and makes it an essential way for "truly finding God," i.e., being saved.

Chapter 2: Faith. "The core of the Catholic faith can be found in the ancient creeds . . . the Bible and the living tradition of the Catholic family." P.23: "Catholics and Orthodox follow the Greek tradition of the Old Testament" (The LXX).

Chapter 3: Jesus. "He unlocked the power that lets us know we can be saved." P.39: "The heart of the teaching of Jesus . . . is presented . . . through the gospels . . . in parables, sermons, debates . . . discourses . . . on a mountain side Jesus gives forth his new law." P.40: "God forgives all who come to Him."

Chapter 4: The Christian Life: Spirit. P.48: "Catholics strive for a holiness that exceeds the demands of the commandments." P.50: "God's grace is his . . . empowering us to accomplish his deeds . . . God's grace comes as a free gift . . . we are responsible for cooperating with it." P.52: "People are free to respond to or reject God's love." P.53: "Acts which may be evils are still not sins if we have no control over them." "This environment of sin makes us tend toward sin." "Jesus never sinned and . . . we also believe that his grace kept Mary, his mother, free from all sin, even original sin." P.58: "Christianity is a people religion. It cannot be lived alone."

Chapter 5: The Christian Life: Prayer and Sacrament. P.59: "The Catholic Church traces its history in an unbroken line to the first disciples of Christ." P.60: "Worship is the prayer of the Christian community." P.61: "Catholics worship only God. They honor saints, particularly Mary, the mother of Jesus, and use their images only as signs of honor." P.62: "The two principal sacraments of the Church are baptism and the Lord's Supper . . . Catholics recognize five other sacraments as well: confirmation, reconciliation, holy orders, matrimony, and anointing of the sick." "The sacraments come from Jesus and from the life of the community that he began." Pp.62-63: "His followers . . . bestowed the Holy Spirit by imposing hands." "Marriage was recognized as an important act of worship." P.64: "Baptism brings forgiveness of all sin done before receiving baptism." "To be baptized a person needs to believe in Jesus and accept the community of the Church." P.66: "When a child is baptized, the parents . . . promise to begin . . . transmitting the faith to the child." "Babies are baptized because of the faith of their parents. Without the faith and consent of their parents, a baby cannot be baptized." P.67: "Confirmation . . . completes the sacrament of baptism . . . when the child has begun to mature." P.68: "The bread and wine . . . are transformed into his body and blood." P.70: "Bread and wine will be changed into the body and blood of the Lord." P.71: "The United States celebrates Jan. 1—Solemn Feast of Mary, Mother of Jesus . . . Aug. 15—The Assumption of Mary into Heaven . . . Dec. 8—Feast of the Immaculate Conception" (of Mary). P.73: "Catholics may receive the consecrated bread and wine, although receiving only the bread is truly receiving the Lord."

Chapter 6: The Christian Life: Healing and Forgiveness. P.77: "No one . . . sins by accident. You make a mistake but you do not sin." P.78: "Forgiveness is the healing of sin . . . the Catholic seeks such healing in the act of reconciliation between the sinner and Church. Pp.79-80: "Priests and bishops have the ministry of healing." P.81: "How are sins forgiven? The mercy of God . . . in the death and resurrection of Jesus is the means of sins' forgiveness . . . this forgiveness is shown however in our actual relationship with God and our relation ship with others. The reconciliation is celebrated by the Church in the sacrament of reconciliation which heals our relationship with others, the Christian community and

God." P.83: "In the history of the Church . . . doing penance as a corrective to sin [has-R.M.] become the common practice of 'going to confession' that Catholics . . . do today." P.84: "Catholics confess their sins and celebrate the sacrament of reconciliation with a priest . . . a priest . . . gives absolution of sin." Must a person confess? "When someone has sinned seriously, he or she confesses before sharing the Eucharist." P.85: "Confess your sins sincerely and openly to a priest . . . you should include sorrow for all the sins you have committed . . . the priest will give a 'penance' . . . to help you be clear about your change of life." P.86: "Catholics confess to an official representative of the Church community, a priest."

Chapter 7: The Christian Life: Ministering to Others. P.92: "The sacrament of confirmation . . . completes baptism." P.99: "Catholics are . . . not to remarry after divorce." P.104: "Married people may not become bishops or priests." P.106: "A bishop is chosen by the Pope."

Chapter 8: Christian Living. P.117: "A sincere Catholic never disregards the Church's teaching."

Chapter 9: The Organization of the Church. P.119: "Bishops, in communion with each other and the Bishop of Rome, seek to continue the work of Jesus." "All dioceses are joined together." P.120: "The Pope, as bishop of Rome, has a ministry for all the Church. He stands in the line of Peter." P.121: "The bishop is answerable to his fellow bishops and to the Pope." P.122: "The bishops, in union with the bishop of Rome are infallible when they speak for the whole Church." "The Pope, when he speaks . . . about faith and morale in a binding way, also enjoys . . . infallibility, of being free from error." P.123: "Canon law . . . specifies the rights and obligations of the members of the Church. Its most recent . . . publishing was in 1984." P.124: "The bishop appoints priests and deacons to their tasks."

Chapter 10: A Community that Hopes. P.127: "Evolution is not a denial of creation but a modification of the particular creation account given in the Bible's first book, Genesis." P.134: "Christians call . . . the fullness of life 'heaven' . . . Catholics believe that all who die in union with God begin to live this state of fullness . . . Catholics call these people 'saints' . . . Catholics regard as the greatest of saints Mary, the mother of Jesus . . . So great a saint is Mary that . . . she lives in the fullness of heaven, body and soul." P.135: "Catholics honor Mary, the Mother of Jesus, with the famous prayer called 'The Hail Mary.'" "We can ask Mary to help us, along with other saints." "What happens to people who die? Those who die . . . pass through a state of purification." P.136: "Catholics call this state 'purgatory'." "How long does this state of purification last? . . . as long as we . . . have not opened our hearts to the fullness of life in God." P.140: "Catholics pray for the day when nuclear weapons will be completely eliminated."

Epilogue: The Continuing Search. P.144: "How do I discover God? Through myself, in my dreams and hopes." P.147: "Illumination . . . is what Christians mean by grace. God's constant gift of grace breaks upon us . . . All of a sudden we are changed."

Robert Mackensen
