THE FOUNDATION OF RELIGIOUS LIBERTY
AS DEVELOPED BY

THE
WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

by


A Thesis submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School, Marquette University in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts in Theology

Milwaukee, Wisconsin
January, 1966
Religious freedom is an ecumenical question of utmost significance and importance in the world today. The whole world is waiting for the Second Vatican Council to make a Pastoral statement on the subject of religious liberty. Bishop Emile Joseph De Smet's of Belgium, schema on religious liberty was rejected as postponed by the last session of the Council. His basis for religious liberty was theological. Bishop John Courtney Murray, S.J. of Woodstock College, Maryland has been selected to draw up the schema on the subject of religious freedom, at the next session of the Council. He is a world wide authority on the subject. His articles have appeared in Theological Studies about religious liberty from 1950 onwards. There is a strange unexplainable interruption of Father Courtney's articles from 1955-1960, and a continuation from 1960 until his most recent scholarly treatise, Problem of Religious Liberty. Judging from the nature of Father Courtney's works, his basis for religious freedom would be juridic, rather than theological.

1. For the ultimate basis of human dignity is the fact that man is a creature of God. He is not God Himself, but an image of God. From this absolute dependence of man upon God there flows every right and duty of man to claim for himself and for others true religious liberty. pg. 247. On pgs. 244-5, quoting Pope John 23, Facem and Terrae (1) by law of nature human person has the right to the free exercise of religion in society according to the dictates of a sincere conscience. (2) public authority must respect this right as such a way that human person in society is kept immune from all coercion of any kind. Kung, Congar, O.P. O'Hanlon, S.J., Religious Liberty, Council Speeches of Vatican II, 1964, pgs. 244-5, 47.

2. Interpreting Father Courtney's mind, I would presuppose that he favors the second of the two views, which he presents. It is not in any sense function of government to
Both of these viewpoints will be discussed in this thesis. It was my good fortune at the suggestion of Father Sheets, S.J., to receive direction from Father Murray on the particular aspect of the problem. I am indebted to both for suggestions, directions, and also to Dr. Angel F. Carrillo de Albornoz, who supplied me with much information about the ideas of Religious Freedom as developed by the World Council of Church. Dr. Albornoz is Executive Secretary of the Secretariat on Religious Liberty established in 1948 in Switzerland.

The World Council of Churches considers religious freedom essential to Christian witness. The goal of the WCC: "ut unum sit".

The ecumenical movement, in caring for religious liberty, not only considers the churches which belong to it, but it has regard for and seeks to serve all Christians and all men, including those who are non-religious. The basis of religious liberty agreed upon and discussed by specialists and theologians of the WCC are two. The basis of religious liberty is juridic or theological. A further determination than presents itself. If the basis of religious liberty is juridic, does right flow from man's interior dignity and worth as a person, or from the non-competence of the state

2. (continued) authorize the existence of any religion true or false pgs. 34-9. "The legal institution of religious freedom in its contemporary sense is not a positive authorization of either truth or error. The people of the United States inspired by the personal and political consciousness, declared that the free exercise of religion is to be immune from coercive restriction by the power of state or any other power within society". pg. 39. "With this growth of man's understanding of his personal and political consciousness of himself as a
in spiritual matters. If the basis is theological, does religious liberty stem from man's status i.e. a person redeemed, who responds freely to God's non-coercive activity with mankind. Theologians not affiliated with the World Council of Churches are divided in their opinions. Those favoring the theological basis for religious liberty are Congar, Martain, Danielou, Pribella, Hartmann, Leonard, Gustave Thebon, and Bishop De Smedt. Theologians favoring the juridic basis (not affiliated with WCC), Murray, Luiggi, Sturzo. Theologians related to WCC reflect a considerable degree of ecumenical unanimity. There are two general tendencies. The first considers inner christian freedom independent and separate from social religious freedom, therefore, religious freedom is based on limitation of states power. (a juridic basis). This first opinion, the limitation of states' power has a large number of devotees. Among these followers could be classified such men as Dr. Nolde, Dr. Carrillo, Dean John Bennett (Union Theological Seminary, New York), J. H. Oldham, Prof. George Peyrot, Prof. Searle Bates, (Professor at Union Seminary at New York, member of Commission on Religious Liberty), Dr. John A. Mackay (former President of the Theological Seminary, Princeton U.), Prof. N. H. Soe (member commission of religious liberty), Dr. G. Voight (East Germany member commission religious liberty).

2. (continued) free person in free society, catholic doctrine on religious freedom must likewise grow in its understanding of itself. pg. 90. Pope John saw the full implication and articulated the concept of freedom as a political end and political method. pg. 91. No argument can be made today which would validate the legal institution of religious intolerance, much less canonize it as a catholic ideal. The fact is that legal intolerance stands condemned today by the common consciousness of the peoples of the world. The condemnation is binding today on all civilized states. Today religious freedom as a human and civil right, personal and corporate, requiring the protection
and Prof. Roger Mehl.

The opposite opinion maintains (1) that freedom in Christ and social religious freedom are intimately related. (2) Inner Christian freedom implies recognition of social freedom. (3) State is viewed, under God, as responsible for spiritual welfare of community. Man’s redeemed status and God’s non-coercive activity with man, postulates a free response by man to God. This theological basis for religious freedom has an equally large following. Included are such men of the WCC as: Prof. H. Berkhof, (member committee on R. L.), Dr. C. Emmanuel Carlson (same committee), Dr. G. Carpenter (International Missionary Council), Dr. R. M. Fagley (Executive Sec. WCC), Sir Kenneth Grubb (Chairman Commission of Churches on International Affairs), Dr. Charles Malik (Former Chairman of U. N. Commission on Human Rights), Bishop Leslie Newbigin (International Missionary Council), Dr. Vittorio Subilia, Dr. J.W.A. Visser T’Hooft, and finally Dr. Amos N. Wilder.

2. (Continued) of a legal institution has emerged as an exigence of the personal and political reason. pg. 103-4.
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THE NOTION OF RELIGIOUS LIBERTY AS ESPoused BY
WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

Religious liberty is a vague term used in designating many different kinds of religious freedom. The essential elements involved in the type of liberty which the ecumenical bodies of the World Council of Churches are seeking, include the following:

1. Active subject - the whole human race, every human being, individually and collectively, who has the capability of exercising religious liberty within society, without any limitations regarding nation, color, sex, religion.
2. The passive subject, whose duty it is to respect the religious liberty of others, is human society in general.
3. Religious liberty must liberate from social coercion, i.e., physical or moral restraint, which undermines the ultimate freedom of choice.
4. Religious matters to be protected include the exercise of one's own chosen religion, or the right to change one's religion or belief, also all external activities of worship, preaching, teaching, practice, and observance, and even the manifestations in words and deeds of the implications of one's own religious convictions for political, economic, or social relations.

The kind of religious freedom sought by ecumenical bodies can be identified as the social faculty of every adult human being (individually, collectively, or corporately) to be free from social coercion in religious matters. Social religious liberty demanded by WCC is distinguished from other

4. Ibid, p. 16.

Freedom before God (e.g., psychological, physical) the freedom within oneself, i.e., inner freedom is not the kind claimed by the WCC or studied here.

5. Social religious liberty excludes not only social and juridic compulsion, but also economic, moral, psychological, conscious, or unconscious forms of compulsion from society.
types of freedom (1) freedom of choice - proper to intellectual creatures, and which can co-exist with external compulsion or negation of social liberty. (2) There is also freedom fundamental difference between social religious liberty sought by the WCC and the "libertas christiana", or christian liberty. The Amsterdam Déclaration 1948, explicitly distinguishes between the "liberty with which Christ has set us free", which is internal freedom, and its outward expression, social external religious liberty. The main proof that both freedoms are distinct and can exist separately is seen in the christian martyrs. (3) A third term to be distinguished from religious liberty is freedom of worship used as a synonym. Theologians of the WCC think that freedom of worship is a very incomplete term, for the area of social religious freedom is much larger than worship. (4) A final distinction poses a problem. Freedom of conscience as applied to social religious liberty, seems to apply only in an analogical sense, because the individual alone has a conscience. It would be difficult to see how the corporate freedom of the church could be understood as freedom of conscience. Therefore freedom of conscience and religious freedom cannot be synonymous terms, but rather freedom of conscience will be considered as a part of religious liberty.


An essential element in a good international order is freedom of religion. Christians are concerned that religious freedom be everywhere secured, in view of world wide nature of christianity. In pleading for this freedom, they do not ask for
The concept of religious freedom as identified by the WCC does not necessarily have its origin in Christian insights, that is "social religious liberty" is not in itself an objectively Christian liberty. For the simple reason that many non-Christians demand the same social religious freedom, as is demanded by the WCC. Nevertheless the WCC concept of social religious liberty is Christian. The articulation of its elements and motivations are grounded on Christian convictions. The WCC claims religious liberty for all men without distinction or discrimination for, "we believe in the fundamental unity of the human family. We demand protection against every social coercion, for we believe that even the state must respect man's highest loyalties. We ask for liberty in a very large area of religious activities, even for the proclamation of the political and social implications of our religious beliefs in virtue of our Christian understanding of religion. In this sense we may say correctly that our notion of social religious liberty is fully Christian.

6. (continued) any privilege to be granted to Christians which is denied to others, while the liberty with which Christ has set men free can neither be given or destroyed by any government. Christians because of that inner freedom are jealous for its outward expression and solicitous that all men should have freedom in religious life. The rights of religious freedom herein declared shall be recognized and observed for persons without distinction as to race, color, sex, language, or religion, and without imposition of disabilities by virtue of legal provisions or administrative acts.

7. The Charter of the United Nations affirms the purpose of the United Nations as to promote, encourage, respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinctions as to race, sex, language or religion. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Article 18 of the draft covenant on civil and political rights states: "Everyone has a right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion, this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief, and freedom, either alone or in
The social religious liberty as identified by the WCC and discussed here is sometime mentioned in the singular, considered as a whole unit; whereas on other occasions this (social religious) liberty is considered under various aspects, as many religious freedoms. The ecumenical statements of the WCC do not give a definition of religious liberty in the singular, but do contain negative and positive formulae, which can be combined to enunciate social religious liberty, as a right of every human being to be free from social or legal coercion in religious matters, as well as man's responsibility to make it possible for all to secure this freedom. Thus the New Delhi Conference of 1961 adopted the following negative norm, "Christians see religious liberty as a consequence of God's creative work, of his redemption of man in Christ and his calling of men into His service. God's dealing with men is not coercive. Accordingly human attempts by legal enactment or by pressure of social custom to coerce or to eliminate faith are violations of the fundamental ways of God with men.

The declaration on religious liberty of the First Assembly of WCC at Amsterdam in 1948 states positively the social possibility of acting responsibility in matters of religion. "While the liberty with which Christ has set men FREE can neither be given, nor destroyed by any government; Christians........are solicitous that all men should have

7. (continued) community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship, and observance.


8. Carrillo, Dr., "The Basis of Religious Liberty", pg.19
freedom in religious life. Perhaps the most complete formulation of religious liberty, as understood by WCC, in singular sense of the Committee on Religious liberty at St. Andrews, 1960;

"The faculty of every human being individually, or in corporate bodies, publicly or in private to be free from social or legal coercion in religious matters, and to be for the proclamation of his faith, and the expression of its implications among his fellow men." [1]

So far for the notion of religious liberty considered in the singular. We will now consider the content of various "religious freedoms" found in the ecumenical documents. These are divided into four main groups. (1) Every person has the right to determine his own faith and creed. (2) Every person has the right to express his religious beliefs in worship, teaching, and practice, and to proclaim the implication of his beliefs for relationships in a social or political community. (3) Every person has the right to associate with others and to organize with them for religious purposes. (4) Every religious organization formed or maintained by action in accordance with the rights of individuals persons, has the right to determine its policies and practices for the accomplishment of its chosen purposes.

11. Abornoz, Religious Liberty, pg. 2. The word faculty means that religious liberty is not merely a legal right, but also a human faculty to be respected by society even outside legal provisions or state protection. St. Andrew, 1960.
12. T'Hooft, Amsterdam, pgs. 97-99. The "Declaration on Religious Liberty made by Amsterdam Assembly 1948, classified the long list of liberties made by the World Conference on Church,
There are four main groups of religious freedoms:

1. Liberty of Conscience, or right to determine freely one's own faith or creed.
2. Liberty of religious expression.
3. Liberty of religious association.
4. Corporate and institutional religious freedom.

Liberty of conscience, for WCC is not be identified with inner liberty, but rather a kind of external or social religious freedom, which allows one to make personal judgments and decisions concerning one's own religious beliefs, without any social coercion. The Amsterdam Declaration considers liberty of conscience as external, declaring, "Religious social and political institutions have the obligation to permit the mature individual to relate himself to sources of information in such a way as to allow personal religious decision and belief". The WCC considers the four freedoms listed above, as complete and adequate to express their notion of a descriptive definition of religious social freedom. Dr. Carrillo makes a distinction between the first of these freedoms and the other three. Albornoz calls "liberty of conscience" pure religious liberty - MEANING _ in man's essential relations with God he is liberated from every social compulsion, and independent from everything besides God. The other three freedoms of

12. (cont'd.) Community and State at Oxford, 1937
The Conference of the International Missionary Council, Madras, 198, (IMC), and the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in América, 1944.

13. T'Hoof, Amsterdam, 1948, pg. 98. St. Thomas wrote that although faith in Christ is good and essential for salvation, if someone were to become a Christian who thought it would be wrong to believe in Christ, then he would be
(1) religious expression, (2) association, (3) corporate freedom, presuppose something more than man's complete dependence on God.

Man is essentially a social being, and the expression of man's thoughts and feelings is a fundamental human right. Therefore, man's right to speak religiously must be considered a sacred right. If man were not social, and we could not speak of religious liberty in spite of man's essential relations with God. So freedom of association and corporate freedom presuppose not only religious freedom in se i.e., man's essential relation to God through faith, and personal worship, according to own religious convictions, but also recognize the human right to associate with others, and freely to administer corporations. Dr. Carrillo calls the latter three freedoms, mixed religious freedoms. In the sense that these three types of freedoms presuppose not only pure religious freedom, but also the fundamental human rights of expression, association, and corporate freedom. This terminology is a development which can be helpful in solving some phases of religious freedom which have perplexed some theologians. Some theologians are reluctant to limit religious freedom by social or legal consideration, whereas others do not want to open up society to every possible abuse (even crimes) committed on pretext of religious convictions.

13. (cont'd.) committing a sin. Article 5 asks, "Whether the will is evil when at variance with erring reason." (Omne quod est contra conscientium patet est; ergo voluntos discordos a ratione errante est malum). The will is evil, when it is at variance with erring conscience. Opera Omnia, Questio 19, Article 5, pg. 77, Musurgia Publisher N.Y., 1948. Hartmann, S.J. has written "Freedom of conscience does not mean giving "rights" to error, it means giving equal status to the people, who are living in accordance with a personal and sincere conscience. Toleranz und Christlicher Glaube, Pg. 188, quoted by Dr. Carrillo.
Applying the distinction of the WCC, as developed by Dr. Carrillo, religious liberty will mean both pure and mixed. In referring to religious liberty in the "pure sense", or "liberty of conscience", the term will not be used as a genus of all kinds of religious freedom. For what can be predicated of pure freedom (liberty of conscience) cannot be predicated about the three mixed religious freedoms. It can be stated that society may not limit "pure religious freedom", or one's complete autonomy in relation to God. However, this cannot be applied without distinction to the mixed religious freedoms. These mixed religious freedoms can certainly be limited by Society. This distinction between pure and mixed religious liberty is an insight into which has helped the WCC in coming close to unanimity in an Ecumenical Dialogue about religious freedom.

THEORETICAL BASIS OF RELIGIOUS LIBERTY AS DEVELOPED

BY THEOLOGIANS NOT AFFILIATED WITH WCC

It is generally admitted in WCC ecumenical circles, that there has not yet emerged a consensus of opinion concerning the theological basis of religious liberty. The most numerous differences of opinion in the discussion about religious freedom center around the basis or grounds for religious liberty. This difference of opinion is noticeable among theologians, not affiliated with the WCC, and also among theologians affiliated with the WCC. In a study of Roman Catholicism and Religious Freedom, Dr. Carrillo of the WCC notes, that Roman Catholic biblical and theological arguments in favor of religious liberty are many. The first of these arguments as a basis for religious liberty is the "dignity of man, who has been created in the image of God." Many catholic theologians agree, among these being Congar, Maritain, Danielou, Rouquette, Fribella, Latreille, Hartman, that in the Bible both in the Old and New Testaments, God addresses Himself, to a Creature, who is able to respond and to recognize His Sovereignty, through free obedience. Because man has free will, he is able to respond to God's call, and to believe and obey, but also to refuse to believe and obey. Man is capable of conversion, and repentance, but also of disregarding God.
The early Fathers explained the capacity for choice inherent in man by the biblical statement that God created man in His own image. Citing scripture Fr. Congar concludes, "East and West in Patristic times are unanimous in maintaining that liberty as a basic faculty for free determination is a quality linked with ontology, and bound up with the very nature of man. Man continues to be made in the image of God, and free, even after the Fall. Maritain explains the consequences for human society of man's freedom, which flows from his resemblance to God. To use violent force to accept the Gospel would be contrary to human dignity. Human society may not destroy the consequence, i.e. external religious freedom, willed by God when God created man.

14. "And this is the condemnation, that light came into the world and men loved darkness rather than the light, because their deeds were evil. For every one who does evil, hates the light, and does not come to the light, lest his deeds should be exposed. But he who does what is true comes to the light, that it may be clearly seen that his deeds have been wrought in God". Jn. 3:19-21. Congar, Yves, O.P. "Le Christianisme Doctrine de Liberte" in L'"Eglise et la liberte" pg. 20-21.

15. "In the sphere of everlasting worth and absolute dignity of the soul, as it has been created, society exists for and is subordinate to man." Maritain, Jacques, "Les Droits de L'homme et La Loi Naturelle" pages 26-27.
Danielou speaks about religious liberty in terms of entering into a new relationship with God, i.e. Sons of God. This means entering into freedom in a new sense, not as servant to the Lord, but as Son to his Father. St. Paul calls the freedom of the children of God, parrhēsis i.e. freedom to speak. In the light of the above catholic theological opinions in conceiving christian life as consequence of God's grace, any effort substituting human coercion of any kind for this divine grace is not only unjust, but ineffective, and even ridiculous.

Other Catholic Theologians consider transcendence of faith as the final and only perfect basis for religious liberty. Dr. Carrillo quotes Fr. Leonard, O.P. (1) faith is a gift of God. A gift depending only on the transcendental action of God's uncreated love. If the assent of believer depends upon the action of the sovereign liberty of God, no human influence (not even church gives faith) can be substituted for work of grace. (2) faith, on the human side is a complete and conditionless committment of man to the word of God. In the drama of committment one of the essential elements is freedom. The believer has extraordinary privilege of participating in God's creative freedom, and inserting his own assent. (3) A faith which is imposed is a contradiction in terms; both in relation to God's free will, and the free acceptance

16. In Greek, this word was used to describe the condition of the citizen in Athens who could speak freely in the assembly among equals.

17. Carrillo, de Albornoz, Dr. A.F., Roman Catholicism and Religious Liberty, pgs. 29-30, 35.
presupposed in the believer. (4) Faith must be free else it will destroy itself. Dr. Carrillo quoting Hartman, S.J., arrives at these conclusions; "Man's dependance upon God is subjectively man's duty to follow the injunction of his own conscience. Man's whole moral conduct depends on his conscience. An act does not have moral value for man unless approved by his own personal judgment. No external authority can take the place of one's own conscience. Authority has value, in so far as, its competence is approved and its orders recognized as binding, by the conscience of the individual. The right to live in accordance with God's will means to live in accordance with one's conscience. This right is called "freedom of conscience". The right to freedom of conscience implies man must not be prevented from fulfilling dictates of his conscience. No one has the right to interfere in matters of conscience i.e., forcing them to act contrary to conscience or preventing from what conscience urges. Religious liberty, when it is understood correctly, does not mean the protection of error - error as such has no right to protection as it is wrong in itself - but the protection of the erring man, who should not be prevented from serving God according to their conscience. Even the erring con-


science imposes obligations and acquires corresponding rights. This is the opinion of Max Pribella, S.J., as summed up by Dr. Carrillo with the conclusion; "The Church itself will therefore be wise to leave God decide on the state of conscience of people with different beliefs."

All the preceding Catholic Theologians not affiliated with the WCC, but cited by Dr. Carrillo of WCC Commission on Religious Liberty, are related in their arguments. All emphasize the theological basis of religious freedom, and make a distinction between inner freedom of choice and external liberties. They hold unanimously that man is essentially a social animal and his inner faculties are vain, if he cannot exercise them, within human society. These theologians maintain that freedom, which cannot express itself, is an illusion, a freedom which has no collective dimension is not human.

20. Carrillo, Roman Catholicism and Religious Liberty, pg. 39. He cites this in context with Matt. 13:28-30. "Then do you want us to go and gather them?" But he said, "No"; lest in gathering the weeds you root up the wheat along with them. Let both grow until the harvest." And also, "Therefore, do not pronounce judgment before the time, before the Lord comes, Who will come, Who will bring to light the things now hidden. And will disclose the purposes of the heart." I Cor. 4:5.
For Christians, the person is not merely an individual, a solitary "I" confronted by the divine "Thou", but a being whose personality can find perfect expression only in a community in a human exchange. This theological basis is reinforced by the opinion of Pope Pius XII, who recognized the relationship between inner and external freedom.

"While we want this unceasing prayer to rise to God from the whole mystical body - that all the straying sheep may hasten to enter the one fold of Jesus Christ, yet we recognize that this step must come of their own free will; for no one believes, unless he wills to believe. The faith, without which it is impossible to please God, is a wholly free submission of intellect and will. Therefore, whenever it happens that anyone is compelled to embrace the Catholic faith against his will, our sense of duty demands that we condemn the act. The WCC is aware of Pius XII opinion." In his schema on religious liberty during session two of Vatican II, Cardinal Emil de Smedt, Bishop of Bruges, Belgium, shows a Catholic development of Religious Liberty, based upon the dignity of the human individual, which is actually a theological basis. Bishop de Smedt cites Pius IX, Leo XIII, Pius XI, Pius XII, and Pope John as contributing to this notion of religious liberty, based upon human dignity. If this is so, why the lag between awareness of the Popes and the unawareness of Catholics even some clergy. If a development is traceable to the Popes, why are some clergy still fighting laicism and treating the faithful as the illiterate masses. An Ecumenical Protestant Theologian comments upon the development of Bishop de Smedt's notion of religious liberty given at Vatican II. Bishop Emile Joseph Smedt of Bruges, Belgium explained the "Law of Development" in his presentation of the religious liberty chapter of the schema on ecumenism. Bishop de Smedt said that according to the law of development: "The ecclesiastical magisterium adapts, explains, and defends genuine doctrine according to the demands of errors and the needs of men arising from development of Society. By this progress, the mind of the Church is led to search more deeply into doctrine and to understand it more clearly. The image portrayed is that the Church which is never false to the truth in its teachings - though confessedly it may sometimes be in practices - always progressing, never regressing, never out of character, bringing the new interpretation, of its ancient truth, out of an old treasury, according to the needs and demands of the
Social context.

The astute Protestant will discern an application of such laws, a wide opening for sophistry and more frequently for pushing scholastic argument to the point of absurdity. Protestants say how much wiser, easier, more honest it would be to admit, as history indicates, that the Church was often wrong in teaching as well as practice in the past, and now to get on with business of what should be done now. It is good for Protestants to say this, but such a suggestion demands a radical and entirely unlike change in Roman Catholic Doctrine. The Catholic Church does not and will not see itself as a fallible institution progressing by trial. There are many men in the Roman Catholic fold who know how fixed and immutable doctrine can paralyze progress. Immobility in doctrine is a serious obstacle in the path of unity. When therefore Protestants see the Roman Catholic Church moving belatedly to positions Protestants have long held, the occasion is one for Protestant joy, rather than complaint. Joy should be the reaction of Protestants to the Council's deliberation of Religious Liberty. As of November 19, 1963, the Council had before it a draft on religious liberty for which, if adopted, with minor emendations, will sweep the Roman Catholic Church into the mainstream of 20th Century thought, and action, in the field of religious liberty. Bishop de Smedt's preface and initial delivery gripped the minds and hearts of the Bishops and drew from them the loudest, most general and sustained applause given to any speech in this session. The immediate reaction of Protestants will be "we tried to tell you this 400 years ago, and you would have none of it". Secularists will say, "What's new about this? How does it differ in applicable principle from the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights?" Beyond the Church's "Ipsa dixit" and the difference to doctrines of continuity and development there is no scriptural argument for religious liberty which Protestants have not preached for centuries. Key sentences from De Smedt's relatio will strike responsive chords. Each and every man, who follows his conscience in religious matters has a natural right to true and authentic religious liberty... No human person can be the object of coercion or intolerance. The greatest injury is to prevent a man from worshipping God, and from obeying God, according to the dictate of his own conscience.

Protestants did not invent religious liberty, nor did they abstract their defense of it rationally.

21. Pius XII, Mystical Body of Christ, par.118-9 part also quoted by Dr. Carrillo, Ibid. pg. 40.

This innate freedom, and its biblical and theological apology are from God. God endowed all men with elemental dignity, and to some men sooner than to others, gave the knowledge of the gift.

Protestant fidelity to truth requires that they pray for other men to come to the blessings of religious liberty, which is preliminary to faith.23

JURIDIC BASIS FOR RELIGIOUS LIBERTY AS DEVELOPED BY THEOLOGIANS NOT AFFILIATED WITH WCC

The opinion of Catholic theologians, who propose a juridic basis for religious liberty is well known to the WCC, especially to Dr. Carrillo, who discusses various opinions in his book, "Roman Catholicism and Religious Liberty".

Roman Catholic Theologians, who hold a juridic basis for religious liberty are John Courtney Murray, S.J., Sturzo, Leonard, Congar. These men realize that a change took place in the relationship between religion and political society, when Christianity appeared in the world. The very idea, which men had until then about religion, was modified by the Gospel. The human soul was placed in a new, higher relationship with the Divine. The old idea of state and religion being one and the same thing ceased to be. The citizen found himself divided between two societies: the civil and temporal, and the other, a religious society, the Church functioning for the spiritual and eternal, end of man. As a consequence something in man became independent of the states' power. The human person, created for an eternal destiny, made in the image of God, becomes a
"free conscience" in the state which cannot force him to worship idols, nor to do evil. It follows then, that both state and Church have their own sovereign jurisdiction, and mutual autonomy. The Church and State are perfect societies; this flows from the principle of autonomy. Another important principle flows from the distinction and autonomy of the two powers. The state does not have competence in religious matters, even if it is called a Christian State. A state formed by Christians does not have a greater power, nor a different kind of power than a state composed by pagans. The state competence is clearly defined by its purposes; religion is not one of these. Fr. Murray writes; The State is not empowered to forbid individuals or groups within society, who deny the exclusive right of the Church as the true Church, and who undertake to preach a gospel of their own, provided the tenets of their gospel are not incompatible with the order of justice, and a threat to public peace."

Many Catholic Theologians are convinced that constructive tolerance springs not from religious indifference but rather from Christian law of love. Christian allegiance to our faith must be the true basis of real religious liberty, yet this presents a dilemma,

22. "It is not the function of the state to guide people towards their salvation in the life beyond." Rouquette, Robert, S.J., Le Probleme du pluralisme religieux. pg. 214.

23. Murray, John Courtney, O.P. J. Government Repression of Heresy, Proceedings of the third Annual Meeting of the Catholic Theological Society of America 1948, pg. 59-60; Also pg. 60; "The protection of members in possession of faith is the task of the Church; it is a spiritual, not a political task. If the Church is too weak to perform this task
a tension of living together with human society in peace, and at the same time on a deeper level, having a duty to one's own conscience and to truth.

This is a problem which Catholic Theologians whom Dr. Carrillo studied in his work, *Roman Catholicism and Religious Freedom* were trying to solve. This problem that is allegiance to truth, to one's own conscience, and faith, and at the same time living together in society, which may even be hostile to these commitments, yet living in this society in peace and love, is a problem which the theologians of the WCC such as Dr. Carrillo, Dr. Fredrich Nolte, Bishop Newbigin, Professor Roger Mehl, Professor Scheuner, Mr. Voight, Sr. Kenneth Grubb, Professor Peyrot, Dr. Berkhof, Dr. Amos Wilder, and others were trying to solve in developing a basis for religious liberty. The WCC is aware of the principle of spiritual power, which explains the principle of autonomy. It is evident that the eternal destiny of man is superior to man's temporal aim, or that objectives of the state are subordinate to those of the Church. This does not mean in any way that the state is in any way subject to the Church; otherwise the principle of autonomy folds up. The distinction between the objectives of Church and state, i.e. temporal and eternal, makes a man a citizen.

(23. cont'd.) successfully, she does by that fact acquire a juridic right to invoke the coercive strength of secular government.
of two destinies. The Church therefore, comes into existential relationship with the state, only directly, insofar as the two powers have a common subject. It is the Church's exclusive task to teach supernatural faith and to maintain the integrity of its doctrine. The state's contribution to this goal must always be indirect. It cannot be that the state somehow must share in this ecclesiastical mission, undertaking to coerce into faith, into regeneration, into unity and grace. The state cannot be the instrument of the Church for undermining religious liberty. The Church has no right to demand of the state what the state is not required or competent by its nature to give. The civil power cannot be the instrument of the Church for the ends of the Church, the state has its own ends, determined by its nature, which are proper ends to it. These ends are not the highest of man. The civil power is only subordinate to the spiritual power in that the whole order of the terrestrial ends of man is subordinate to the order of his transcendent, supernatural destiny, to which the Church guides man. This subordination is not that of the vassal or instrument, but of the free man. The primacy of the spiritual cannot be a feudal overlordship.

24. "It is common Roman Catholic Doctrine that the state in itself, has no competence in religious matters", Murray, Repression Heresy, pg. 10, cited by Dr. Carrillo, Roman Catholicism and Religious Liberty, pg. 35-45.
but a spiritual reign, infinitely respectful of all human freedoms in the temporal order. It seems that a mission of the Church, to the world, to bring all men unto communication with God may be best carried out, according to biblical revelation, through the prophetic word, and by the teaching of the Church. St. Paul did not ask Christians, or the Church to take the sword of the state, for religious purposes, but the sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God. This sharp distinction between the different spheres of Church and state activity implies a purification, and is healthy and beneficial. A state can very well be Christian, without interfering with the exclusive competence of the Church. Christ is Lord of the State, as He is Lord of the Church. The immediate arm of the state is the natural life of men, with their human activities, not the divine life. Such a Christian state does not require of its members that they should subscribe to a common religious belief; and does not relegate to a position of inferiority, or political or civil disadvantage, those who are strangers to the faith.

This phase of the inquiry into the WCC of search for a

26. Religious minority groups where Roman Catholic Church is in majority have been hindered exercising religious freedom. The winds blowing from Vatican II continue to exert their healing influence in several countries. In Italy the improvement for minority groups is slow, this is true in Colombia. All other countries of Roman Catholic majority with the exception of Spain and Haiti, have become more favorable to religious liberty. Belgium, Austria, Ireland, and most Latin American and Carribean Republics are cited by Dr. Carrillo as making notable contributions towards religious liberty. Carrillo, Religious Liberty, World Situation, 1964.
basis of religious liberty in the writings of Catholic Theologians can be concluded by noting that great damage has been done to true religion, by all forms of coercion. Wherever the state was given competence in religious matters, beyond its jurisdiction, and violence was used to obtain apparent external success; the unity of faith which was externally preserved by coercion, has suffered from congenital defects, which have developed into all kinds of symptoms of diseases centuries later. "One thing is certain, the application of force to maintain unity of faith has not succeeded in preventing the secularization of the modern spirit, in the very countries where there is the so-called

26. (cont'd.) In the same survey, Dr. Carrillo writes; "The draft law on the civil rights of non-Catholics has been the occasion of a great controversy among Spanish Catholics. Articles against this government project appeared widely in daily newspapers, even Bishop Pildain published a Pastoral Letter exhorting Roman Catholics to pray that religious liberty be withheld from Protestants in Spain (Ecumenical Press Service, May 28, 1964). This letter has now been withdrawn from circulation. If rights are given to Protestants, many still fear that any form of "public witness" will be withheld from minority groups, because many Bishops, as well as Cardinal Arriba, have declared proselytism of any kind as a threat and grave danger to Catholic unity, and to religious and social peace. Ibid, pg. 6.
Catholic unity, on the contrary, this secularization is largely the outcome of such compulsions."

27. Carrillo, Roman Catholicism and Religious Liberty, pgs. 52-53.
PART - II - BASIS FOR RELIGIOUS LIBERTY AS DEVELOPED
BY THEOLOGIANS AND ECUMENICAL ASSEMBLIES AFFILIATED
WITH THE WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

THEOLOGICAL GROUNDS FOR RELIGIOUS LIBERTY
AS DEVELOPED BY WCC THEOLOGIANS AND THE
ECUMENICAL ASSEMBLIES OF WCC

We have considered the development basis of religious liberty by WCC as garnished from theologians not affiliated with the WCC, namely Catholics. Let us now consider the contributions made by theologians affiliated with the WCC. Biblical and Theological grounds for a basis of religious liberty have been proclaimed by Ecumenical Assemblies, affiliated with the WCC, on many occasions. Yet there is lack of unanimity in agreeing what would be a distinctive theological basis, which would be acceptable to all members of WCC. The differences of opinion are due to the variety

28. Oxford, 1937, World Conference on Church Community, State, 1948, Amsterdam, First Assembly of WCC, 1949, Buenos Aires, First Evangelical Conference of Latin America, 1961, New Delhi, Statement on Religious Liberty. When in the 1937 Oxford Conference the question of socialism and communism was taken up, and their relation to WCC. The Conference approved a statement that God might speak to the Churches, more clearly through their enemies than through their friends. Hence it is now commonplace
of theological traditions among various members of the WCC. Even though there are theological tensions among the various members of the WCC in defending a common basis of religious liberty there is, nevertheless, complete ecumenical agreement, that religious liberty is not a revealed truth. Even though religious liberty is not revealed truth, many scholars argue that Sacred Scripture provides a foundation for religious liberty.

To establish a foundation for religious liberty the Bible requires a study of not single passages from Scripture, but rather an evaluation of Christ's way of approaching mankind as found in the Bible. This would specify a theological foundation from Scripture of

28. (cont'd.) that there was much of the Hebraic prophet in the godless Karl Marx, whose moral indignation was hardly consistent with his allegedly scientific theory of economic determinism. Muller, Herbert, Religion and Freedom in the Modern World, University of Chicago, pg. 3, 1963.

29. Wilder, Dr. Amos, Eleutheria in the New Testament and Religious Liberty, The Ecumenical Review, Vol. 13, No.4, July, 1961, pgs. 409-420. This is an excellent article with many references. Wilder thinks that creation and re-creation, or redemption by Christ is of great importance in establishing religious liberty. God's honors the ultimate freedom of a human creature, and will make proper retribution on the basis of how freedom was exercised. In support of his argument, Wilder cites passages from Romans, 1:21, also 2:5-6, 5:12-15, Phil. 2:5-7. Let your bearing towards one another rise out of your life in Christ Jesus, in other words force or coercion cannot be used to promote faith. Nyborg Meeting of the Central Committee of the WCC, 1958, Ecumenical Review, Vol. 11, No.1, October 1958, pgs. 36-42.
Religious Freedom. However, there is no ecumenical agreement among members of WCC, in what manner
Scripture and Theology give direction for a foundation of social religious liberty. The most discussed point
has been the interrelation between inner Christian freedom, with which Christ has set us free; and the
social or external religious freedom which ecumenical bodies of WCC seek. The well known statement of the
Amsterdam Assembly, 1948 was a breakthrough in articulating agreement, and also fomenting controversy among
ecumenical theologians. The statement is reproduced here:

While the liberty with which Christ has set men free can neither be given nor destroyed by any
government, Christians because of that inner freedom are jealous for its outward expression and solicitous
that all men should have freedom in religious life.30

30 T' Hooft, W. L. A. Visser, General Secretary
WCC, First Assembly of WCC, Amsterdam, pg. 97. The
statement of Amsterdam has been re-interpreted by Dr.
Carrillo as follows; (1) Christian liberty or the liberty
with which Christ has set us free is an inner freedom (2)
Christian liberty cannot be given or destroyed by any
human power, because of its inwardness (3) social or external
religious liberty is the outward expression of the inner
Christian liberty. Social religious liberty can be given
or recognized, or destroyed by human powers. Social
religious liberty is not identical with inner Christian
liberty. (4) Christians demand social religious liberty
(outward expression), because of the inner Christian
liberty.
All WCC Ecumenical theologians agree on the distinction between Christian liberty and social religious liberty. This is a clear cut distinction, between what a man is able to be, in himself, in terms of spiritual allegiance, convictions as to right and wrong, moral judgments he makes, personal commitments, and desires and purposes which he hopes for. Quite a different matter is a phase of life in which man has power and freedom to express, to manifest and to carry into effect his purposes in the social fabric of life. All WCC theologians agree on this clear cut distinction between inner religious freedom and its outward expression. There is also ecumenical unanimity that social religious freedom is the outward expression of the inner Christian liberty. This agreement which was originally articulated at Oxford, 1937, was actually restated and formulated at Amsterdam in 1948. A consequence of the agreement among WCC theologians on the distinction between inner religious liberty, and social religious liberty, was a precipitation of a controversy. The controversy resolved itself around the question whether Christians should demand outward expression of social religious liberty.

A minority group claims that the two liberties are completely different, so that one cannot be the reason for the other. The great majority of theologians believe that Oxford, 1937, and Amsterdam, 1948, established a causal nexus between Christian inner liberty and social external liberty. Some argue that the interaction between (1) absolute freedom of spirit and (2) the outward expression of a free spirit is thwarted by the psychological restraints placed by society. Consequently, the external coercion of society, deprives a man of the possibility of acting responsibly in religious matters. This is therefore a denial of God's intent for man. The conclusion is this, a liberation from external coercion is demanded by the very nature of inner Christian freedom. Others deny the above arguments, maintaining that the liberty,


33. Oldham, J.H., *The Church and the Disorder of Society*, WCC, pg. 147-151. Oldham speaks about the social order which Christians must seek to realize in virtue of their faith. These goals can be attained only in a society which respects the consciences of its members, and is open to the creative impulses to free men who participate in making moral decisions. This freedom includes the right of members to criticize existing institutions, to seek, to expose error, so that health of society may be permeated by the personal responsible action and initiative of a whole community.
with which Christ has set us free, can neither be
given nor destroyed by any government. Persecutions
are interpreted as being normal situations which purify
and strengthen Christianity. Other theologians seem
to think that inner religious liberty does not need
the protection of social liberty absolutely speaking,
but only relatively. External coercion seems to
contradict God’s intention of giving man inner freedom.
They claim that the beneficial effects of persecution
are exaggerated. They cite Henry VIII who tried and
turned a Roman Catholic population into an Anglican one
in a few years. It would seem that external coercion
certainly has destructive effects on inner freedom, and
that persecution, when radical, does not have inner
purifying and strengthening effects. God may permit
coercion in His Providence, but His primary intention
is that man remains free. God respects His own inner
freedom, His will is a "fortiore", that man do the same.

Many theologians are convinced that inner freedom
demands social religious freedom, regardless of any
influence, which external coercion may or may not have
on inner freedom. Dr. Wilder cited previously, the freedom
of man in the Bible is not only inner, but this freedom
demands, in itself, that authorities do not trespass upon

34. Alborenoz, OP, Cit., pg. 60.
this final zone of liberty in what concerns man's
destiny and dealings with eternity. Wilder reasons
that in the New Testament the existence of self, is
a social-historical existence. The primordial freedom
of man must be allowed a public-historical expression
subject to the limits of the Divine sovereignty, which
operates in part through the social orders. But the
social orders and the civil powers must act here within
the terms of their mandate and subject to divine judgment.
Wilder thinks that Paul's eleutheria is an eschatological
freedom operating in the world, in history. Eleutherea
is not just a superficial concept of indifferentism to
environment, such as is found in stoicism, Gnosticism,
and some modern forms of idealism. Paul's radical view
of Christian freedom of sons identified with the life
of the Spirit, with joy, peace, glory, carries with it
an irresistible pressure upon all dimensions of the
flesh, whether Church or state. (I can't help but
feel that some of this pressure of freedom of sons is
now being exerted in the dimension of civil rights for
negroes, who are constituted Sons, as willed by the Father,
and announced and spoken by Christ.) Wilder's conclusion
through his interpretation of Paul's notion of Christian
liberty are: (1) Ultimate responsibility for choice and
decision on the part of believer is presupposed. (2) Free-
dom is not only inner and private, but has historical-
social and cosmic proportions (3) The Christian is obliged to recognize the freedom of fellow believers in this same sense. (4) The temporal power of the state is similarly obligated. This portion of Dr. Wilder, that there is an essential relationship between inner and social external religious freedom, is accepted by most ecumenical theologians. And also that the inner Christian freedom presupposes that external social freedom be made possible for all in a community. (My own question would be, when does one really achieve inner freedom, in practice, not only in theory, what happens if inner freedom is not achieved by transformation?)

There are actually many ecumenical theologians, who recognize the essential relationship between inner and social freedom, yet are opposed to Wilder's theory. Their insight into man's freedom is both as to the internal and social aspect follows two directions of development. The first argument considers the status of man as created, redeemed, and called by God to engage in making free choices, to fulfill a personal destiny, and a social vocation. Man bears the consequences of his decisions. The opinion seems to be more in line with the dignity of man, than restraint or coercion, which helps man from making mistakes. The

second of the two arguments follows the direction of God's ways with men. God, the Father, as disclosed through Jesus Christ, is neither arbitrary nor coercion. God does not use force to win our allegiance. This divine respect for human freedom should be a lesson for the Church and state, as to how power should be exercised. God does not compel faith. The second of these insights forms what develops into juridic basis for some theologians. These theologians deny the essential relationship between inner and social freedom. For them, social religious liberty is a consequence of the limits set upon the authority of worldly power or a lack of competence in spiritual matters. (This would be more along the line of argumentation of Father John Courtney Murray, S.J.)

These three different positions will now be studied in more detail.
THE STATUS OF MAN AS A BASIS
OF SOCIAL RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

Actually the status of man, and God's way of dealing with men, are both aspects of the same spirit of Christian revelation; however, for sake of dissecting the various strands of theological development, each insight will be treated separately. The Commission on Religious Liberty of the WCC at Spittal, 1959 summed up the main Ecumenical statements concerning man's status according to Christian revelation. This summation of man's redeemed status was expressed in this general formula:

"God created man in His own image and redeemed him by His own free act of grace in Christ, and calls him to a life of Sonship in freedom, in which the responsibility to accept or reject is placed upon man himself."

After Ecumenical discussion some new elements to the above formulation were added namely, God created in love, redeemed in love, called men in love, to be a free child of God in Christ. Each is responsible before God; nothing can alter this relation between God and man. Human coercion often does assault man's power to cling to God by faith (as a free child).
Because of the violence to man's essential (Christian) nature, coercion is sinful (Italics mine). The general criticism of some ecumenical theologians seems to be that the above formulation is not theologically clear, nor convincing. Some propose a trinitarian formulation e.g. Prof. Berkhof, a member of WCC Committee on Religious Liberty. The French Commission of Theologians believes that every human being created in image of God benefits from Christ and therefore deserves to be respected, even when he makes mistakes. Other theologians are much more reserved in considering the "Imago Dei", as a foundation of man's religious freedom. In fact some reject the idea, claiming that the "Imago Dei" could serve both as a foundation for religious liberty, and a denial of freedom. The Italian Commission says, "If man is made in the "image of God" he is committed to allow that image

36. Carrillo, Dr., The Basis of Religious Liberty, pg. 65. This formulae is based upon statements made at Oxford 1937, Madras 1938, Amsterdam 1948, Chambon sur-Lignon, France 1948, New Delhi 1948, 1961, later re-affirmed the general notions. At Oxford: "Man created in image of God, and has indestructible value" at Madras, "Grounds for religious liberty are rights and obligations of men as children of God"; Amsterdam, "Every person has place in divine purpose. Created by God in His image, object of Christ's redeeming love, (each) must be free to respond to God's calling. Chambon-sur-Lignon (France) 1948, "Every man should first obey God, all others should in no way circumscribe this obedience. Also found on pages 4-7 of "Systematic Analysis of Ecumenical Statements by Dr. A. F. Carrillo of WCC 1959, Geneva are statements made at Buenos Aires 1949, First Evangelical Conference; Bangkok 1949 Eastern Asia Conference; Buenos Aires. Liberty of Conscience is inherent in human personality, and has its deepest foundations in the Gospel of Jesus Christ, Bangkok. The fundamental rights of the human person cannot endure except as they are acknowledged as derived from man's relation to God
to shine forth within him. But at the same time he may be committed to suppress the distortion of this image. The idea that man is the "Imago Dei", and therefore is free, because God is perfectly free, is an incorrect oversimplification. The reality of the image is much more complex. Man is a spiritual being with the power to think, judge, decide. This power or ability must be fully respected. So there is a danger of two destructive illusions in this opinion of man's redeemed status being a theological foundation for religious liberty. One exaggerates the dignity of man, in such a way, as to make man wholly superior to society, and independent of it. Man is abjected to society, but not totally, as St. Thomas expresses so clearly. Another possible danger in considering the created and redeemed status of man, as a foundation for religious liberty is danger of "secularization", according to

36. (cont'd.) in Christ. These same statements, except Buenos Aires, are found in Ecumenical Review Dr. Carrillo, pgs. 421-426, Vol. 13. This study also includes statements from Chichester 1949, Evanston, 1954, and St. Andres, 1960. Halverson, William H, "Freedom and the Self", Journal of Religion #43, 1963, pgs. 139-150. The theological dimension of the problem of freedom may be stated as a problem of the relation of the self to God. This relation must be conceived analogically in such a way as to account for three things (1) The universality of estrangement (its tragic character) (2) The self's responsibility for its own estrangement (its moral character) (3) The self's inability to overcome its own estrangement (the need for grace).

37. Ibid, Carrillo, Dr., both opinions pg. 68-69.

38. Summa Theologica I-II, q. 21, Art. 4, and ad.3, "Man is not ordained for the body politic, according to all that he is and has, and so it does not follow that every action of his acquires merit or demerit in relation to the
Wilder, Professor Vittorio Subilia also stressed this danger, where theological insights can be confused with humanistic and secular considerations.

38. (cont'd.) Body politic. But all that man is, and can, and has, must be referred to God; and therefore every action of God, whether good or bad, acquires merit or demerit in the sight of God, as far as the action itself is concerned.
GOD'S WAY WITH MAN AS A THEOLOGICAL FOUNDATION FOR RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

Man's status as child of God, created to an eternal destiny is one aspect in a theological investigation for a basis of religious liberty. The other aspect is the manner in which God deals with men. This is a new insight, a new development, the most recent declaration had been articulated by the Central Committee on religious liberty at St. Andrews, 1960, and approved by the New Delhi Assembly, 1961.

"God calls men into His service. God's redemptive dealing with men is not coercive. Accordingly human attempts by legal enactments, or by pressure of social custom, to coerce or to eliminate ways of God with men. The freedom which God has given in Christ, implies a free response to God's love, and the responsibility to serve fellow men as the point of deepest need."39

The new insight is that the act of God in Christ is a result of a free decision, the free giving of the Son, and therefore requires a free response. God as

39. T' Hooft, W.A. Visser, The New Delhi Report, WCC, 1962, pg. 159. In a very interesting study Archimandite Jerome Cotsonis I of Holy Cross Greek Orthodox Theological School, points out that Force was used in ancient times by Eastern despotism and Roman Absolutism to impose religious convictions. Maybe the Church once accepted force as a means of imposing the faith, but this was in antiquity, in the Old Testament. Artaxerxes permitted Ezdra to rebuild
God as disclosed, or spoken of by Christ, is neither arbitrary nor coercive. God has placed man in a world endowed with everything for man’s full development. God has given men freedom to use gifts of creation as they choose. God respects man’s freedom, even when men abuse this faculty. However, men must take full responsibility for decisions, and abuses. Biblical revelation is a disclosure of God’s love, and concern for mankind, in Christ Jesus, who laid aside all divine glory in order to live among men in free obedience, as one who humbled Himself. Our Lord invites us to imitate Him, to respond to God the Father. Man’s religious act can constitute an authentic response to God, only when the act is voluntary and uncoerced. God deals with men, as free responsible beings, and He expects from men an uncoerced response. Even though there seems to be general agreement in accepting this insight by WCC; Dr. Carrillo believes there is a possibility of misunderstanding this principle in an exaggerated sense, which would be alien both to scripture, and also to

39. (cont’d.) Jerusalem, he wrote an order; Everyone who does not do the law of God, and the law of the King, readily, let judgment be upon him speedily either death - banishment - confiscations of goods, or person. Ezdras 7:12. According to the author of the Epistle to Diognetos; God sent His only Son into the word - to convince, not to force, for force is not becoming to God. Lucianus, Gregory Nazianzus, and Athanasius, the Great, teach that it is the nature of God to persuade, to teach, not to coerce, and brow beat. This is clear from a great number of scripture passages; "Whosoever will come after me", Mt. 6:24, repeated also in Mk. 8:34; Lk. 9:23. The Lord asks the Apostles freely to
Theology. Before entering into a detailed account of the state's competence or a juridic basis for religious liberty, as formulated by the WCC, it would be proper to point out that man's status, as redeemed, and as a responsible agent, whose liberty must be respected by society; and god's non-coercive dealing with man, requiring a free response, are one and the same theological reality. God's redemptive dealing men has left men free to accept the divine revelation.

39. (cont'd.) decide whether they will follow him, Jn. 6:67. Two difficulties in the N. T. "compel them to come in that my house may be filled", Lk. 14:23; and "the Kingdom of God suffers violence and violent, bear it away", Mt. 11:12 (Lk. 16:66). The first says St. Cyril Alexandria is an insistent urging that invitation is sincere, even though the invited seem so unfit. The second, St. John Chrysostom says; "the Lord was referring to severe effort or pressure one imposes on self, not a force from without. The Greek Orthodox Theological Review, Freedom and Coercion in the Proposition of the Faith, pgs. 97-111.

40. Carrillo, Dr., The Basis of Religious Liberty, pg. 74. (1) It is true that the Lord's self revelation requires a free response, however, proclamation in biblical texts includes judgment and the possibility of eternal loss. (2) Bible teaches man's enslavement by sin; and the mystery of election. Of course man's enslavement by sin does not impede the possibility of freely accepting or refusing God's revelation, Mt.23:37. "How I have longed - but you would not." (3) Another element for understanding God's non-coercive activity with man, is the actual existence of coercion in the world. This seems to be ordained by God for a purpose. Traditional theology does not throw much light on the freedom of the Kingdom of God, and coercion in the world which creates a tension in a dynamic interaction in human society. The exact boundaries of the "irremovable" limit of state's coercive competence has not been precisely delineated by theological speculation and principles.
Precisely because of His non-coercive method, God has created and redeemed freely and called man to be freely responsible, before Himself and His fellow men.
JURIDIC BASIS FOR RELIGIOUS LIBERTY AS DEVELOPED BY WCC

Some WCC theologians are reluctant to accept essential interrelationship between inner Christian freedom, and social religious freedom. For these theologians, social religious liberty flows as a consequence of the Christian teaching on authority of worldly powers, and the limits set upon them. Ecumenical formulations have stressed these limits of the states competence, or lack of it, to rule over man's conscience. However, these statements limiting the states powers have had as their basis the Christian insights of man's status, and God's non-coercive activity with men. Once these Christian concepts have been established, then it naturally follows that man should respond responsibility to God;

41. Carrillo, Dr., Basis of Religious Liberty, pg. 63. The Christian view considers the state as having authority from God. In this limited authority the state is not entitled to rule over the conscience of man. Therefore, Christian doctrine can demand that the state recognize the right of the Christian to exercise his religion freely. Fr. John Courtney Murray writes, "Religious freedom was recognized as a human right during the post-Reformation era of Confessional Absolutism. Even an absolutist prince could not compel a man to act against his conscience. The doctrine of religious freedom, as an immunity from coercive restraint was, however, first effectively proclaimed by the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States. The Declaration recognized that religious freedom, like other human and civil rights is exercised within society and may be subject to limitation." American Magazine, January 9, 1965, pg. 40.
and that the state has no right to impede this religious liberty. There are some theologians of WCC, who argue that the limitations of states powers, or competence is the only basis for religious liberty. However, this non-competence of the state, or juridic basis for religious liberty is not deduced from the Christian insight of man's free response to God. This

42. Oxford, 1937, World Conference on Church, Community and State, "All Churches should renounce the use of coercive power of the state in religious matters", pg. 2. Madras, 1936, Report on Church and State, by International Missionary Council; "Whenever a Church anywhere has for conscience sake refused acquiescence in the demands of the state, pg. 3. Amsterdam, 1948, WCC, Report on Church and State and the International Disorder. "It is presumptuous for the state to assume that it can grant or deny fundamental rights, pg. 22. Chichester, 1949, Central Committee WCC, Statement on Religious Liberty. Only the recognition that man has ends and loyalties beyond the state which ensure true justice to the human person. pg. 10. Toronto, 1950, Central Committee WCC, "Declared opposition to all practices of governments, churches (Catholic - Males are predominant Religions) or other agencies, which curb exercises of religious liberty." pg. 16. Evanston, 1954, The Second Assembly of WCC, "Since we believe in the Holy God as a source of justice, we denot consider the state as the ultimate source of law, but rather its guarantee. It (state) is not the lord but the servant of justice. There can be for the Christian no ultimate authority but the very God." This definition of the function of the state was also articulated by the Oxford Conference, 1937. The Evanston Report also said, "No one form of government has a universal claim on Christians, but any political system must include some elements without which it tends to become an oppressive tyranny." pg. 115, The Evanston Report, Second Assembly WCC, Harper Brothers, 1954. Nyborg, 1958, Central Committee WCC, Study on Religious Contribution resolved to study the legitimate limitations and the abuses of these limitations which government, churches, and societies invoke involving limitations in an arbitrary or discriminatory manner to the detriment of religious liberty. pgs. 22-23. New Delhi, 1961, Re-affirm all opinions above, and further pointed out; "It is the obligation of governments and society to ensure the exercise of these civil rights (claimed in name of Christ - freely available to all men to exercise responsibility) without discrimination." pg. 37.
insight for a juridic basis evolves from (1) States' non-competence over man's conscience, and also the states' (2) incompetence concerning the objective judgment and definition of religious truths. There is a division of opinions as to the precise theological insight upon which Christians base their view concerning the states' non-competence in the affairs of man's conscience. The majority of opinions would consider man as created and redeemed by God, and in dealing with God, man is solely responsible to God. Therefore the State must respect man's responsibility before God. Trying to argue from Christian revelation about the precise limits of civil authority in virtue of the states' nature, in dealing with man would be extremely difficult. So it would seem that religious liberty, would be based upon the freedom given to man by God, rather than the limitations of political authority, as deduced from Christian revelation. However, some WCC theologians are reluctant to accept the view that religious liberty can be derived from faith. They say tolerance cannot be derived from faith. The reason advanced is that Christian faith is absolute truth, i.e. every inclination toward a recognition of two

or more possibilities of truth must be avoided. So some theologians seek a Christian basis of religious liberty in the limitations of civil power. This is done to avoid objective relativism of divine revelation. Even though many Ecumenical statements have been articulated and formulated by the WCC (footnote 43), a Church-State relationship is full of complex and intricate problems. Ecumenical Theologians of WCC agree unanimously, that both the Church and State are willed and ordained by God! Another point of agreement is the state's incompetence concerning the judgment and definition of religious truth (also matters of conscience). If there is discussion concerning the state's competence in religion, it certainly has not reached the level of dogmatic convictions, and new theological insights. Some argue that it is alien to civil society to impose an ideology, which would crush religion. An institution (civil) which is incompetent to judge among various religions beliefs is still less competent to decide against all religious convictions. Ecumenical Theologians also agree, that the state not only has the duty to recognize and respect legitimate

43. Carrillo, Dr., Basis of Religious Liberty pg. 83-87, 92. Summary of above opinions.
44. Carrillo, Ibid., pg. 125.
religious freedom, but also the positive duty to protect religious liberty against the many extra
legal forces, which tend to limit or destroy it. Theological opinion divides itself as to the degree
of states competence concerning religion, and the free
exercise of faith. For some, such as Sir Kenneth
Grubb, "the state should interfere as little as
possible in religious matters. Civil society should
recognize the fact of religious pluralism, and guarantee
the harmonious exercise of the religious activities of
all citizens and institutions. Other theologians
such as Dr. Wilder stress the positive responsibility
of the state in religious matters. The state can re-
ceive guidance from the Church to fulfill its God-given
functions. Dr. Wilder comments upon Romans 13 to show
that Paul's words should not be modernized to teach two
orders, temporal and eternal, one caring for natural
life, and the other for spiritual life of man. Paul's
notion of state has a sacral character, and is related
to God's action, at least in the sense of orge (wrath).

45.Drs. Mackay, Nolde, Voigt, seem to
hold the same opinion. Even Mr. Nehru of India has said,
"Although our ultimate aim is a secular state not to be
identified with any particular religion, freedom of
conscience and the recognition of the religious rights of
all citizens must be the starting point." Ecumenical
Press Service, #29, August, 1946.
The state should serve man positively, not only negatively, in work of salvation. For these Theologians the state cannot be neutral about religious views, state will be compelled to take sides, because of Christ having entered into history, and having introduced into history a polarization, in which men are compelled to take sides. The state is expected to secure the necessary order and freedom, within which man can develop as a responsible person. These Theologians look with suspicion upon formulations such as "peace and public order"; "public order and morality", which delineate the states' area of competence regarding religious liberty. To deny legitimate competence of civil power would cause a dangerous re-action in opposite directions, either, (1) the state will abuse its power; then men will wake up and ask, too late, why the state has so much responsibility, or else (2) the Church will find its relation to commontotal fabric of life, as a fossilized hierarchy. The defenders of the states competence in religious matters advise that the state should work out in a continuing dialogue between the body politic, the church, and school restraints. The restraints can be imposed upon harmful and disorder-

46. Wilder, Amos, Eleutheria, Ecumenical Review, Pg. 419. Dr. Fagley also says, "The need for thorough study on the relation of the Christian faith to the principles of world community advanced on behalf of the churches is urgent. Ecumenical Review, Vol. 8, pg. 392."
ly expressions of religion. This involvement by the state in religious matters is certainly very different, from the position which considers the state completely secular, and separated from any religious group or body. In spite of the sharp contrast, in the two opinions concerning the degree of states competence in religious matters; there is agreement in saying, that the states' competence must be solved, not by elaboration of abstract principles, but by studying each particular case, in its historical setting and dynamic circumstances. Different situations will require different solutions in establishing a relationship between Church and State. The WCC has to face situations and find solutions in three situations where (1) Catholic tradition predominates and the state becomes involved in defense of the "status quo". The tendency is to inhibit the activities of other religious denominations, to protect the closed system of religious unity.

(2) A second situation is that in which a newly independent nation with a non-Christian majority is animated by anti-colonialistic and nationalistic spirit. The main obstacle to religious liberty here, would be a strong desire by the new nations, for political unity. One religion is used exclusively to achieve this unity. The work of the WCC would be in showing new nations, that Christians are loyal citizens

47. Carrillo, A. F. de Albornoz, Religious Liberty A General Review of Situations in World, 1964; Italy, Spain, Colombia; are places of tension. pgs. 1--5.
of a state, which recognizes religious liberty.

(3) The most difficult situation with which the WCC must deal, to insure religious liberty, based upon the principle of states juridic competence, would be in a country with an atheistic government, bound up with dialectic materialism. If state pretends to to be bound up with man's best interests, then the state can also pretend to be liberating man for his own free development. The state pretends to be limiting only those activities, which are against the social and political welfare of the people. The Ecumenical bodies of WCC are divided on the juridic basis of the states' competence in promoting religious liberty. There are also extreme positions, and opinions among members of WCC on whether Church and State should be separated. The two extremes which

48. Ibid., Carrillo, pg. 6 "Algeria and Syria proclaimed Islam as official religion, - Tunisia signed a modus vivendi - with Catholics discriminating to Protestants." pg. 10. Sudan deported all Christians missionaries from state "to restore stability and security of state", March, 1964, pg. 11. Ceylon government drove all Catholic nuns from hospitals, leprosariums, medical and health institutions, February, 1964. Part of drive to rid all foreign missionaries from country, pg. 15.

49. Ibid., Carrillo, pg. 16-24. Situations in communist countries. In China, obstacles placed to baptism of Christians. Russia, workers employed by religious organizations are barred from state pensions. pg. 20.
must be rejected are (1) the position which denies that the Church has the duty to co-operate, to a degree, with the state, for the promotion and protection of religious liberty. The opposite opinion, (2) advocating involvement which would subject the Church to civil authority. The result would be the loss of that freedom, which is necessary for the Church's special mission of social service and sacred witness. The competence of State in Church matters, and the relation of Church and State is an issue deserving further research, and study, which the WCC hopes will lead to ecumenical agreement, of two approaches to the problem of religious liberty from a juridic viewpoint, (1) which over-embarrasses the unconditional aspects of freedom, while ignoring the power and function of the state; and the (2) other approach, which exalts the power and function of the state, while minimizing the ultimacy of the human conscience; neither approach really solves the problem. Dr. Carrillo believes with other WCC theologians, that the distinction between pure religious freedom, and the mixed religious freedoms, which involved other civil freedoms, would help to solve the question of states.

(not visible)
The point at stake is this; the limitations of the states competence, and the juridic basis for religious liberty cannot rest upon arbitrary foundations. So now we shall consider some factors, and conditions, which delineate and restrict the states activity, when the state regulates social liberties, which are structured into a religious setting. After these considerations, this study will be concluded by an analysis of how religious liberty can be exercised responsibly by the individual in a Church society.
LEGAL LIMITATIONS OF RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

In virtually every country there are constitutional and legal recognitions of religious liberty. At the same time there are simultaneously, limitations of religious liberty, based upon a variety of reasons, such as (1) national unity, (2) public order, (3) public safety, (4) public morality. Some limitations of the free exercise of religion are legitimate; however, the WCC believes that frequently violations of religious freedom occurs, when reasonable limitations are invoked in an arbitrary or discriminatory manner. The fact that some legal limitation of the exercise of religious liberty is legitimate and necessary is generally agreed upon by WCC. Most of the Ecumenical statements about legal limitations explicitly given, but vague, and open to interpretations. It is difficult to determine, what precisely are reasonable and necessary limitations. It is equally difficult to determine abuses which constitute real, unjust violations of religious freedom.

50. (1) Oxford, 1937, "Where there are majority and minority churches in a state, the same essential liberties should be enjoyed by both majority and minority churches, pg. 17 (2) Madras, 1938, "A grave tension between Church and state arises from imposition of restrictions upon church - church involved must be left ultimate decision as to when to refuse to submit
The most precise formulations leading to any type of standard, and criterion of evaluating abuses, and reasonable limitations is the Amsterdam 1948 Declaration. This declaration was confirmed by the New Delhi Conference 1961. This formulae establishes a satisfactory solution to the vagueness of the previous ecumenical statements. The Amsterdam and New Delhi statements follow:

(1) Limits of the liberty of conscience: The right to determine one's belief is limited only by parents; otherwise a person may determine, and adhere or change his belief at will. This includes the right to instruction, education, access to information.

(2) Limits of the liberty of religious expression: Institutions should grant immunity from discrimination, and from legal disability (meaning disqualification) solely on grounds of expressed religious conviction. This freedom should prevail, until recognized community interests are adversely affected.

(3) Limits of liberty of religious association: This type of liberty should be subjected to the same type of non-discriminatory laws, and limited in some way, as all other non-religious associations are limited.

(4) Limits of corporate religious freedom: The community has a right to require, and expect obedience to non-discriminatory laws, passed in the interest of public order, and well being. A religious body must respect the rights of other religious bodies, and also the individual and corporate rights of the whole community.

50. (cont'd.) to state laws which curtail its activities." Both above from "Main Ecumenical Statements on Principles of Religious Liberty by WCC. (3) Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America; statement on religious liberty, 1944." "Religious Freedom is subject only to the maintenance of public order and security." (4) Buenos Aires, 1949, Declaration of Religious Liberty, "The practice of religious liberty cannot recognize any limitations by legal action other than those which are necessary for the defense of morals and public order." (3) and (4) from Carrillo, Basis of Religious Liberty, pg. 136.
The above formulation is based upon the WCC insight, which distinguishes between pure religious freedom (liberty of conscience), and mixed religious freedom which includes (Liberty of) (1) religious expression, (2) association, and (3) corporate freedom.

Pure freedom must be absolutely protected by civil society, for it involves a man’s personal relationship to God. The other religious freedom (mixed) involves the exercise of other rights not specifically religious; therefore, these rights may be legitimately limited insofar as the exercise of these other rights involve some rulings, and legal determinations of the state. In other words, the basis for limiting some religious freedoms is always external to the essence of religious freedom. The need for order to secure the common good, which is the reason for limiting rights, refers only to mixed religious freedoms, which are not specifically religious ones. So in light of this distinction the WCC maintains that the proposition: the state has power and competence to limit religious liberty is false, unless qualified to mean any rights which involve the exercise of OTHER civil rights which the state may legitimately control.

When a particular religious power presupposes

51. These limitations are found on pages 6 and 7 of the Amsterdam Declaration and pgs. 25-37 of the New Delhi Report. WCC Main Ecumenical Statements, Geneva, 1965.
of a social right, the state may limit the exercise of the social right in proportion to the degree of state's competence on the matter. The conditions for the legitimate limitations of a right, in which state has competence, must be prescribed and requested by law, and not left to arbitrary administrative decisions. Again the limitations must be equally applicable to all citizens, and to all religious organizations, and never discriminatory. Of course, non-discrimination is necessary; but in itself, non-discrimination is not sufficient for enjoying full liberty. It may happen, that the exercise of a human right or an essential manifestation of a human right may be prohibited or restricted for all. While it is true, there is no discrimination at the same time the exercise of a human right has been denied (non-discriminately) to all. The problem of non-discrimination by civil authority is related to the problem of limiting religious freedom, because of a particular confession or creed. In a pluralistic society, any limitation imposed upon a particular religious group within the community which is advantageous to another religious group, must necessarily be discriminatory. If the limitation is based

merely on confessional grounds, civil authority may never deny religious freedom to dissenting minority groups, for the sake of preserving religious unity, and the privileges of the religious majority. The limitation of religious liberty in order to maintain or produce religious unity, within a society is never justified. (This is one of the reasons why the Spanish speaking Bishops opposed Vatican II's schema on Religious Liberty in the second session of the Council). Restrictions on the free manifestation of religious convictions, and of their implicit consequences, cannot be justified by society for fear of eventual dangers.

The WCC is in ecumenical agreement that the application of the principles concerning the states competence in religious matters is difficult, and changeable with changing environments and societies. Therefore, even though the theoretical Christian basis remains as outlined in the study here; yet, the WCC realizes, that its stand on religious liberty must be constantly adapted to the needs of changing times and conditions. This study of the WCC on religious liberty will be concluded by considering the responsible exercise of religious liberty by the individual and institutional bodies.

53. Italics mine.

54. Prof. Peyrott, "Observations to Commission on Religious Liberty." Carrillo, Ibid., pg. 144.
RESPONSIBLE EXERCISE OF RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

Religious freedom is certainly not absolute, so it must be exercised responsibly. There are, of course, differences of opinions and controversies regarding the responsible exercise of freedom. The differences of opinion, as seen by WCC, can be roughly divided into four groups. (1) Group one would include the minority confessions or churches, who suffer serious and unjust limitations of their religious freedom. These do not like to speak of responsible exercise, even though recognizing in principle, that freedom cannot be absolute and unlimited. They hesitate to speak of responsible exercise of freedom, because they themselves have been persecuted on grounds of suspected irresponsibility. (This is an argument which is used against civil rights demonstrators now-a-days). Under the pressure of a hostile official environment, it is not rare, that this group advocates, and defends complete separation of Church and State, and a liberal individualism. (2) The second group in controversy,

55. Carrillo, Dr., Basis of Religious Liberty pgs. 100=104.
as to how freedom is to be exercised responsibly, are those Christian people, who enjoy freedom within a state, which is favorable to all confessions. These see the Church and State as a part of framework for the common good of humanity. Unbridled religious freedom appears, to these, as unwarranted, unjust, and as a serious danger, and threat to freedom itself. The state should be responsible for the moral concerns of the community, because religion is not foreign to a state maintaining an environment in which all confessions flourish and are given free expression.

(3) There is another opinion dealing with the responsible exercise of religious liberty, from those who live within the confines of countries, in which the government is indifferent even hostile to religion. For these, the WCC claim for religious liberty is inopportune. Social religious problems should not be put in terms of liberty, but in terms of a fertile incorporation of Christian principles into the concrete society in which Christians live, (4) A fourth opinion dealing with the responsible exercise of religious liberty is advanced by Christians, who live in non-Christian countries; where the majority religion is non-Christian. These Christians advocate a secular state, indifferent to all religions, as the best solution for their problems. They ask for fundamental rights for all without discrimination. These different opinions and tendencies, must be considered in
arriving at a possible solution, and orientation of an individual and institutional exercise of religious liberty, which is responsible. While exercising religious freedom, one must be ready to expect some unavoidable restrictions of liberty. Responsibility is inherent in the very concept of freedom. Man creates and achieves his destiny in constant relationship with his neighbor. Man is made free by God, not to follow every erratic impulse, but to grow to maturity as a social being, aware of the ties to his fellows in the community. Responsible exercise of religious liberty must constitute a commitment toward God, one's neighbor, and towards society. Responsible exercise of freedom is basic for guaranteeing the very survival of liberty. Irresponsible use of freedom, and undisciplined libertinage will usually usher in coercion, as a necessary substitute for liberty. Responsible freedom is the only alternative to force. The above principles on responsible exercise of liberty are valid, although the practical application of some of these principles in certain circumstances and cases, will present almost insurmountable obstacles. The objections responsible for the exercise of religious liberty advanced by some churches of WCC were defended

56. Bishop ERnest Primeau, Manchester, US in an address to Vatican II pointed out that today's layman is aware of his own abilities, dignity, and responsibilities and will not longer put up with being treated as a passing member submitting blindly to the authority of the Church as "silent sheep". There are faithful who have special competence in areas, which clergy lacks. They ask the clergy to
as follows. The first objection: some are afraid of complete liberty for all? The answer to this could be that even among the WCC, some majority religions fear and suspect proselytism by minorities in their territory. The other objection fears that any proclamation of limits on religious liberty may be dangerous, for the state will then take advantage on any pretext to limit exercise of freedom unfairly. This danger cannot be minimized; but it is also true, that absolute religious liberty itself can be even more dangerous. For the risk in the responsible exercise of religious freedom is not temporal, but eternal. In spite of this, God is willing to take this enormous risk, and so does the WCC of proclaiming and demanding responsible religious liberty, for the individual and institutional bodies (minority groups). The consideration of future or eventual danger will not deter the WCC from recognizing responsible religious freedom, and from accepting whatever legitimate restrictions are imposed by the state. The WCC recognizes that it is necessary to proclaim these limitations upon the responsible exercise of religious freedom for two reasons (1) because the churches have a responsibility to illumine society, (2) the WCC would lose its authority if while defending

56. hear them. This awareness of their ability and dignity necessarily should set up a dialogue between laity and clergy. One question which must be answered in this dialogue is the relationship between freedom and authority. pgs. 83-86. Council Speeches Vatican II.

religious liberty, and condemning unjust limitations, it would not recognize legitimate limitations. The New Delhi Assembly enunciates the individuals behavior in acting responsibly in exercising religious liberty. Dr. Carrillo points out that it is the duty of a responsible Church in the exercise of religious liberty to claim this right, not only for oneself but for all religious bodies, even non-believers; and then to proclaim, and practice this right. The Church may not exercise any type of coercion, either physical or moral, in order to persuade someone, to profess something, that he does not believe, nor to act against his conscience.

The Church's witness must be by the strength of the divine power, given to Jesus in heaven and on earth, and never by the force of human power. Finally, responsible exercise of religious liberty by the Church, includes a complete renunciation of the use of power by the state in religious matters, especially in subjecting or eliminating religious minorities. The responsible Church, in ecumenical union with the WCC, must continue to ask for the recognition of complete religious freedom for all.

58. The freedom with which Christ has set us free calls for responsibility for the rights of others. The civil freedom which we claim in the name of Christ must be freely available for all men to exercise responsibly. Secretariat on Religious Liberty, WCC, Main Ecumenical Statements on Principles Concerning Religious Freedom, Geneva, 1965, pg. 37.


60. Oxford and Amsterdam Conferences, "We condemn any Church which seeks power of state to enforce religious unity."
It must be ready to choose to suffer persecution, and must refuse to submit to unjust state laws, and regulations, or administrative actions, which will curtail essential activities, in its essential witness. Individual members must even choose death, rather than to disobey God, and the dictates of their conscience.

Finally the WCC has declared its loyalty to the message of Amsterdam to stay together in a solidarity in the certain knowledge that Jesus is Lord: "Stand fast therefore, in the liberty whereby Christ has made you free."
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