*Osservatore Romano*, Sept. 23, 1934

From Sinai to Moscow (note: this headline follows an article about Reich Bishop Mueller's declaration that the Nazi regime wants a German church free from Rome - see trans below - also note Manchukuo on same page)

A Titta Modia in Mattino of Naples says that, regarding women in the criminal code of the Soviet Republic, the Bolshevik law approximates the divine law of the Decalogue, to which it is similar if not identical. Protected and favored in Moscow, just as the woman is protected and favored at Sinai. And he writes: This favoritism towards the woman is not of today: it was already found in the Sacred Laws, in the commandment that prescribes, "do not covet another's woman," but does not say "another's man," which does not put limits on the desires of women; and St. Paul as well, in his First Letter to the Corinthians, insists upon a unilateral formulation . . . "and the man must not repudiate his wife . . . Men, love your wives as Christ loves the Church . . ."

Thus, first of all, that the liturgy of "memento homo" on the first day of Lent, should be thought of as woman not being "pulvis" nor "in pulverem revertetur"; it should be concluded that since it is always stated "rights" and "duties of man," the woman has no rights or duties. And it should be demonstrated that because "human" and "humanity" are words derived quite evidently from "man" and not from woman or female, because otherwise it would said "feminine" and "femininity," the woman does not appear to belong to the human species and is not "within the bounds" of humanity.

And in fact it is not to be suspected that the admonition of St. Paul does not apply also for the woman, seeing that the man is to love the woman as Christ loves the Church, and the woman - even more so - is to love the man as the Church loves Christ. This is especially so since this bilateralism does not emerge only from logic, but from the texts. And anyone who has the Sacred Scriptures at hand should not forget verse 10 of chapter 2 of Leviticus, where adultery is punishable by death, as much for one spouse as for the other; as it should be perfectly remembered about those who are ready to stone the adulteress, whom Jesus defended, but also commanded: "sin" no more.

The article from Mattino strikes at the Soviet code with a bit of burlesque irony. But such a game does not lend itself to the Sacred.

translation of preceding article:

Correction

Given the particular importance of the fact, it is not out of place or superfluous to return to the words that the newspapers reported on the 21st of this month, in summarizing the speech given in Hanover by the head of the the [Protestant] Reich Church, Dr. Müller, attributed to the speaker himself.

That is:

"We want a German church that is free from Rome. The purpose for which we struggle is: one State, one people, one church."

Such statements, if they were confirmed to be accurate, would obviously arouse - particularly at this time in which negotiations are developing between representatives of the Catholic bishops of Germany and the Government of the Reich for an equitable agreement for religious peace - a justifiable regret not only in the minds of Catholics, but of those who know and feel that it would be harmful for everyone, without distinction, among such material troubles, to have spiritual backlash.

We have seen, however, that a statement released for publication by the same Müller acknowledged that the above sentences attributed to the head of the Reich Church not only were not spoken, but were contrary to the letter and spirit of his speech.

"I only said - says Müller in fact - that Luther wanted to form a church free from Rome. We do not want any fight against the Catholic Church in Germany; on the contrary, I maintain that the two great Christian churches should not act in conflict, but that they have a common moral duty and humanity."

These statements come at a good time. Of course they merit appropriate reservations on the part of Catholics, whether as to the appropriateness of discussing such delicate matters in a public speech, whether as to the doctrinal content of the same press release.

In any event it is fair to take note of the promptness with which they were confirmed publicly and the intentions that they frankly manifest.