



## Abba Hillel Silver Collection Digitization Project

Featuring collections from the Western Reserve Historical Society and  
The Jacob Rader Marcus Center of the American Jewish Archives

### **MS-4787: Abba Hillel Silver Papers, 1902-1989.**

Series IV: Sermons, 1914-1963, undated.

---

Reel  
165

Box  
60

Folder  
956

The Soviet Union and the West, 1955.



## THE SOVIET UNION AND THE WEST

Beginning a series of three lectures on  
The "New Look" in World Affairs

October 16, 1955

I was in Switzerland last summer at the time of the Summit Conference at Geneva, and I was able to observe it at a closer range. I was able to get the reactions of the peoples of Europe to that Conference, both from reading the European Press, from personal contact with peoples, from conversations with them.

The reaction to that Conference in Europe, and evidently the same reaction was shared by peoples all over the world, was one you will recall of marked relief, as if some tension had suddenly been relaxed - as if some crushing burden had been lifted from the hearts of people. One could sense palpably - sense a more hopeful mood everywhere he went. Suddenly people were talking and writing more confidently and more hopefully about the future and about peace. This in a way was very surprising for actually no action of any definitive nature took place at Geneva. No fundamental agreements were reached on any of the outstanding issues between the East and the West - no decisions were made really of major significance. In fact the clear purpose of that Conference was to settle an agenda for a subsequent Conference of the Foreign Ministers of these States, a Conference which by the way, will soon be held, where all the issues would be discussed in detail and where an effort would then be made to settle them if possible. And it still remained, at that time of the Summit Conference, quite uncertain whether these issues can or will be settled.

What was it then that so uplifted the spirits of men and of nations, in this Geneva Conference. It was something very real indeed, but not very palpable - something that was implied rather than formally expressed.



A change of atmosphere took place, rather than formal agreements. These seemingly irreconcilable enemies, who presumably were out to destroy one another, and who for nearly a decade had indoctrinated each other and themselves with these convictions, found themselves suddenly, or not so suddenly, by arrangement here in Geneva, face to face with one another and seemed to discover to their amazement that their suspicions and fears were perhaps a bit too hysterical. They were not such mortal enemies after all - they were not out to destroy one another and that they both wanted the same things - peace and security. They both wanted an end to the cold war and an end to the suicidal armament race. And here these heads of the governments involved found themselves talking to one another, calmly, reasonably, no longer shouting at one another through a foghorn of propaganda principally for home consumption -- shouting those well-known, blood curdling slogans of catastrophe - either you or I. The ten years of the diplomatic frost had seemingly begun to thaw.

They were reasoning now with one another at this Conference and not growling at one another. They were aware of course of the differences which existed between them and which they realized would probably continue to exist between them for a long time to come, but they seemed to feel that they could talk about these differences quite frankly, one to another. And that they could explore ways of perhaps reconciling some of them, of at least blunting the sharpest edges of the most irritating of issues.  
s  
And they were talking to one another as equals - resigned to each others existence and convinced at long last that they must live together in the same world and they could only live in the same world on the basis of reasonable and mutual accommodation.

Here at Geneva both East and West had turned their backs upon saber rattling and snarling at one another. And on the frantic efforts to organize the world



for a final and inevitable showdown in war they were returning to the ways of negotiation and compromise, ways of living and letting live, and they were returning to correct diplomatic speech, and practice. And the world around that Conference which eagerly and prayerfully watched that Conference — the world sensed all that in the speeches and more particularly in the attitudes of the heads of the governments towards one another. And the world felt greatly relieved.

Everyone realized that nothing substantial had really been decided, but everyone also realized that something even more important had taken place. The leaders of the two divisions of mankind had tacitly agreed that in so many words they simply could not go to war with one another in an age of nuclear weapons. The discovery of the atomic bomb and the hydrogen bomb simply made any major war in the future a prelude to collective suicide. They realized and they acknowledged that peace is no longer something ideally desirable but something intrinsically and practically mandatory if the human race is to survive. It is no longer a question of peace or war - it is now a question of peace or universal destruction. It was either, therefore, coexistence or no existence at all, for the East and West. And none knew it better than those heads of government who assembled at Geneva and who controlled the huge stockpiles of nuclear bombs whose destructive power simply staggers the imagination of men. They realized, they knew - that the coming war - if there is to be another war - that in this coming war there would be no battlefields - there would be no front lines - and the combatants would not all be soldiers - every city in the world would be a battlefield. Every street and home would be on the front line - and every man, woman and child would be in the bloody shambles.

The Statesmen who met at Geneva knew this full well - and so they ruled out the possibility of war - they ruled out war as a possible way of settling their differences and they also spoke to one another as equals. That's very important.



They had come to realize that neither side could gain any advantage from the inferior military position of the other. They were both strong - very strong - and getting stronger - and they were both sufficiently balanced militarily; so as to discourage any hope of their easy victory of one over the other.

The heads of the governments of Great Britain and France and the United States certainly came to Geneva desiring peace. These nations do not want war - they seek nothing from the Soviet Union - they have no territorial ambitions which impinge upon the interests of the Soviet Union. Great Britain and France want trade with the Soviet Union badly in order to maintain the standard of living of their own people. They came seeking peace. So clear and patent was this fact that President Eisenhower, speaking for the democracies, was able easily to impress this truth with a sincerity and a forthrightness which captivated not only the members of the Conference, but the whole world. Our ailing President, for whose complete recovery the whole world prays, was the prophetically dominant personality at this Conference. His integrity - his moral integrity - ~~was~~ unimpeachable and he was able to allay many of the fears of the statesmen of the East, who in many ways are the victims of their own propaganda, and of their own dogmatism and catechism. They saw an honest man speaking <sup>forthrightly</sup> to them ~~forthrightly~~ for peace and could not help but be tremendously impressed.

But the Russians too, came to Geneva seeking peace. One can never be sure of the motives which move men and nations - but in the case of the Russians, certain factors, among others, were undoubtedly responsible for their new approach to the West. In the first place, Stalin was dead. Stalinism was not universally popular among the Russian people. The rigors and hardships which his regime had imposed upon the Russian people were resented by many, though, of course, not expressed in so many words, in public. That is not a safe thing to do in Russia.



But it was sensed - and the leaders of the Russian people know it and a relaxation of these economic stringencies was greatly desired by the Russians' people and with the death of Stalin, hopefully expected. But such a relaxation, in terms of an increase in consumer's goods, <sup>and the</sup> amenities of life, could only come about if the government were in position to spend less of its budget on its heavy industry and on war production and more on consumer's goods - spend less on bullets and more on butter. It can only do that if it were assured of an era of peace. Added to this fact was the fact of a serious slump in agricultural and food production in the Soviet Union which still further aggravated ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> situation. Russia had great need for more trade with the ~~free~~ West - with the free world in order to increase her food and her consumer goods. Russia has not yet fully recovered from the frightful devastation of her territory and her industry at the hands of the Nazis during the last war. Stalin had counted very heavily, as ~~in~~ did all doctrinaire Marxists, upon the early breakdown of Capitalism in the Western world. But evidently this rotten and decaying Capitalism was neither rotting ~~or~~ decaying, rather it was giving evidence of remarkable buoyancy and of vigorous creative energy. And this discouraging truth had begun to assert itself more and more, though not yet publicly acknowledged of course, among the the leaders of the Russian people, namely that the early collapse of the capitalist world is not to be expected nor that its overthrow in war was at all feasible. They realized that the Communist advance in the West had been definitely halted and was not making any headway in Europe. In fact it had suffered some very serious setbacks in Europe. It realized that the power of the democratic front had grown stronger in recent years rather than weaker so they had come to the conclusion that peace was an urgent and vital need of the Russian people and the Russian government. And this realization of the need for peace on both sides, East and West came to full expression. And on this realization much can be built.



Whether it will be built - whether a real beginning will be made at the forthcoming Conference of the Foreign Ministers remains to be seen. Here skill and courage and imagination and caution will prove the determining factors. Certainly, as a result of this Geneva Conference more normal diplomatic relations can now be established between the East and the West. Certainly more International Trade can now be encouraged. And since the possibility of War involving the East and the West is practically ruled out of consideration by both sides, some real progress in disarmament can be looked for. Areas of agreement in this field seem to be possible as evidenced by the recent correspondence between Eisenhower and Bulganin.

As a result of this Conference too, the United Nations, as an instrumentality for adjusting differences between nations might come to be greatly strengthened, for if the differences between these two divisions of mankind cannot be settled by war, that that is unthinkable, then there must be some agency readily available to adjudicate the differences in a peaceful manner. It is quite possible that the prestige of the United Nations will begin to mount as a result of this Conference.

Accommodations will have to be made, naturally. It will not be easy to make them. It will be the task of statesmanship to find the satisfactory formula for these accommodations. The reunification of Germany for example, if it is pressed at this Conference of the Ministers, may prove a serious stumbling block, for Germany cannot be reunified under present conditions unless it is also neutralized. The Soviet Union will never agree to the unification of Germany as long as Western Germany is a member of NATO that is allied with the West and member of what the Soviet regards as a military alliance aimed against it, since it is not a member of it itself. I have always believed, and have so expressed it, as you may know, time and again that our policy with reference to Germany is a quite unrealistic policy. You cannot, on the



one hand arm Western Germany and integrate it in a Western alliance and at the same time hope to get Russia's agreement to a unification, of East and West Germany. I have always expressed the thought that the rearming of Germany was a great mistake, undesirable from every point of view, though I have always favored the reunification of Germany. Perhaps the answer lies in a satisfactory security system for the whole of Europe. A system which would include the Soviet Union, but which will not, however leave Europe at the mercy of the Red Army.

Now the question that arises in minds of many people, which was uttered during this Geneva Conference and frequently heard after the Conference, "Can we trust Russia?" Well, we will have to do business with Russia in spite of our distrust. We need not relax our vigilance - we should not lower our guard - but we will have to live in the same world, and if the need for peace is as real on both sides as I believe it is, we will learn to get along together on the basis of mutual adjustments, in spite of our suspicions and distrusts. We can work together in some areas even if we disagree in others.

From time to time I hear people quote, or I see in newspapers and in newspaper's editorials, quotes, What Lenin said and What Stalin said and what other Russian leaders said about the irreconcilability between the East and the West and how Communism is out to dominate the world and therefore the conclusion of these quotes seemingly is, there is no way ~~is~~ of doing business with Russia - in fact they don't point to any conclusion which stems from these quotes except to say that we have got to be on our guard. I am not impressed by these quotes although I know that they exist. Governments, and other organizations of men and great religions accommodate themselves frequently on the basis of convenience or practical needs to their



own traditional pronouncements and make revisions in practice where they cannot make revisions in doctrine. Its a common experience. Democracy did the same thing as Communism - Democracy in the early revolutionary days of the French Revolution and the American Revolution was out to destroy monarchy and tyranny everywhere on the face of the earth and was possessed of a real crusading spirit. And you can bring quotes, eloquent quotes, from <sup>some of</sup> the great revolutionary leaders of our own country and of other countries, to demonstrate that democracy and monarchy could not live ~~or~~ <sup>and</sup> coexist in the same world and I suppose ~~and I suppose~~ theoretically they could not, but in practice they did. Our own government was able to get along quite satisfactorily for many many years with the government of Czarist Russia, and we are now doing business with Franco and with Tito. Its true also of great Religious Organizations. They have their dogmas from which they are unwilling or unable to disassociate themselves in theory, but in practice they do. That is true of Judaism - that is true of Christianity. There are many declarations in the holy book of the Bible which are categorical but which later ages of loyal Jews found necessary to revise, not in theory, but in practice. According to our Bible for example, one must not kindle any light in his home on the Sabbath day. The law is very clear on that point - there must be no light in the home on the Sabbath and those who took that law literally, like the Karaites, actually spent the day, or the evening of the Sabbath in darkness and the day for them became a sad day - a day of enforced inactivity. But the progressive leaders of Judaism, who wanted to keep Judaism vital, reinterpreted this law and said that the Sabbath was given to the people for a day of rest and joy, not for a day of darkness and sadness - that was its purpose - and therefore we may have light burning in our homes on the Sabbath. We will kindle the lights on the eve of the Sabbath - but in the evening we will have light in our homes. And the kindling of the Sabbath lights in our



homes was demonstrably an assertion of this fact. Actually in violation of the law - of the clear stated doctrine - practically a fulfillment of the spirit of that law. You take the attitude of the Roman Catholic Church for example, which has been most vigorously fighting Communism, in relation to the dogma of the Church itself. The official organ of the Jesuits, published the statement in April 1948, on the Catholic philosophy of tolerance and freedom for non-Catholics. This is the quotation from that statement:

"The Roman Catholic Church, convinced, through its divine prerogatives, of being the only true church, must demand the right of freedom for herself alone, because such a right can only be possessed by truth, never by error. As to other religions, the Church will certainly never draw the sword, but she will require that by legitimate means they shall not be allowed to propagate false doctrine. Consequently, in a state where the majority of the people are Catholic, the Church will require that legal existence be denied to error, and that if religious minorities actually exist, they shall have only a de facto existence without opportunity to spread their beliefs. . . . In some countries,

(and this is the point that I am endeavoring to make)

Catholics will be obliged to ask full religious freedom for all, resigned at being forced to cohabitate where they alone should rightfully be allowed to live. But in doing this the Church does not renounce her thesis, which remains the most imperative of her laws, but merely adapts herself to de facto conditions, which must be taken into account in practical affairs."

This is it - you accommodate yourself to new situations, without the necessity of abandoning dogmatic convictions. On the subject of the



relationship <sup>between</sup> ~~the~~ Church and State for example, the attitude of the Catholic Church was expressed by Monsignor George B. O'Toole, Professor of Philosophy at the Catholic University of America, in 1939, in these words:

"It is clear, then, that no Catholic may positively and unconditionally approve of the policy of separation of church and state. But given a country like the United States, where religious denominations abound and the population is largely non-Catholic, it is clear that the policy of treating all religions alike becomes, all things considered, a practical necessity, the only way of avoiding a deadlock. Under such circumstances, separation of Church and State is to be accepted, not indeed as the ideal arrangement, but as a modus vivendi."

I read this, not in criticism of the Church, and I am not expressing any opinion on the attitude of the Church in these matters, but I am endeavoring to drive home the point that in life - in practical life - governments, regardless of their philosophies, and governments never ~~really~~ officially abandon a philosophy unless there is a revolution in the country - that governments make necessary accommodations, and while Lenin and Stalin and Trotsky said so and so about the irreconcilability between the Communist and the non-Communist world, just as these men speak of the irreconcilability between Catholics and non-Catholics, nevertheless, in practice such reconciliations are resorted to, in order that life may advance and the needs of the peoples be satisfied.

Doctrinaires, my dear friends, apostles of the irreconcilable, are dangerous guides in the kind of a world in which we live today. They can score on the argument, by pointing to sentence, verse and chapter, but the point to know - modus vivendi - to know a way of living together in a world where we must live together, because the only other alternative of living together is to die <sup>ing</sup> together,



in a universal cataclysm.

What inspired me much about the Geneva Conference was the quality of leadership which President Eisenhower gave to that Conference. It all depended on him, really, because he was the representative of the greatest power opposing the Soviet power in the world. Yet he came there with his disarming sincerity and honesty in the name of the greatest democracy on earth, and the noblest traditions of free men and said in so many words - let's put aside our bitterness, our mutual suspicions and hates - let's talk to one another as human beings upon whose decisions the fates of hundreds and millions of people depends. Let's see ~~if~~ whether we can't find a way of living together - a modus vivendi. And the answer was - we believe that such a way can be found - let's try to explore that way. And I hope that the Foreign Ministers, who are coming to their Conference in a few days, will not re-introduce that same old spirit of mutual distrust and suspicion into their deliberations. And if they do - this greatest hope of man will be indefinitely deferred.

I pray that the spirit of President Eisenhower may come to dominate the forthcoming Conference, as it dominated the Summit Conference <sup>in</sup> ~~at~~ Geneva.







A change of atmosphere - rather than formal agreements  
seemingly irreconcilable enemies - who previously were out  
to destroy one another - who for nearly a decade had  
indiscriminately each other and themselves with their con-  
victions - ~~and~~ <sup>now</sup> suddenly face to face with each other - and  
discovered, that their ~~surprises~~ <sup>surprises</sup> ~~were~~ <sup>were</sup> ~~have been~~, perhaps,  
a bit too hysterical; that they were not such mortal  
enemies, after all; that they are not out to destroy one  
another; that they both want the same things - peace  
and security, ~~and~~ an end, the Cold War - <sup>and</sup> an end to  
a mutual armament race.

- ~~they find themselves~~ <sup>they find themselves</sup> talking to one another - ~~and no longer~~ <sup>and no longer</sup>  
shouting at one another - ~~in home consumption~~ <sup>in home consumption</sup> ~~for the past~~ <sup>for the past</sup>  
through the fog-brown, prewar and ~~the~~ <sup>well-known</sup>  
black-curdling slogans of ~~do a die~~ <sup>they</sup> ~~again to their management~~ <sup>disappointed</sup> ~~that~~ <sup>first</sup> the 10 years <sup>first</sup>  
to show ~~and~~ they were ~~talking~~ <sup>talking</sup> to each other - ~~in that~~

They were now reasoning with one another - <sup>was</sup> ~~in that~~ <sup>growing</sup>  
they were aware of the differences which existed bet. them -  
and which would continue to exist in all probability, for some  
time - but they now seemed to feel that they could talk about  
these points frankly - ~~and to each other~~ - and explore ways of  
reconciling them - <sup>bluntly</sup> ~~at least~~ at least the sharpest edges  
of the most irritating issues.



They were now talking as equals, not ~~mutually~~ afraid (3)  
of each other - assigned to each other's existence - and  
enraged at how lost but that they went his in the same  
world, on the basis of reasonable mutual ~~adjustment~~ <sup>agreements</sup>.

[illegible]

7. The world seemed all that - in the speeches and the attitudes,  
the heads / sent who assembled at Geneva - and the  
world felt / revealed. Only one knew that as they had  
really been shocked - but every one realized that something  
even more important had taken place.

The leader of the two divisions / manhood had truly  
 agreed that they simply could not go to war <sup>or no such</sup> as an  
 age of nuclear weapons; The discovery of the atomic  
 bomb and the Hydrogen bomb ~~had~~ makes any major  
 war in the future a prelude to collective suicide!

- Race is ~~not~~ <sup>no longer</sup> some thing ideally desirable - It is <sup>intrinsically</sup> practically mandatory - of the human race is to survive!



It is no longer a question of peace or war - but of peace and the end! (4)

It is ... either co-existence for the East and West or no existence!

None knew it better than the men who ~~assaulted at large~~ ~~have~~ <sup>assaulted at large</sup> ~~who~~ <sup>and those</sup> who controlled the huge stock-piles of nuclear bombs - whose destruction power stops the migration -

The enemy war - if it comes - <sup>they know</sup> will not be a war of battle fields - There will be no front-lines - The combatants will not <sup>all</sup> be soldiers - Every city will be a battle field - Every street & house ~~is~~ <sup>is</sup> a front line - and every <sup>man</sup> ~~man~~ & child - will be in the ~~blow~~ <sup>blow</sup> ~~hammer~~

The statesmen at Geneva knew this full well - and so they ruled out war - as a possible way of settling what they wanted ~~settling~~ <sup>settling</sup> their differences

6/. They also took to no one else - as equals. They were ~~as~~ fully aware that no one could gain advantage from the inferior military <sup>position</sup> ~~strength~~ of the other. Both sides were <sup>very</sup> ~~strong~~ <sup>strong</sup> - and representatively balanced militarily so as not to encourage the hope of any easy victory <sup>gone</sup> ~~in~~ <sup>on</sup> the other.



7/ The heads of the party of G.B.-F. & the U.S. - certainly came to London (5)  
desiring peace. They want ~~to~~ no war. They seek nothing but  
the Soviet Union. - They have no territorial ambitions which  
impose upon the interests of the Soviet Union. G.B.-F. want trade  
So clear and patent ~~was~~ this fact - that Pres. G. speaking for the  
democracy was easily able to impress this fact into  
with a sincerity and a forthrightness which operated not  
along the conference but the whole world. Our ~~audience~~ <sup>audience</sup>  
pendent for whose complete recovery ~~was~~ the whole  
world press - was the prophetic dominant personality  
at Geneva - His integrity was incomparable - and  
he alleged many of the fears of the statesmen, the fact -  
who in many ways are the victims, then our propagandists  
and ~~thinkers~~ <sup>thinkers</sup> take charge.

8/ But the Russians, too, came to Geneva seeking peace.  
We can never be sure of the motives which move men  
and nations - but in the case of the Russians, certain  
factors <sup>among other</sup> were undoubtedly responsible for their new approach  
to the West.

① Stalin was dead. Stalin was an not universally popular  
among Russian people. The rigors and hardships which his  
regime had imposed upon the people were resented by many -  
though not expressed in so many words - that would not be  
safe in Russia - But it was sensed - a relaxation of the  
Comm. discipline was greatly ~~and~~ <sup>desired</sup> and with the



death, status, hopefully expected. -

But such a relaxation - and an increase in consumer  
power could only come about - if the govt. were in position  
to spend less on <sup>these</sup> many industries and use production  
- less on ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~and~~ - more on health & on health!  
is & the need - if ~~there was~~ it was sound of an era  
of peace.

⑬ ~~Russia has not yet recovered from the~~ added to that  
on the fact of a serious slump in agriculture and food pro-  
duction in Soviet Union - which adds to the desperate  
situation.

(c) Russia has need for more trade - with the free world to  
maintain her food and consumer goods.

(d) Russia has not yet recovered fully from the physical devastation, her territory and her industry at the hands of the Nazis during World War II

(4) Stalin had counted very heavily - as did all doctrinaire Marxists - upon the break-down of capitalism in the W. and Rotten and decaying capitalism was evidently not nearly so strong as decaying - rather was enduring remarkable buoyancy and ~~fast~~ vigorous creative energy. The disorganizing ~~convulsion~~ has begun to assert itself - even tho' not yet fully acknowledged - that the early collapse of capitalism out of its own weakness - was not to be expected - and that its overthrow in the W. - is inevitable. F. D. I. Co. (f.d.)

as common in the - is. Undoubtedly  
(by Marxist dogma) abt. capitalists' profits sent to destroy Soc. State  
- ~~the~~ also not less concerned by the fact



U.S. Communism advances in the West - has been halted, (?)  
It is not making any head-way in Europe - and the power of  
the democratic front - its main strength - rather than weak.  
- Russian statements have apparently come to the conclusion  
that peace is an <sup>important</sup> vital need for their country -

9/ The need for peace <sup>on both sides</sup> both in the West & the East - came to  
full expression in Geneva.

On this foundation much can be built - Whether it will  
be built - & what way made at the forth coming conference  
of the Foreign Ministers - remains to be seen - Here skill,  
energy, imagination and common sense determine the outcome.

10/ Certainly - as a result of this Conference - new normal  
dipl. relations should be established - new international  
trade encouraged - And since the possibility of war  
between the East & the West - is not considered or  
imminent - some real measures of disarmament should  
finally be agreed on: Arms agreement in this  
field seem to be possible as evidenced in the recent  
conferences but the Communists and Balparmes.

11/ U.N. should be strengthened - If problems are not to  
be referred to the arbitrator, the summit - then -



12/ The rearmament / f. if it is pressed - will form a  
Humbling Block - for fr. cannot be rearmament without  
this rearmament - Soviet will not agree to G. rearmament  
as long as W.G. is a member, Kato - that it is not  
as a military alliance - I don't think it - since it has not  
been invited into it. - (I have always felt that an policy is possible  
- among W.G. - but now two very important  
- the rearmament as danger policy (and)

Perhaps the answer lies in a such policy security system  
for the whole Europe - which will however not leave  
Europe at the mercy, the Red Army.

13/ Can we trust Russia? No one can answer it. We will  
have to do business with Russia in spite of our distrust  
We ~~must~~ not relax our vigilance, as danger is <sup>most likely</sup> present, but  
we will have to live in same world - and, if the need for  
peace is as real on both sides as we believe it is, - we will  
get along together - on the basis of mutual accommodations.  
We can work together in some areas - even if we disagree in others.

14/ From here to here - Gents - I am not impressed -  
Gents. + Churches accommodate Eos <sup>consequently & sympathetically</sup> to their own <sup>national</sup> <sup>prominence</sup>  
- ~~Deacons~~ Big Gent Ranks - Evangelists - Tito  
- Catholics - Other churches - Jewish orthodoxy -

15/ Modus Vivendi - Doctrines - Opinions, the Inevitable  
are danger guides in the complex world, to-day.



The official world organ of the Jesuits, Civiltà Cattolica of Rome, published in April, 1948, a striking statement concerning the Catholic philosophy of tolerance and freedom for non-Catholics:

The Roman Catholic Church, convinced, through its divine prerogatives, of being the only true church, must demand the right of freedom for herself alone, because such a right can only be possessed by truth, never by error. As to other religions, the Church will certainly never draw the sword, but she will require that by legitimate means they shall not be allowed to propagate false doctrine. Consequently, in a state where the majority of the people are Catholic, the Church will require that legal existence be denied to error, and that if religious minorities actually exist, they shall have only a de facto existence without opportunity to spread their beliefs. . . In some countries, Catholics will be obliged to ask full religious freedom for all, resigned at being forced to cohabitate where they alone should rightfully be allowed to live. But in doing this the Church does not renounce her thesis, which remains the most imperative of her laws, but merely adapts herself to de facto conditions, which must be taken into account in practical affairs. <sup>11</sup> The Church cannot blush for her own want of tolerance, as she asserts it in principle and applies it in practice. <sup>(11)</sup>



This conditional and provisional endorsement of the principle of church-state separation was expressed very frankly by Monsignor George B. O'Toole, Professor of Philosophy at the Catholic University of America, in 1939:

It is clear, then, that no Catholic may positively and unconditionally approve of the policy of separation of church and state. But given a country like the United States, where religious denominations abound and the population is largely non-Catholic, it is clear that the policy of treating all religions alike becomes, all things considered, a practical necessity, the only way of avoiding a deadlock. Under such circumstances, separation of Church and State is to be accepted, not indeed as the ideal arrangement, but as a modus vivendi.<sup>(15)</sup>

(underlined sections appeared in italics)