

[Click here for Table of Contents](#)

# **ROMAN CATHOLICISM**

*Facts or Fabrications?*

**L. R. WILSON**

*Editor, Voice of Freedom*

Published by  
**THE FREEDOM PRESS, Inc.**  
Nashville, Tennessee 37202

*Library of Congress, Catalogue Card Number 65-24974*

*Copyright 1965, by L. R. Wilson*

*Printed in the U. S. A.*

## Table of Contents

[Click on chapter title for text](#)

	<i>Page</i>
INTRODUCTION .....	vii
FOREWORD .....	ix
FOUNDATION STONES OF CATHOLICISM EXAMINED .....	1
THE CATHOLIC ATTITUDE TOWARD THE BIBLE .....	14
TRADITION AND THE SCRIPTURES .....	25
CATHOLICISM IS UNORTHODOX .....	41
CATHOLIC CLAIMS OF "INFALLIBILITY" .....	57
OTHER FANTASTIC CLAIMS OF CATHOLICS .....	69
CATHOLICISM IS IMMORAL .....	84
CATHOLICISM IS INCORRIGIBLE .....	99
CATHOLICISM IS UNRELENTING .....	114
CATHOLICISM IS UN-AMERICAN .....	131
CATHOLICISM IS INTOLERANT .....	154
CATHOLICISM IS PERNICIOUS .....	168
EPILOGUE .....	189
BIBLIOGRAPHY .....	195

## INTRODUCTION

*Roman Catholicism: Facts or Fabrications?* by L. R. Wilson is one of the great books of this decade. It fills a definite need in the church. It is scholarly and ably done by one who knows and understands Roman Catholicism. It is designed especially for classroom study. Every church would do well to see that its adult classes make use of this book.

The foundation principles of Catholicism are studied in the light of what the New Testament teaches. It clearly shows that the New Testament does not substantiate the claims of the Catholic Church concerning its organization, establishment and perpetuity.

The attitude of Catholics toward the Bible is clearly set forth. It is quite evident that their professed love for the Bible is not as they would have men believe.

The author has ably and carefully documented the facts, showing that the Catholic Church is unorthodox, incredible, and that its teachings encourage immorality. Any system that is un-American, unrelenting, intolerant and unscrupulous does not deserve the apologies that are made for it by many so-called Christians today.

The writer of this excellent book was born at Cord, Arkansas, December 23, 1896, and served in the AEF with honor in World War I. He began his college education at Freed-Hardeman, from which he graduated. He then attended Union University at Jackson, Tennessee, and later received his Master's degree from Birmingham-Southern College. He also holds the LL. D. degree from Oklahoma Christian College.

Brother Wilson's work has peculiarly fitted him for writing such a book as you now hold in your hand. As a writer he is one among the most fluent and able scribes in the church. For fifteen years he served as a staff writer for the *Firm Foundation*,

## INTRODUCTION

and wrote the advanced *Bible School Quarterly* for eight years. He has served as a staff writer for the *Gospel Advocate* since 1955. In 1956 he became editor of the *Voice of Freedom*, an excellent publication designed to expose both Communism and Catholicism, and any other man-made authoritarian system.

The author served as local minister for churches in Knoxville, Tennessee; Tulsa, Oklahoma; San Antonio and Amarillo, Texas. He has conducted gospel meetings in more than half of the states in the Union. He was the founding president of Florida Christian College in Tampa, Florida, and for several years served as president of Central [now Oklahoma] Christian College.

In addition to this excellent volume, Brother Wilson is the author of *The Triumphant Jesus*, *The Never-Failing Scriptures*, *The New Testament Church*, *Highlights in Church History*, *Congregational Development*, and *Aerial Bombardments*. He has written numerous booklets, tracts and other publications.

The author is an able speaker, and has served the pulpit well. He has also been very effective on the radio. For over twenty years he conducted radio programs over some of the strongest stations in the United States, and frequently appeared on national network programs. More than a million copies of his radio sermons are now in circulation.

This work has been carefully documented, and a complete bibliography is included. We are pleased to commend this volume and encourage churches to buy and use it in class study. Every preacher should have a copy.

H. A. Dixon  
President, Freed-Hardeman College

## FOREWORD

*The masses of Roman Catholics in the United States are honest, sincere, and good American citizens.* They like America as it is today, and would not want to live in a predominantly Catholic country, with all of its attendant evils and restrictions. But all of their lives they have heard only one side of the Catholic story. They do not really know what Catholicism is. They have never seen or heard of its seamy side. If they knew the facts, they would be among the first to rebel. The revolution in France (1793), Italy (1870), Mexico (1910-12), and in Spain (1936-39), were all waged by Roman Catholics against the clerical system, which had become intolerable.

On the whole, there is more restlessness in Catholic countries today than anywhere else. Most of the South and Central American countries are seething with unrest. Although they are overwhelmingly Catholic, the masses have little respect for their religious leaders. In 1960 the Puerto Ricans defied their bishops, and voted their sentiments in spite of the threat of excommunication. The bishops had to back down. In Cuba the lid blew completely off a few years back. Cuba then turned to Communism.

Roman Catholic leaders realize that they must exercise absolute control over the education of all their people, otherwise they will lose them. This explains their relentless battle in this country today to get state and federal support for their schools. Unless such aid is forthcoming they will not be able to maintain all their schools in competition with our free public schools. A failure to do so will endanger their control over the minds of their people. Of course, many will remain Catholic in name, but they will not • truckle to the hierarchy. Already there is considerable anti-clericalism among the Catholic laity in this country.

The aim of this book is not to stir up hatreds, or to create

## FOREWORD

discord and strife. Rather it is to call attention to some of the evils of the Roman Catholic system which we believe to be contrary to New Testament Christianity and our American way of life. The most powerful weapon against error is truth. When people know the facts they cannot be enslaved. Well did Jesus say, "And ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free" (John 8:32).

*This work is so arranged that it can be used by classroom teachers and study groups.* Although there is some repetition in it, there is hardly enough to detract materially from its value. All of this might have been avoided by discussing each topic separately and fully when once it was introduced. But most of Rome's doctrines are so interwoven that it is difficult to separate them. It seemed simpler to us, therefore, to deal with them under some general chapter headings rather than trying to break them down into separate categories. For instance, in chapter IV, *Catholicism Is Un-Orthodox*, some things are necessarily discussed that are also touched on in other chapters. Some doctrines are not only unorthodox, they are also un-American. But when such doctrines are referred to more than once they are approached from different angles.

Some of our charges may appear rather caustic. But we have studiously avoided all sarcasm and bitterness. We should like to think that many Catholics will read this work, though it is not written with them in mind primarily, *because they are not permit-led to read such material.* Our chief aim is to fortify non-Catholics with the *truth* in order that they may not be taken in by the clever Catholic propaganda which is literally flooding this country today.

Much of the subject matter used in this work has been discussed in the *Voice of Freedom* in recent years. But papers and

## FOREWORD

magazines are usually thrown away within a few days and the facts are soon forgotten, whereas books are more often preserved and referred to when needed.

*Special thanks go to Ruth J. Wilson*, my faithful companion for forty years, who has worked so diligently with me in every undertaking in which I have engaged for the furtherance of the Cause of Christ and the advancement of the Truth. All of these pages were read by her in the early stages, and many valuable suggestions were then made. But the writer accepts full responsibility for the accuracy (or any inaccuracy) of this work, as well as for any weaknesses in its composition or sentence structure. This work would have been greatly improved if Mrs. Wilson could have checked every word before it was sent to the printers.

Unless otherwise indicated, the scripture quotations are from the American Standard Version—except in rare instances.

Such terms as "Father," "the Reverend," "His Holiness," and similar expressions, have been placed in quotation marks to indicate their extraordinary usage, except where they are found inside of another quotation. When quoting from other sources we have left all markings and punctuations as they were. The usage of such terms as religious titles is contrary both to the teaching and spirit of New Testament Christianity. Our use of the term "Doctor" is purely academic, and never carries any religious connotation.

Sometimes our sentences may seem encumbered by the excessive use of the term "Catholic" or "Roman Catholic," often inserted in brackets before the term "Church." This is done because we do not equate the Roman Catholic Church with the church set forth in the New Testament. The Roman Catholic Church is a particular sectarian body, whereas the church of our



## FOREWORD

Lord was never so regarded. It carried with it no sectarian connotation of any kind. The translators of the New Testament clearly understood this, and never regarded the term "church" as a proper noun, but a descriptive term for all of God's people.

It is our sincere hope and fervent prayer that many will be lead to a clearer understanding of Roman Catholic fallacies and unsupported assumptions as a result of this work.

The Author

Dec. 1, 1964

# CHAPTER I

## Foundation Stones of Catholicism Examined

Catholicism is perfect in one respect only: it is a perfect riddle. It is one of the most monolithic and at the same time one of the most heterogeneous structures in existence. It has been on every side of every question. Yet the more it changes the more it is the same. Like a chameleon, it adapts itself to the times and circumstances, but its goals are ever the same.

During the past fifteen hundred years Catholicism has spread its web over the entire world, and has become inextricably interwoven into the very fiber of the social, political, educational and economic structure of civilization itself. Tracing out all of its doctrines, devices, schemes, and fantasies would be like trying to explore a mammoth cave, honeycombed with endless caverns. Obviously, we cannot even undertake such a gigantic task. But we do propose to take a straight and honest look at *some* of the most bold and daring claims made by Catholicism.

### I. Basic Catholic Assumptions

The *assumed* foundation stones upon which the whole Catholic system rests can be briefly summarized as follows:

1. *The church was built upon the apostle Peter.*
2. *Peter was given the authority of binding and loosing whatever laws he deemed expedient for the times, within the framework of the fundamental teachings of Christ.*
3. *Peter was made not only the head of the church but also the vicar (deputy) of Christ and rector (ruler) of the universe.*
4. *Peter was made the Prince of all the apostles.*

5. *The authority of Peter and his successors was universal, being both spiritual and temporal.*

6. *The authority bestowed upon Peter and his successors in office was "supreme" and "independent" of all earthly authority.*

7. *The office (throne or power) of Peter has been passed down to his successors throughout all the ages.*

Let us look at the first four of these assumptions. If they are spurious, it is axiomatic that the others are likewise. Furthermore, if these supports will not hold, then the entire superstructure of Romanism collapses with the foundation.

What then are the facts?

## II. Was the Church Built Upon Peter?

In all the Word of God there is but one scripture to which Catholics look for support of their claim that the church was built upon Peter. In the *Confraternity-Douay Version*,<sup>1</sup> which is identical with the *King James Version* here, this passage reads:

And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. '

When Jesus said, "Thou are *Peter*" he used the masculine gender (*petros*), signifying "a small, detached stone." When he added "upon this *rock* I will build my church" he used the feminine gender (*petra*), which signifies "a ledge or a cliff of rock." Thus, the two different terms for "rock" in this passage must have different significations. Jesus could not have meant that he would build his church upon the apostle Peter because of his use of the two different genders, each having a different connotation.

The translators of *The New English Bible* fell into a grave error regarding this scripture. They rendered the term, "You are Peter, *the Rock*; and on this rock I will build my church." The extra clause, "the Rock," which was here inserted, is an in-

---

<sup>1</sup>Authorized Catholic Version.

<sup>2</sup>Matt. 16:18.

terpolation for which there is no justification. Evidently it was intended as a sop to the Roman Catholic Church. But *Catholic translators* have not tampered with the original in this verse. Instead, they have rendered the term correctly, as did the translators of both the King James and the American Standard Versions. The Catholic error here is not in their translation but in their interpretation. Just why the translators of *The New English Bible* made this blunder is difficult to understand, unless it was a deliberate insertion intended to win Catholic approval, in the hope of making a few sales of the N. E. B. to Roman Catholics.

Catholics try to minimize the significance of the two genders in Matt. 16:18 by explaining that Jesus spoke in Aramaic, in which language Matthew's gospel originally appeared, and that these two terms were identical in the Aramaic. This explanation is based upon three assumptions, neither of which can be proved. (1) No one can prove that Jesus spoke in Aramaic. (2) No one can prove that the book of Matthew was written in Aramaic. This is only a Catholic tradition. (3) Even if we should admit the first two assumptions (which we do not), no one can be sure that Jesus used identical terms. Hence, the claim that the church was built upon Peter rests upon at least three unsupported assumptions, all of which we reject on the following grounds.

1. *The two terms, "petros" and "petra," are found in the oldest Greek manuscripts we now have.* Surely those who gave us these early manuscripts must have had a reason for using the two different terms. They certainly had better opportunities to know if there was a difference than we now have. To *assume* that our oldest and most reliable manuscripts were wrong, and that there was no distinction in the original language is contrary to all the rules of sound exegesis.

2. *No object can occupy two or more positions in the same picture at the same time.* In the figure of a building, which Jesus here used, Peter is represented as the doorkeeper. But he

could not occupy the place of doorkeeper and foundation both at the same time. While Jesus is variously represented as the builder of his church, the purchaser of his church, the foundation of his church, the chief cornerstone of his church, and the head of his church, never in a single figure is he pictured as occupying more than one position or place at any one time. For instance, he is sometimes said to be a "lion," while at other times he is said to be a "lamb"; but never is he both a "lion" and a "lamb" in the same picture. If we should see a group picture in which one person appears twice, we would know that it was an anomaly.

3. *When establishing a congregation, no inspired apostle ever felt under any obligation to preach anything about Peter.* If Peter was the foundation, it seems strange that the apostle Paul never felt the necessity of laying this foundation when he established a congregation in Thessalonica, Philippi, Corinth, Ephesus, or any other place. However, there was one basic fact which he never overlooked in the establishment of a congregation: he never forgot to declare that "Jesus is the Christ the Son of God." Indeed, it is upon this sublime *truth* that the church of our Lord was built. Peter had just confessed this great truth when Jesus declared that upon *it* he would build his church. Never did any inspired man ever overlook this foundation truth after our Lord returned to the Father.

4. *If the church was built upon Peter "the man," then it was not built upon any "office" which he supposedly held.* It could not have been built upon both. If built upon Peter the man, then the church cannot rest upon any supposed successor. However, if it was built upon the office that Peter occupied, then the Romanists are wrong in asserting that the church was built upon *Peter*. But if it was built upon Peter, the man, then they are wrong in assuming that he passed down to his successors any office or authority. They cannot have it both ways.

### III. Was Peter Given Authority to Define Laws for Christ?

The assumption that Peter was given authority to *define* laws for Christ and for his church, and that this authority has been passed down to his successors (the popes), is postulated upon the following scripture:

I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.<sup>3</sup>

The assumption that Christ here gave Peter the right to define or to repeal laws for him is only a myth. Jesus bestowed upon all the apostles the same authority that he gave to Peter, saying, "Peace be unto you: as the Father hath sent me, even so send I you. And when he had said this, he breathed on them, and said unto them, Receive ye the Holy Spirit: whose soever sins ye forgive, they are forgiven unto them; whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained."<sup>4</sup> Thus, it is evident that all the apostles had the same authority that Peter had. This is further confirmed in the following statement which was addressed first of all to the apostles: "What things soever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and what things soever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven."<sup>5</sup> Jesus here used almost the identical language he had previously used when addressing Peter.

It must not be supposed that Jesus ever conferred upon Peter or upon any others the right to *legislate* for him or for his church in any matter whatsoever. The literal rendering of Matthew 16:19 is: ". . . and whatever you forbid on earth must be what is already forbidden in heaven, and whatever you permit on earth must be what is already permitted in heaven." The two terms, "must be what is already forbidden" and "must be what is already permitted," are perfect passive participles. The same is

---

<sup>3</sup>Matt. 16:19.

<sup>4</sup>John 20:21-23.

<sup>5</sup>Matt. 18:18.

true of the verbs in Matthew 18:18, and is so rendered by Dr. Charles Williams.<sup>6</sup>

The only authority any of the apostles ever had was the right of *making known* the laws of Jesus Christ—laws which had already been "bound" or "loosed" in heaven; and this they did only as they were guided by the Holy Spirit. The apostles, and *only* the apostles, were chosen as Christ's ambassadors,<sup>7</sup> to make known his will. They were eyewitnesses of Christ. They were especially trained for the work they were given to do. However, they were not left to their own wisdom in declaring the will of Christ. The work to which they were called was too important to be left to their judgment. Before his death, Jesus promised to send the Holy Spirit, saying, "Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he shall guide you into all the truth."<sup>8</sup> Just before his ascension he thus cautioned his apostles: "I send forth the promise of my Father upon you: but tarry ye in the city, until ye be clothed with power from on high."<sup>9</sup> After the outpouring of the Holy Spirit on the first Pentecost following Christ's resurrection, the apostles were infallibly guided by the Spirit in the revelation of his will.<sup>10</sup> Paul, who was later called and qualified as an apostle by the Lord, was endowed with the same rights and privileges as were the other apostles.<sup>11</sup> In making known the will of Christ they spoke only as it was revealed to them by the Holy Spirit.<sup>12</sup>

When the "infallibility" of Pope Pius IX was defined by the Vatican Council in 1870, *it was not by revelation of the Holy Spirit but by a majority vote of the cardinals and bishops*, and that after many days of bitter debate.

---

<sup>6</sup>*The New Testament, A Translation in the Language of the People.*

<sup>7</sup>2 Cor. 5:20.

<sup>8</sup>John 16:13.

<sup>9</sup>Luke 24:49.

<sup>10</sup>Acts 2:4.

<sup>11</sup>Gal. 1:11-17.

<sup>12</sup>Acts 2:4; 1 Cor. 2:4; 2 Pet. 1:21.

To assume that the apostle Peter was especially endowed with the power to declare God's will to all mankind in all matters of faith and morals, and that this right was passed down to his successors, is to commit three basic errors: (1) Peter was given no such authority; (2) he had no successors in office; (3) he could not pass down to others what he himself never had. Neither scripture, history, nor reason bears out any of these assumptions.

#### IV. Was Peter Made Head Over All the Church?

We quote here in full the scripture chiefly relied upon by Roman Catholics in support of their claim that Peter was made head of the whole church.

So when they had broken their fast, Jesus saith to Simon Peter, Simon, son of John, lovest thou me more than these? He saith unto him, Yea, Lord; thou knowest that I love thee. He saith unto him, Feed my lambs. He saith to him again a second time, Simon, son of John, lovest thou me? He saith unto him, Yea, Lord; thou knowest that I love thee. He saith unto him, Tend my sheep. He saith unto him the third time, Simon, son of John, lovest thou me? Peter was grieved because he said unto him the third time, Lovest thou me? And he said unto him, Lord, thou knowest all things; thou knowest that I love thee. Jesus saith unto him, Feed my sheep.<sup>13</sup>

Catholics make three unwarranted assumptions regarding this scripture: When Jesus asked, "Simon, son of John, lovest thou me more than *these?*" (1) It is assumed that he asked if Peter loved him more than the other disciples loved him. (2) It is assumed that when Peter was told to "Feed my lambs" and "Tend my sheep" that our Lord was distinguishing between the "laity" and the "clergy." Thus, Catholics argue, it was the Lord's way of telling Peter that he was to be responsible for both the "lay members" *and* "the order of the clergy"; hence, *the whole church*. (3) It is assumed that this authority was passed down by Peter to all subsequent popes—his (supposed) successors in office.

It would have been folly for Jesus to have asked Peter if he

---

<sup>13</sup>John 21:15-17.



loved him more than the other disciples loved him. Peter could not know how much the others loved him. (For some reason, John was referred to as "that disciple whom Jesus loved." Until this day he is spoken of as "the beloved John.") All of the circumstances indicate that when Jesus used the expression "these" he did not mean to ask Peter if he loved him more than "these" other disciples loved him. This becomes quite evident when we note the surrounding circumstances at the time Jesus spoke.

When our Lord was crucified the hopes of all the disciples were shattered. When he joined two of them on the day of his resurrection, as they journeyed to the little village of Emmaus, they were so heavy of heart and misty-eyed they did not recognize him at first. When he asked concerning their despair, they reported what had happened—the crucifixion of Jesus, the entombment of his body, and its disappearance—and expressed surprise that he did not seem to know about all these happenings. They then revealed their disappointment, saying, "But we hoped that it was he who should redeem Israel."<sup>14</sup>

When a few women reported to the disciples that they had seen the risen Christ, "these words appeared in their sight as idle talk; and they disbelieved them."<sup>15</sup> Even after Jesus had manifested himself to his disciples— prior to the giving of the great commission—the apostles knew not what to make of it all. They still had no hopes for the future. Peter, therefore, said to some of the other disciples, "I go a fishing. They say unto him, We also come with thee. They went forth, and entered into the boat; and that night they took nothing. But when day was now breaking, Jesus stood on the beach: yet the disciples knew not that it was Jesus." He called and asked if they had caught anything. "They answered him, No." Jesus then said, "Cast the net on the right side of the boat, and ye shall find. They cast therefore, and now they were not able to draw it for the multitude of fishes."

---

<sup>14</sup>Luke 24:21.

<sup>15</sup>Luke 24:11.

It appears that day was just now breaking and the disciples had not yet recognized Jesus; but they knew that the one speaking to them was no ordinary stranger. The beloved John then shouted, "It is the Lord. So when Simon Peter heard that it was the Lord, he girt his coat about him (for he was naked), and cast himself into the sea."<sup>16</sup> The other disciples brought the boat and the nets to the land. There they found some live coals of fire, which they rekindled, and cooked some of the fish. After they had all eaten and refreshed themselves, Jesus looked about at the large draught of fishes, the nets, the boats, and at the sea, all of which were lying at his very feet. With perhaps a gesture of the hand toward all of these things, he then asked Peter, "Lovest thou me more than *these*?"

When finally he had tested Peter sufficiently Jesus urged him once again to give up his old occupation, to which he had now returned, and devote his time henceforth to the higher occupation to which he had previously been called some three years earlier.<sup>17</sup> With the reassurance that Peter still loved him, the Lord, in substance, said, "You must give your time henceforth to the work to which I have called you."

It is incongruous with all the facts to use the above scripture, as the Romanists do, as "proof that Peter loved Jesus more than did the other disciples, and that, as a result of Peter's greater love, our Lord conferred upon him the authority to take the oversight of the entire church, which he divided into two classes: the "clergy" and the "laity." But such a forced construction is necessary to the support of a conjectured theory.

In his admonition to the apostle Peter Jesus used two Greek terms: "*boske*" and "*poimaine*." *Boske* is ordinarily translated by the simple term, "feed." When used in a figurative sense it means to teach, or to impart spiritual food. This is the work of

---

<sup>16</sup>John 21:3-7.

<sup>17</sup>Matt. 4:18-22.

all ministers of the gospel; yea, all teachers of God's Word. The term *poimaine* is used a number of times in the New Testament and is usually translated "feed," though some of the versions render it "tend," signifying to "care" for the flock. This work was done by all of the elders of the congregations. In giving his charge to the elders who had come from the church at Ephesus the apostle Paul said, "Take heed unto yourselves, and to all the flock, in which the Holy Spirit hath made you bishops, to feed [*poimainein*] the church of the Lord."<sup>18</sup> Here the *elders* were told to do exactly what Jesus told the apostle Peter to do.<sup>19</sup> Peter is in perfect agreement with Paul in this regard. He wrote, "The elders therefore among you I exhort, who am a fellow-elder. . . Tend [*poimante*] the flock of God which is among you, exercising the oversight, not of constraint, but willingly, according to the will of God."<sup>20</sup> Peter never intimated that he thought of himself as the Pope, or the head of the church. Instead he declared that he was a "fellow-elder." In exhorting (not commanding) those to whom he wrote he used the same term that Jesus used in giving charge to him. Certainly, he did not intend to pass on to the elders in general a specific commission which belonged exclusively to him and to his supposed successors.

#### V. Was Peter Made Chief of All the Apostles?

We here raise three objections to the claim that Peter was made chief of the apostles.

1. *Peter was "sent" by the apostles on a special mission.* Writing by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, Luke said,

Now when the apostles that were at Jerusalem heard that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent unto them Peter and John: who, when they were come down, prayed for them, that they might receive the Holy Spirit.<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup>Acts 20:28.

<sup>19</sup>John 21:15-17.

<sup>20</sup>1 Pet. 5:1, 2.

<sup>21</sup>Acts 8:14, 15.

If Peter had been the "prince of the apostles," he would hardly have been "sent" by the others on a special assignment. Instead, *he* would have done the sending. Try to imagine, if you can, a group of *bishops* sending the Pope today on any mission whatever!

2. *Peter was not the chief spokesman for the church, at least on one occasion.* Witness his role in the settlement of a dispute in the Jerusalem church about requiring the Gentiles to be circumcised. There never was any question in the mind of any of the apostles regarding the circumcision of the Gentile converts. But because some Judaizing teachers had gone from Jerusalem and disturbed the minds of the disciples in Antioch, Paul went to Jerusalem and took with him certain witnesses to settle the minds of all those who were disturbed regarding this question. The apostle Peter then related the facts concerning his special mission to the Gentiles and the circumstances which led up to his proclamation of the gospel to them. When he had finished, Paul related what the Lord had done by him among the Gentiles. James then Announced the consensus of the "whole church":

Wherefore my judgment is, that we trouble not them that from among the Gentiles turn to God; but that we write unto them, that they abstain from the pollutions of idols, and from fornication, and from what is strangled, and from blood. . . . Then it seemed good to the apostles and the elders, with the whole church, to choose men out of their company, and send them to Antioch with Paul and Barnabas.<sup>22</sup>

It was not a case of Peter deciding what should be done and then giving orders to all the others. Quite the contrary! After his speech it was James—not Peter—to whom the people gave ear. Yet it was not the decision of James, neither was it the decision of any other particular individual. The decision was unanimous: ". . . it seemed good to the apostles and the elders, *with the whole church.*" This procedure would never have been followed had there existed any such organization as the Roman hierarchy. Instead, a papal encyclical would have gone out from

---

<sup>22</sup>Acts 15:19-22.

"Pope Peter" regarding the question of circumcision. As it was, the decree was issued in the name of "the apostles and the elders, with the whole church."

Observe further that the decision was not reached merely by consultation, argument and debate. It was in reality the decision of the *Holy Spirit*: "For it seemed good to the Holy Spirit, and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things."<sup>23</sup> The decision of the "whole church" was, then, the decision of the Holy Spirit. The church simply united in accepting what was revealed by the Holy Spirit through James, the chief spokesman on this occasion. The apostles, the elders, and the whole church were in complete accord with the decision of the Holy Spirit.

3. *Peter was once rebuked by Paul.* The apostle to the Gentiles completely refuted the idea that Peter had any supremacy whatever over the other apostles, declaring, "I am not a whit behind the very chiefest apostles."<sup>24</sup> If Peter had been the "prince of the apostles," or "the chief apostle," Paul never would have used this expression. He never recognized any apostle as "*the* chief." Furthermore, as an apostle, Paul never considered himself *one whit behind* any one of them. Once he declared,

But when Cephas came to Antioch, I resisted him to the face, because he stood condemned. For before that certain came from James, he [Peter] ate with the Gentiles; but when they came, he drew back and separated himself, fearing them that were of the circumcision. And the rest of the Jews dissembled likewise with him; insomuch that even Barnabas was carried away with their dissimulation [*hupokrisei*, i.e., hypocrisy]. But when I saw that they walked not uprightly according to the truth of the gospel, I said unto Cephas before them all, If thou, being a Jew, livest as do the Gentiles, and not as do the Jews, how compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?<sup>25</sup>

Certainly no cardinal or bishop today would dare to write in such a manner about an "infallible" pope.

---

<sup>23</sup>Acts 15:28.

<sup>24</sup>2Cor. 11:5.

<sup>25</sup>Gal. 2:11-14.

Tradition is the only other ground on which any argument can be postulated for the supremacy of Peter. But there are no reliable traditions that bear out the theory that Peter was the first Pope. Any such tradition falls far short of the requisite time of reliability. For a tradition to be of any value at all it must have been *recorded* as far back as the first century. No such tradition is to be found. Hence, we must conclude that *the whole foundation of Roman Catholicism rests upon a series of baseless assumptions. It has no support whatever in holy writ, profane history, or reliable tradition.*

### VI. Questions for Catholics

When did the apostle Peter ever claim to be ruler of the universe?

When did he ever claim any political or earthly power?

When did he ever claim any supremacy over any of the other apostles?

When did he ever claim to hold "the place of God" on earth, as do the popes today?<sup>26</sup>

When did he ever claim to be able to speak for Christ, except as he was directly guided by the Holy Spirit?

Where do we find any grounds whatsoever for arguing that Peter was ever in Rome?

When did he establish there the "papal throne"?

Where do we find any scriptural grounds for supposing that Peter had any successor?

An honest answer to all of these questions makes it evident that the entire papal system is one of the most incredulous fabrications ever foisted on a believing world.

---

<sup>26</sup>Pope Leo XIII, "*Praeclara Gratulationis Publicae*" (The Reunion of Christendom), June 20, 1894.

## CHAPTER II

### The Catholic Attitude Toward The Bible

Most Protestants regard the Bible as a revelation of the mind of God, given to us by the Holy Spirit. While Catholics profess to do likewise, in reality they have very little use for the Bible. Sometimes we think they wish it had never been written. It is more of a hindrance than it is a help to them in indoctrinating their people. Apparently they get along much better without it than they do with it.

#### I. Catholics Have Little Use for the Bible

Roman Catholics claim to be the mother of the Bible, but they treat it more like a stepchild. Protestants have always had a greater love for it than Catholics have. It would appear that Protestants have adopted this cast off child of the Catholics—if indeed the Bible be their child.

Even if we should admit the claim made by Catholics that they gave us the Bible, they certainly did not give us our translation of it. On the contrary, they kept the Bible from the masses as long as they could. It was an evil day for their cause when a translation of the scriptures was made in the vernacular tongue.

1. *Catholics tried to suppress all of the early translations of the Bible.* In 1380, John Wycliffe translated the scriptures into the Old English. Since this was before the invention of the printing press, Catholics were able to destroy most of the handwritten copies before the masses had any opportunity to see them. Some years after his death, Wycliffe's body was exhumed and burned, and his ashes sprinkled upon the river, as a reward for his labors.

It was not until after the printing press was invented that William Tyndale, in 1527, made his English translation. Catholics were unable then to rid the land of it because copies were turned out faster than they could be destroyed. In 1536, Tyndale paid for his "crime" of translating the Bible into the language of the people by being strangled and burned.

Later in the same century, the *Coverdale Bible*, *Matthews' Bible*, *The Great Bible*, *The Geneva Bible*, and *The Bishops' Bible* were all given to the people in the vernacular, in spite of all the efforts of the Roman Church to keep the Word of God from them.

Finally, late in the sixteenth century, Roman Catholics made a translation of their own, called the *Rheims-Douay Version*, which was well doctored with copious notes. Even so, very few Catholics ever saw a copy of it for centuries. In fact, only a small per cent have seen a copy even until this day.

2. *Catholics are not encouraged to read the Bible.* The papacy has always apologized for its refusal to give the Bible to the people in the language they could read, on the ground that it is too confusing for the average man to understand. The Supreme Council of the Knights of Columbus puts it this way:

In the Middle Ages the Church made use of pictures as a means of instruction, to supplement the knowledge acquired by reading or oral teaching. For books only existed in manuscript form and, being costly, were beyond the means of most people. Besides, had it been possible for the multitude to come into the possession of books, they could not have read them, since in those rude times, education was the privilege of few. In fact, hardly any one could read, outside the ranks of the clergy and the monks.<sup>1</sup>

This "explanation" fails to explain three facts: (1) It does not explain why the people were kept in ignorance through so many centuries. Before the "Dark Ages" the masses could read for themselves. (2) It does not explain why the masses in Catholic countries are still held in ignorance. (3) It does not explain

---

<sup>1</sup>*The Catholic Encyclopedia*, vol. ii, p. 546.



why Catholics have made so little effort to encourage their people to read even their own version of the Bible. In contrast, the section of the United States that has the fewest Catholics is ironically referred to by them as "the Bible belt." This is a confession that Catholics do not read the Bible. Actually, very few Roman Catholics in this country today even own a copy of the Bible, or ever read it. Yet nearly all of them are expected to read the diocesan Catholic paper, their prayer books, and other Catholic literature.

3. *The Bible is the first on the index of forbidden books.* *The Sacred Canons* has a chapter on "Censorship," and another on the "Prohibition of Books." The first of these deals with the "*Kind of books for which censorship by the local ordinary is prescribed.*" It begins with Canon 1385 and continues through Canon 1394. It is interesting that the first category of censored books is the Bible. It forbids the reading of

The books of Holy Scripture, or their annotations or commentaries. Included in this category are all, even the smallest, portion of Holy Scripture, in any language, even though accompanied by notes. . . .<sup>2</sup>

The chapter on "*The Prohibition of Books*" begins with Canon 1395 and goes through 1405. *Canon 1399* sets forth "The types of forbidden books." Listed under it are twelve different types. Again it is interesting that the very first on this list is that of the Bible, even though it be an early Catholic version. *This Canon* "prohibits"

Editions of the original text of the ancient Catholic versions of Holy Scripture, even those of the Oriental Church, published by any non-Catholic, as well as versions of these in any language when so made or published.<sup>3</sup>

It is oddly strange that we must go all the way down the list to number *nine* before we find the prohibition of books which "teach lascivious or obscene matters." We can hardly think it was a mere coincidence that Roman Catholics listed the scriptures as number *one* on their list of forbidden books.

---

<sup>2</sup>Canon 1385.

<sup>3</sup>Canon 1399.

4. *Bible societies are condemned.* The objective of these societies is the distribution of Bibles and portions thereof, yet all such are "prohibited" by Catholic Canon law.<sup>4</sup> Since the Canons specifically condemn "Bible Societies. . . and the like," they include the Gideons, an organization that merely supplies Bibles without cost to hotels, motels, hospitals and other public institutions. If the Catholic Church is the mother of the Bible, is it not strange that it has had so little use for its own offspring?

5. *The Bible has little place in Catholic education.* Msgr. Thomas J. Quigley, Superintendent of the Diocesan schools of Pittsburgh, said: "I do not believe the (Catholic) doctrine class should be cluttered up with Bible or church history. These belong to the history class."<sup>5</sup>

Emmett McLoughlin who was a Catholic priest for more than fifteen years gives us some interesting facts regarding the place of the Bible in Catholic education. He writes:

Never once, in all the years that I attended a parochial grammar school and high school, can I recall a priest or a nun or a teaching Christian Brother using the Bible itself to prove a point of Catholic doctrine in a religion class or to emphasize a matter of behavior in an exhortation to the student body—or in prayer. The incontrovertible authority was simply, "The Church says so."

Nor, in fact, can I remember the Bible being used in class or our being encouraged to probe it privately during the five junior years in St. Anthony's Seminary in Santa Barbara. When we began our four-year course in theology, eight years after we had entered the seminary (seventeen years after I had begun my Catholic education) we were given a Catholic Bible. We were told that we were expected to read it through once during the next four years. This was to provide a background for our theological course in Exegesis—the interpretation of the Scriptures according to Catholic tradition.

During the last seven years of our studies for the Catholic priesthood, "spiritual reading" was an obligation for us. It was done publicly during our meal? in the monastery refectory and we were expected to do it privately in our cells. The monastery library was filled with the lives of the saints and the treatises of ascetic writers. Neither during all those years of training nor in the fifteen years that I was a Roman Catholic priest was it

---

<sup>4</sup>Canons 1065, 2335.

<sup>5</sup>*American Culture and Catholic Schools*, p. 22.

ever suggested that as "spiritual reading" I might try the Bible.<sup>6</sup>

Never is the Bible quoted as an authority in Catholic education. According to McLoughlin, the final authority is simply, "Rome has spoken, the matter is settled."<sup>7</sup>

According to Neil J. McEleney, C. S. T., a Paulist Priest, the Pontifical Biblical Commission was established by Pope Leo XIII, in 1902.<sup>8</sup> Pope Pius X followed up this Commission with the establishment of the Pontifical Biblical Institute in Rome, in 1909. This is an institution of higher learning devoted to the study of courses that have to do with "Biblical Science," such as Biblical history, archaeology, geography, textual criticism, and the like. A doctor's degree is now offered by this school, but before one can enroll in it he must first have a degree in *Catholic theology*.

Graduates from this Pontifical Institute are now teaching courses in Biblical fields in some other Catholic higher institutions of learning. These are especially designed for priests who want some advanced work in this field. More recently "the number of adult education courses in scripture is increasing," says McEleney. "The Christian family movement has for its 1961-1962 Inquiry Program the study of the Old Testament's relation to the New Testament and the liturgy." Thus, those who have been thoroughly grounded in Catholic education are being allowed more Bible information. But this must be properly filtered to them before they are allowed to partake of it.

We can only hope that in time Catholics will no longer be able to keep their people in ignorance of the Bible. This will become increasingly more difficult as the masses become better educated. You simply cannot give people a well rounded education and still keep them in darkness. As long as Catholics could keep them: people from being educated it was a simple matter to keep the Bible from them. But with the Renaissance in Europe in the

---

<sup>6</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 25.

<sup>7</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 26.

<sup>8</sup>*Eternity* (magazine), June, 1962.

fourteenth, fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, the great Reformation was also born. When people are allowed to read and think for themselves they make their own decisions. When this is done a crippling blow is struck at the very foundation of Roman Catholicism.

## II. Catholic Claims Regarding the Bible

The following are direct quotations—most of them headlines —taken from some of the widely-circulated newspaper and magazine advertisements sponsored by the Supreme Council of the Knights of Columbus:

*The Bible Is a Confusing Book.*

*The Bible Is a Catholic Book.*

*The Bible Alone Is Not Enough.*

*The Catholic Church is, first of all, the mother of the Bible.*

*The Bible Is Not Our Sole Guide.*

*The Bible An Authority Only In Catholic Hands.*

*Nowhere in the Bible text will you find a list of the 73 inspired books of which it is composed. This was given to the world by the Catholic Church almost three full centuries after the crucifixion of Jesus.*

In view of these bold assertions we should like to pose a few questions.

1. *If "the Bible is a Catholic book," then why is it "a confusing book"?* Why did Catholics give us a book which serves only to "confuse"? Why should it have been necessary for some particular person to interpret the Bible for all the rest of us? Why did the Catholic Church not give us a book that all could understand? And why did Paul write to Timothy "that from a babe thou hast known the sacred writings which are able to make thee wise unto salvation"<sup>9</sup> when he knew that, without Catholic tradition and Catholic interpretation the scriptures could do no such thing?

2. *If "the Bible is a Catholic book," yet "not enough," then why did the Catholics not give us "enough" when they gave it to*

---

<sup>9</sup>2 Tim. 3:15.

us? Why did they decide to wait and give us just a little at a time over many centuries? If, during the first two centuries of the Christian era, the Bible was enough for the early disciples, then why is it not enough now? If those of the first century could understand it sufficiently to be saved then—without any knowledge of an "infallible" interpreter—why can people not do so now?

3. *If Roman Catholics decided early on "the 73 inspired books of the Bible," why did they wait 1500 years before "officially" approving them?* It was at the fourth session of the Council of Trent (1545-1563) that they "officially" catalogued the books they thought should be included in the Bible.<sup>10</sup>

The last book in the Bible was finished nearly 1500 years before the Council of Trent was held. A translation of the Old Testament from the Hebrew into the Greek—called the Septuagint Version—was completed not later than 150 B. C. The New Testament books were all written between 50 and 100 A. D., centuries before the Roman Catholic Church came into being. If the Roman Catholic Church is "the mother of the Bible," then the offspring is older than its mother.

4. *If "the Bible is a Catholic book," then why does it nowhere mention the Catholic Church?* Why is there no mention of a pope, a cardinal, an archbishop, a parish priest, a nun, or a member of any other Catholic order? How can the Bible be a "Catholic" book when it does not even use the language that the Roman Catholic Church uses?

5. *If "the Bible is a Catholic book," why are Catholics forbidden to read any but a Catholic "authorized" translation?* Why should they not be permitted to read any translation of a volume which belongs to them? Why must they be limited to a translation which has been well doctored with copious notes and expla-

---

<sup>10</sup>*Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent*, pp. 17, 18.

nations? Is the papacy afraid for Catholics to read this inspired "Catholic book"? Could it be that the hierarchy is afraid that the people might learn some facts that they should not?

6. If "*the Bible is a Catholic book*," why has the papacy been so afraid of it? To James V. of Scotland, Johann Cochlaeus—a notorious Roman Cathologian—wrote:

The New Testament translated into the vulgar tongue, is in truth the food of death, the fuel of sin, the veil of malice, the pretext of false liberty, the protection of disobedience, the corruption of discipline, the depravity of morals, the termination of concord, the death of honesty, the well-spring of vice, the disease of virtues, the instigation of rebellion, the milk of pride, the nourishment of contempt, the death of peace, the destruction of charity, the enemy of unity, the murderer of truth.<sup>11</sup>

Concerning the efforts of the Romanists to darken Counsel and blind the people to the Word of God, William Tyndale said,

A thousand books had they lever [rather] to be put forth against their abominable doings and doctrines, than that the Scripture should come to light. For as long as they may keep that down, they will so darken the right way with the mist of their sophistry, and so tangle them that either rebuke or despite their abominations with arguments of philosophy, and with worldly and apparent reasons of natural wisdom, and with wresting the Scriptures to their own purpose, clean contrary unto the process, order, and meaning of the text; and so delude them in descanting upon it with allegories, and amaze them, expounding it in many senses, whose light the owls can not hide, that though thou feel in thy heart, and art sure, how that all is false that they say, yet couldst thou not solve their subtle riddles.<sup>12</sup>

The Bible was publicly burned in New York as late as 1842. There is scarcely an age or a land in which Catholics have not burned it at one tune or another. It was burned in Spain in 1956.

Spanish authorities seized Bibles at the Madrid offices of the British and Foreign Bible Society. Some 30, 000 Bibles and devotional books were taken and the doors of the printing plant sealed shut by police. In keeping with this action, a leading Spanish Catholic Action spokesman declared that the "Protestant danger" in Spain is "greater than ever."<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup>*The Church, The Falling Away, and The Restoration*, pp. 82, 83.

<sup>12</sup>*Op. Cit.*

<sup>13</sup>*The American Review of Eastern Orthodoxy*, May, 1956.

### III. The Catholic Interpretation of the Bible

Although Roman Catholics claim to have given us the Bible they completely ignore what the Bible says in some instances. In others they even reverse it.

1. *Catholics have omitted one of the original Ten Commandments.* They claim to believe in these as the fundamental basis of all moral theology, yet they have deleted the second completely. All Catholic catechisms—beginning with the first grade and going on to adulthood—are based upon the *Catechism of the Council of Trent*, which makes no mention whatever of the second commandment in the Decalogue. In the *Confraternity-Douay Version*, this commandment reads:

You shall not carve idols for yourselves in the shape of anything in the sky above or on the earth below or in the waters beneath the earth; you shall not bow down before them or worship them. For I, the Lord, your God, am a jealous God, inflicting punishment for then: father's wickedness on the children of those who hate me, down to the third and fourth generation.<sup>14</sup>

Millions of the Catholic laity are unaware that this commandment has been omitted, because they have never examined a copy of the Bible—not even one of their own translations. Very few of those who do have a copy of their approved version ever read it, because they are not encouraged by their priests to do so.

One would think that the Romanists would at least be consistent. If they are going to take the Ten Commandments as a basis of their moral theology, they should not leave their people in the dark about the changes they have made. But they have good reason for deleting the second commandment, which forbids the making of an image of "anything in the sky [heaven] above or on the earth below or in the waters beneath," or "to bow down before them or worship them."

According to the Roman Catholic catechism the *second* commandment reads, "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy

---

<sup>14</sup>Ex. 20:4, 5.

God in vain." In both the Catholic and Protestant versions this is the *third* commandment in the Decalogue. The *ninth* in the Catholic catechism reads, "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbors wife." The tenth says, "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbors goods." Thus, in order to complete the Ten, Catholics have divided the tenth so as to make two of it.

The eighth commandment in the Decalogue, according to the Catholic version, says, "You shall not bear false witness against your neighbor." The Catholic catechism says this commandment forbids "the telling of secrets we are bound to keep." Actually, it suggests no such idea whatever. But it is so misconstrued to allow Catholics to take an oath "with mental reservation"—if the occasion warrants it. They can solemnly swear in court "to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth," and still withhold whatever facts they deem necessary. To use the eighth commandment in the Decalogue to justify such practice is dishonest.

2. *In the New Testament the Lord plainly says, ". . . call no man your father on the earth."*<sup>15</sup> It is evident that Jesus here used the term "father" in a spiritual sense, because elsewhere the New Testament recognizes *fleshly* fathers.<sup>16</sup> But, since some of the aged apostles referred to some of their converts as "children" (meaning no more, perhaps, than "little" or "young" ones in Christ), Catholics attempt to explain away the language of our Lord so as to justify their anti-scriptural practice of addressing *all priests*, regardless of their age or spiritual relationship, as "Father." In so doing they not only set their priests apart and above all the people, but they make the language of Christ meaningless.

3. *The apostle Paul said, "The bishop therefore must be . . . the husband of one wife."*<sup>17</sup> In an effort to weaken the force of this scripture the *Confraternity-Douay Version* renders it "mar-

---

<sup>15</sup>Matt. 23:9.

<sup>16</sup>Eph. 6:4; Col. 3:21; Heb. 12:9.

<sup>17</sup>1 Tim. 3:2.



ried but once." This is a "watered down" translation intended to make it more palatable. The word for "marry" in the original is *gameo*. But Paul here used the term *gunaikos*, meaning "woman" or "wife." The clause reads, "*mias gunaikos andra*," literally translated, "man of one woman," meaning (as it evidently does here) "husband of one wife." The papacy has gone completely contrary to this scripture, decreeing that a bishop *must not be married at all*. Although many bishops (and popes) have become fathers of illegitimate children, they must not marry. Thus concubinage for bishops is preferable to marriage.

4. *Roman Catholics forbid marriage and "enjoin the abstinence of foods."* Paul says, "But the Spirit saith expressly, that in later times some shall fall away from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of demons, through the hypocrisy of men, that speak lies, branded in their own conscience as with a hot iron; forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats, which God created to be received with thanksgiving by them that believe and know the truth."<sup>18</sup> The efforts of the Romanists to explain their practice in the light of such clear statements are both unscriptural and unreasonable. There is absolutely no way to reconcile their teaching with the Bible, which they claim to have given to us.

Is it any wonder then that Catholics have burned the Bible in nearly every country in the world? Or, is it any wonder that millions of their people live and die without ever seeing a copy of the Bible? And, is it any wonder that they put their traditions above the Bible?

---

<sup>18</sup>1 Tim. 4:1-3.

## CHAPTER III

### Tradition and the Scriptures

The papal system appeals to two general sources of authority, as interpreted by Catholic theologians and approved by the Roman Pontiff—*as the times and occasions warrant*. In the final analysis Catholicism rests upon its own declarations and assumptions, which have no more basis than the unsupported claims of Ellen G. White, Joseph Smith, or Emanuel Swedenborg.

#### I. The Roman Catholic Position

The hierarchy reasons that the Bible is but a collection of writings which the Catholic Church—by its own authority—decided should be placed in the canon of scriptures. As per this contention, the reliability of both the sacred scriptures and Catholic tradition rest upon the same basis—*the unsupported assertions of the Roman Catholic Church*. When it is all summed up, Catholics reason: "We have the particular books which are now contained in the Bible solely because we (Catholics) approved of them. But they have no more value and no more authority than do the works of the 'Church Fathers.'"

One Catholic querist recently posed: "I would like to know where the Bible says anything about Confession?"

Msgr. J. D. Conway answered,

First of all, I think you know that we Catholics do not base all our doctrines on the Scriptures alone. We revere the Sacred Writings as the inspired word of God—given us for our inspiration and instruction, and as the principal source of God's revelation to man. But we do not consider them the exclusive source of the things God wants us to know. We believe that Jesus Christ established his Church to be our teacher; to preserve the Bible, to tell us which writings rightly belong in the Bible, and to interpret its true meaning to us.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>*The Catholic Digest*, April, 1961; pp. 119, 120.

The Protestant view *versus* the Roman Catholic view is clearly and fairly set forth by the Supreme Council of the Knights of Columbus:

The Protestant principle is: The Bible and nothing but the Bible; the Bible, according to them, is the sole theological source; there are no revealed truths save the truths contained in the Bible; according to them the Bible is the sole rule of faith: by it and by it alone should all dogmatic questions be solved; it is the only binding authority. Catholics, on the other hand, hold that there may be, that there is in fact, and that there must of necessity be certain revealed truths apart from those contained in the Bible; they hold furthermore that Jesus Christ has established in fact, and that to adapt the means to the end He should have established, a living organ as much to transmit Scripture and written Revelation as to place revealed truth within reach of everyone always and everywhere. Such are in this respect the two main points of controversy between Catholics and so-called orthodox Protestants."<sup>2</sup>

Those of us who believe the Bible to be divinely inspired— and, therefore, inerrant—regard all other books as of human origin and, hence, susceptible to error, since they rest on no greater support than that of human wisdom. It is impossible for us to comprehend the Catholic concept of authority until we first understand the basis from which they reason. Catholics start with the unsupported premise that the Roman Catholic Church was established *for the purpose of teaching and preserving all the truth*.

Their reasoning is summed up by Pelican A. Foy, O. F. M., and his associates, thus:

The Catholic Church was commissioned by Christ to teach the whole of divine revelation to all men of all times. . . .

Throughout its history the [Catholic] Church has been conscious of its mission to teach and to preserve in its entirety the divine truth, or deposit of faith, contained in the books of the Old and New Testaments and in the Tradition communicated to the Apostles by Christ. The Church has also been conscious of its exclusive and infallible authority, received from Christ and guaranteed by the presence and operation of the Holy Spirit, to teach and interpret all the truths of divine revelation. . . .

All the implications of the revelation contained in Scripture and Tradition were not simply and explicitly set forth in the very beginning of the Christian era. *The Church became conscious of many of these things*

---

<sup>2</sup>*The Catholic Encyclopedia*, vol. xv, p. 6.

*gradually and progressively* [Emphasis added] and, as this consciousness deepened, the details of divine truth were studied in the light of the whole of divine revelation and then were set forth as articles of faith. In the course of this development of dogma. . . differences of teaching arose between the infallible Church and individuals and groups of persons. When these differences occurred, as they did in connection with virtually all of the principal dogmas of the faith, the Church, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, declared the true meaning of the matters at issue. . .<sup>3</sup>

All of the above we are expected to accept on the mere assertions of Roman Catholic theologians. *Beginning with these assumptions*, Catholics have fabricated their colossal superstructure which casts its shadow over the entire world.

The basic differences between Catholics and Protestants have created an impassable gulf between these two bodies. As long as we cannot agree on what constitutes the final source of authority in religion there is no hope that any ecumenical council, or any other kind of a council, can ever bring us together.

In defining "Authority of Tradition" [they always spell Tradition with a capital T] the Romanist say:

It is an article of faith from a decree of the Vatican Council that Tradition is a source of theological teaching distinct from Scripture, and that it is infallible. It is therefore to be received with the same internal assent as Scripture, for it is the word of God. Whereas much of the teaching of Scripture could not be determined without Tradition, *Tradition would suffice without Scripture*; it is the safeguard of Scripture.<sup>4</sup> [Emphasis supplied.]

In an effort to justify their reasoning, Catholics try to support their traditions by the scriptures, which *they say* are "confusing"; at the same time they try to support the scriptures by their traditions, which are much more confusing. This is like trying to prove the veracity of two witnesses in court by the testimony of each other. If we accept the scriptures as authoritative, then we must reject the authority of all human traditions, because they have no support whatever in the scriptures, and but very little in reliable history.

---

<sup>3</sup>1963 *National Catholic Almanac*, p. 265.

<sup>4</sup>A *Catholic Dictionary*, pp. 41, 42.

## II. What About the Unanimous Consent of the Fathers?

Unable to find any defensible support in the scriptures for their traditions, Catholic apologists tell us their traditions rest upon "the unanimous teaching of the Fathers," whether written or oral. The Council of Trent was very bold to decree:

Furthermore, to check unbridled spirits, it decrees that no one relying on his own judgment shall, in matters of faith and morals pertaining to the edification of Christian doctrine, distorting the Holy Scriptures in accordance with his own conceptions, presume to interpret them contrary to that sense which holy mother Church, to whom it belongs to judge of their true sense and interpretation, has held and holds, or even contrary to the *unanimous teaching of the Fathers*, even though such interpretations should never at any time be published. Those who act contrary to this shall be made known by the ordinaries and punished in accordance with the penalties prescribed by the law.<sup>5</sup>

Alexander Campbell so thoroughly demolished the myth concerning "the unanimous teaching of the Fathers" we are here taking the liberty of citing several quotations taken from his trenchant pen, to which we are adding our own emphasis.

*The unanimous consent of the Fathers* is as perfect a non-entity as "the philosopher's stone," or "the elixir of immortal youth". . . . If there be any consent at all among the Fathers, it is in recommending. . . to all, the necessity, utility, and importance of reading the sacred Scriptures, as the true and only faithful source of faith and morals.<sup>6</sup>

Campbell then quoted a number of statements from the so-called Church Fathers, most of whom the Catholic Church has canonized, and all of whom are held by them in high esteem. These all agree on one point: *the scriptures constitute our one and only guide in matters of religion*. Let us note some of these quotations.<sup>7</sup>

*Clement*, to the Corinthians (93 A. D.): —Brethren, look into the Holy Scriptures, which are the true words of the Holy Ghost. You know that *there is nothing unjust or counterfeit in them*. . . .

*Polycarp*, to the Philippians (116 or 117 A. D.): —The blessed and

---

<sup>5</sup>Decree Concerning the Canonical Scriptures, Fourth Session, April, 1546.

<sup>6</sup>*The Millennial Harbinger*, vol. viii, pp. 19, 20.

<sup>7</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 20-22.

renowned Paul—did, with all exactness and soundness, teach the word of truth: and being gone from you did write an epistle to you, into which, if you look, *you will be able to edify yourselves in the faith that has been delivered to you.* . . . I trust that *you are well exercised in the Holy Scriptures*, and that nothing is hid from you.

*Tertullian* (about 200 A. D.): —Let this man's school show that it is in the Scriptures: *if it is not in the Scriptures*, let him fear the curse against those who add to or diminish.

*Basil*, a Greek (born 326 A. D.): —The hearers that are instructed in the Scriptures must examine the doctrines of their teachers; *they must receive those things which are agreeable to Scripture, and reject what are contrary to it.*

*Cyril*, Bishop of Jerusalem (315-386 A. D.): —It behooveth us not to deliver the very least thing of the holy mysteries of faith without the Holy Scriptures: that is the sincerity of our faith, not that which is from our own inventions, but from demonstrations of the Holy Scripture.

*Chrysostom*, a Greek (345-497 A. D.): —I. . . will never cease to exhort you, that you will not only attend to the things spoken to you here; but when you are at home, you continually busy yourselves in reading the Holy Scriptures; which practice also I have not ceased to drive into them which privily come to me. . . . The canon ceases to be the canon if anything is added to or taken away from it.

*Jerome* (born 340 A. D.): —But the word of God smiteth the other things, which they spontaneously discover, and *feign as it were, by an apostolical authority, without the authority and testimony of Scripture.* . . . As the Apostles wrote, so also the Lord hath spoken—that is, by the gospels; not in order that a few, but that all may understand.

*Athanasius* (about 340 A. D.): —If ye are the disciples of the gospel, speak not unrighteously against God; but walk in the things that are written. But if you will speak anything besides that which is written, why do you contend against us, who are determined neither to hear nor to speak anything but that which is written? The Lord himself says, If ye continue in my word, ye are truly free!. . . *For the holy and divinely inspired Scriptures are of themselves sufficient for the discovery of truth.*

*Augustine* (354-430 A. D.): —I will not have the holy church proved by human documents, but by Divine oracles. . . .

Read these things to us from the Law, the Prophets, the Psalms, the Gospels, apostolical writings; read, and we will believe. . . .

*It is the will of Christ that his disciples should be confirmed by the testimony of the Law and Prophets.* These are the rules of our cause: these are the foundations: these are the confirmations.

The above quotations from the "Fathers" plainly contradict the decree of the Council of Trent. They agree only on the absolute necessity of adhering to the writings of the sacred scriptures.

And they also contradict the Bull of Leo X, signed April 30, 1519, which reads, "You will firmly abide by the true decisions of the Holy Roman Church and to this Holy See, *which does not permit errors.*"<sup>8</sup> This Bull has never been revoked; neither has the decree of the Council of Trent.

### III. The Scriptures Versus Tradition

The term "tradition" [Gr. *paradosis*] is found thirteen times in the Greek New Testament, but only three times does it carry a favorable connotation. In all of the other passages it incurs the disfavor of Christ or an apostle.

In the three passages where the term is used in a favorable sense it is plainly evident that the writer was talking about something which he personally had taught. Let us look at these scriptures.

1. Now I praise you that ye remember me in all things, and hold fast the traditions [ordinances. A. V.], *even as I delivered them to you.*<sup>9</sup>

2. So then, brethren, stand fast, and hold the traditions which ye were taught, *whether by word, or by epistle of ours.*<sup>10</sup>

3. Now we command you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly, and not after the tradition *which they received of us.*<sup>11</sup>

These are the only scriptures Roman Catholics have ever used, or ever can use, to support their views regarding tradition. But even a casual reading of these passages clearly shows that they convey no such meaning as the Romanists would have us believe. The Greek word *paradosis*, which is translated "tradition" in the New Testament, signifies "what is delivered, the substance of the teaching: so of Paul's teaching, 2 Thes. 3:6; in plur. of the particular injunctions of Paul's instruction, 1 Cor. 11:2; 2 Thess. 2:15."<sup>12</sup> Concerning the same three passages, another authority says, ". . . in N. T., what is transmitted in the way of

---

<sup>8</sup>*The Sources of Catholic Dogma*, p. 240.

<sup>9</sup>1 Cor. 11:2.

<sup>10</sup>2 Thes. 2:15.

<sup>11</sup>2 Thess. 3:6.

<sup>12</sup>*A Greek English Lexicon of the New Testament*, p. 481.

teaching, precept, doctrine."<sup>13</sup> In none of these passages was Paul talking about some custom that had been handed down from one generation to another. In each instance the tradition was something which he himself had taught, and which *had been revealed to him by the Holy Spirit*.

There was a time when Paul was very strict in following the traditions of the fathers, so much so that he could say, "I advanced in the Jews' religion beyond many of mine own age among my countrymen, being more exceedingly zealous for the traditions of my fathers."<sup>14</sup> But when Paul learned the truth of God he renounced these traditions and turned to the Lord Jesus Christ. Thus, he declared, "For I make known to you, brethren, as touching the gospel which was preached by me, that it is not after man. For neither did I receive it from man, nor was I taught it, but it came to me through revelation of Jesus Christ."<sup>15</sup>

After his conversion Paul was vehement in his denunciation of those who relied upon tradition rather than upon the Word of God. To the Galatians, some of whom were being turned away from the gospel to the doctrines and commandments of men, Paul wrote, "Ye observe days, and months, and seasons, and years. I am afraid of you, lest by any means I have bestowed labor upon you in vain."<sup>16</sup> If Paul reprimanded some of the Galatians for observing special days and seasons because of their traditions, he would have much greater reason for reproving Roman Catholics today who have foisted upon the religious world more days, seasons, and special events than Judaism ever did. If some of the Galatians had departed so far from the truth of God in such a short time, holding to their traditions, how far a field must the Roman Catholics have gone in the nearly fifteen hundred years of their existence, relying as they do on their traditions!

---

<sup>13</sup>*Greek and English Lexicon to the New Testament*, p. 137.

<sup>14</sup>Gal. 1:14.

<sup>15</sup>Gal. 1:11, 12.

<sup>16</sup>Gal. 4:10, 11.



Jesus denounced the Pharisees in vitriolic terms because they turned aside from the Word of God to their traditions. When they saw Christ's disciples eating without diligently washing their hands, they asked, "Why do thy disciples transgress the tradition of the elders? For they wash not their hands when they eat bread." Jesus replied, "Why do ye also transgress the commandment of God because of your tradition?" In stinging terms he then accused them of making void the Word of God by their tradition, adding,

*Ye hypocrites, well did Isaiah prophesy of you, saying,*

*This people honoreth me with their lips;*

*But their heart is far from me.*

*But in vain do they worship me,*

*Teaching as their doctrines the precepts of men.*<sup>17</sup>

If it was vain (sinful) to teach "the doctrines and precepts of men" during Christ's time upon the earth, is it any less so now?

#### **IV. The Catholic Right of Interpretation**

Roman Catholics assume (1) that the church founded by Christ in the very beginning was the Catholic Church and (2) that it gave to us the Bible. Hence, the Bible means whatever the Catholic Church says it means. This conclusion is postulated on the ground that the Pope is the successor of Peter, and that the Bishops are the successors of the other apostles. Hence, the Pope (as head of the church) has the right to declare the true meaning of any scripture. Since November 21, 1964, the College of the Bishops share this right with the Roman Pontiff in theory, but not in fact.

The Romanists merely suppose that the rest of us have accepted their canon of the Bible upon their own assertions. But they are hard put to explain why we have rejected the apocryphal books which they retain in their Bible. The truth is that all of

---

<sup>17</sup>Matt. 15:1-9; cf. Mark 7:1-13.

the canonical books were recognized long before any general councils were ever held—yea, even before there was any Roman Catholic Church. Moreover, the apocryphal books contain nothing new as far as any Christian doctrine is concerned. If we were to accept them all, there is nothing in any of them to alter or change our practice in any way.

Sometimes the Romanists resort to a passage in one of the apocryphal books to substantiate their doctrine of purgatory.<sup>18</sup> But the "proof" text in this passage cannot be sufficiently distorted as to sustain their dogma. And even if it were possible to substantiate this doctrine by any one of the apocryphal books, then we would have to reject it in its entirety because of its contradiction of other plain scriptures which make it quite evident there are only two places for the spirits to go after death—the place of eternal rest and the place of eternal punishment.

The fact that the New Testament writers make only two or three casual references to the apocryphal books—while quoting freely (and approvingly) from the other books of the Old Testament—makes it evident that they did not recognize the apocryphal books as being inspired. The further fact that most of the apocryphal books are wanting in the earliest catalog of the inspired writings is added evidence of their failure to measure up to the canon which was universally accepted centuries before there was any pope, any Roman Catholic Church, or any general councils.

It is an historic fact that in the latter part of the first century all of the churches had copies of the inspired writings which make up the New Testament scriptures. They were familiar with all of these writings, and made it a practice to read from them at all of their assemblies for worship. Even the infidel writers of the first and second centuries were well acquainted with the books of the Bible.

---

<sup>18</sup>2 Mac. 12:43.

A number of early lists of the Old and New Testament scriptures still exist.<sup>19</sup> (1) At the Council of Carthage, which met in 397 A. D., a catalog was made of all of the sacred scriptures, including all of the Old and New Testament books. (2) As early as the middle of the fourth century, Athanasius, who made a catalog of the inspired writing, declared that these books were "delivered to the fathers" by those who were "eyewitness and ministers of the Word." He then appended this solemn warning: "Let no one add to them or take anything from them." (3) Cyril, a bishop in the Jerusalem church, in a letter to a friend, listed the books which were read and accepted as inspired of God. He then added, "The apostles and ancient Bishops, governors of the church, who delivered these to us, were wiser and holier than thou." (4) Eusebuis made mention of all the books contained in the New Testament. Among his voluminous writings, was a commentary on nearly all the New Testament scriptures. (5) Clement of Alexandria (165 to 220 A. D.) was likewise a prolific writer. Of him Eusebuis declared that he gave "concise explanation of all the canonical scriptures, not omitting the disputed books" [i.e., 2 Peter and Revelation]. In his existing writings there are names and quotations from all but three or four of the shortest of the epistles. (6) Tertullian, though not naming the books in order, quoted freely from them. (7) In 1740, in an old library in Milan, an Italian scholar, named Muratori, found an old manuscript containing a catalog of the books of the New Testament, which dates back to the first hah<sup>0</sup> of the second century.

Aside from the catalogs and the quotations from the various books of the Bible, there are at least three versions still *in* existence—two Coptic and one Syriac—which contain virtually all of the books of both the Old and New Testament writing as we now have them. These versions date back to about 150 A. D. —centuries before the world ever heard of a pope or of the Roman Catholic Church, or any ecumenical council.

---

<sup>19</sup>*Evidences of Christianity*, Part II, pp. 59-76.

### V. How the Church Was to be Protected from Error

Roman Catholics would have us believe that since the church existed for "centuries" without any Bible (until they decided upon the canon), there is really no need for it. In so many words, they affirm that "Tradition would suffice without Scripture." Thus, they argue that the church can only be protected from error by the scriptures, *plus their traditions, as interpreted by their theologians and defined by the Pope and the councils.* This position we must reject, and for good reasons.

At the end of the apostolic age God's complete revelation to man was finished and was clearly and fully recorded for the edification and protection of his people. During apostolic times, however, there were certain men who were endowed with miraculous gifts which were imparted to them by the Holy Spirit, through the laying on of the apostles' hands. Some of these were appointed to teach God's Word and to protect the believers from the deceptive errors of false teachers. These miraculously endowed teachers were "for the perfecting of the saints, unto the work of ministering, unto the building up of the body of Christ: *till* we all attain unto the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a fullgrown man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ."<sup>20</sup> The apostle Paul enumerates nine different miraculous gifts of the Holy Spirit which were possessed by the different members of the church at Corinth.<sup>21</sup> He hastens then to tell us that these special gifts were to cease when the church passed from its state of infancy to manhood.<sup>22</sup> James speaks of the "perfect law of liberty"<sup>23</sup> by which God's people were to be governed after the church was firmly established. Henceforth, it was to be protected and governed by the inspired

---

<sup>20</sup>Eph. 4:12, 13.

<sup>21</sup>1 Cor. 12:8-11.

<sup>22</sup>1 Cor. 13:8-11.

<sup>23</sup>Jas. 1:25.

Word of God—which was given by the Holy Spirit through the apostles. We do not today, therefore, look to any church to tell us what the Bible means, but we read the Bible to learn what the church should be and what it should teach.

Roman Catholics hold that the Pope and his representatives are all guided (though not inspired) by the Holy Spirit in their decisions today.<sup>24</sup> If this be true, it would seem that they should be able to present some evidence of their claim. In apostolic times various and sundry miracles were preformed by the specially endowed teachers of God's revelation. The apostle Peter pronounced the death sentence upon Ananias and Sapphira, which was immediately executed by the Holy Spirit;<sup>25</sup> on another occasion he restored the dead to life.<sup>26</sup> The apostle Paul invoked a curse of blindness on Elymas.<sup>27</sup> He also restored life to the dead.<sup>28</sup> These were genuine miracles, wrought by the Holy Spirit through the apostles. Unlike the supposed miracles, wrought by some "saint" who has been dead for centuries, it was not necessary to wait hundreds of years before deciding that some miracle had been performed by or through them.

Any man who claims to forgive sins or to make known God's will today ought, like Jesus, to present the proof of such claims. Our Lord declared, "But that ye may know that the Son of man hath authority on earth to forgive sins (he saith unto the sick of the palsy), I say unto thee, Arise, take up thy bed, and go unto thy house. And he arose, and straightway took up the bed, and went forth before them all; insomuch that they were all amazed, and glorified God, saying, We never say it on this fashion."<sup>29</sup> If the popes have always been infallibly guided by the Holy Spirit in their decisions, why has the Roman Catholic Church

---

<sup>24</sup>*The Catholic Encyclopedia*, vol. vii, p. 790; *1963 National Catholic Almanac*, p. 265.

<sup>25</sup>Acts 5:1-11.

<sup>26</sup>Acts 9:36-43.

<sup>27</sup>Acts 13:8-12.

<sup>28</sup>Acts 20:9, 10.

<sup>29</sup>Mark 2:10-12.

sometimes had two, and even three, rival popes at the same time? Should not a "successor" of the apostle Peter have been able to expose the pretenders by some miraculous power?

## VI. The All-Sufficiency of the New Testament Writings

The night before his death Jesus said to his apostles, "Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he shall guide you into *all the truth*: for he shall not speak from himself; but what things soever he shall hear, these shall he speak: and he shall declare unto you the things that are to come."<sup>30</sup> Thus, the Holy Spirit was to guide the apostles into "all the truth." Peter affirmed "that his divine power hath granted unto us all things that pertain unto life and godliness."<sup>31</sup> Writing to the evangelist Timothy, Paul asserted, "Every scripture inspired of God is also profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction which is in righteousness: that the man of God may be complete, furnished completely unto every good work."<sup>32</sup> He makes no allowance whatever for anything more, such as the immaculate conception of Mary, her perpetual virginity or her bodily assumption into heaven. To argue that "the Bible is not enough"—that we need *more* than the sacred scriptures to guide us in matters of religion—is to render the Word of God void and meaningless.

Jude, a brother of James and a half-brother of our Lord, according to the flesh, aptly wrote: "Beloved, while I was giving all diligence to write unto you of our common salvation, I was constrained to write unto you exhorting you to contend earnestly for the faith which was once for all delivered unto the saints."<sup>33</sup> "The faith" signifies the gospel system. This clearly implies that the

---

<sup>30</sup>John 16:13.

<sup>31</sup>2 Pet. 1:3.

<sup>32</sup>Tim. 3:16, 17.

<sup>33</sup>Jude 3.

gospel would never be revealed again, nor would it be altered or augmented in any way.

After the other apostles had all gone to their reward, the beloved John was careful thus to warn all Christians against any who came to them with a new doctrine: "Whosoever goeth onward and abideth not in the teaching of Christ, hath not God: he that abideth in the teaching, the same hath both the Father and the Son. If any one cometh unto you, and bringeth not this teaching, receive him not into your house, and give him no greeting: for he that giveth him greeting partaketh in his evil works."<sup>34</sup> Any supposed revelation which men have ever claimed to receive at any time since the New Testament was completed is contrary to the Word of God. Just before closing his earthly career the beloved John sounded this final warning against any who might add to or take from God's revealed Word: "I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall add unto them, God shall add unto him the plagues which are written in this book: and if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part from the tree of life, and out of the holy city, which are written in this book."<sup>35</sup>

To the Galatians the apostle Paul wrote, "But though we, or an angel from heaven, should preach unto you any gospel other than that which we preached unto you, let him be anathema. As we have said before, so say I now again, If any man preacheth unto you any gospel other than that which ye received, let him be anathema."<sup>36</sup> Thus, Paul warned in the strongest possible language against *any* alteration in the gospel which he preached. There can be no further revelation from God, because any such would have to be the same gospel as that preached by the apostles and the inspired evangelists in New Testament times, otherwise, it would

---

<sup>34</sup>John 9-11.

<sup>35</sup>Rev. 22:18, 19.

<sup>36</sup>Gal. 1:8, 9.

be false. The gospel which was revealed by the Holy Spirit, and penned by the apostles and evangelists of our Lord, does not admit of any additional revelation or amendment. Truly, it can never be altered, nor will it ever be revealed again.

The scriptures leave no room whatsoever for uninspired traditions or other sources of authority except that set forth by divine inspiration. Any claim made for any additional revelation is diametrically opposed to the Word of God, by which all men shall be judged in the final day of reckoning.<sup>37</sup>

## VII. Deductions and Conclusion

When the Romanists assume that tradition is of equal authority with the sacred scriptures they are forced to concede all of the following:

1. That the uninspired writings of the so-called "Church Fathers" are as authoritative as the writings of the inspired apostles;

2. That the traditions of the so-called "Church Fathers" of the second, third, fourth, and even later centuries, set forth the will of God as accurately and carefully as do the sacred writings of the inspired apostles;

3. That the uninspired teachings of the so-called "Church Fathers" have been as carefully preserved and as accurately transmitted to us as the sacred writings, which "liveth and abideth for ever";

4. That the Roman Catholic Church, through all the ages, has not only been able to say what books belong in the Bible, but also what traditions were reliable and what traditions were not;

5. That what the Bible has to say about tradition must not be understood in the language in which it is clearly stated;

6. That the Roman Catholic Church, which claims to rest upon both the sacred scriptures and early tradition, is actually

---

<sup>37</sup>John 12:48.



*above both* in authority; and that *it* determines not only what scriptures and what traditions are to be accepted, but also what explanation and interpretation shall be given to any statement found in either;

7. And, finally, that the authority of both scripture and tradition rests upon the authority of the Roman Catholic Church— thus the Roman Catholic Church does not and can not rest upon either scripture or tradition, because the validity of both depend upon the Catholic Church itself.

## CHAPTER IV

### Catholicism Is Unorthodox

The word "orthodox" quite frequently is used to signify the most generally accepted doctrine of the time. This, however, is not its etymological meaning. Originally, it came from two Greek words, *orthos*, meaning "straight," or "correct," and "*doxa*," meaning "opinion" or "to think." Orthodoxy, then, means a *correct opinion*, or *straight thinking*. Hence, when we say Catholicism is unorthodox, we mean that it is incorrect, it is not true, or it is unsound in its teachings, or doctrines. The fact that the earliest councils were composed primarily of Greeks is *prima facie* evidence that the *Roman Church* is of later origin. The further fact that the Greek Church has always been called the *Orthodox Church* clearly implies that the Roman Church is regarded as *unorthodox*.

It would be an endless task to examine minutely all of Rome's errors. Even if such a stupendous work *should* be carried out, it would be of little value. Furthermore, just *when* each of Rome's erroneous doctrines came into existence is of no particular consequence. Hence, no attempt is here made to arrange these departures from the truth in chronological order.

#### I. The Doctrine Concerning Birth Control

Catholics forbid the use of artificial contraceptives of every kind to married couples who may wish to space their children, or limit the number born to them. Pope Pius XI decreed:

Any use of the marriage act, in the exercise of which it is designedly deprived of its natural power of procreating life, infringes on the law of God and of nature, and those who have committed any such act are stained with the guilt of serious sin.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>"*Casti Connubii*" (The Abuse of Marriage), Dec. 31, 1930.

To this Pope Pius XII added,

Our predecessor, Pius XI. . . brands the use of contraceptives as a violation of natural law. An act to which nature has given the power to create new life is deprived of it by human will.<sup>2</sup>

Wherever it is possible for them to do so, Roman Catholics bind their dogma of birth control not only upon their own people, but upon non-Catholics as well. A good example of this was found in New York City until a few years ago. Physicians and nurses were forbidden to give information on birth control in *any* of the city hospitals, regardless of the requests for such information. In 1958, however, the city commissioners voted to permit doctors to dispense such information in the city hospitals upon request from patients desiring it. Immediately Cardinal Spellman called upon all Catholic employees to go on strike if such information was given in any Catholic hospital.

If a pregnant mother is taken violently ill and it is recommended that a therapeutic abortion be performed in order to save her life, such an operation cannot be performed in any Catholic hospital in the land. Both the mother and the unborn child must die, even though the doctors may recommend such an operation to save the life of the mother. Thus Roman Catholic canon law takes precedence over the laws of the various states in this respect. Emmett McLoughlin—who has been head of a hospital in Phoenix for many years—says that many mothers die unnecessarily in Catholic hospitals every year as a result of this law of Rome.<sup>3</sup> This doctrine is not only unorthodox, it is un-American; it is wicked.

## II. The Doctrine Concerning "Fetus Baptism"

One who "thinks straight" can hardly conceive of the Roman Catholic doctrine with regard to the baptizing of a fetus, which is thus explained:

---

<sup>2</sup>1959 *National Catholic Almanac*, p. 183.

<sup>3</sup>*People's Padre*, p. 221.

If there is not a probable hope that a child can be baptized after birth, Baptism may be administered in the womb: in the case of a head presentation, on the head; in other presentations on the part presented, but then it has to be again baptized conditionally if it is living on complete delivery. Should the mother die in labour, the child is to be extracted from the womb, and, if certainly living, baptized absolutely; if life is doubtful, conditionally. An aborted fetus must also be baptized, unconditionally or conditionally according to circumstances.<sup>4</sup>

The Catholic doctrine of "fetus baptism" was set forth more fully in a diocesan publication, which quoted Wilfred D. Schlattmann, Catholic chaplain, as saying,

Since theologians hold that the soul is infused at the very moment of conception, the infant should be baptized even if miscarriage occurs very early in pregnancy.

I am shocked at the number of Catholic mothers who do not know that even the small, immature foetus should be baptized. When no effort to baptize is made, *the soul has no chance to get to heaven.* [Emphasis supplied.]

When the foetus is not sufficiently developed for water to be poured over the head, immersion is the most reliable procedure. The foetus may be handled more conveniently if laid on cotton or gauze, and completely immersed in a bowl of water. While the water washes, the necessary words are recited, and the foetus is then immediately lifted from the bowl.<sup>5</sup>

This doctrine is as repulsive as it is fantastic. It has no foundation either in scripture or in reason. It rests solely upon the notions of Catholic theologians who gave birth to the idea during the Dark Ages—when all reason was abandoned.

### III. The Doctrine Concerning the State of the Dead

Let us note two of Rome's peculiar notions concerning the future state.

1. *The doctrine of purgatory is highly imaginative.* "Purgatory," according to the Catholic definition, is "the state or the abode of temporary punishment for those souls, who having died in the state of grace, are not entirely free from venial sins or have

---

<sup>4</sup>*A Catholic Dictionary*, p. 45.

<sup>5</sup>*The Catholic Messenger*, August 19, 1956.

not yet fully paid the satisfaction due to their transgressions. It is . . . a state . . . of purification by suffering. . . . Although Holy Scripture does not expressly mention Purgatory, it presupposes it."<sup>6</sup>

Concerning the doctrine of purgatory, the twenty-fifth session of the Council of Trent decreed,

Since the Catholic Church, instructed by the Holy Ghost, has, following the sacred writings and the ancient tradition of the Fathers, taught in sacred councils and very recently in this ecumenical council that there is a purgatory, and that the souls there detained are aided by the suffrages of the faithful and chiefly by the acceptable sacrifice of the altar, the holy council commands the bishops that they strive diligently to the end that the sound doctrine of purgatory, transmitted by the Fathers and sacred councils, be believed and maintained by the faithful of Christ, and be everywhere taught and preached. . . . The bishops shall see to it that the suffrages of the living, that is, the sacrifice of the mass, prayers, alms and other works of piety which they have been accustomed to perform for the faithful departed, be piously and devoutly discharged in accordance with the laws of the Church, and that whatever is due on their behalf from testamentary bequests or other ways, be discharged by the priests and ministers of the Church and others who are bound to render this service not in a perfunctory manner, but diligently and accurately.<sup>7</sup>

The doctrine that those who are saved must first be tortured in the fires of purgatory until all evil has been burned out and their souls have been purified—after many priestly prayers have been offered—is contrary to both scripture and reason. Forgiveness of sins rests upon the blood of Christ and humble submission to his will. No one lives a perfect life here. But all who humbly and obediently submit to the will of God are cleansed through the blood of the Lord Jesus Christ. All such can expect to meet God in the judgment without having to burn first—for centuries—in the imaginary fires of purgatory, while they wait until enough masses have been offered (at a considerable cost) to get them out.

2. *The doctrine of limbo exists only in the imagination.* Limbo is defined as,

---

<sup>6</sup>*The New Catholic Dictionary*, p. 801.

<sup>7</sup>*Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent*, p. 214.

(1) a region bordering upon hell, the abode after death of unbaptized children and righteous people who lived before Jesus. (2) a prison or imprisonment. (3) a place or condition of neglect or oblivion to which unwanted things or persons are relegated.<sup>8</sup>

This is, perhaps, one of the most fuzzy of all the imaginary doctrines held by Catholics.

Theologians distinguish a two-fold limbo: the limbo of the Fathers, where the just that died before Christ, were detained until heaven, which had been closed in punishment for the sin of Adam, was reopened by the Savior; and the limbo of infants, where those who die in original sin, but without personal mortal sin, are deprived of the happiness which would come to them in the supernatural order, but not of the happiness in the natural order.<sup>9</sup>

During the passing of the centuries, Catholic theologians have been on every side of this question. The Supreme Council of the Knights of Columbus confesses as much.

The New Testament contains no definite statement of a positive kind regarding the external lot of those who die in original sin without being burdened with grievous personal guilt. . . the question therefore arises as to what, in the absence of a clear positive revelation on the subject, we ought in conformity with Catholic principles to believe regarding the eternal lot of such persons. Now it can confidently be said that, *as the result of centuries of speculation on the subject* [Emphasis supplied], we ought to believe that these souls enjoy and will eternally enjoy a state of perfect natural happiness; and that is what Catholics usually mean when they speak of the *limbus infantium*, the "children's limbo."<sup>10</sup>

Thus Catholic authorities admit that "limbo" is not a New Testament doctrine, but that, "as the result of centuries of speculation on the subject," Catholics "ought to believe" what their speculators have finally decided upon.

To charge that such a doctrine is unorthodox is the very least we can say of it.

#### **IV. The Doctrine Concerning the "Eucharist"**

The Roman Catholic doctrine concerning the so-called Eucharist is one of the most unreasonable of all of Rome's unortho-

---

<sup>8</sup>*Webster's New World Dictionary*, p. 850.

<sup>9</sup>*The New Catholic Dictionary*, p. 561.

<sup>10</sup>*The Catholic Encyclopedia*, vol. ix, p. 256.

dox teachings. Here error is piled on top of error.

1. *The definition of the term "eucharist" in the original in no way resembles the Catholic idea.* The verb, *eucharisteo*, is defined, "to thank, give thanks." The noun, *eucharistia*, is defined: "gratitude, thankfulness. . . the act of giving thanks, thanksgiving."<sup>11</sup> This is quite different to the definition given by Catholics, which reads:

A Sacrament of the New Law in which, under the appearances of bread and wine, the body and blood of Christ are truly, really and substantially present, as the grace-producing food of our souls.<sup>12</sup>

There is scarcely any resemblance between these two definitions. In its finality the question is whether the New Testament writers were "thinking straight" or whether Roman Catholics are now doing so.

2. *The doctrine of "transubstantiation" is foreign to the Word of God.* It took shape a millennium after Christ instituted his supper. This doctrine declares that when "Mass" has been said (meaning when the priest has given thanks for the bread) the elements of the "Mass" become the real body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ.

. . . in the Eucharist, that which before consecration was bread and wine, becomes, after consecration really and substantially the body and blood of our Lord.<sup>13</sup>The substance of the bread and wine is so changed into the body and blood of our Lord, that they, altogether, cease to be the substance of bread and wine.<sup>14</sup>

If any one shall say, that in the holy Sacrament of the Eucharist the substance of the bread and wine remains, together with the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, let him be anathema.<sup>15</sup>

Since, according to Catholic doctrine, Christ exists "whole and entire"<sup>16</sup> under either species of the bread or fruit of the vine, the "laity" is permitted to eat of the bread only. This practice does

<sup>11</sup>*A Greek-English Lexicon to the New Testament*, p. 79.

<sup>12</sup>*A Catholic Dictionary*, p. 177.

<sup>13</sup>*Catechism of the Council of Trent*, pp. 148, 149.

<sup>14</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 156.

<sup>15</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 161.

<sup>16</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 160.

not conform to the New Testament teaching. Not only did the early Christians partake of both the bread and the fruit of the vine, but the elements were called by these very terms.<sup>17</sup>

3. *Catholics argue that a miracle takes place every time "Mass" is said.* In other words, God, through Catholic priests, performs a miracle by converting the bread into the actual body and blood of Christ. This doctrine is erroneous in three respects.

(a) It is inconsistent to think that God would perform a miracle through Catholic priests by changing the bread and wine into the real body of Christ, while priests can give no evidence whatever that this is so, or that God ever performs any other miracles through them. (We have only the word of Catholics that a miracle is performed when a priest says "Mass." In New Testament times there were visible evidences of every miracle performed.) If God would hear them and perform a miracle regarding the giving of thanks for the bread and the wine, then why will he not hear them and perform miracles regarding other matters?

(b) Our Lord spoke of the "fruit of the vine" in its literal sense after he had given thanks for it, and after the disciples had partaken of it. He declared, "I shall not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom."<sup>18</sup> The apostle Paul likewise referred to it in a literal sense, saying, "But let a man prove himself, and so let him eat of the *bread*, and drink of the *cup*."<sup>19</sup> These scriptures cannot be made to harmonize with the Catholic doctrine of "transubstantiation."

Since Jesus said, "I am the vine, ye are the branches,"<sup>20</sup> it would be as logical to argue that Jesus was an actual vine and his disciples were actual branches as to argue that the bread becomes the real body of Christ when the priest offers thanks for it.

---

<sup>17</sup>1 Cor. 11:27.

<sup>18</sup>Matt. 26:29.

<sup>19</sup>1 Cor. 11:28.

<sup>20</sup>Jno. 15:5.



(c) We can only judge of *facts* by our physical senses. After Jesus was raised from the dead he told Thomas to put his fingers into his side and into his hands, and to feel and to know that he was the Son of God.<sup>21</sup> If Thomas could be assured of the bodily presence of Christ through the medium of sight, hearing, and touch, may we not determine the actual substance of the bread and fruit of the vine by our physical senses today? Four of the five senses—sight, taste, smell, and even the sense of touch—tell us that the contents of the bread and fruit of the vine are the same after thanks have been offered as they were before, and that no miracle has taken place.

What do Catholics mean by "the body of Christ" into which the bread and the fruit of the vine are (supposedly) converted? Do they have in mind the *fleshly* body or the *spiritual* body of Christ? If the fleshly body, then it would be unscriptural to eat of his literal flesh and drink of his literal blood, because the Holy Spirit, through the inspired apostles, legislated against the drinking of blood.<sup>22</sup> If Catholics mean the spiritual body of Christ, then we must remind them that his spiritual body is *not* "flesh and blood," because ". . . flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God."<sup>23</sup>

4. *It is argued that Christ is offered (sacrificed) afresh every time "Mass" is said. If this doctrine be true, then Catholics are in the same class with those who crucify "the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame." All who thus did in Paul's time "fell away" from Christ, making it "impossible to renew them again unto repentance."*<sup>24</sup> Apparently the writer of the book of Hebrews was striking at the very root of this fallacy when he said, ". . . nor yet that he should offer himself often, as the high priest entereth into the holy place year by year with blood not his own; else must he often have suffered since the foundation

---

<sup>21</sup>Jno. 20:27, 28.

<sup>22</sup>Acts 15:29.

<sup>23</sup>Cor. 15:50.

<sup>24</sup>Heb. 6:6.

of the world: but now once at the end of the ages hath he been manifested to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. . . so Christ also, having been *once* offered to bear the sins of many, shall appear a second time, apart from sin."<sup>25</sup> If this scripture means anything at all, it means that Christ will never again be offered for our sins.

## V. The Doctrine Concerning Penance

Twenty-one canon laws (871-892) deal with the subject of penance. These find their expression in *auricular confession*, i.e., confession in the ears of a priest. This doctrine may be thus summarized:

Penance is a sacrament of the New Law instituted by Christ in which forgiveness of sins committed after baptism is granted through the priest's absolution to those who with true sorrow confess their sins and promise to satisfy for the same. It is called a "sacrament" not simply a function or ceremony, because it is an outward sign instituted by Christ to impart grace to the soul. As an outward sign it comprises the actions of the penitent in presenting himself to the priest and accusing himself of his sins, and the actions of the priest in pronouncing absolution and imposing satisfaction. The whole procedure is usually called, from one of its parts, "confession"; and it is said to take place in the "tribunal of penance," because it is a judicial process in which the penitent is at once the accuser, the person accused, and the witness, while the priest pronounces judgment and sentence. The grace conferred is deliverance from the guilt of sin and, in the case of mortal sin, from its *eternal punishment*; hence also reconciliation with God, justification. Finally, the confession is made not in the secrecy of the penitent's heart nor to a layman as friend and advocate, nor to a representative of human authority, but to a duly ordained priest with requisite jurisdiction and with the "power of the keys," i.e., the power to forgive sins which Christ granted to His Church.<sup>26</sup>

The *nature* and *extent* of confession is thus set forth by the Council of Trent:

In confession we should employ all that care and exactness which we usually bestow upon worldly concerns of the greatest moment, and all our efforts should be directed to effect the cure of our spiritual maladies and to eradicate sin from the soul. With the bare enumeration of our mortal sins, we should not be satisfied; that enumeration we should accompany with the relation of such circumstances as considerably aggravate or ex-

---

<sup>25</sup>Web. 9:25-28.

<sup>26</sup>*The Catholic Encyclopedia*, vol. xi, pp. 618, 619.

tenuate their malice. Some circumstances are such, as of themselves to constitute mortal guilt, on no account or occasion whatever, therefore, are such circumstances to be omitted. Has any one imbrued his hands in the blood of his fellow man? He must state whether his victim was a layman or an ecclesiastic. Has he had criminal intercourse with any one? He must state whether the female was married or unmarried, a relative or a person consecrated to God by vow. These are circumstances which alter the species of the sins: the first is called simple fornication; the second adultery; the third incest; and fourth sacrilege. Again, theft is numbered in the catalogue of sins; but if a person has stolen a guinea [a gold coin], his sin is less grievous than if he had stolen one or two hundred guineas, or a considerable sum; and if the stolen money were sacred, the sin would be still aggravated.<sup>27</sup>

The doctrine of "penance" rests upon three passages of scripture,<sup>28</sup> all of which we examined in the first chapter. The arguments in support of this unorthodox teaching fail because (a) the power to "bind" and "loose" was given to the apostles only. Even they could "bind" and "loose" only what had already been "bound" and "loosed" in heaven, (b) The apostles had no *successors* or *deputies* to whom they transferred their apostolic powers, (c) There were no officers in the early church which corresponded to the Catholic priests of today. All Christians in the New Testament church were priests,<sup>29</sup> and were of equal rank and standing before God. When they sinned they confessed it "one to another" (not to some specially ordained priest) and "prayed one for another."<sup>30</sup>

Not content with promulgating the erroneous doctrine of "penance," Catholicism goes into the most minute details regarding the different kinds of sins, and demands that each and every sin be revealed precisely to the priest. Neither scripture nor common sense can be made to support such unorthodox doctrine.

## VI. The Doctrine of Praying to the "Saints"

Concerning this doctrine, Donald Attwater says,

---

<sup>27</sup>*Catechism of the Council of Trent*, pp. 194, 195.

<sup>28</sup>Matt. 16:19; 18:18; Jno. 20:23.

<sup>29</sup>1 Pet. 2:9; Rev. 1:6.

<sup>30</sup>Jas. 5:16.

It is the teaching of the Church that God enables the saints to hear and see the needs of those on earth; that they present our petitions before the throne of God; and consequently, that we may pray *to* them. This is part of the doctrine of the communion of saints.<sup>31</sup>

Nothing is here said about praying through "Saints," or asking them to pray *for us*, but rather praying *to* them.

The twenty-fifth session of the Council of Trent declared,

The holy council commands all bishops and others who hold the office of teaching and have charge of the *euro animarum*, that in accordance with the usage of the Catholic and Apostolic Church, received from the primitive times of the Christian religion, and with the unanimous teaching of the holy Fathers and the decrees of sacred councils, they above all instruct the faithful diligently in matters relating to intercession and invocation of the saints, the veneration of relics, and the legitimate use of images, teaching them that the saints who reign together with Christ offer up their prayers to God for men, that it is good and beneficial suppliantly to invoke them and to have recourse to their prayers, assistance and support in order to obtain favors from God through His Son, Jesus Christ our Lord. . .<sup>32</sup>

The notion that those whom the Roman Church has "canonized" can hear the prayers of men on earth, and that they can prevail upon God to hear the cries of his children, and thereby obtain special blessings for them, is foreign to the Word of God, or to the practice of the early Christians.

Paganism, with all of its heathen deities, has played a major role in Catholic thinking and practices. This is manifest especially in the great number of "patron saints" that have been designated by the papacy. To illustrate: Saint Florian protects against fire; Saint Nicholas guards sailors in time of shipwreck; Saint Crispin takes care of shoemakers; Saint Ulric answers the prayers for relief by those whose premises are infested with rats; cab-drivers have the gracious aid of Saint Fiacre; and Saint Christopher protects motorists or travelers from accidents and death.

In looking for a patron saint of space travel some are now proposing the name of "Saint" Joseph of Cupertino, one of more

---

<sup>31</sup>A *Catholic Dictionary*, p. 261.

<sup>32</sup>*Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent*, p. 215.

than two hundred Catholics who are said to have "defied the laws of gravitation." The life of this "great saint" (*who was "not very bright" at first*) was characterized by "a long succession of ecstasies, miracles of healing, and supernatural happenings on a scale not paralleled in the reasonably authenticated biography of any other saint. . . over seventy occasions of levitation [defiances of gravity] are recorded, and he is the classical example of this class of phenomenon."<sup>33</sup> It is said that he sometimes "sailed" over the heads of his congregation and landed on the pulpit, or flew around the room, carrying another person in his arms at tunes.

If it seems strange that the Romanists waited some three hundred years before giving very much publicity to the phenomena of this "saint," let it be remembered that when a "patron saint" is needed for any purpose Catholics can always find one; the "inventing" of saints is no problem for them. When they do not have what they want at hand, they let their imagination run wild until they create whatever they need.

## VII. The Doctrine of "Mariology"

All the Bible has to say about Mary, the mother of Jesus, has been told in a few hundred words. And we have scarcely any reliable information about her from any other source. Yet Roman Catholics have large libraries on "Mariology." Some of their colleges offer a doctor's degree in "Mariology." The unreliable and even fantastic statements made about Mary are so extravagant that it would take endless volumes to relate them all.

1. *The doctrine regarding the "Immaculate Conception" is without support.* This dogma is predicated on the erroneous doctrine that all men are born into the world in sin. Catholic theologians talk about "original sin" as if it were a plainly stated truth. It is assumed that all people are born sinners, with the exception

---

<sup>33</sup>A *Dictionary of Saints*, p. 153.

of Jesus and his Mother. In 1854 the doctrine of the immaculate Conception was thus defined by Pope Pius IX:

We declare, pronounce, and define that the doctrine, which holds that the most Blessed Virgin Mary at the first instant of her conception, by a singular grace and privilege of Almighty God, in virtue of the merits of Christ Jesus, the Savior of the human race, was preserved immaculate from all stain of original sin, has been revealed by God, and on this account must be firmly and constantly believed by all the faithful.<sup>34</sup>

To argue that any such doctrine was ever "revealed by God," or that it can be relied upon as a fact, is both presumptive and unorthodox. There is no foundation for such a doctrine either in scripture or in reason. It rests solely upon the arguments of Catholic theologians, as defined by the Pope.

2. *The doctrine of the "Perpetual Virginity" of Mary is unorthodox.* After describing the virgin birth of our Lord, Matthew says of Joseph that he "knew her [Mary] not *till* she had brought forth her firstborn son."<sup>35</sup> The Confraternity (Catholic) Version, reads, ". . . and he did not know her [Mary] *till* she brought forth her firstborn son." In a new translation James A. Kleist, S. J., late professor of Classic Languages, at St. Louis (Catholic) University, renders this passage, "He [Joseph] had no conjugal relations with her [Mary] before she gave birth to a Son, whom he named Jesus."<sup>36</sup> This verse could have no meaning at all unless it implied that after Jesus was born Joseph *did* know Mary, i.e., have sexual relations with her. Both Matthew and Mark actually name the brothers of Jesus; they also speak of his sisters.<sup>37</sup> All of the efforts of the Romanists to destroy the truth of these statements, arguing that these were cousins of Jesus, are groundless.

On the subject of Mary, under the sub-heading, "Her Perpetual Virginity," one authority says,

---

<sup>34</sup>"*Ineffabilis Deus*" (Definition of the immaculate conception), Dec. 8, 1854.

<sup>35</sup>Matt. 1:25.

<sup>36</sup>*in loc. cit.*

<sup>37</sup>Matt. 13:55, 56; Mk. 6:3.

This doctrine was, to say the least, of no importance in the eyes of the evangelists, and so far as extant writings go there is no evidence of its having been anywhere taught within the pale of the Catholic Church of the first three centuries. On the contrary, to Tertullian the fact of Mary's marriage after the birth of Christ is a useful argument for the reality of the Incarnation against Gnostic notions, and Origen relies upon the references to the Lord's brethren as disproving the Docetism with which he had to contend. . .<sup>38</sup>

3. *The Catholic doctrine of the "Bodily Assumption" of Mary is contrary to the scriptures.* On November 1, 1950, this doctrine was thus denned by Pope Pius XII:

Therefore, the august Mother of God. . . would overcome death and be taken away soul and body to the supernal glory of heaven, where as Queen she would shine forth at the right hand of the same Son of hers, the immortal King of Ages.<sup>39</sup>

This is completely contrary to the teaching of the apostle Paul. In describing the bodies that we shall have in the resurrection he thus differentiates between them and the bodies we now have: "It is sown in corruption; it is raised in incorruption: it is sown in dishonor; it is raised in glory: it is sown in weakness; it is raised in power: it is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body."<sup>40</sup> The apostle makes four distinctions between the bodies we now have and the bodies we shall have.

*Earthly Bodies*

1. Corruptible
2. In dishonor
3. In weakness
4. Natural

*Heavenly Bodies*

1. Incorruptible
2. In glory
3. In power
4. Spiritual

Paul further explains, "Now this I say, brethren, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, neither doth corruption inherit incorruption."<sup>41</sup> Roman Catholics fly in the very face of this scripture and declare that Mary's *earthly body* was taken to heaven. They make no explanation of any change what-

---

<sup>38</sup>*Encyclopedia Britannica*, 1955, vol. xv, p. 590.

<sup>39</sup>"*Munificentissimus Deus*" (Definition of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary), Nov. 1, 1950.

<sup>40</sup>1 Cor. 15:42-44.

<sup>41</sup>1 Cor. 15:50.

ever taking place in her body. This flatly contradicts the scriptures.

4. *The doctrine that Mary is "Queen of Heaven" is fantastic.* This claim rests neither upon scripture nor upon any early tradition. It is wholly imaginary. More and more Catholic papers are playing it up, however, as if it were a revealed truth. In fact, it is regarded by all "the faithful" as *a revealed truth*, because it was asserted by Pope Pius XII in his definition of the "Bodily Assumption of Mary." This unorthodox doctrine exists in fancy only.

5. *The doctrine that Mary is "Co-Mediatrix with Christ" is wholly imaginary.* Pope Leo XIII went so far as to say,

. . . she it is "of whom was born Jesus" namely, His true Mother, and for this reason she is worthy and quite acceptable as the mediatrix to the Mediator.<sup>42</sup>

Again in an earlier Encyclical Letter, this same Pope said,

Therefore, no less truly and properly may it be affirmed that nothing at all of the very great treasure of every grace, which the Lord confers, since "grace and truth came by Jesus Christ," *nothing is imparted to us except through Mary*. . . so, just as no one can approach the highest Father except through the Son, *so no one can approach Christ except through His Mother*.<sup>43</sup> [Emphasis supplied.]

In his decree, *Explorata res* (February 2, 1923), Pius XI said,

The Virgin participated with Jesus Christ in the very painful act of redemption. In the decree of the S. C. of the Holy Office (section on Indulgences), "*Sunt quos amor*," June 26, 1913. . . he [the monk, Eadmar] praises the custom of adding to the name of Jesus the name of "His Mother, our coredemptor, the Blessed Virgin Mary"; cf. also the prayer enriched by the Holy Office with an indulgence, in which the Blessed Virgin Mary is called "coredemptress of the human race"—Jan. 22, 1914.<sup>44</sup>

Paul plainly said, "For there is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, himself man, Christ Jesus."<sup>45</sup>

---

<sup>42</sup>*Fidentem*," on the Rosary, Sept. 20, 1896.

<sup>43</sup>*Octobri mense*," on the Rosary, Sept. 22, 1891.

<sup>44</sup>*The Sources of Catholic Dogma*, p. 502.

<sup>45</sup>1 Tim. 2:5. (Confraternity-Douay Version)



The doctrine that Mary is "coredemptor," or "coredemptress," with Christ is unscriptural, it is untrue, it is blasphemy.

Finally, as if this were not enough, we read:

Therefore, as St. Peter Damian remarks, the Blessed Virgin can do whatever she pleases both in heaven and on earth. She can cause even those who are in despair to hope; and so he addressed the following words to her: "All power is given to you in heaven and on earth, and nothing is impossible to you because you can raise those who are in despair to the hope of salvation." And then he adds: "When the Mother goes to seek a favor for us from Jesus Christ [whom the saint calls the golden altar of mercy, at which sinners obtain pardon] her Son regards her prayers so highly and is so eager to satisfy her, that when she prays it seems as if she were commanding rather than praying, and as if she were a lady rather than a servant." Mary honored Jesus so much during her life that Jesus is now pleased to honor his beloved Mother in this way, by granting at once whatever she asks or desires. This is beautifully confirmed by St. Germanus, who addresses the Blessed Virgin and says: "You are the Mother of God and are all-powerful to save sinners; with God you need no other recommendation, for you are the Mother of true life."

"At the command of Mary, everybody obeys, even God." St. Bernardine of Siena is not afraid to utter this sentence, meaning thereby, of course, that God grants the prayers of Mary as if they were commands. And so St. Anselm addresses her, saying: "Our Lord, O holy Mary, has exalted you to such an extent that by His favor all things that are possible to Him should be possible to you!" "For your protection is omnipotent, O Mary," says Cosmas of Jerusalem. Yes, Mary is omnipotent, remarks Richard of St. Lawrence, for by every law the queen enjoys the same privileges as the king. And since the power of a son and that of a mother are the same, a mother is made omnipotent by an omnipotent son. "And thus," says St. Antoninus, "God has placed the whole Church not only under the patronage, but also under the dominion of Mary."<sup>46</sup>

Thus, Mary (a) "can do whatever she pleases both in heaven and on earth"; (b) she has been given "all power. . . in heaven and on earth"; (c) she is granted "at once whatever she asks or desires"; (d) "God grants the prayers of Mary as if they were commands"; (e) she is "omnipotent." Truly, Mary has been exalted to the place of God himself—being "omnipotent," holding "all power in heaven and on earth," with the Almighty God subject to her commands.

*This is none other than blasphemy.*

---

<sup>46</sup>*The Glories of Mary*, vol. i, part i, pp. 112, 113.

## CHAPTER V

### Catholic Claims of "Infallibility"

Roman Catholics deny that the Bible is our final source of authority in religion. Instead, they say, it is "the living voice of the living Church."<sup>1</sup> Yet they try to *prove* this by scripture, which they say is *not* our final source of authority. Thus the "proof" of their position is based upon a source of authority which they will not accept as final.

#### I. Can the Catholic Church Teach Error?

Catholics argue that Jesus guaranteed that "his [they mean the Roman Catholic] Church could never teach error." As "proof they cite the words of Jesus, when he said, "Upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it."<sup>2</sup> This statement, however, does not even suggest the idea that the church could never teach error. It can have only one of two meanings: (a) that Jesus would establish his church and the gates of Hades could not prevent him from doing so, or (b) that Jesus would establish his church and it could never be destroyed. As long as we have the Word of God (as it is recorded on the pages of Holy Writ), which is "the seed" of "the kingdom,"<sup>3</sup> and honest hearts in which to plant the seed, it will reproduce New Testament Christians; and as long as we have Christians we have the Lord's church.

In the great commission Jesus said to his apostles, "Go. . . and make disciples of all nations," adding, "and lo, I am with *you* always, even unto the end of the world."<sup>4</sup> At that time the church had not yet been established. However, Catholics hastily conclude that Jesus here promised not only to be with his church to the end of time, but to protect it from ever teaching error.

---

<sup>1</sup>*Stevens-Beevers Debate*, p. 32.

<sup>2</sup>Matt. 16:18.

<sup>3</sup>Lk. 8:11.

<sup>4</sup>Matt 28:19, 20.

Such a conclusion is out of harmony with both facts and reason. This passage in no way indicates that Christ would always protect his church from the teaching of error.

In every matter we must start with some basic truth. Something must be assumed as self-evident. We assume, for example, that a straight line is the shortest distance between two points. This needs no proof. Likewise, we must assume that the Bible is our basic source of authority, else the church is the basic source. If the Bible is the basic source, then the church is not. If the church is the basic source, then the Bible is not. If we assume that the church is the basic source, then we cannot prove it by the Bible. But if the Bible is the basic source, then we cannot prove it by the church. We cannot have it both ways. Yet this is exactly what Catholics try to do. They move in a circle, like a dog chasing his tail.

Catholics say we cannot accept the Bible as our final source of authority because it is a confusing book. But if we accept the idea that the (Catholic) Church is our final source of authority, then we have far more confusion than we do in assuming the Bible to be our final source of authority. The Catholic Church has committed every crime conceivable. It has led "Crusades" in war in which thousands upon thousands have been slaughtered. It has brutally massacred hundreds of thousands of men, women and children. It has promulgated every kind of ruthless deeds that can be imagined. Its priests, its bishops, and its popes have been guilty of drunkenness, fornication, murder, rape, gambling, simony, bickering and every other kind of evil known to man. Popes have been murdered because of their evil deeds; at least one was exhumed and his body dismembered by his successor to the chair of "St. Peter"; some have denounced the edicts and decrees of their predecessors; councils have reversed councils; popes have reversed popes. Truly the Catholic Church has been on every side of almost every question. Yet Catholics confidently affirm that "the [Catholic] Church can never teach error."

When confronted with these irrefutable facts Catholics admit that many diabolical deeds have been committed by some of their popes and other members of the hierarchy; and that many vile deeds have been committed in the name of the Catholic Church, but they avow that these were *personal* errors, and that the [Catholic] *Church* has always been protected from the teaching of error. This makes about as much sense as it does for the atheists to admit that Jesus was the wisest and best man that ever lived upon the earth yet the greatest impostor.

In their attempted explanations Catholics argue that since "the [Catholic] Church can never teach error," it inevitably follows that the head of it can never teach error. They admit that the Pope can make personal mistakes, that he can be wrong in private judgment, that he *personally* can teach error, that he can mislead people by his own private conduct, that he can make all kinds of *individual* mistakes, but in his official capacity, when he speaks for the whole church "on matters of faith and morals" it is impossible for him to err. Of course, this is contrary to both scripture and reason. It makes no sense at all.

Let us look at the Catholic explanations regarding infallibility and some of the consequences.

## II. Catholic Explanations of Infallibility

It is much more difficult to comprehend the Catholic explanations regarding infallibility than it is to try to understand all the ramifications of the federal income tax laws.

It was centuries after the Lord's church was begun before anyone ever thought of the Catholic doctrine of infallibility. Even after the great apostasy, it was a long and arduous task to force this doctrine upon the Catholic hierarchy. As late as 1837, in his debate with Alexander Campbell, Bishop John B. Purcell was goaded into an explanation of the *source* of Catholic infallibility. Speaking from his chair, the Bishop said the source of infallibility

was in "A general council, or the pope, *with the acquiescence of the church at large.*"<sup>5</sup> In 1870, however, after weeks of bitter debate, and upon the insistence of Pope Pius IX, the Roman Pontiff was declared to be infallible when he speaks *ex cathedra*; i.e., when he speaks officially, *from his chair*, for all the church.

Although Bishop (Archbishop after 1850) Purcell had vigorously opposed the idea of "papal infallibility," he was too much of a coward to wait and cast his ballot against the wishes of the Pope. Upon returning home and hearing of the dogmatic decree that the Pope had been declared infallible when he speaks *ex-cathedra* for the whole church on faith and morals, he preached a sermon in his cathedral in Cincinnati, in which he said, "I am here to proclaim my belief in the infallibility of the pope in the words of the Holy Father defining the doctrine."<sup>6</sup> This contradicted the position he had previously held.

The definition on infallibility concludes: ". . . and so such definitions of the Roman Pontiff of themselves, *but not from the consensus of the Church*, are unalterable."<sup>7</sup> At one tune or another the Catholic Church has taught error. If, prior to 1870, the hierarchy was right in contending that infallibility rests in a General Council, or in "the pope, with the acquiescence of the church at large," then the definition regarding the present source of infallibility is wrong. Contrarywise, if infallibility now rests in an official pronouncement by the Pope, then the Catholic Church was in error when it contended otherwise. Since the Catholic Church has completely reversed its position on its source of infallibility, then it either taught error before 1870, or it has been teaching error ever since that time.

One of the American "princes" of the Catholic Church, following the first Vatican Council, seemed very explicit concerning the source of "infallibility." Said he:

---

<sup>5</sup>*Campbell-Purcell Debate*, p. 181.

<sup>6</sup>*The Catholic Encyclopedia*, vol. xii, p. 571,

<sup>7</sup>*The Sources of Catholic Dogma*, p. 457.

The Church, therefore, like civil powers, must have a permanent and stationary supreme tribunal to interpret its laws and to determine cases of religious controversy.

What constitutes this permanent supreme court of the Church? Does it consist of the Bishops assembled in General Council? No; because this is not an ordinary but an extraordinary tribunal which meets, on an average, only once in a hundred years.

Is it composed of the Bishops scattered throughout the world? By no means, because it would be impracticable to consult all the Bishops of Christendom upon every issue that might arise in the Church. The poison of error would easily spread through the body of the Church before a decision could be rendered by the Prelates dispersed throughout the globe. The Pope, then, as Head of the Catholic Church, constitutes, with just reason, this supreme tribunal.<sup>8</sup>

Apparently this is the ultimate in clarity. But subsequent events have caused the Catholic hierarchy to use greater generalities when they speak. When we read what the Supreme Council of the Knights of Columbus says we are a trifle confused. This "authoritative" source indicates that "infallibility" may rest *either with the Pope or with an ecumenical council*.

Hence, when we say, for example, that some doctrine defined by the pope *or by an ecumenical council* is infallible, we mean merely that its inerrancy is Divinely guaranteed according to the terms of Christ's promise to His Church, not that either the pope or the Fathers of the Council are inspired as were the writers of the Bible or that any new revelation is embodied in their teaching. It is well further to explain (a) that infallibility means more than exemption from actual error; it means exemption from the possibility of error; (b) that it does not require holiness of life, much less imply impeccability in its organs; sinful and wicked men may be God's agents in defining infallibility.<sup>9</sup>

From the above it would seem that the authority of the "Fathers" and the "Councils" are equal to that of the Pope. And while contending that infallibility "means exemption from the possibility of error," the Supreme Council of the Knights of Columbus admits that "sinful and wicked men may be God's agents in defining infallibility."

In an effort to clarify the Catholic position John A. O'Brien, a recognized Catholic theologian, explained it this way:

---

<sup>8</sup>*Faith of Our Fathers*, pp. 132, 133.

<sup>9</sup>*The Catholic Encyclopedia*, vol. vii, p. 790.

It is to be noted that three conditions are required:

1. The pope must speak *ex cathedra*, i.e., from the Chair of Peter, in his official capacity.
2. The decision must be binding on the whole Church.
3. It must be on a matter of faith or morals.<sup>10</sup>

If we accept the theory that the Pope is infallible when he speaks officially for the whole church on faith and morals, there is still a great deal of misunderstanding about what may be included in "faith and morals." Apparently, some would have us think the Pope is infallible in his interpretation of any scripture, since his interpretations are for the whole (Catholic) Church, and since all scripture has to do with "faith and morals." If the Pope is not infallible in his interpretation of all scripture, then there is no infallible interpreter today. If the Pope is the infallible interpreter, then infallibility goes far beyond the explanation of most Catholic theologians.

Some argue that the Pope is infallible only when he defines some special doctrine which must be held by the whole Catholic Church—and which has usually been taught by Catholic theologians until it is generally accepted. For example, the Pope defined the bodily assumption of Mary which had been generally taught for hundreds of years (though not since the beginning of the church by any means.) This, they say, was an infallible pronouncement. Sometimes we are told that only about a half dozen such pronouncements have ever been made.

Some Catholic authorities would have us believe that the papal "encyclicals" are infallible; others say that only those that deal with "faith and morals," and which relate to the "whole [Catholic] Church" are infallible. Still others would have us believe that only *portions* of the encyclicals are infallible. Apparently, nobody knows just when the Pope is infallible and when he is not. But from all we have read, about the best conclusion we can draw is that the Pope is always infallible *except when he makes a mis-*,

---

<sup>10</sup>*The Faith of Millions*, p. 132.

*take*, as he did in condemning Copernicus and Galileo—and in the annulment of the Magna Carta.

Although no one seems to be able to say just what decrees of the Roman Church are infallible, and what are not, from article 23 of the "Syllabus of Errors" it would appear that any and all official pronouncements of the Catholic Church are infallible. Pope Pius IX declared it a mistake to say that "The Roman Pontiffs and the Ecumenical Councils have trespassed the limits of their powers, have usurped the rights of princes, and have erred in defining matters of faith and morals."<sup>11</sup> It should be remembered, however, that this pronouncement was made back in the days in which the Pope dared to assert his power. But since neither the Pope nor the councils can ever admit the teaching of error, such pronouncements, regardless of how absurd they may be, must be defended. This takes a lot of explaining today.

### **III. Private Judgment vs. Infallibility**

Catholics argue that it is a mistake to rely upon our own personal judgments in religious matters. Instead, they contend that since the (Catholic) Church has the "Divine commission to teach and instruct all people" it must be infallible. Thus, they rule out the use of private judgment altogether. But there is no such thing as a responsible person going through life without exercising his own private judgment in religion. If one is born into a Catholic family, and is reared in the Catholic faith, he must decide on whether to remain in the Catholic Church or not. He must decide whether he believes in the infallibility of the Catholic Church or not. He must try to decide between the "infallible" statements of the Pope and those that are not. Even if he "decides" not to decide on any religious matter, leaving it to the "infallible" (Catholic) Church to decide for him, he must still exercise his own private judgment in deciding the course he chooses to follow.

---

<sup>11</sup>*The Sources of Catholic Dogma*, p. 437.



Roman Catholics are expected to do everything they can to convert non-Catholics. Some decide to work at this job diligently, while others decide not to do so. Still others decide to make some effort, yet not too much. But they all have to make some decisions on their own. If they decide to try to convert non-Catholics, then they must try to convince non-Catholics that they have been in error and that they must decide to change their religious life. They are expected to tell non-Catholics that they cannot depend upon the Bible alone, that they cannot understand the Bible without an infallible interpreter, that they must look to the "infallible [Catholic] Church" to interpret the Bible for them.

If a non-Catholic decides that he has been in error in his religion, that he cannot understand the Bible for himself, that he must look to an infallible interpreter, and that the Catholic Church is that infallible interpreter, then he must make several decisions before he actually changes his religion. When once he changes, he must still decide whether his decision was the right one or not. He must decide on whether to continue to follow the teachings of the papacy or not.

Some Roman Catholics attend Mass faithfully, others attend when convenient, while still others rarely attend at all. Some go to confession regularly, while others go rarely, and still others attend only when it suits their notion to do so. Yet they are all Catholics, and are counted as a part of "the faithful." When a Catholic goes to confession, he may decide to confess all of his sins which he thinks will condemn him if he does not get the forgiveness of the priest. Or, he may go to confession with very little thought of what he is going to confess when he gets there. When the priest begins to question him he may decide to answer truthfully or he may not. In any event, Catholics must rely upon private judgment. There is no escape.

Even if one decides that the Pope is infallible, and that he is under obligation to follow the teachings of the Catholic Church

faithfully in every matter, he must do this upon his own private judgment. It is a decision that he has to make for himself.

#### **IV. What Is the Meaning of Papal Infallibility?**

For more than fifty years the Catholic Church had two rival popes, both claiming to occupy the chair of Peter and to be the rightful Vicar of Christ. For a time there were three who claimed to be the successor of Peter. How were the claims of all of these to be decided? There was but one possible way: the one who exerted the greatest influence and had the greatest following was the winner. There was no other way to decide on the "rightful" successor to the supposed throne of Peter.

When a heavy weight prize fighter wins the crown he is called "the champion of the world" because he has beaten his strongest contender. This does not mean that he is necessarily the greatest fighter in the world. It does not mean that there is no one who could possibly beat him in the ring. It simply means that he has not as yet encountered any one in the ring who could beat him. The Catholic claim to infallibility does not rest upon the teachings of the scriptures. It does not rest upon sound reasoning. It rests upon the fact that Roman Catholics have fought to achieve world domination, and have largely succeeded in overcoming their rivals. This does not mean that the Catholic Church will always succeed, however. Neither is it any guarantee of "infallibility." It means only that "might makes right." This is how Catholicism operated all through the Middle Ages, and how it operates until this day.

The claim of the Catholic Church to infallibility is made in order that it may exercise supreme power over its people. A strong dictator will never admit that he has erred. This would weaken his power over his subjects. Parents who rule their children with a strong hand can always find fault with their children, but can never confess to error 'on their part. A man

who exercises the office of President of the United States will rarely admit that he has made a mistake. Regardless of his actions, he tries to defend them. He seeks to create the impression that he is always right. The same is true regarding the Pope. This is grounded in the idea that "the King can do no wrong."

When the Pope has been proved wrong, as he has been in so many cases, such as his condemnation of Galileo and Copernicus, he tries to find some way of escape. About the best explanation that can be given for the papal action regarding these two characters is that they taught what was at first regarded as "theories" as *if they were "facts,"* and that before they had been proved. Regardless of the mistakes made by the popes, the councils, and the (Catholic) Church, they still argue for infallibility. But their explanations regarding their numerous blunders are often ludicrous.

### V. Predictions of Apostasy

If it is impossible for the church ever to teach error, then a number of passages in the New Testament have no meaning. The apostle Paul clearly predicted a general falling away of the Lord's church before his second coming. Speaking to the bishops (sometimes referred to as elders)<sup>12</sup> of the church at Ephesus, Paul said,

Take heed unto yourselves, and to all the flock, in which the Holy Spirit hath made you bishops, to feed the church of the Lord which he purchased with his own blood. I know that after my departing grievous wolves shall enter in among you, not sparing the flock; and from among your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away the disciples after them.<sup>13</sup>

Here the apostle definitely declared that "grievous wolves shall enter in among *you*, not sparing the flock." The apostasy originated among the bishops, as Paul here predicted. To say that the "church" could never teach error is equivalent to saying that the

---

<sup>12</sup>Acts 14:23; 20:17, 28; Phil. 1:1.

<sup>13</sup>Acts 20:28, 29.

highest officers in the church (in fact the only officers who have any supervision whatever over the church) could never teach error. Yet Paul definitely said that some of them would do so.

In the second letter that Paul ever wrote to any church he clearly pointed out the rising of "the man of sin" and a general falling away of the church of our Lord. Note his predictions:

. . . let no man beguile you in any wise: for it [the coming of the Lord] will not be, except the falling away come first, and the man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition, he that opposeth and exhalteth himself against all that is called God or that is worshipped; so that he sitteth in the temple of God, setting himself forth as God. Remember ye not, that, when I was yet with you, I told you these things? And now ye know that which restraineth, to the end that he may be revealed in his own season. For the mystery of lawlessness doth already work: only there is one that restraineth now, until he be taken out of the way. And then shall be revealed the lawless one, whom the Lord Jesus shall slay with the breath of his mouth, and bring to nought by the manifestation of his coming; even he, whose coming is according to the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceit of unrighteousness for them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved.<sup>14</sup>

It was very evident to Paul that there would be a general "falling away" of the church, and that some official would arise in it, opposing the New Testament order of things, and exalt himself to the position of God on earth, requiring that men bow down and worship him—"so that he sitteth in the temple of God, setting himself forth as God." The only possible fulfillment of this prediction is seen in the papacy today. The Pope not only requires that all others bow to him, and worship him by the kissing of the hand (or foot), he also exalts himself above all earthly powers, pretending to be the Vicar of Christ and to hold the place of God on earth.

Before the last of the apostles died there were some in the church who were already ambitious for power. One such was Diotrefes, of whom John said:

. . . but Diotrefes, who loveth to have the pre-eminence among them, receiveth us not. Therefore, if I come, I will bring to remembrance his works which he doeth, prating himself against us with wicked words: and

---

<sup>14</sup>2 Thes. 2:3-10.

not content therewith, neither doth he himself receive the brethren, and them that would he forbiddeth and casteth them out of the church.<sup>15</sup>

The rise of the papacy followed the pattern of Diotrephes in every detail. No doubt the apostle Paul—early in his career— had such a defection in mind when he said, "the mystery of lawlessness doth already work."<sup>16</sup>

The book of Revelation makes it evident that the church would experience a falling away. Otherwise the picture of the woman fleeing into the wilderness<sup>17</sup> would have no meaning. Neither would the numerous pictures of the struggles and triumphs of the Lord's church. Somewhere along the way error has been taught in and by the church, otherwise the scriptures make no sense whatever. To say that our Lord guaranteed that his church could never teach error is to give the lie to numerous passages of scripture. Most of the epistles in the New Testament pointed out numerous errors that had already crept into the church, which the writers sought to correct.

---

<sup>15</sup>3 Jno 9, 10.

<sup>16</sup>2 Thes. 2:7.

<sup>17</sup>Rev. 12:5, 6.

## CHAPTER VI

### Other Fantastic Claims of Catholics

Many of the claims of the Catholic Church are so unrealistic as to baffle the imagination. Very few non-Catholics, however, have any idea of the absurdities which Catholics put forth in the name of religion. They suppose that their preposterous claims existed only during the "Dark Ages," or else have been advanced by only a few who are completely out of line with the official teaching of the hierarchy. They simply can't believe them to represent the Catholic Church of today. Indeed, not many Catholics are conscious of the numerous contradictions, superstitions and absurdities which have been accepted by their church. They are so out of harmony with truth and reason that they are almost inconceivable. We can only note here a small fraction of their unreasonable and fraudulent claims.

#### I. Terms Applied to the Catholic Church

The Romanists use quite a variety of terms to designate their religio-political system, some of which are either self contradictory or else misnomers.

1. *Catholics call theirs "the one true church of Christ."* This is an assumption which has no foundation whatever. The papal Church has so completely departed from the Word of God during the past 1500 years that it in no way resembles the one true church which Jesus founded. It is an apostasy in every sense. The mere citation of only a few facts will show this to be true, (a) Christ never made any provisions for any man on this earth to become the head of his church; (b) Christ never made Peter, *a* any one else pope; (c) Christ never once hinted that any of the apostles would ever have any successors in office; (d) Christ made no provisions for any such a system of priesthood as

the Catholic Church now has; (f) Christ warned against all human traditions and false doctrines that might turn people away from his teachings. Such doctrines as the seven sacraments, the veneration of saints, purgatory, limbo, indulgences, celibacy and infallibility are nowhere to be found in the New Testament. These all mark the Roman Church as an apostate body; not "the one true church."

2. *Catholics call theirs the "Holy Catholic Apostolic Church."* We deny that it is either holy, apostolic, or Catholic, (a) It is not holy because it contains numerous heresies, false doctrines, corruptions, misrepresentations, and unwarranted claims, (b) It is not apostolic because it does not believe, teach, or practice what the apostles did. The apostles knew nothing whatever about the primacy of Peter, Roman Catholic canon law, praying to the "saints," auricular confession, transubstantiation, infant baptism, and the multiplicity of other unscriptural teachings which have grown up in the Catholic Church during the past fifteen hundred years. Any church that claims to be apostolic should teach what the apostles taught, and not stray so far away that it does not even resemble what we find in the New Testament.

3. *The "Roman Catholic Church" is a contradiction of terms.* If it is Roman, then it cannot be Catholic. If it is Catholic, then it cannot be Roman. The term "catholic" means "universal." The Lord never once referred to his church as the Roman Church, nor did he ever refer to it as the Catholic Church. Neither did any of the inspired writers ever so speak of it. There is simply no defense for the use of these terms.

When Catholics are confronted with these facts they try to explain that this title is not recognized by the papacy. But the Council of Trent actually used the term "holy Roman Church"<sup>1</sup> as an official designation. *The Catholic Encyclopedia* admits the

---

<sup>1</sup>*Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent*, p. 15.

term "Roman Catholic Church" is used in its "negotiations" and "in formal documents" relating to the papal Church.<sup>2</sup> *The New Catholic Dictionary*, Vatican Edition, says, "*Roman Catholic*, a term commonly applied today to the Church established by Christ." It then goes on to explain, "This term, 'Roman Catholic,' is generally adopted today as a non-controversial term and has a recognized and legal standing."<sup>3</sup> Donald Attwater says the term "Roman Catholic" extends to "the whole Catholic Church as having its head in Rome. . . For Catholics it is in effect an abbreviation of the 'Holy Catholic Apostolic Roman Church' used by the Vatican Council (Session III, cp. I)."<sup>4</sup>

## II. Claims Regarding the Priesthood

In New Testament times all Christians were "kings and priests unto God."<sup>5</sup> But Catholics have created a special order of priests and elevated them above the masses, for the purpose of offering "sacrifices." Rather they repeat the same sacrifice—the body of Christ—over and over, for the people, which they claim to do when saying "Mass." As per their claim, Christ is offered anew each and every time "Mass" is said. This contradicts the scriptures which plainly state that Christ was offered "once for all."<sup>6</sup>

1. *Catholic authorities admit that the word "presbuteros" originally meant presbyter.* But they have appropriated this term to designate "priest." Thus, they confess, "This word has taken the meaning of 'sacerdos,' from which no substantive has been formed in various modern languages."<sup>7</sup> Since they could find no term in the original which corresponded to their special order of priests, it was necessary for Catholics to misappropriate a term,

---

<sup>2</sup>Vol. xiii, pp. 121, 122.

<sup>3</sup>*The New Catholic Dictionary*, p. 832.

<sup>4</sup>*A Catholic Dictionary*, p. 436.

<sup>5</sup>1 Pet. 2:5; Rev. 1:6; 5:10; 20:6.

<sup>6</sup>Heb. 9:26-28; 10:10.

<sup>7</sup>*The Catholic Encyclopedia*, vol. xii, p. 406.



and give it an entirely different meaning to that which it originally had.

2. *Catholics claim that the priest can and does in reality forgive sins.* Although the Bible clearly teaches that God alone can forgive sins,<sup>8</sup> the Council of Trent says, "the power with which the priests. . . are invested, is not simply to declare that sins are forgiven, but, as the minister of God, really to absolve from sin."<sup>9</sup> Christ possessed the power to forgive sins only by virtue of the fact that he was one with God the Father.<sup>10</sup> To argue that any one else has this power is blasphemy. Yet the Council of Trent says, "the priest represents the character and discharges the functions of Jesus Christ."<sup>11</sup>

These blasphemous claims were made in order for the "priests" to control the masses. Once they succeeded in obtaining this power, they have jealously guarded it lest they lose control over their people.

### III. Catholic Apparitions

Perhaps the most preposterous of all the claims made by Catholics is their imaginary stories about the many appearances of Mary. Affirming "eight authenticated apparitions of the Blessed Virgin Mary," Felician A. Foy, O. F. M. and his co-laborers relate all of these in the *1965 National Catholic Almanac*.<sup>12</sup>

1. *"Our Lady of Banneaux, Belgium."* Supposedly, Mary "appeared eight times to an 11-year-old peasant girl, Mariette Beco." To this imaginative child, Mary called herself "The Virgin of the Poor," explaining, "I have come to bring relief to the sick . . . Pray much." Although this "apparition" was claimed to have happened in 1933, it was not approved until 1949. A

---

<sup>8</sup>Isa. 43:25; Mk. 2:7.

<sup>9</sup>*Catechism of the Council of Trent*, p. 182.

<sup>10</sup>Jno. 10:30.

<sup>11</sup>*Catechism of the Council of Trent*, p. 182.

<sup>12</sup>See pp. 298-300.

chapel was built to "The Virgin of the Poor" where the phenomenon occurred, and Mary was designated as "Our Lady of Banneaux. . . Queen of Nations." In 1958, on the twenty-fifth anniversary of the supposed appearance of Mary, "over a million pilgrims visited the shrine" at Banneaux. Already the "International Union of Prayer, which is connected with devotion to the Virgin of the Poor, has 2, 000, 000 members throughout the world."

2. "*Our Lady of Beauraing, Belgium.*" Here Mary is supposed to have appeared to "five children" (whose ages are not given) 33 times between November 29, 1932 and January 3, 1933. Her message to them was "To pray always." (A long time ago the apostle Paul said, "Pray without ceasing."<sup>13</sup> Hence, this was not exactly new.) Approval of Mary's appearances here as "The Virgin of the Golden Heart" was given February 2, 1943, but it was not confirmed until 1949. However, a statue of the "Virgin" was unveiled here in 1946, and a chapel was consecrated in 1954. "*The Marian Union of Beauraing*" now has "thousands of members throughout the world."

3. "*Our Lady of Fatima, Portugal.*" Mary is said to have appeared here to three children, the oldest of whom was ten; the other two were seven and nine years of age. The first "apparition" was on May 13, 1917. Mary, we are told, "appeared" on the 13th of each month until October, at which time she promised, "I shall tell you who I am." She "recommended the frequent recitation of the Rosary and urged works of mortification for the conversion of sinners." It is reported that on October 13 of that same year, "70, 000 persons assembled in Cova da Iria, despite a downpour of rain," at which time Mary appeared for the last time to the children, but not to the people. "The rain suddenly ceased and the sun appeared. It was seen revolving like a wheel, throwing out in all directions shafts of varicolored light; it came

---

<sup>13</sup>1 Thes. 5:17.

to rest, then wheeled a second and a third time. Then it seemed to rush toward the earth. When the terrifying phenomenon ceased, it was observed that the crowd's drenched clothing had dried completely." It was not until October, 1930, that "the apparitions were declared worthy of belief and devotion to Our Lady of Fatima was authorized under the title of Our Lady of the Rosary."

"Sister Lucy, the sole survivor of the three shepherd children and now a Carmelite Nun at Coimbre, wrote in 1941-42 a three part account of the apparition of July 13, 1917. The first two parts concerned a vision of hell and the conversion of Russia. . . . The third part was the so-called 'secret' which, it was said, was not to be opened until 1960, or the death of Sister Lucy, whichever came first." But 1960 has now passed and the supposed "secret" still remains a secret.

4. "*Our Lady of Guadalupe, Mexico.*" In 1531, Mary "appeared to a fifty-five-year old Indian, Juan Diego," in Mexico City. He is reported to have seen Mary four times during his visionary period. As "proof" of her appearance to Juan, a mantle "bearing the picture [of Mary] has been preserved and is enshrined in the Basilica of Our Lady of Guadalupe, which has a long history as a center of devotion and pilgrimage in Mexico."

Some 200 years after this "appearance" of Mary "Pope Benedict XIV issued a decree naming Our Lady of Guadalupe the patroness of Mexico, and named December 12, "the feast of that title, a holiday."

5. "*Our Lady of Knock, Ireland.*" On August 21, 1879, Mary is reported to have appeared to Mary Beirne and the housekeeper for a parish priest. In this vision three figures appeared, with Mary in the center, Joseph on the right and John the apostle on the left. Just to the left of John "was a full-size adorned altar on which stood a lamb, turned toward the Virgin; behind the lamb was a large cross." It is said that "the vision

lasted for two hours and at least fifteen persons" swore they had witnessed it. "Three similiar visions were reported on January 6, February 10 and 12, 1880." These all occurred in Knock, a small place in the county of Mayo, Ireland. Here Mary is called, "Our Lady of Knock."

6. "*Our Lady of La Salette, France.*" On September 19, 1846, Mary, it is claimed, appeared "to two peasant children, Melanie Matthieu, 15, and Maximin Giraud, 11 years old." In 1851, "Pius IX declared: 'This is the secret of La Salette: Unless the world repent, it shall perish.'" We see nothing new in this. Jesus made a somewhat similar statement<sup>14</sup> more than eighteen hundred years before Mary is supposed to have spoken to these two children.

7. "*Our Lady of Lourdes, France.*" Mary is supposed to have appeared some eighteen times, between February 11 and July 16, 1858, to 14 year-old Bernadette Soubirous. She was also a peasant girl, and not too bright. Apparently she suffered ill health both physically and mentally all of her life. She died at the age of 35. The message to her was, "You will pray to God for sinners." (This all Christians have done ever since our Lord's church was established.) Bernadette is supposed to have scratched the ground at a cave where a spring miraculously burst forth into a stream flowing 27, 000 gallons of water a day. A shrine was built here and a feast was instituted by Pope Leo XIII commemorating Mary's supposed appearance to Bernadette. Millions now visit Lourdes in southern France every year, hoping to be cured of their maladies, but most of them come away disillusioned.

8. "*Our Lady of the Miraculous, Medal, France.*" Mary is said to have appeared to Catherine Laboure in 1830, at which time she "commissioned Catherine to have made the medal of the

---

<sup>14</sup>Lk. 13:3, 5.

Immaculate Conception, now known as the Miraculous Medal," which is sold by the millions—*for profit*.

Five of these eight "apparitions" were to children ranging in age from seven to fourteen. One was to an illiterate Indian. The other two were to women who, no doubt, were very emotional. All of these are about as reliable as the "ghost stories" which we so often heard as a child. In "revival" meetings we used to hear people tell their experiences of grace, many of which were of visions and apparitions they had seen and heard, and which they recounted quite vividly. We heard some so many times we could repeat them in every detail, except for the fact that those who reported such experiences usually embellished them, making them sound a little better each time they were told.

Ellen G. White and Joseph Smith both "substantiated" their visions as accurately and completely as the papacy has the stories told by these imaginative children and visionary women. Very recently a book came to our desk written by a man claiming a "doctor's" degree, asserting that he had received a vision from God and that what he wrote was the Word of God. His proof (which was his own word) is just as good as the many "apparitions" claimed for Mary. When one contrasts these stories with the gospel facts there is a chasm between them as wide and as deep as the universe. No religion can be regarded as reliable that is founded on such unsupported and fantastic tales.

But these stories have served well the purposes of the Catholic Church—they have brought millions of dollars to the Vatican from the shrines and other factors that are entwined with these fantastic tales.

#### **IV. Fraudulent Claims of Miraculous Cures**

Roman Catholic writers claim that miracles have been performed at Lourdes (in Southern France) "right and left." However, the Vatican has "officially" recognized only 57 "miracu-

lous" cures.<sup>15</sup> It is strange that so many millions have gone to Lourdes expecting to be healed, and that so many wild claims have been made for the cures received there, while the Vatican has admitted such a very small number. It is also strange that the Vatican says many more cases of miraculous healings have taken place at Lourdes, but these have not been sufficiently "tested" to be approved as *genuine*.

Similar claims to those that have been made for the cures at Lourdes have also been made by the officials of many heathen shrines, and the *evidences* of the miracles performed at such shrines are equally as well attested.

Most patent medicine companies have made out as good cases for their products as the Catholic Church has ever done for its miraculous cures. Doctors in this country have used blank pain reliever tablets in thousands of cases with good results. Operations have been performed, babies have been delivered, and many other uses have been made of blank pain reliever tablets with complete success.

There is a big difference in "faith healing" and in *miraculous* healing. That many *functional* disturbances have been completely overcome by various and sundry "faith" methods cannot be questioned. But there are no known cases of miraculous healings in modern times, such as were performed by Jesus and his apostles. Neither Roman Catholics nor any other modern "healers" are able to bring one back to life who has been dead for hours and even days. There are no known cases of those born blind, deaf, or with a missing limb, being miraculously healed since the days of the apostles. In New Testament times when one was healed of any ailment the healing was done instantly and completely, and that in the presence of large numbers of people. But it usually takes Roman Catholics from 25 to 300 years after the supposed miracle has been performed to approve it. They wait until they

---

<sup>15</sup>1965 *National Catholic Almanac*, p. 300.

are quite certain their purported miracles cannot be disproved before they place their stamp of approval upon them.

A UPI news item from Toulon, France, tells the story of a woman who had been "bedridden" for two years "with a mysterious paralysis which the doctors pronounced incurable." Her husband, Julien Hauspiez, had done "the shopping, cleaned the house, and prepared the meals. In the evenings, he sat by his wife's bedside and read to her. After two years of this sort of life, with no signs of any improvement, something snapped in Julien Hauspiez." He decided to end it all by stabbing his wife to death and then taking his own life.

But his hand was shaky and his aim bad. Instead of plunging the knife into her heart, he inflicted a superficial wound on the side of her head.

Mrs. Hauspiez woke up and was horrified when she saw her husband standing over her, the knife in his hand poised for another blow.

She leaped from the bed and ran across the room screaming. It was the first time she had used her legs in two years.<sup>16</sup>

Mrs. Hauspiez, the doctors said, "apparently had completely recovered from her paralysis." We doubt if any such a "miracle" as this ever happened at Lourdes.

The following article, carried by the United Press under a London dateline of May 23, 1958, expresses our sentiments regarding the claims of miracles performed not only at Lourdes but elsewhere.

The British Protestant "Churchman's Magazine" blasted Roman Catholic pilgrimages to Lourdes today as a "black, blasphemous" lie "believed by millions."

David Root Nash, in an article in the Magazine, said the "Big lie about Lourdes. . . is the lie about God, the lie that says that we have that sort of heavenly father—a father who will do something for you at Lourdes that he will not do for you anywhere else."

Nash referred to a "God who sells his favors to those of his children who can pay; a God whose grace is mixed up with geography; a God to whom you can draw near by taking a Cook's tour; a God from whom you can expect answers to your prayers according to just where you are on the map.

---

<sup>16</sup>*The Dallas Morning News*, January 18, 1960.

“There is the real lie of Lourdes—black, blasphemous and believed by millions.”

Nash said 25, 000 pilgrims visited Lourdes in 1877, this year it was likely to be between six and ten million.

British children are being drawn by the hundreds into this holy fraud," he charged.<sup>17</sup>

### V. Degrees of Worship Accorded to "Saints" and Images

Roman Catholics would have us believe there is a difference in the worship accorded to God, to Mary, and to the saints. They use three words to express three different "grades" or lands of worship. The highest is *latria*, which they accord to God alone. *Hyperdulia* is accorded to Mary, while the "saints" only receive a type of worship expressed by the term, *dulia*. This is a splitting of hairs. The term *latria* and *dulia* are both used to express a service belonging to God. As for *hyperdulia*—used to express a type of worship in between and belonging to Mary alone—this is purely a figment of the imagination. There is no such term in the Greek New Testament. The Bible knows nothing about any type of worship (call it "veneration" or what you will) as belonging to Mary, or to any of the other so-called "saints."

As to the type of worship accorded to the "saints" generally, Catholics explain,

One whose holiness of life and heroic virtue have been confirmed and recognized by the Church's official processes of beatification and canonization, or by the continued existence of an approved *cultus* and feast. To such only may public *veneration* and liturgical honor be given; but the *Church also produces numerous other saints* who remain unknown and unrecognized.<sup>18</sup>

Those who have been canonized are accorded "public veneration," while those who have not been canonized are not so honored. Concerning the term "veneration," Catholics say,

The word commonly used to express in English that *worship given to the saints*, either directly or through images or relics, which is different in

---

<sup>17</sup>*The Fort Worth Press*, May 4, 1958.

<sup>18</sup>*A Catholic Dictionary*, p. 444.



kind from the divine worship (adoration, *latría*) given to God only.<sup>19</sup>

When we go into a Catholic Church building and see the statues and images lining the walls, and people creeping into the building, bowing down and crossing themselves, praying with their eyes fixed upon the statues and images, how are we to guess that they are not worshipping these images on which their eyes are fixed? The second commandment in the Decalogue (which the Roman Catholics have deleted entirely) declares.

Thou shall not make unto thee a graven image, nor any likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth; *thou shall not bow down thyself unto them* nor serve them.<sup>20</sup>

In harmony with this command Jesus said, "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve."<sup>21</sup> The apostle Paul asked, "And what agreement hath the temple of God with idols?"<sup>22</sup> The answer, of course, is none whatever. The aged apostle John closed his first short epistle by saying, ". . . guard yourselves from idols."<sup>23</sup>

We can put no dependence in any church that encourages its people in the worship ("veneration") of saints and images—bowing down before them—and yet pretending that it believes the Bible to be authoritative; that its people are not violating the commandment of the Lord; that they are not worshipping Mary and the "saints," but merely "venerating" them.

## VI. Claims Concerning Ancient Relics

In December, 1957, the *Voice of Freedom* carried the following article by Waymon D. Miller:

The religion of Rome reeks with relics. Fragments of the body of some pious person or articles which either belonged to him or else came in contact with him or his tomb, are accorded adoration and veneration. Rel-

---

<sup>19</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 512, 513.

<sup>20</sup>Ex. 20:4, 5.

<sup>21</sup>Matt. 4:10.

<sup>22</sup>2 Cor. 6:16.

<sup>23</sup>1 Jno. 5:21.

ics are also believed by Romanists to possess supernatural curative powers, with all sorts of miracles and cures being attributed to them.

Relics are found in great profusion in the Catholic Church. I suppose every Catholic Church building possesses a relic, since the Council of Nicea, in 787, forbade bishops to consecrate churches without relics,<sup>24</sup> under the pain of excommunication.

The variety of relics is as broad and as imaginative as fiction and fraud can conceive. Claims of relics range from absurd to preposterous. A catalog of all the relics of Romanism would run into volumes. But to name a few: Catholics claim to have in their possession the head of Paul, the head of Peter, the skeleton of Peter, a lock of the Virgin Mary's hair, the stone on which the rooster crowed at Peter's denial of Christ, a quantity of Christ's blood, the arm of Lazarus, the shoulder blade and leg bone of Mary Magdalene, the tail of Balaam's ass, five legs of the colt upon which Christ rode into Jerusalem, the very stones the devil tempted Christ to turn to bread, Joseph's trousers, Mark's boots, a part of the Virgin's green petticoat, St. Anthony's nails, parings of St. Edmond's toenails, a bottle of St. Joseph's breath and the carpentry axe he used, several bottles of the Virgin's milk, a part of the Holy Spirit's finger, some of the rope with which Judas hanged himself, the nose of an angel, feathers from the wing of the angel Gabriel, the beard of Noah, one of the steps of Jacob's ladder, the rock on which Jacob slept, carloads of fragments of the cross of Christ, our Lord's foreskin at his circumcision, his navel cord, tears he shed at the grave of Lazarus, the Lord's seamless coat, a tooth of Christ, the manger, his cradle, the pillar on which he leaned while disputing in the temple, the water-pots in which he turned water into wine, nails (perhaps tons of them) from Christ's cross, and heaven only knows what else!

We can have no confidence in any church which "venerates" such supposed relics. This is especially true when their own scholars admit, as they do, that so many of these relics are spurious they cannot vouch for the genuineness of any of them—at least this is what it amounts to.

. . . it remains true that many of the more ancient relics duly exhibited for veneration in the great sanctuaries of Christendom or even at Rome itself must now be pronounced to be certainly spurious or open to grave suspicion.<sup>25</sup>

## VII. Catholic Forgeries

One of the best known forgeries is that of the so-called "Apostles' Creed." Its origin cannot be traced further back than

---

<sup>24</sup>So did the Council of Trent. See *Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent*, p. 215.

<sup>25</sup>*The Catholic Encyclopedia*, vol. xii, p. 737.

the third century. In fact there have been many changes made in it since it was first adopted by the Nicean Council in 325. But this is just *one* of Rome's many forged documents. Catholics admit that "Substitution of false documents and tampering with genuine ones was quite a trade in the Middle Ages."<sup>26</sup> It is true that every genuine article has been counterfeited. Every organized body has had some characters within it who were unworthy, and who have been a disgrace to it. But if the Roman Church would correct its false teachings which are based upon such forgeries, we would have far more respect for it. Catholic authorities, however, admit the perpetration of fraudulent relics, yet they condone the practices based upon them. Thus they say,

Honour may, and ought, to be paid to those relics whose genuineness is morally certain, but the question of their authenticity is one of fact, to be determined by the evidence, and the [Catholic] Church does not guarantee the genuineness of a single specific relic. . . Many famous relics are almost certainly spurious, but there is no need to assume deliberate fraud. Honour given in good faith to a false relic is nevertheless profitable to the worshipper and in no way dishonours the saint. . .<sup>27</sup>

As long as the Romish Church continues to condone its forgeries, and offers no apologies for them, we must stamp the system with the guilt and fraud.

### VIII. Catholic Propaganda

Roman Catholics gave birth to the modern methods of propaganda. The Roman Curia, which was especially organized for the propagation of the faith, has developed some of the most effective methods of propaganda known to modern times. While its seat is in Rome its tentacles reach out to the uttermost corners of the earth. In America the Catholic propaganda organization is so complex that it would be impossible to describe it. Its effects are seen in the press, the radio and television, the motion picture industry, in the textbooks used both in our *public* and private schools, in the classroom, in the legislative halls, and in fact in

---

<sup>26</sup>*Ibid.*, vol. vi, p. 136.

<sup>27</sup>*A Catholic Dictionary*, p. 423.

almost every phase of our every day life. Suppose you call the office of Bishop Fulton J. Sheen, 366 Fifth Avenue, N. Y. You will hear some one pick up the phone and answer: "Propagation"!

But Catholic propaganda manifests itself most openly perhaps in the ads being run by the Knights of Columbus in many of the leading newspapers and magazines throughout the country. This organization alone has spent multiplied millions of dollars on these ads, which are cleverly written so as to deceive the innocent and mislead honest souls. Sometimes one single ad will contain more than a half dozen misstatements of facts, yet they are done in such a clever manner that many have been completely taken in by them.

The deceit practiced in the propaganda perpetrated by the Roman Catholic Church stamps it as a fraud. When we see a number of glaring misstatements in a single ad we at once become dubious of anything that the hierarchy says. However, the members of the hierarchy will deny any statement in history that reflects unfavorably on the Roman Catholic Church. With them the end justifies the means.

Catholicism is the most subtle, the most monolithic (yet the most heterogenic), the most powerful, the most determined, and one of the most unreliable organizations on the face of the earth today.

## CHAPTER VII

### Catholicism Is Immoral

The Romanists are vociferous in denouncing immorality and ungodliness, but the consequences of their teachings do not comport with their words. For example, the hierarchy denounces low-necked dresses and high hem lines, dating in high school, obscene pictures and literature, "secularism" in the public schools, divorce and birth control, while approving of other practices which *result* in far more evil. However much the clergy may disavow the dire consequences of their teachings and practices, the facts are inescapable.

#### I. Catholicism Encourages Lying

The doctrine of "mental reservation" may be and often is used to excuse those who do not want to tell the truth. This doctrine declares:

If either the statement itself or circumstances show that a sense other than the obvious may be signified, this is strict mental reservation. . . strict mental reservation is sometimes justifiable, e.g., if it is a necessary means to preserve secrecy.<sup>1</sup>

Another source defines the term as "an act of the mind limiting the spoken phrase that it may not bear the full sense which, at first hearing, it seems to bear. A pure mental reservation is not indicated externally and is a lie."<sup>2</sup>

Another authority explains:

Mental reservation [is] the name applied to a doctrine which has grown out of the common Catholic teaching about lying and which is its complement. According to the common Catholic teaching it is never allowable to tell a lie. . . . However, we are also under an obligation to keep secrets faithfully, and sometimes the easiest way of fulfilling that duty is to say what is false, or to tell a lie. Writers. . . admit the doctrine of the

---

<sup>1</sup>*Catholic Dictionary*, p. 319.

<sup>2</sup>*The New Catholic Dictionary*, p. 623.

lie of necessity, and maintain that when there is a conflict between justice and veracity it is justice that should prevail.<sup>3</sup>

In a department of speech play at Notre Dame University, in the summer of 1957, mental reservations were wise-cracked as "a gimmick to tell as much of the truth as you think advisable and mentally reserve the rest." A subsequent story in the press raised many questions about mental reservation. In order to clarify the Catholic position, Dr. Francis J. Council, C. S. R., one of the best known Catholic theologians in the United States, explained,

A mental reservation is a procedure recognized by all Catholic theologians as a lawful means of keeping from a person information to which he has no right.

A mental reservation may, for example, be a statement which, if taken literally, is false, but which people commonly recognize as meaning something else. Thus, the lady who wishes to pass a restful afternoon can order her maid to tell a caller that she is not at home. The maid is using a lawful mental reservation, or restriction, and is not telling a lie.

Similarly, *if* a busybody asks me whether my brother is doing well in business, I may answer, "Yes," even though my brother is not succeeding financially. My *intention* is to say that he is doing well spiritually in his work, since he is an honest man.

Again, if a person bluntly asks me: "Were you ever arrested?" I may answer "No" even though this is not a fact. My answer is not a lie but merely a legitimate means of telling a person "It's none of your business!"

Some Catholic theologians have a slightly different way of explaining a person's right to conceal information which the questioner is unjustly trying to force from him. They say that a false statement is justifiable as a means of defense against the efforts of such a person.<sup>4</sup>

If the above does not give Roman Catholics the right to misrepresent the truth about any matter which seems to serve their purpose, then we have studied our Bible and our dictionary to no purpose. As we view it, any question a Catholic does not wish to answer, or any fact about which he does not wish to tell the truth, he may tell an untruth in good conscience. This may be all right, according to Catholic teaching, but it is not according to the teachings of the Word of God. *Webster's Dictionary* defines a *lie* as "a falsehood uttered or acted to deceive." Dr. Council, defines mental reservation in the same way that Webster defines a

---

<sup>3</sup>*The Catholic Encyclopedia*, vol. x, p. 195.

<sup>4</sup>*Catholic Men*, Washington, D. C., Dec. 1956.

lie. The apostle John declared that all such shall be cast into "the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone."<sup>5</sup>

## II. Catholicism Encourages Drunkenness

In Napa, California, the "Christian Brothers" have their own brewery, which is in competition with other breweries, and for nearly a century had escaped all federal taxes. It was not until late in 1961 that the "Christian Brothers" finally agreed to the payment of nearly four million dollars of accumulated taxes, after more than eight years of litigation. Their escape hatch was that their business is owned by the Catholic Church; that its legal head is "His Holiness" the Pope.

Any time Catholics go on a retreat, a picnic, or an outing of any kind, they carry a good supply of beer or brandy. A few years back St. Anthony's Catholic Church in Wichita, Kansas, obtained a license to sell beer *in a* church building, even though it was unlawful for anyone else to sell beer or liquor within 250 feet of any church or school in that city. More recently, a permit was issued for the sale of liquor on the property adjacent to the Georgetown (Catholic) University, Washington, D. C. This permit was obtained even though it violated the law forbidding the sale of liquor within 400 feet of a school, and despite the protests of many citizens living in the neighborhood. While visiting Rome in July, 1963, the author and his wife made a brief "tour" of "St. Peter's" Cathedral, where we paused at "St. Peter's bar" for a Coca-Cola—which was taken from under the counter. Others were drinking hard liquor, which was prominently displayed on the shelves.

At a convention of the National Licensed Beverage Association, which was held in Grand Rapids, Michigan, on October 26, 1959, the "Reverend" Hugh Michael Beahan, radio and television director of the Roman Catholic archdiocese, told the 1, 500 delegates to "stand up and fight the blue nosed enemies" of the liquor industry. "Drinking," said this (alleged) *another Christ*, "re-

---

<sup>5</sup>Rev. 21:8.

lieves tensions and keeps people relaxed." Barkeepers, he added, should get rid of their "inferiority complexes" because they are in "an honorable profession."

It is not infrequent for Catholic priests, who lecture all of us on the subject of morality, to be arrested for drunken driving. However much the clergy may contend that they teach moderation and soberness, we indict them for actually encouraging young people in the use of intoxicating beverages, which, in all too many instances, leads to drunkenness. Drunkenness leads to reckless driving on the streets and public highways, thus endangering the lives of innocent people. Drunkenness often leads to robbery, rape, and all the other evils concomitant. The hierarchy cannot escape by saying, "We do not believe in such practices; we discourage them." By encouraging young people to drink intoxicating beverages of any kind, in any degree, in any manner, Catholics encourage drunkenness; and in encouraging drunkenness they encourage all the evils that go with drunkenness.

### **III. Catholicism Encourages Gambling**

In their church edifices (which no woman may enter without covering her head) the Roman clergy sponsors beer parties, raffles, bingo, and other games of chance. Such practices are generally open to the public.

An Associated Press release, June 6, 1957, told the story of a priest who had won \$56, 000 on a horse race. The priest planned to use the money, he said, for building a meeting house.

From the *Grand Rapids* (Michigan) *Press*, August 11, 1958, came this report:

State Police and Kent County sheriffs deputies Sunday night raided the traditional home coming festival at St. Patrick's Church, Parnell, and confiscated gambling wheels, bingo equipment and money.

Officers said about 2, 500 persons were on the church grounds, where the festival was held, when the raiding party of about a dozen officers arrived in response to complaints. . .



Rev. Gordon Grant, pastor of the church, who was in the rectory when the raid occurred, said. . . he would make no statement until "we see how this thing comes out."

At about this same time, state law enforcement officers raided a gambling and drinking orgy at St. Florian's Church at Hal-ley, Wisconsin, near Wausau. In addition to a bountiful liquor supply, the officers found bingo equipment, horse race "games" and wheels of chance. The officers said they played the games, and bought whiskey "at 25 cents a shot." After they had stayed long enough to get all of the information needed, the officers backed up their cars and began loading the gambling equipment as evidence. A fracas of pushing, shoving and the wielding of beer bottles ensued. One law enforcement officer died when he was "pushed to the ground." Whether he died of "natural causes" or was the victim of rough treatment, we never learned.

The priest was fined \$100 for "permitting real estate to be used for gambling" and \$250 for violating the liquor law. No punishment was assessed against any others. The priest complained because the law enforcement officers did not give him any advanced notice so he could "close shop." *He was disgruntled because he could not get a "tip-off"— information that the underworld pays large sums to obtain.*

Gambling in any form is wrong in its very nature. When somebody gets something for nothing, others get nothing for something. It is a form of filching the public in order to get all the money one can without giving value received. Gambling leads to misunderstandings, dishonesty, fights, and nearly every other known evil. Most of the states have laws forbidding gambling, yet it is often difficult to enforce them because of the priests' defiance of them.

In his church bulletin Earl Fly gave the following account of a picnic he attended in August of 1957.

*Shively [Ky.] Newsweek* carried an advertisement on August 8, of a forthcoming picnic sponsored by St. Paul's Catholic Church, at Pleasure

Ridge Park. It featured "Amusements—Games—Refreshments," and, as grand prize, "A 1957 4-door Ford Station Wagon—Complete."

Dan Hogue and I decided to attend in order to get firsthand knowledge of the kind of amusements, games, and refreshments characteristic of Catholic Church picnics. So on Saturday night (Aug. 17) we spent about two hours taking in "St. Paul's" picnic. . . .

We counted 28 booths where people of all ages were gambling, from 5 cents on a wheel to \$6 at the dice table. The nuns, dressed in their flowing black robes, were gambling. One young boy was winning a little on one of the wheels. The mother, beaming because of his winnings, proudly told us he was only 5 years old. Young girls, old men and old women were gambling. A loud-speaker in one of the buildings frequently urged the crowd to gamble at various booths. Once we heard a hawker cry, "Win a statue of the Blessed Virgin"! The bingo gambling was in full swing, requiring 5 attendants to run it. Gambling prizes included hams and other foods; also dolls, radios, cameras, money, *wine* and *beer*. "Twelve cans of beer for a dime," was the cry at one gambling wheel.

#### IV. Catholicism Encourages Delinquency and Crime

Statistics show that delinquency or crime among Catholic youths is about twice as great as it is among Protestants. According to one report,

Catholic pre-eminence in the field of crime and juvenile delinquency is notable in our Northern cities, especially in New York. A study, *Crime and Religion*, by Father Leo Kalmer, *Franciscan Herald Press*, Chicago, 1936, showed that the rate of Catholic criminals committed to prisons in 28 states was about twice that of the Catholic proportion in the population . . . Bishop Gallagher of Detroit declared, according to the *New York Times* of December 8, 1936: "It is a matter of serious reproach to the [Catholic] Church that more Catholic boys, in proportion to the total number, get into trouble than those of any other denomination. One-fifth of the people of Michigan are Catholics, but 50 per cent of the boys in the Industrial School for Boys at Lansing are Catholics."<sup>6</sup>

In his book, *Crime and Immorality In The Catholic Church*, Emmett McLoughlin cites statistics gathered over many years, not merely in the United States, but all over the Western world, which prove beyond all doubt that the crime rate is much higher among Catholics than it is among Protestants. A brief visit to a

---

<sup>6</sup>*American Freedom and Catholic Power* [1949], p. 321.

few of the predominantly Catholic countries makes this quite evident even to the casual observer.

If it is argued that many Catholic children in this country are from poor families, immigrants and the like, it should be remembered that the Roman Catholic Church has had nearly fifteen centuries in which to correct a bad situation. Why has it not done so? All through the ages the hierarchy has sought to indoctrinate the people in the Catholic faith; much time and effort have been spent trying to tell the rest of us how ungodly our public schools are, and how much superior the parochial schools are, where children are taught about God, righteousness, and holy living. If the Catholic system is so much superior to the "Protestant" system, we wonder why it is that delinquency and crime are all out of proportion in the ranks of Roman Catholics in this country. We charge that *it is the result of the Roman Catholic system*

#### **V. Catholicism Encourages Sexual Immorality**

We do not argue that Roman Catholics actually preach or openly encourage sexual immorality, but we do charge that *as a consequence of their dogma* on clerical celibacy immoral sexual relationships often are the results. It is an abnormal state for either men or women to live a life of continency. Although celibacy may be an ideal state, theoretically, for those who devote all of their services to the Lord, it is impractical in most cases. This the apostle Paul recognized.<sup>7</sup> Most of those who are deprived of a normal family relationship are subjected to temptations too strong for them to resist.

When women with sex appeal confess immoral practices, and even immoral thoughts, in the ears of a Roman Catholic priest, which they are required to do under penalty of mortal sin, it arouses inordinate emotions and desires, both within the one con-

---

<sup>7</sup>1 Cor. 7:1-7.

fessing and the confessor (the priest). Numerous cases have come to light about priests who have taken advantage of such women to satisfy their pent-up passions. In many cases such sins would not have been committed if the priests had not been required to live a celibate life, and had not been forced to inquire into the most intimate secrets of every act, word, and thought of their parishioners.

The only way we have of ascertaining the actual facts in such cases is from the testimony of that great host of ex-priests. It is shocking to hear the stories of some of these who have told not only of their own shortcomings, but of the numerous confessions they have heard at the mouth of their fellow-priests. If we may believe their stories—and we have no reason to disbelieve them—we may thus judge that vast numbers have taken advantage of those who confess in their ears their most intimate secrets. This they have done to gratify their fleshly desires which burn within them, and which they cannot legitimately quench in the bond of sacred wedlock.

Since the confessional is one of the most immoral aspects of the entire Roman Catholic system let us observe:

1. *The Confessional is blasphemy against God.* Through one of his prophets, God said, "I, even I, am he that blotteth out thy transgressions for mine own sake; and I will not remember thy sins."<sup>8</sup> The scribes were partially right when they reasoned, "Why doth this man thus speak? He blasphemeth: who can forgive sins but one, even God?"<sup>9</sup> Their error was in their failure to recognize that Jesus was God incarnate. Had he not been, they would have been right in their accusation. Any man who presumes to forgive sins blasphemes. Again, the Jews said, "For a good work we stone thee not, but for blasphemy; and because that thou, being a man, makest thyself God."<sup>10</sup> Christ never de-

---

<sup>8</sup>Isa. 43:25.

<sup>9</sup>Mk. 2:7.

<sup>10</sup>Jno. 10:33.

nied that it was blasphemy for a *man* to presume to forgive sins. Had the Jews been right in their premise (that Christ was but a man), they would have been right in their conclusion. The priest literally assumes the prerogatives of God when he presumes to forgive sins. He (it is assumed) is "invested with the character of Christ."<sup>11</sup>

A familiar Knights of Columbus ad is captioned "Yes. . . A Priest Can Forgive Your Sins." This is the official doctrine of the papal church, as stated in the Catechism "published by command of Pope Pius the Fifth":

. . . the Redeemer instituted the sacrament of penance, in which we cherish a well founded hope, that our sins are forgiven us by the absolution of the priest. . . who is legitimately constituted a minister for the remission of sins, is to be heard *as that of Christ himself*, who said to the lame man: "Son, be of good cheer, thy sins are forgiven thee." . . . Unlike the authority given to the priests of the Old Law, to declare the leper cleansed from his leprosy, the power with which the priests of the New Law are invested, is not simply to declare the sins forgiven, but, as the ministers of God, really to absolve from sins."<sup>12</sup>

Truly, this is blasphemy!

2. *The Confessional is a pitfall for women.* It causes many to lie. There are literally thousands of Roman Catholic women who have such a keen sense of propriety that they will not reveal the secrets of their own sins to any man. They would rather face God in the judgment with their sins unforgiven than to permit a priest to pry into the personal secrets of their own lives. Charles Chiniquy, who spent fifty years in the church of Rome, said,

More than once, I have seen women fainting in the confessional-box, who told me afterwards, that the necessity of speaking to an unmarried man on certain things, on which the most common laws of decency ought to have forever sealed their lips, had almost killed them! Not hundreds, but thousands of times, I have heard from the lips of dying girls, as well as of married women, the awful words, "I am forever lost! All my past confessions and communions have been so many sacrileges! I have never dared to answer correctly the questions of my confessors! Shame has sealed my lips and damned my soul!"<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup>*The Catechism of the Council of Trent*, p. 175.

<sup>12</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 180-182.

<sup>13</sup>*The Priest, The Woman and the Confessional*, p. 22.

3. *The Confessional is a pitfall for priests.* Hundreds of priests and laymen have testified to this fact. The priest is an unmarried man of like passions with other men. He is subject to all of the temptations of men. What, then, can be expected of a priest who listens to all of the confessions of immorality going on in the community! What tales of woe, what scandalous secrets he must hear! Such tend to fill his mind with all manner of uncleanness; the effect is bound to be degrading. Who can believe that Roman Catholic priests are stronger than Samson, who was seduced by Delilah, or wiser than David, who was tempted by Bathsheba?

Charles Chiniquy echoes the experiences of many priests when he says,

How few are those who have escaped the snares of the tempter compared with those who have perished? I have heard the confessions of more than 200 priests, and to say the truth as God knows it, I must declare that only twenty-one had not to weep over the secret or public sins committed through the irresistibly corrupting influences of auricular confession!

I am now more than seventy-seven years old, and in a short time I shall be in my grave. I shall have to give an account of what I now say. Well, it is in the presence of my great Judge, with my tomb before my eyes, that I declare to the world that very few—yes, very few—priests escape from falling into the pit of the most horrible moral depravity the world has ever known, through the confession of females.<sup>14</sup>

Will Durant, who was brought up a Roman Catholic, writes at length concerning the unmoral practices of the clergy shortly before the sixteenth century Reformation. He declares,

Bishop Hardouin of Angers reported (1428) that the clergy of his diocese did not count concubinage a sin, and that they made no attempt to disguise their use of it. In Pomerania, about 1500, such unions were recognized by the people as reasonable, and were encouraged by them as protection for their daughters and wives; at public festivals the place of honor was given as a matter of course to priests and their consorts. In Schleswig a bishop who tried to outlaw the practice was driven from his see (1499). At the Council of Constance Cardinal Zabarella proposed that if sacerdotal concubinage could not be suppressed, clerical marriage should be restored. The Emperor Sigismund, in a message to the Council

---

<sup>14</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 64.

of Basel (1431), argued that the marriage of the clergy would improve public morals.<sup>15</sup>

Writing on conditions a century later Dr. Durant says,

The Church was as genial and corrupt in Switzerland as in Italy. . . . One Swiss bishop charged his clergy four guilders for every child born to them, and in one year garnered 1522 guilders from this source. He complained that many priests gambled, frequented taverns, and got drunk—apparently without paying an episcopal fee.<sup>16</sup>

Durant further writes:

Cardinal Beaton had eight bastards, and slept with Marion Ogilvy on the night before he went to meet his Maker; John, Archbishop Hamilton, obtained from divers sessions of the Scottish Parliament letters of legitimation for his increasing brood. The pre-Reformation poets of Scotland spared no words in satirizing the clergy; and the clergy themselves, in the Catholic provincial synod of 1549, ascribed the degradation of the Church in Scotland to "corruption in morals and profane lewdness of life in churchmen of almost all ranks."<sup>17</sup>

The Twenty-fifth Session of the Council of Trent decreed,

. . . it shall not be lawful for sons of clerics, not born in lawful wedlock, to hold in those churches in which their fathers have or had some ecclesiastical benefice, any benefice whatsoever, even though a different one, or to minister in any way in those churches, or to have salaries from the revenues of the benefices which their fathers hold or formerly have held.<sup>18</sup>

In January of 1958, the Associated Press and United Press both carried an account released by a Reuters report from Nancy, France of a priest who killed a woman who was to bear him a son within a few days. After killing the woman he ripped her open and stabbed the baby to death. In court the priest confessed that he was the father of the baby, and further admitted, according to the report,

. . . that he previously had seduced two other girls. He had celebrated the marriage of one of them and went on seeing her while her husband was in military service.

The jury deliberated 90 minutes after the one day trial. It agreed that Desnoyers deliberately shot to death Regine Fays on December 3, 1956, and then used a knife to kill the child she was to have delivered in a few days. . . .

---

<sup>15</sup>*The Story of Civilization*, vol. vi, pp. 21, 22.

<sup>16</sup>*ibid.*, pp. 403, 404.

<sup>17</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 603.

<sup>18</sup>*Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent*, p. 248.

Desnoyers, occasionally clutching a crucifix, confessed to the crime and admitted affairs with other women, one of whom bore him a child. . . .

We are not charging that this Roman Catholic priest is typical of the priesthood of the Roman Church. However, we do charge that the Roman Catholic *system* often subjects both priests and women to temptations beyond their ability to bear. When beautiful young women and girls must confess their temptations and their sins in the ears of an unmarried man, possessed with all of the physical urges and longings of any normal man (whose passions have never been satisfied in the sacred marriage relationship) the temptations are more than many of them can bear. Such confessions arouse the emotions not only of the priest, but often of the women and girls, to the point that they are an easy prey.

We charge that this unscriptural teaching is a potential evil, into which many men and women have needlessly fallen. This is but one of the immoral aspects of the teachings of the Roman Catholic Church, which cannot be justified on either Biblical, moral, ethical, or any other grounds.

Even though the councils of Rome have condemned priests who keep concubines, it is admitted by some Catholic theologians that it has been the practice of some priests through the years. In the debate between Alexander Campbell and Bishop Purcell, the following statement was read from the works of St. Liguori, one of the most revered theologians in the Roman Church:

A Bishop, however poor he may be, cannot appropriate to himself pecuniary fines, without the license of the Apostolical See. But he ought to apply them to pious uses. Much less can he apply those fines to any thing else but pious uses, which the *Council of Trent* has laid upon nonresident Clergymen, or upon those *Clergymen who keep Concubines*.<sup>19</sup>

Bishop Purcell denied that there was any such passage in the works of Saint Liguori, and called on "the heavens and the earth" to bear witness to his denial.<sup>20</sup> Campbell borrowed the Bishop's set of Liguori's works on *Moral Theology*, and the passage was

---

<sup>19</sup>*Campbell-Purcell Debate*, p. 218.

<sup>20</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 253.



later found on page 444, as Campbell had read it. Six men—including Samuel F. B. Morse, and four prominent clergymen of different faiths—verified the facts, and notarized a signed statement attesting the truthfulness of it.<sup>21</sup>

## VI. Moral Apostasy in the Middle Ages

Indicting the Apostate Church with the gravest kind of immorality, the May, 1958, issue of the *Voice of Freedom*, carried the following article, written by Cecil N. Wright, on the "*Midnight*" of the Dark Ages.

1. *Among the Laity.* The lofty standards of the first century rapidly deteriorated. One reason for the low moral tone among the laity was not alone the examples set by their leaders, but the fact that so very many of them had come from heathenism without any genuine conversion. When Christianity became the state religion many heathens changed just to be on the popular side, or because the emperor recommended it. Their only interest in religion was of a temporal nature. In some instances whole nations were "converted" with the sword; not with the gospel. There was no moral change in their lives. Their religion was nothing more than a superstition. Most of the pagan religions not only had failed to inculcate high moral standards, they even encouraged low morals. Their greatest celebrations were immoral orgies.

2. *Among the Clergy.* From among these pagans came many of the priests. Discouraged for centuries from having wives, and being finally forbidden absolutely to marry, it is reported that in many places their parishioners were glad when the priests kept mistresses. It made it safer for their wives and daughters.

3. *Among the Popes.* Such immorality was not confined to the lower clergy. Nowhere was it worse than among the popes and their associates. Some of the popes were nothing short of monsters of sin. That period of time from A. D. 870 to 1050 has been called the darkest period of the papacy, or the "Mid-night of the Dark Ages."

Pope John XII (955-963) was "guilty of almost every crime; violated virgins and widows, high and low; lived with his father's mistress; made the papal palace a brothel; was killed while in the act of adultery by the woman's enraged husband." Benedict IX (1033-45) "surpassed John XII in wickedness; committed murders and adulteries in broad daylight; robbed pilgrims on the graves of martyrs; a hideous criminal, the people drove him out of Rome." Gregory VI (1045, 6) bought the papacy. During this period there were three rival popes—Benedict DC, Gregory VI, and Sylvest-

---

<sup>21</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 359, 360.

er III. One writer says, "Rome swarmed with hired assassins; the virtue of pilgrims was violated; even churches were desecrated with bloodshed." In 1046, Emperor Henry III of Germany appointed Clement II as pope "because no Roman clergyman could be found who was free from the pollution of simony and fornication." Conditions improved temporarily. Yet the situation was nearly as bad in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, when the Protestant Reformation began.

In the same issue of the *Voice of Freedom* the following headline, "Moral Decay Seen Growing In Europe," was taken from a current issue of the *Dallas Times Herald*.

The cradle of Western culture is now the center of a massive moral decay providing Communism with much of its impetus, a missionary director believes.

Rev. Noel O. Lyons, home director of the Chicago based Greater Europe Mission, told students of the Dallas Theological Seminary Thursday that "the people of civilized Europe desperately need a religious reawakening as a result of their dying religion and growing susceptibility of the packaged way of life promised by Communists. . . .

"The hearts of Europeans" he said, "are hungering for reality, and while they seek hope and a better way of life they are easy prey to the false hopes presented by Communism."

"People who belong to churches in Europe know nothing of the hope of salvation, the joy of living or the awareness of a living God. . . there are more people living in civilized Europe who have never seen a Bible than the combined populations of the United States and Canada. . . .

Most of the predominantly Catholic countries until this day are plagued with disease, poverty, illiteracy, gambling, communism and strife. If one doubts what we here charge let him take a stroll through Old Mexico and on down through Central and South America, where the Roman Catholic Church has held sway for centuries, and look at the gambling dives, the free flow of liquor, low wages, squalor, disease and unrest and then try to justify the moral standards of the papal church!

There are no middle class people in most Catholic countries. Practically everything is owned by *a very few*. Nearly all of the rest are extremely poor. The Roman Catholic *system* is largely responsible for this condition, which is breeding one revolution after another. It is a veritable spawning ground for so much Communism.

## VII. Immorality in Catholic Spain

In 1957, Richard Wright depicted the immoral and depraved conditions in Spain, which is one of the most thoroughly Catholic nations in the world today. He wrote:

In Spain sex has been converted into a medium of exchange for almost all kinds of commodities and services to a degree that cannot be found in any other European country. . . . Madrid alone, according to spokesmen of the Catholic hierarchy itself, has more than one hundred thousand prostitutes, forty thousand of whom are not registered with the police or health authorities. Barcelona and Seville literally crawl with hungry women willing to grant access to their bodies for bread or its equivalent.

These trapped and unfortunate women have been referred to as a "wall of flesh" and that wall is everywhere: in bars, cafes, pensions, hotels, sidewalks, churches, parks, etc. Almost all of these women are deeply religious and almost all of them have children to feed. A large portion of them are sunk in illiteracy. Some practice prostitution professionally, some part time; some operate on their own, others have pimps. . . .

The unbelievably low wage rates for domestic workers are enough to convince any girl with any capacity for reflection that it is by far preferable to merchandise her body than to be an ill-clad, half-starved slave to some spoiled, bourgeois Spanish wench.<sup>22</sup>

This is the same country praised by Pope John in a letter to Franco in 1960, for its "strong Catholicity," which gave him "particular comfort and satisfaction."<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup>*Pagan Spain*, pp. 150, 151.

<sup>23</sup>The *Denver Register*, Jan. 30, 1960.

## CHAPTER VIII

### Catholicism Is Incurrigible

Roman Catholicism is incurrigible (1) in spirit, (2) in doctrine (3) in organization, and (4) in practice. This is evident from the very nature of the system itself, albeit the vast majority of Roman Catholics are honest, and sincerely believe the Catholic system is of God. But as long as they blindly follow their clergy we have an obligation to try to break through the velvet curtain which has been drawn about them and get through to them with the facts.

Catholicism has so far departed from first century Christianity it has passed the point of no return. There is no earthly power that can reform the papal system. We humbly appeal, therefore, to all sincere Catholics, as individuals, to study the facts for themselves and to make up their own minds regarding the truth of what we say. The very fact that the papacy forbids its people to attend any religious services, other than its own, or even listen to or read what others say, is a confession of weakness and fear.

#### I. The Spirit of Catholicism Is Incurrigible

The spirit of Roman Catholicism is everything but the spirit of him who said, ". . . he that is least among you all, the same is great."<sup>1</sup> Or again, "Except ye turn, and become as little children, ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven. Whosoever therefore shall humble himself as this little child, the same is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven."<sup>2</sup> The apostle Paul said, "Have this mind in you, which was also in Christ Jesus: who, existing in the form of God, counted not the being on an equality with God a thing to be grasped, but emptied himself, tak-

---

<sup>1</sup>Lk. 9:48.

<sup>2</sup>Matt. 18:3-4.

ing the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men; and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, becoming obedient even unto death, yea, the death of the cross."<sup>3</sup>

The whole Roman hierarchy is so constituted that it is contrary to the spirit set forth in the above scriptures. The Pope, who is regarded as the "Vicar of Christ," wears all the titles applied to Christ (and even more). He is officially addressed as "His Holiness the Pope." Next in order are the Cardinals, who are styled the "Princes in the Church." A cardinal is formally addressed as "His Eminence." The Archbishop is addressed as "His Excellency," or "The Most Reverend." Next is the Bishop who is usually addressed as "The Very Reverend" or he may be likewise addressed "The Most Reverend." The titles of honor and the manner of addressing the members of the hierarchy are an evidence of the wrong spirit manifested by Catholicism. The further fact that all people are expected to bow before the members of the hierarchy and kiss their hand accentuates the Roman Catholic spirit of exaltation. This act of reverence for all members of the ruling hierarchy denotes an act of *worship*. The Greek word for "worship" is *is proskuneo*, which literally means, "to do reverence or homage by kissing the hand."<sup>4</sup> This spirit of anti-Christ is manifested in numerous ways.

1. *The Catholic Church is the most dogmatic body in the world.* A Catholic dogma has the force of divine law behind it. All Roman Catholics are expected to believe whatever dogmas may be put forth by the papal church. Catholicism goes far beyond the realm of faith. The idea is drilled into the people from their earliest existence that *they know that they are right*. In view of this dogmatic teaching, they are forbidden to attend the services of other religious bodies; they are forbidden to read any published works that are contrary to Catholic teaching. Their minds must be completely closed to any possibility of change. They are

---

<sup>3</sup>Phil. 2:5-8.

<sup>4</sup>A *Greek-English Lexicon to the New Testament*, p. 159.

among the most completely brain-washed people in the world. They must attend separate schools, have their own separate organizations of almost every kind in order to keep them from the association of other religious people. The spirit of research, of learning and of choosing for oneself is completely absent in the Catholic system. The entire concept of papalism is incorrigible. The Roman Church would fall apart in a very short time if the people were allowed to exercise the freedom of thought, of choice and of voluntary obedience as set forth in the New Testament.

2. *Roman Catholicism defies any authority that stands in its way.* Kings may be deposed, rulers may be driven out, and the people may be absolved from any allegiance whatsoever to their rightful rulers. But the Pope not only defies any authority that stands in his way, he is exalted above all earthly power. This spirit of defiance, this exaltation of the papacy, this right of Catholicism to make and enforce its own laws in any land, is unscriptural, unreasonable, and inexcusable. The apostle Paul could say, "Let every soul be in subjection to the higher powers."<sup>5</sup> The apostle Peter wrote, "Be subject to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake: whether to the king, as supreme; or unto governors, as sent by him. . ."<sup>6</sup> The papacy says in substance, "Be subject to civil powers *as long as the civil powers are subject to the Roman Church.*"

3. *Catholics are constantly trying to control the politics of any and every country where they possibly can.* They simply cannot keep from meddling. A good example of the Pope's attempts to impose his own power on a nation is seen in the excommunication of Queen Elizabeth I by Pope Pius V, in 1570. In part this Papal bull of excommunication reads:

He that reigneth on high, to whom is given all power in heaven and on earth, committed one holy, Catholic, and apostolic Church, *out of which there is no salvation* [Emphasis supplied], to one alone upon earth, to Peter, the prince of the apostles, and to Peter's successor, the bishop of

---

<sup>5</sup>Rom. 13:1.

<sup>6</sup>1 Pet. 2:13, 14.

Rome, to be governed in fullness of power. Him alone he made prince over all people, and all kingdoms, to pluck up, destroy, scatter, consume, plant, and build, that he may retain the faithful that are knit together with the band of charity, in the unity of the spirit, and present them spotless and unblamable to their Saviour. In discharge of which function, we, who are, by God's goodness, called to the government of the aforesaid church, do spare no pains, laboring with all earnestness, that unity, and the Catholic religion, which the author thereof hath for the trial of his children's faith, and for our amendment, suffered to be exercised with so great afflictions, might be preserved incorrupt. . . .

Being, therefore, supported with his authority, whose pleasure it was to place us, though unequal to so great a burden, in this supreme throne of justice, we do, out of the fulness of our apostolic power, declare the aforesaid Elizabeth, being an heretic, and a favorer of heretics, and her adherents in the matter aforesaid, to have incurred the sentence of anathema, and to be cut off from the unity of the body of Christ. And, moreover, we do declare her to be deprived of her pretended title to the kingdom aforesaid, and of all dominion, dignity, and privilege whatsoever. And also the nobility, subjects, and people of the said kingdom, and all others which have, in any sort, sworn to her, to be forever absolved from any such oath, and all manner of duty, dominion, allegiance, and obedience; as we also do by the authority of these presents absolve them, and do deprive the same Elizabeth of her pretended title to the kingdom, and all other things above-said. And we do command and interdict all and every one of the noblemen, subjects, people, and others aforesaid, that they presume not to obey her, or her admonitions, mandates, and laws; and those who shall do the contrary, we do innodate with the like sentence of anathema. (May 5, 1570).<sup>7</sup>

Wherever Catholics have the power they unite the church and state, but always in such a way as to compel the state to recognize Catholicism as "the Church." The National Catholic Welfare Conference is one of the most powerful organizations in this country. It is staffed by some of the most able men in the Roman Catholic hierarchy in America. The aim of this organization is to obtain every favor it possibly can in the way of legislation, gifts, and bequests—and through every conceivable type of maneuvering. Nearly every country in the world has had serious trouble with the Catholic Church where it has been allowed to gain any substantial power. Nearly all of the Latin American countries have been plagued by revolutions, precipitated by Catholic pressure. It is but a matter of time until the American peo-

---

<sup>7</sup>*The History of the Popes*, vol. iii, pp. 482-3.

ple will wake up to the startling fact that Catholicism is leading our nation to a state of chaos and decay. The spirit manifested by Catholic pressure groups is completely contrary to the New Testament Church.

4. *Roman Catholicism abounds in assumptions, allegations, and misrepresentations.* All of her dogmatic teachings, her peculiar practices, as well as her social structure rest upon tradition, assumptions and Catholic decrees. We are simply expected to take the word of Catholics for what they teach. Augustine, Thomas Aquinas and others are "saints" because the Catholic Church made them saints. In turn whatever these "saints" taught is true and right because they *are* "saints." Thus, the Catholic Church made them "saints" and they, as "saints," made the Catholic Church what it is. Occasionally the "infallible" church decides to unmake a saint, and then there are always a lot of red faces and a lot of explaining to do. In April of 1961, the papacy—speaking for the church that "never changes"—*unmade* "St. Philomena." Those who are investigating are wondering now if such a person ever existed. As yet they have not explained the many "miracles" wrought by this fictitious "saint."

At the very time "St. Philomena" was "unsainted," Cardinal Gushing of Boston was preparing to dedicate a cathedral to her. The loyal Cardinal complained that he was "always" caught "in the middle." He had founded a guild dedicated to "St. Philomena" which had "distributed hundreds of miniature statues of her." Many churches which have been named for this particular "Saint," who has now been "desainted," will have to change their names. As yet, we have not been told what all of the good "Sisters" who have taken the name of this deposed "Saint" are going to do about their names. But *dropping* a "saint" or even a pope poses no real problem for the Roman Pontiff who cannot possibly make a mistake in such matters. However, it does catch a lot of the members—all the way from cardinals down—"in the middle" of a fix. About the only explanation they can make is that the



Pope cannot be wrong. Thus, when one pope creates a saint he does so by his "infallible" authority, and when another pope debunks a saint he is also doing it by his "infallibility."

## II. Roman Catholic Doctrines Are Incurable

1. *One of the foundation stones of Roman Catholicism is its claim to infallibility.* If this claim should ever be surrendered, it would be impossible to sustain any doctrine not supported by the Word of God. The canon laws of Rome would then rest on no authority above that of human reason. But the wisdom of man can never be relied upon as absolute in any field, whether in science, art, theology, or any other. Well did one of the prophets of old say, "I know that the way of man is not in himself; it is not in man that walketh to direct his steps."<sup>8</sup> Only by the inspiration of God is it possible for one to know the will of God. If it should be admitted that the Pope is fallible, that it is possible for him to err when he speaks officially for the whole Catholic Church, then the doctrine of infallibility would have to be surrendered.

If any such concessions should ever be made, Catholics would be driven to the admission that all of Rome's canon laws are based upon human judgment; that the traditions which have been received by the papal church are of no more value than other traditions handed down through the years; that Rome's interpretations of the scriptures are of no more significance than the interpretations of anyone else; it would mean that the authority claimed by the head of the Catholic Church is without any validity in fact; that all of the claims made by the Catholic Church are the claims of fallible men, and that the entire papal system rests upon a foundation of sand. Manifestly, it is impossible for Rome ever to make any such concessions. This being true, it is utterly impossible for any reformation to take place in Rome's teachings.

---

<sup>8</sup>Jer. 10:23.

2. *Since the papacy can never admit of error, then it must endorse and confirm the decrees of the Roman Church from the very beginning.* It must accept all of the mistakes of the past, and seek to justify them by any and all means where they cannot be ignored. Since the hierarchy knows it cannot justify or excuse some of the decrees of the councils and of the popes in the past, it tries by every conceivable means to venerate them over, arguing that, "Jesus said his church could never teach error."

In a letter addressed to the author and signed by "Mario S. Constantino, President, and Joseph A. Torres, Chairman, Religious Activities Committee and Vice-President of the Holy Name Society, San Antonio, Texas," we were taken to task for some of our statements. The writers of the letter asserted, "Jesus said that His church would never teach error. . . you say it does teach error. If you are right, Jesus is wrong; if Christ is right, you and your followers are wrong."<sup>9</sup> Of course, Jesus never made any such statement, or any statement akin to this. But most of the Catholic people sincerely believe this doctrine. The rank and file of the members of the Catholic Church do not realize the consequences of Rome's claim to infallibility. Hence, they try to excuse the "infallible" decrees of the papacy on the ground that circumstances and conditions which provoked such decrees in the past, "need not be so now."

In January of 1837, Alexander Campbell engaged Bishop (later to become Archbishop) Purcell in a discussion of the differences between Protestantism and Roman Catholicism. One of the propositions affirmed by Campbell was, "She [the Catholic Church] is not uniform in her faith, or united in her members; but mutable and fallible, as any other sect of philosophy or religion—Jewish, Turkish, or Christian—a confederation of sects with a politico-ecclesiastic head." Purcell was one of the most learned bishops of his day. It is doubtful if any representative of

---

<sup>9</sup>See *Voice of Freedom*, May, 1959, p. 67.

the Romish Church could have done a better job of defending her doctrines than did Purcell. However, he made some very damaging admissions. In his apologies for some bad popes he said, "I should not be surprised if these bad popes were at this moment expiating their crimes in the penal fires of hell."<sup>10</sup> The Bishop then admitted that the "council" had "cashiered three doubtful popes" and elected one "true" pope.<sup>11</sup> To this Campbell replied,

. . . there were in all four popes created and destroyed at that one time. . . I ask now, how are we to decide which of these four had the best title to St. Peter's chair? Where is the authority for a council's creating one and destroying three popes?. . . But if we say with the bishop, that no one of the three popes was a true pope, then what a link is wanting in the succession; and how could the council of Constance furnish it?<sup>12</sup>

A third of a century before the first Vatican Council yielded to the will of Pope Pius IX, giving him the "infallible" power which he sought, Campbell argued,

. . . *Adrian VI did, unequivocally, disown the pope's infallibility.* Now, from this single fact, I prove the fallibility of the pope; for Adrian was either right, or he was wrong. If right, the pope is fallible; for he avows that he is. If wrong, the pope is fallible; for he was a pope and yet did err. This is a dilemma never to be annihilated nor disposed of. Pope Stephen VI rescinded the decrees of pope Formosus. Pope John annulled those of pope Stephen, and restored those of pope Stephen. [The two popes called Stephen here had different numbers.] Sergius III so hated Formosus and all that he did, as pope, that he obliged all the priests he ordained to be re-ordained.<sup>13</sup>

Campbell thus concluded his argument on papal "infallibility":

I have thus shown that the church of Rome is not uniform; and need we farther proof that she is mutable and fallible; —without that real unity and uniformity of which she boasts? Have we not found pope against pope, council against council, the church of one age against the church of another age, and, by the acknowledgement of a pope, as much strife and party as amongst Protestants?<sup>14</sup>

Although Rome's contention of infallibility is untenable from every viewpoint, the doctrine can never be surrendered. If it

---

<sup>10</sup>*Campbell-Purcell Debate*, p. 145.

<sup>11</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 146.

<sup>12</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 154.

<sup>13</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 179.

<sup>14</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 180.

should be, then all the claims that have been made for her teachings and authority would likewise have to be surrendered. Even the boast that the Catholic Church has made through the years, that "Rome never changes," would have no meaning. Rome not only claims to be the seat of authority, but the deposit of all truth.<sup>15</sup> Even the Bible itself depends upon the Catholic Church for its inspiration and its authority, according to the papacy. Herein lies one of Rome's inexplicable contradictions. She attempts to sustain her right to infallibility by appealing to the Bible as "an authority," then declares that the authority of the Bible rests upon the authority of the papacy.

In an effort to relieve the papacy of the *consequences* of the doctrine of infallibility, Catholic theologians tell us there are certain laws the Pope cannot change; other laws the Pope may but probably will not change, and still others that he can and may change. When we read all of these explanations on what the Pope can do and what he cannot do we wonder if it does not boil down to the fact that he can do whatever he can get away with.

When we say Roman Catholicism is "incorrigible" in its doctrine, we are stating a fact which cannot be refuted. Since the Romish Church cannot surrender its doctrine of infallibility, it cannot change its position on any other doctrine. If it were thus to do, it would confess its mutability. Such a confession would completely destroy the foundation of the entire papal system. Its authority, its claim to possession of all truth, its system of canon laws, and, indeed, its whole system of teaching would collapse. But when pressed for proof that the Catholic Church can never teach error, or when confronted with the fact that it *has* taught many errors, and has often reversed itself, it still chooses to belittle or to ignore the facts rather than confess its untenable position.

---

<sup>15</sup>1964 *National Catholic Almanac*, p. 241.

### III. The Catholic Organization Is Incurable

1. *The papal system is the most complicated yet the most monolithic organization in the world.* The ruling hierarchy is organized as follows:

The pope, who is the Bishop of Rome, the successor of St. Peter and the Vicar of Christ on earth, is the supreme head of the Church. He has the primacy of jurisdiction and honor over the entire Church and all of its members.

Assisting him and acting in his name in the central government and administration of the Church are the cardinals, who are his principal advisers, and officials of the congregations, tribunals and offices of the Roman Curia.

Subject to the Holy Father and directly responsible to him for the exercise of their powers over various jurisdictions or divisions of the church throughout the world are resident archbishops and metropolitans (archdioceses), resident bishops (dioceses), vicars and prefects apostolic (vicariates apostolic and prefectures apostolic), abbots and prelates nullius (abbacies and prelacies nullius), apostolic administrators. Each of these, within his respective territory, has ordinary jurisdiction, according to the provisions of Canon Law, over pastors (who are responsible for the administration of parishes), priests, religious and faithful.

Also subject to the Holy Father are titular archbishops and bishops (who have delegated jurisdiction), religious orders and congregations of pontifical law, pontifical institutes and faculties, papal nuncios and apostolic delegates.<sup>16</sup>

Concerning the hierarchies of order and jurisdiction, the same source explains,

By virtue of their ordination and reception of holy orders, all clerics belong to the hierarchy of order, which has for its purpose the sanctification of the faithful. Bishops, priests and deacons belong to this hierarchy by divine law; subdeacons and those in lower orders belong to it by ecclesiastical institution.

The hierarchy of jurisdiction has for its purpose the governing of the faithful for spiritual ends. Its head is the supreme pontiff who, by divine law, exercises supreme jurisdiction over the Church from the moment of his acceptance of the papacy. The bishops under him belong to this hierarchy by divine law; various other officials belong to it by ecclesiastical institution. All members of the hierarchy of jurisdiction, except the pope, receive and hold ecclesiastical office in virtue of canonical appointment.<sup>17</sup>

It will be noted that "the hierarchy of *jurisdiction*" is com-

---

<sup>16</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 215.

<sup>17</sup>*in loco cit.*

posed of those vested with the governing authority: the Pope, the cardinals, the archbishops, the bishops, and all the prelates— those with the rank of bishop or above.

The "Roman Pontiff," or Pope, as he is generally called, is the absolute dictator of the entire Catholic Church, *and the Catholic State*. Through the cardinals, archbishops and bishops (who have sworn allegiance to him above all others) he rules with "supreme" or "divine" authority. Since the authority of the papacy is absolute, it can never be altered or changed. There might be changes in *terminology*, in the rankings of those who serve under the Pope, or in the *the jurisdiction* exercised by those who belong to the "hierarchy of jurisdiction." But not one whit of the power of the so-called "Vicar of Christ," or of the hierarchy, can ever be relinquished.

2. *In addition to the hierarchical organization, the Catholic Church has literally hundreds of "religious orders and communities," of both men and women, in the United States.* A listing of these, giving the dates of their founding, a statement of their purposes and their headquarters, fills 25 pages in the *1964 National Catholic Almanac*. In addition to the hundreds of orders of the Catholic Church they have any number of national organizations to cover almost every phase of work imaginable, such for instance as the *National Catholic Welfare Conference*, which is again broken down into eight major divisions, as follows: Executive Department, Department of Education, Press Department, Immigration Department, Social Action Department, Legal Department, Youth Department, Department of Lay Organizations. Then there are "Specialized Catholic Social Services," "Catholic Action Groups," "Catholic Work in the Communication and Arts," "Catholic International Congress"; there are also Secular Institutes, and a multiplicity of guilds of almost every land, for lawyers, nurses, firemen, doctors, trade unions, etc. "The National Council of Catholic Women is a federation of 14, 000 U. S. Catho-

lic women's organizations with a total membership of approximately 10,000,000."<sup>18</sup>

The intricate workings of the Catholic Church through its thousands of organizations, orders and guilds, are so complicated that it would be next to impossible to present any clear picture of them all. These organizations may be modified, enlarged, or changed, but the over-all existence and workings of such can never be corrected. Nothing less than a complete abolition of the entire system could do so. This can never be done. It would destroy the Catholic Church itself. Hence, we say Roman Catholicism is incorrigible in its organization. It can never be so reformed or corrected as to conform to the New Testament pattern. The Pope himself could not correct the departures in doctrine or organization. If he, together with the entire hierarchy of both jurisdiction and orders were to attempt to do so, it would destroy both their power and position. This they can never do.

3. *The New Testament church was the very embodiment of simplicity in its organization.* Jesus Christ was its only head. He was made the head of the church after his ascension to God.<sup>19</sup> When he was raised from the dead it was to die no more; "death hath no more dominion over him."<sup>20</sup> Hence, he can never die out of office. His headship over his church, therefore, can never be relinquished to another. There is no intimation in the scriptures that he could have a successor or a vicegerent in office, whether it be Peter or any subsequent character. The only head the church set forth in the New Testament has ever had, or ever will have, was and is the Lord Jesus Christ, who "*ever liveth* to make intercession for"<sup>21</sup> us. Each congregation in New Testament times had

---

<sup>18</sup>*op. cit.*, p. 583.

<sup>19</sup>Eph. 1:20-22.

<sup>20</sup>Rom. 6:9.

<sup>21</sup>Heb. 7:25.

a plurality of "bishops and deacons."<sup>22</sup> There were no ecclesiastical laws or ties that bound the congregation in any way, except brotherly love and voluntary co-operation on the part of each congregation. They had no central headquarters or organization of any kind to tie them together under one earthly head.

The organization of the Roman Catholic Church is so contrary to the scriptures and to the spirit of New Testament Christianity that there is no more resemblance between the two than there is between darkness and light.

#### IV. Roman Catholic Practices Are Incorrigible

When we say that Roman Catholicism is incorrigible in its practice, we have in mind both its religious and its moral practices.

1. *Roman Catholic religious practices are incorrigible.* By the religious we think of such practices as the burning of candles, the "saying" of prayers (rather than sincerely praying from the heart), bowing before images, the "saying" of Mass, the practice of celibacy, penance, auricular confession, extreme unction, etc. These are but a few of Rome's unscriptural religious practices, many of which are not only unscriptural, they are completely contrary to the scriptures. Jesus condemned all such, "For the Pharisees, and all the Jews, except they wash their hands diligently, eat not, holding the tradition of the elders; and when they come from the marketplace, except they bathe themselves, they eat not; and many other things there are, which they have received to hold, washing of cups, and pots, and brazen vessels."

Then quoting from the prophet Isaiah, our Lord rebuked the Pharisees for all such practices, saying,

This people honoreth me with their lips,

But their heart is far from me.

But in vain do they worship me,

Teaching as their doctrines the precepts of men.<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup>Acts 14:23; 20:17, 28; Phil. 1:1.

<sup>23</sup>Mk. 7:3-7; see also Matt. 15:1-9.



Speaking of all unscriptural practices, the apostle John said, "Whosoever goeth onward and abideth not in the teaching of Christ, hath not God: he that abideth in the teaching, the same hath both the Father and the Son."<sup>24</sup> The many religious practices which have grown up in the Roman Church belong to the "doctrines and precepts of men." And all who practice such "abide not in the doctrine of Christ." Thus, according to the apostle John, they have not the approval of God.

It is possible, of course, for Catholics to *modify* their unscriptural practices, but they can never give them up. Truly, if they were to abandon all unscriptural practices which have grown up through the centuries, the entire papal system would collapse. The Roman Catholic Church simply could not exist *as such* if it gave up everything not taught in the New Testament. It would then cease to be the Roman Catholic Church. In this respect, therefore, Catholicism is incorrigible.<sup>25</sup>

2. *Catholicism is incorrigible in its moral practices.* We do not charge the Catholic Church with actually advocating immorality, but we do charge that its practices are of such nature that they result in immorality. We indict the Church of Rome on five specific counts: Rome's attitude toward (a) liquor, (b) gambling, (c) mental reservation, (d) misleading propaganda, and (e) forbidding her people to read, hear, or learn the truth.<sup>26</sup>

3. *Roman Catholics are not allowed to think or to choose for themselves.* They are ruled by an absolute power that claims to "hold the place of God on earth." The Pope's authority is regarded as supreme. None of his subjects can challenge what he says, or go contrary to his wishes, without risking excommunication. Everyone must believe and teach what the "infallible" dictator decrees. His rule is dictatorial, unscriptural, and immoral,

---

<sup>24</sup>2 Jno. 9:10.

<sup>25</sup>See Chapter IV, Catholicism Is Unorthodox, for a fuller discussion of Catholic religious practices.

<sup>26</sup>See Chapter VII, Catholicism Is Immoral, for a discussion on this subject.

like all other dictators who have claimed to exercise "supreme" authority.

We do not mean to say that the Roman Church could not reverse its teaching on some practices which lead to immorality, but the fact that every effort made *in* the past to bring about a reformation has been in vain, is proof enough that Rome is incorrigible in this respect. When Martin Luther began his work he had no thought of starting another church. He was a loyal priest in the Romish Church. But he was thoroughly convinced that the practices carried on and even encouraged by the hierarchy were immoral and contrary to the Word of God. Hence, he undertook to bring about a reformation of such. But he found that the Church of Rome was immune from any such reformation. Indeed, the Council of Trent was called to resist all efforts at reform. Instead of bringing about any reformation in the Catholic body, the entire papal system—as indicated by the decrees of the Council of Trent—became even more hardened, demonstrating once and for all that it is incorrigible.

## CHAPTER IX

### Catholicism Is Unrelenting

Although Roman Catholicism has suffered many setbacks, it never gives up. There is hardly any limit to its zeal and determination. Through centuries of long and weary struggles the papacy has learned some valuable, though sometimes costly lessons from which it has profited greatly.

In December of 1948, Mr. Jackson Martindell, President of New York's American Institute of Management proposed to Pope Pius XII that his organization be allowed to evaluate the efficiency of the Vatican Church. The proposal was accepted and 200 researchers started to work. For a whole year they sifted through the archives of the Vatican, studying and evaluating every phase of the work carried on by the papal Church. These 200 experienced workers "were aided by other researchers in 30 languages throughout the world."<sup>1</sup>

In summarizing its 28 page published report, *the American Institute of Management* gave the Catholic Church an 88 per cent over-all efficiency rating as compared to 90 per cent for Standard Oil Co. of N. J. The highest score was in its "operating efficiency." Here the Vatican Church scored 650 points out of a possible 700. (The first published report by the A.I.M. was released in 1956. In 1960 a supplemental report showed that the Vatican had profited by what it learned from the first report and had increased its efficiency rating still further.) This is understandable, since most Catholic workers receive very little pay for their services. There is no other institution that can compete with Catholicism in this respect. Each passing year, however, the papacy finds it more difficult in an enlightened world to recruit enough "slave" labor within its ranks to carry on its expanding program.

---

<sup>1</sup>*Time* magazine, January 30, 1956.

But as "recruits" get harder to come by, the ingenuity of the hierarchy takes on new proportions. We need not, therefore, expect the papacy to fold up in the foreseeable future from a lack of help.

Outside the United States, Canada and a few other countries, the Catholic Church is steadily losing members, reports "Father" Henry J. Klocker<sup>2</sup> of Cincinnati. The power and prestige of the papacy are also ebbing outside the Western Hemisphere. In the United States, however, Catholicism is increasing both in numbers (not from "conversions" but from an increase in the birth rate) and in power. Catholic countries in many parts of the world have already gone over to Communism, else they are very shaky. Most of these are sick and tired of the galling yoke of Romanism.

### I. Interpreting Catholic Figures

1. *Catholic figures are unrealistic.* It is impossible to reconcile them. According to the *Catholic Almanac*, the Catholic population in the United States on January 1, 1958, was 36, 023, 977. Within less than three months after these figures were published, Catholics suddenly upped this number to more than 43, 000, 000. This was based upon a "religious census survey" which was made by polling some 30, 000 people over 14 years of age "in every section of the country." Catholics argued that, according to this survey, they had a total of 30, 700, 000 above 14 years of age. With this as a basis they came up with a grand total of 43 million plus. But, according to the *National Catholic Register*, May 24, 1959, the number of Catholics in the United States was 39, 505, 475, a "gam of 3, 481, 498 in the year." Again the *Register*, of May 29, 1960, carried a five-column headline which read: "Increase by 1, 365, 827 in Year—Catholics in America Rise to 40, 871, 302." On May 7, 1961 this same publication carried another five column headline which read, "1, 233, 598 More Faith-

---

<sup>2</sup>The *National Catholic Register*, Jan. 14, 1963.

ful Up Total to 42, 104, 900." These figures were based upon the 1961 report in the *Official Catholic Directory*, published by P. J. Kennedy and Sons, New York.

The phenomenal increase in the Catholic population in the United States seems almost incredible. But a UPI report from New York of May 6, 1961, helps to understand this sudden rise in numbers. It explains,

The 10-year increase figure published by the Catholics included the addition of 235, 500 members in the two new states of Hawaii and Alaska and of more than 2 million Catholics serving overseas in the armed forces and government posts. *These figures have been added in the last three years.*

We think the number of Catholics serving in the armed forces has been exaggerated. According to *U. S. News and World Report*, July 15, 1963, the total serving in the U. S. Armed Forces was only 2, 815, 000.

The total number of Protestants in the United States is listed as 62, 500, 000. If we may rely on the accuracy of the totals for all Catholics and all Protestants, then Catholics now number but a fraction more than two thirds as many as Protestants. It should be remembered also that about 50 per cent of the Protestants count none save baptized "believers." If the children of all of these be reckoned on the same basis as Roman Catholics reckon their children, then the total number of Protestants would be between 75 and 80 million. This still does not account for some 60 million who profess no religion. On this basis, to reckon a total of two million Catholics in our armed forces and other overseas organizations would be all out of proportion.

In another report, Catholic writers explain,

The new total. . . represents a 10-year increase of 13, 470, 022 or 47. 04 per cent, over the 28, 634, 878 Catholics listed in 1951. Converts last year totaled 136, 953. It was the eighth consecutive year that they exceeded 125,000.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup>*Ibid.*, May 7, 1961.

In another banner headline came this report, bearing a New York date line:

. . . 3, 472, 176 in Public Schools—9, 136, 823 Receiving Catholic Instruction.

Included in the total. . . are 3, 472, 176 *public* school students, 170, 775 more than in 1960. Of these, 2, 578, 340 are elementary school pupils and 893, 836 are in high school.<sup>4</sup>

2. *Catholic figures are all misleading.* They count everyone from infancy to the grave—and sometimes beyond. According to Emmett McLoughlin, the Catholic parish figures are swelled for the purpose of creating the illusion that Catholics are much stronger than they really are. By quoting large numbers they often threaten business establishments, newspapers, radio and TV stations with a Catholic boycott unless all such concede to their mandates. Candidates for public office are pressured into believing that the Catholic vote is much stronger than it really is. Assuming that we now have a total population of 192, 000, 000 in the United States and that in any national election we could expect to see 71, 000, 000 go to the polls, that would mean about 37 per cent of all the people could be expected to vote. Based on the same percentage, it would mean that not more than 18 million Catholics could be expected to vote in any national election today. Of this number perhaps less than 75 per cent could be counted on to follow the Catholic line. With this percentage, however, Roman Catholics hold a "threat" over the heads of most candidates seeking any high political office.

The following report shows how Catholics seek to create the illusion of a phenomenal growth.

Among the 227 members of the Hierarchy listed are five Cardinals, 32 Archbishops, and 190 Bishops, an increase of three over last year. . .

Received last year were 146, 212 converts, an increase of 5, 801 over the year before. The total conversions in the past 10 years are 1, 328, 374.

The largest number of priests ever recorded is listed—53, 796, including 32, 569 diocesan priests, an increase of 608 and 21, 227 priests of religious communities, an increase of 499. Priests ordained last year total 1, 844. . .

---

<sup>4</sup>*op. cit.*

There are 10,472 brothers in the U. S., an increase of 764 over last year, and 168, 527 sisters, an increase of 3, 605.<sup>5</sup>

These figures have all been increased since 1960. But Catholics made their smallest gains in 1961 in more than a dozen years. The total increase, according to their figures, was less than 800,000. The increase in 1962 was about equal to 1961. But it dropped again in 1963 to an even lower figure.

*All statistics are out of date before they are ever published. These are here cited merely to emphasize the unreliability of the boasted growth of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States.*

Catholics probably lose many more adult members every year than they gain. But they never list the number they lose— except by death or excommunication. It is estimated by some Protestant editors that Roman Catholics lose more than four times as many members each year to the denominations than they gain from them—not to mention those who merely "fall away." There are good reasons to suspect that they not only carry the names of great numbers who have left the Catholic Church but some who are deceased in order to create the impression of great strength. No doubt many in the armed services are counted twice—in then: home parishes *and as a body* in the military.

Even though we feel justified in discounting the over-all totals of Roman Catholics, we must admit that they are growing— at least in influence—in the United States. This growth poses a serious threat to our American way of life. Under no circumstance would we want to deprive any religious body of its constitutional rights—rights which belong to us all—but we must not close our eyes to the direct threat of the Catholic power. Burying our head in the sand and trying to make ourselves believe there is no danger to our American system will soon turn our nation into another pagan Spain—unless we first fall prey to the godless system of Communism.

---

<sup>5</sup>*Ibid.*, May 29, 1960.

## II. How Roman Catholics Have Made Their Growth

Catholics have not made their gains accidentally. Neither has it been due to the watchful eye of Providence over them. They have left nothing to chance. Very few business concerns have operated with the vision, the planning and the efficiency of the papacy. The increase may be attributed primarily to four factors: (1) Their aggressive mission program; (2) their systematic teaching program; (3) the increased birth rate; (4) the breaking down of our immigration laws with respect to Catholic countries. A cursory glance at these factors will show how they work.

1. *Roman Catholics have a very aggressive mission program.* One large metropolitan newspaper carried an article under the bold headline. "No Priest-Land: Catholics Open Up Bible Belt." The article related the story of "The Reverend" John F. Loftus, a member of a society of "secular priests dedicated to bringing the [Catholic] faith [not the gospel of Christ] into 800 priestless counties in the United States."

The 22-year old society, Glenmary Home Missioners, is following the big push of Northern industry into the South and Southwest and setting up churches and missions among people who never before have seen a Catholic priest.

With the industrialization of some of the heretofore rural mountain regions of the South has come a sprinkling of Catholics. Around these few Catholics the Glenmary Missioners are building parishes and churches.<sup>6</sup>

Roman Catholics are especially active among the Negroes in the South. According to the 1962 *National Catholic Almanac*, "There were 653, 217 Catholic Negroes in the United States, an *increase* of approximately 37, 000 over the preceding year; 12, -448 of these were converts." The 1959 edition of the *Catholic Almanac* claimed an increase of 60 per cent during the previous decade.

In 1956 a number of dioceses organized what they called

---

<sup>6</sup>*The Chicago Sun-Times*, June 29, 1959.



"Operation Doorbell," designed to make many new contacts and to spread their propaganda among non-Catholics.

"Operation Doorbell," the house-to-house religious survey of a parish with its three missions completed here by the pastor and his assistant, reveals that 503 or 68 per cent of the 734 families visited desired to learn something about the Catholic religion. Seventy-eight fallen-aways were also discovered.

During the nine months of the survey, Father Leonard Weber and Father Gerald Noesen visited every non-Catholic home in the 1,000 square mile area. They asked three questions: (1) name, (2) religious affiliation, and (3) whether the occupants would be interested in learning something about the Catholic Church. If they answered the last question in the affirmative, they were sent a series of Catholic pamphlets explaining the Catholic religion, one about every three weeks.

After they had received about 10 or 12 of these pamphlets they were sent a personal letter written by Father Weber inviting them to do any or all of three things: (1) to read more pamphlets, which they could obtain free from the Knights of Columbus (a list of the 50 pamphlets published by the Knights was enclosed); (2) enroll in the Knights of Columbus' correspondence course, which they could take in the privacy of their own homes; (3) attend inquiry classes that were being conducted simultaneously here and at one of the missions. . . .

They feel, however, that getting more than 500 non-Catholic families to read Catholic literature is well worth the sacrifice involved.<sup>7</sup>

Another Catholic Publication reporting on some of the early results of "Operation Doorbell," said,

Forty per cent of the 2, 192 increase in converts throughout the nation during 1956 over the previous year took place in six dioceses that conducted "Crusades for Souls," or Catholic Census and Information programs, according to Father John A. O'Brien, research professor at Notre Dame University. A total gain of 883 converts over 1955 was recorded last year in the Indianapolis archdiocese and in the dioceses of Evansville, Lafayette and Fort Wayne in Indiana and the sees of Alexandria and Lafayette in Louisiana, Father O'Brien pointed out.

The crusade launched throughout the State of Indiana under the leadership of Archbishop Paul Schulte of Indianapolis netted an increase of 662 converts over the previous year. The two Louisiana dioceses recorded an increase of 221 converts. . . .

An "Operation Doorbell" [house to house] campaign was later carried out on a state wide basis in Wisconsin, using 31, 000 canvassers. Plans were then laid for a similar campaign throughout the entire nation. "Father" O'Brien estimated that the Roman Catholic Church would gain a million members as a result.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup>*The National Catholic Register*, Sept. 23, 1956.

<sup>8</sup>*The Catholic Messenger*, June 20, 1957.

Where Roman Catholics have the power, as in Spain, Portugal, and Colombia, it is a violation of the law for Protestants even to try to proselyte (make converts of) Catholics, yet in this country they are compassing earth and sea to make Catholic converts.

In order to get their magazines and literature into the hands of as many as possible the Jesuit schools in Dallas in 1957 gave awards to their students to encourage them to get out and sell their magazines. With the desire to help students some will buy magazines who would not otherwise do so. In Dallas alone sales made by high school Catholic students exceeded \$2, 300 in one year.<sup>9</sup> Multiply this by all the Jesuit high schools in the nation and it would make a tidy sum. But more important than the money is the fact that Roman Catholics are adding many new readers each year. The circulation of their newspapers, magazines and other periodicals increased by more than a million and a half in 1960.

2. *Roman Catholics maintain a systematic teaching program.* They begin the indoctrination of the child from birth— yea, even before. This continues until the child has completed his schooling—including his special preparation for his life's work, whatever it may be.<sup>10</sup> Canon Law 1381 says, "The religious training of youth in all schools whatever is subject to the authority and supervision of the [Catholic] Church."<sup>11</sup> In addition to their regular schooling, the Romanists have intensive training work in their multiplicity of youth organizations, including their own Boy Scout and Girl Scout troops. They have their own retreats, their own youth camps, and in fact their own youth organizations for every activity, down to the minutest degree.

3. *Roman Catholics consistently maintain a high birth rate.* According to Canon Law 1013, it is a sin for married couples to

---

<sup>9</sup>*The Dallas Morning News*, Oct. 20, 1957.

<sup>10</sup>At least this is the Catholic aim, even though students do not always adhere to it.

<sup>11</sup>*The Sacred Canons*, vol. ii, p. 611.

use any kind of contraceptives (other than what the hierarchy calls the "rhythm method") to space their children or to limit the number born to them. Hence, Roman Catholic families are multiplying much more rapidly in this country than non-Catholics. This practice is the greatest single factor in the growth of the Catholic Church.

"The Very Reverend" John P. Leary, President of Gonzaga University in Spokane, Washington, recently said:

In the last five years, one third of all the children born in this country are Catholics. . . . In twenty years, when this one third have grown up, they probably will have half of all the children.<sup>12</sup>

4. *Roman Catholics seek to break down our immigration laws.* They are constantly using every possible tactic to bring more Catholics into this country. We are now admitting several thousand each year from Italy, France and other European countries which are predominantly Catholic. Meanwhile more holes are being made in the dike to let in more "refugees," "displaced" persons, and other Catholics. (Well over a hundred thousand have come from Cuba in the past few years.) In 1956 John F. Kennedy sponsored a bill in the Senate to admit an extra 64, 000 from Catholic countries—most of them came from Italy. Before his assassination in 1963, the late President Kennedy asked Congress to change our immigration laws to allow larger quotas from Southern Europe, and from the predominantly Catholic countries. President Johnson has again asked that this measure be passed. All of this is a part of a well laid, systematic plan on the part of the Vatican to increase the number of Catholics in this country— to capture it for the papacy.

Rome's plans are all well laid, and are being methodically and effectively implemented.

### **III. The Catholic Influence in the United States**

Only a few years ago Protestants—true to the name by

---

<sup>12</sup>Associated Press Report, Feb. 19, 1962

which they were called—were united in their opposition to Catholicism. One could say what he really thought about the absurd teaching of the papacy (which everyone regarded as his American right), if he so desired, without exceeding the limits of propriety or his rights as a free American citizen. But if one now openly opposes Roman Catholicism, he is usually branded as a Communist, or at least a bigot, even though he is standing for the same principles and ideals as did all Protestants of a half-century ago. Any opposition to Catholicism now is generally considered both un-charitable and un-Christian, even among so-called Protestants. The label of bigotry is now pinned on every one who even mildly criticizes Catholicism.

1. *Catholics gain politically.* In 1928 a national poll showed that only 41 per cent of the American people would be willing to vote for a Catholic for the office of president. As late as 1956 a Roman Catholic could not squeeze into the vice-presidency. But by 1960 the avalanche of Catholic propaganda which was turned loose in 1956 had definitely turned the tide in favor of a Catholic for the presidency. In the future it may be *necessary* for both political parties to nominate a Roman Catholic for the presidency, or at least for the vice-presidency, if either expects to win.

According to press reports, both Senator Barry Goldwater and President Johnson consulted with Francis Cardinal Spellman before deciding on their running mates. Johnson, according to the report, was told that "it is not imperative that a Roman Catholic be on the Democratic ticket."<sup>13</sup>

When the Constitution of the United States was adopted in 1789, the Catholic population in this country was less than one per cent. Now Catholics claim about 24 per cent. Yet when they threaten a candidate or a business concern they usually talk in much larger terms. But any way we look at it, we must admit

---

<sup>13</sup>*Fort Lauderdale (Fla.) News and Sun-Sentinel*, Aug. 23, 1964.

that the Catholic population has increased at a phenomenal rate in the past 175 years.

While only three Cabinet members were Roman Catholics when President Kennedy was assassinated, a preponderance of appointees were in the State Department, in the Health, Education and Welfare Department, also in high military posts. In high government posts their strength was almost equal to *all* other religious bodies combined. Of the 62 Democratic County Chairmen in New York in 1960, sixty were Roman Catholics. Except for the few months between the time of Mr. Kennedy's nomination and his inauguration the National Chairman of the Democratic Party has been a Roman Catholic since the appointment of Jim Farley, in 1932. In 1960 a Roman Catholic was chosen as Chairman of the Republican party. During the Kennedy administration the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Democratic Senate Majority Leader were both Roman Catholics. So also was the head of the CIA. The alarming question is, if Roman Catholics wield so much power now, with less than 25 per cent of the population, what will they do when they get a majority?

2. *Catholics dip into nearly all public funds.* It is a clever trick of the hierarchy to wait until just a few days before Congress adjourns to raid the federal treasury. When everybody is in a hurry to get home the Catholic money bills are dumped into the hopper with a lot of other appropriation bills, called the "Omnibus Money Bills," which are hurriedly passed by a voice vote, often without ever being presented even to a sub-committee for study. A good example occurred only a few *hours* before Congress adjourned in 1956. A bill which had been rushed through the House by Representative John McCormack (a Roman Catholic from Massachusetts) was jammed through the Senate, appropriating approximately eight million dollars for Catholic schools and other Catholic institutions in the Philippines, based, on a claim made by the Archbishop of Manila (presumably) for

food supplied to our American soldiers in 1944, while they were liberating the Filipinos. Only a few days earlier Congress passed a bill allocating approximately a million dollars to repair the Pope's summer home in Italy—which was damaged by Allied war planes while being used by German Catholics as a fortress in holding back our armies.

In 1948 the Hill-Burton Act was passed by Congress allocating certain funds to aid private and church supported hospitals. By the first of December, 1956, a total of \$123, 278, 000 had been allocated to Catholic hospitals in this country, while only \$26, 454, 000 had gone to all Protestant hospitals combined. Thus, nearly five times as much went to Catholic hospitals in this country as to all Protestant hospitals in the first eight years. We do not have the latest figures, but the total going to Catholic hospitals is now probably well past the three hundred million dollar mark, with about the same ratio holding with respect to Protestant hospitals.

When Catholics first started their drive for tax funds for their parochial schools we were told that all they wanted was a little "welfare" aid—public school buses, free hot lunches, medical care, and such like. Of course, none who knew anything at all about the history of Catholicism expected the hierarchy to be satisfied with half a loaf. This was only the beginning. But the all-out effort to get funds to run their schools, which were founded for the express purpose of indoctrinating all of their students with their sectarianism, actually came sooner than many anticipated. More than fifty bills were introduced in the Eighty-Seventh Congress to give aid to parochial schools. A flood of bills were then dumped into the hopper of the Eighty-Eighth Congress. Within one month after the death of President Kennedy, President Johnson signed two bills which provided federal aid to both public *and private* (mostly religious) higher institutions of learning. He then expressed the hope that some kind of federal aid would be pro-

vided for *private* (90 per cent of which are Catholic) grade and secondary schools. Without waiting for the ink to dry on the President's signature, Catholics began pressing their claims for similar measures to aid their parochial schools.

3. *Catholics seek to "capture" our public schools.* Some of the states have allowed the Roman Catholics virtually to take over some of their public schools. Six counties in Kentucky have all but surrendered to them. Several years ago the State Supreme Court ordered the Marion County school board to establish a *public* high school, but at the time of this writing the order has not yet been carried out. The "sisters" and nuns teach here in their ecclesiastical garb. Several years back the public schools in more than 20 counties in New Mexico were—for all practical purposes—"captured" for the papacy. In more recent years, however, Catholics were denied the privilege (which they had hitherto enjoyed) of teaching in their ecclesiastical garb in New Mexico. But though they had to give up their religious habits here, they have not abandoned their efforts to control the teaching in many of the "public" schools. Quite a number of counties in Kansas, also several parishes in Louisiana, have allowed their public schools to become pawns to the Roman hierarchy.

There are a number of independent school districts in Texas where the "sisters" teach in their religious garb, and where the schools are, in reality, "Catholic" schools. Some of these so-called "public schools" are actually listed as parochial schools in the *Official Catholic Directory*. The salaries of most—if not all — of these teachers go directly to the religious orders of the "sisters," and indirectly into the tills of the Vatican. It was not until the 1961-62 school year that the federal government ever got a penny in withholding tax from the salaries of some of these teachers. More than 2, 000 *garbed nuns* are now teaching in the public schools in some twenty states, very few of which have ever paid any tax at all on their earnings. All of these are furthering the Catholic teaching, at the expense of the taxpayers.

4. *Catholics grab all the charity funds they can.* Besides dipping into our federal and state treasuries, the United Fund drive (the Community Chest, or whatever it may be called) usually is loaded with Catholic charities. They share heavily in all such funds. Many "free" Americans have lost their jobs because they could not conscientiously support these organization. In the cities where Roman Catholics have their hospitals, colleges, and other institutions (which means nearly every city of any size) numerous public campaigns for funds are waged in which it is almost mandatory that every business organization and every public worker support them. Thus, non-Catholics pay a large share of the expense of most of the Catholic institutions, which serve as a "mission" base for disseminating information about the Roman Catholic religion and strengthening the hands of the papacy.

5. *Catholic propaganda knows no limits.* Catholic publications in this country have reached an all-time high. According to the 1964 *National Catholic Almanac*, there were 505 Catholic periodicals with a combined circulation of 27, 020, 479. The *Almanac* lists 87 publishing houses which turned out a total of 1, 144 different Catholic books in 1963. It would probably be safe to assume that these averaged more than 10, 000 each, for a combined circulation of well over a million copies. To all of these papers, magazines and books must be added several million tracts, pamphlets and paid advertisements published yearly by the Catholics in this country. The Knights of Columbus alone circulate millions of tracts every year. This does not take into account their paid ads.

The following is illustrative of the Catholic pressure used to compel advertisers to buy their "services."

As the [Catholic] *Directory* was issued, Msgr. John S. Randall of Rochester, N. Y., CPA President, called upon Catholics to assist the Catholic Press in securing a "fair share of the money being spent today by the large national advertisers."

Pointing out that the new *Directory* will be distributed to some 6, 500 of the largest national advertisers, Msgr. Randall said it is becoming "in-



creasingly evident that if Catholic publishers are to increase substantially their advertising revenue from these large producers, it will require the cooperation of Catholic buyers in making their purchasing power known to the sales people."

Advertisers cannot help but be "influenced by the comments of purchasers in the supermarket, the drug store, the shoe store, the clothing store, the gasoline station."<sup>14</sup>

*The Catholic people are expected to patronize those who advertise in the Catholic papers, and let them know that they are doing so. This type of coercion used by Catholics to sell their advertising is little short of blackmail. This may be good Roman Catholicism, but it certainly is not good Americanism. It completely destroys our system of "free enterprise."*

Just how much the above report was blown up we do not know. But it does point up the fact that Catholics *are determined to make those who are in business buy advertising from them, and make them pay the full price for it.*

#### **IV. Roman Catholicism and Russian Communism Compared**

Although Catholicism and Communism outwardly appear to be deadly enemies, they are very much the same. In reality, they are rivals. Their close similarity makes it easy to transfer one's loyalty from the dictator of one of these systems to the other. Very little change is necessary.

1. *Both are controlled by an absolute dictatorship.* Neither will tolerate any subversion or disagreement. No one can question the top "boss" in either case. His word is final; he speaks for the Almighty.

2. *Both have their earthly headquarters.* One is in the Kremlin while the other is in the Vatican. All orders of significance must have the approval of the top boss.

3. *Both are religio-political bodies.* Communism is both a

---

<sup>14</sup>*The Catholic News*, June 23, 1956.

religious and political philosophy. Communism will tolerate no other sort of religion or political thinking. The same is true with Catholicism. The only difference is in the amount of stress each of these dictatorial powers places upon the single-headed dual system of their own creation.

4. *Both are universal in their aims.* Each is determined to conquer the world at all cost. Anything less than world conquest falls short of the goal that each has set for itself. Let no one mistake the aims and ambitions of either of these totalitarian powers.

5. *Both have their secret agents throughout the whole world.* All of us have been alerted to the dangers of the Communists. The Catholics are no less ambitious and dangerous to our freedom. Each body is probing every conceivable weak spot in our defenses in an effort to get a foot further into the door.

6. *Both are spending enormous sums for propaganda purposes.* Billions of dollars are being spent every year by these rival powers to further their aims. Wherever they can get in and make innocent people foot their bills they do so.

7. *Both are infiltrating themselves into the highest and most important places in our government.* They seek to control the thinking and the actions of all our public officials. They strive to influence our lawmakers under a disguise of piety and love for all mankind. If all of us knew the extent of their influence in government, we would be appalled and exasperated.

8. *Both are very cunning.* They feign meekness, love, piety and goodness. But beneath all their outward manifestations they are seeking to get complete control of all our news media, our educational institutions, our religious organizations, our economic and social system, and even our government. They are desperately struggling for the complete control of the minds of all men, everywhere.

9. *Both are deadly enemies of freedom.* Both seek to con-

trol our thinking, our right of free speech, our public education, and our right of worship. Both would destroy our Constitution which guarantees our freedom; they would both make mental slaves of every one of us. Compare the Catholic government in Spam with any communistic government and note the striking similarity between them.

10. *Both are anti-American.* They demand that their subjects (especially those card carrying Communists in the one and those who make up the hierarchy of jurisdiction in the other) swear allegiance to a foreign dictator. Both of these powers are political and religious dictatorships. If either of these should get control in this country—which each is striving day and night to do—it would rob us all of our most cherished possessions and make us slaves to its tyranny.

## CHAPTER X

### Catholicism Is Un-American

We have many Catholic friends whom we respect and appreciate. We get many letters and clippings about the heroic deeds and sacrifices of individual Catholics; we also receive numerous copies of great speeches which they have made in favor of our American way of life. For all of these we are truly grateful. Let no one suppose, therefore, that we are accusing all Roman Catholics of disloyalty to our country. When we say *Catholicism* is un-American we are not arguing that the Catholic Church is trying to overthrow this country by force of arms, as the Communists would do. Neither are we charging that the rank and file of the Roman Catholic *people* in this country are un-American. What we *are* charging is that the Roman Catholic *system* is contrary to our Constitution and to our American way of life.

#### I. Catholicism and Marriage

Catholic restrictions on marriage are contrary to our American concept. Many who have never studied these restrictions merely regard them as somewhat peculiar, and nothing more. But a careful study of the Catholic attitude toward marriage will reveal the fact that it is unscriptural, un-Christian, unreasonable and *un-American*. Let us note some of its aspects.

1. In "*mixed-marriages*" the non-Catholic must take special instructions from a Catholic priest. This special course of instructions usually lasts some six to eight weeks, depending on how long it takes to convince the priest that the non-Catholic is willing to submit to all of the restrictions imposed by the Catholic Church.

2. Only one ceremony—which must be by a Catholic priest—is permitted. Catholicism is very strict on this point.

Even though a dispensation from the impediment of mixed religion

has been obtained from the Church, the spouses are not permitted, either before or after the marriage contracted before the Church, also to go, either in person or by proxy, to a non-Catholic minister in his ministerial capacity for the purpose of giving or renewing their matrimonial consent.<sup>1</sup>

This agreement is certainly not in harmony with our best American traditions and ideals.

3. *All children born of a "mixed marriage" must be reared in the "Catholic faith."* Catholic canon law is quite emphatic on this point also. It declares:

. . . the non-Catholic party gives a guaranty to remove from the Catholic party the danger of perversion and both parties give a guaranty that all offspring will be baptized and reared only in the Catholic faith . . . the guaranties must be made in a form the secular law cannot challenge. If the secular law is opposed to the giving of the guaranties, a special provision must be inserted in them recognizing this fact and providing for their fulfillment notwithstanding the secular law. Indeed, dispensations from the matrimonial impediment are forbidden unless the parties to the marriage have given guaranties the faithful execution of which no one can prevent, even in virtue of the secular law to which either of the parties may be subject and which is in force in the place of their present or intended future residence.<sup>2</sup>

If either or both spouses of a "mixed marriage" die, the children must still be reared in the "Catholic faith." Many cases have been taken to court to enforce this agreement. Often a non-Catholic will sign an agreement of this kind, expecting to ignore it after the wedding has taken place. But those doing so have usually found that they were in serious trouble. Many have rued the day they signed such an agreement—committing the spiritual welfare of their unbegotten and unborn children to the dictatorial rulers of an authoritarian system. This is un-American, un-Christian and intolerant.

4. *Catholics forbid divorce on any grounds.* Although our Lord allowed divorce on the ground of fornication (Matt. 5:32), Catholics will not tolerate even this.

A valid ratified and consummated marriage cannot be dissolved by any human power or by any other cause except death. . .

---

<sup>1</sup>Canon 1063.

<sup>2</sup>Canon 1061.

Adultery does not afford ground for a dissolution of marriage. This has been the constant teaching of the [Catholic] Church, and the Council of Trent dogmatically declared that the [Catholic] Church does not err in holding this doctrine.<sup>3</sup>

In 1950 Bishop J. Dearden of Pittsburgh (now Archbishop of Detroit) issued the following edict:

Following a valid marriage, it is strictly forbidden for any Catholic, whether as plaintiff or as attorney to approach the civil courts to obtain a separation, divorce, or annulment, without prior approval of the Bishop.

More recently Catholic lawyers have accepted these restrictions, according to reports:

. . . the Church as the official custodian of God's interests on earth has not only the right but also the obligation to guard scrupulously the terms of the marriage contract.

No civil court has competence in this area. Neither can an attorney on his own authority decide whether or not the marriage in question is valid or invalid. The judgment can only be made by diocesan court established by the Bishop.<sup>4</sup>

5. *The Pope can "dissolve" a marriage on just about any pretext he wishes.* This right he normally exercises when it is to the advantage of the Catholic Church for him to do so. But note the "law" on this:

An unconsummated marriage between baptized persons or between a baptized and an unbaptized party is dissolved both by the law itself through solemn religious profession and by a dispensation granted by the Holy See for a justifying reason on the petition of both parties or of one of the parties, even though the other does not wish it.<sup>5</sup>

Theoretically, the Pope can dissolve "a merely ratified marriage"; though he cannot dissolve a marriage after it has been both "ratified" and "consummated." But the Pope *can* decide whether a marriage has been consummated. This depends on whether he thinks it will or will not advance the cause of Catholicism for him to do so.

## II. Catholicism and Education

Catholicism would destroy our free public school system.

---

<sup>3</sup>Canon 1118.

<sup>4</sup>*The Witness*, July 3, 1958.

<sup>5</sup>Canon 1119.

Since our public schools have served our country so well for more than a century, any tampering with them, or any effort to destroy them would certainly seem un-American. Naturally, we do not expect the Roman Church to make an *open* fight against our public schools, but the cunning methods which they are using to undermine them will effectively destroy them unless we turn back the Catholic challenge, and that very soon.

1. *Catholic children are forbidden to attend the free public schools.* Most of the Catholic propaganda charges that failure to support the Catholic schools by public taxes is "discrimination" against *parents* who *choose* to send their children to the parochial schools. This is a false charge. *Catholic parents have no choice.* They are positively forbidden to send their children to the free public schools unless they get a special dispensation from the bishop allowing them to do so. Such permission is usually granted only when it would be next to impossible for Catholic parents to send their children to a parochial school. Canon law is quite specific on this point.

Catholic children shall not attend non-Catholic schools, neutral schools, or mixed schools, that is, schools that are also open to non-Catholics.<sup>6</sup>

Catholics are *required* by canon law to establish their own schools.

If the Catholic elementary and intermediate schools contemplated by canon 1373 are lacking, provision shall be made, especially by local ordinaries, that they be established. . . . The III Plenary Council [of Baltimore] required that a parochial school be established in every parish unless the bishop permits a delay.<sup>7</sup>

The Catholic hierarchy claims the right to control all education.

The religious training of youth in all schools whatever is subject to the authority and the supervision of the [Catholic] Church. . . . The right and the duty vindicated *in* this canon are not restricted to schools established by the [Catholic] Church. The [Catholic] Church cannot renounce this right, since it is divinely conferred.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup>Canon 1374.

<sup>7</sup>Canon 1379.

<sup>8</sup>Canon 1381.

2. *Wherever possible Roman Catholics take over our free public schools, or to state it differently, they capture them.* This has been done in a number of states. Several such schools have been taken over in the state of Texas. A good example is in Bremond, Texas. For 12 years one of the schools there was completely staffed with "robed" nuns as teachers and with a "Mother Superior" as principal. It operated in the parochial school building, as usual, where all of the pictures, statues, the cross, and everything remained intact just as it was. It was still called "St. Mary's School." It was listed in the *Official Catholic Directory* as a Catholic school. One section in the library contained Catholic books only. During that time not a single non-Catholic student attended. Yet free bus transportation for the children was furnished by the state. The salaries of the teachers were paid by the state, which they turned over to their respective orders—without any withholding tax being deducted. They were merely conduits through which such funds were channelled into the coffers of the Catholic Church. It was not until a group of citizens filed a court suit in February of 1959, against the independent school board at Bremond, that any relief whatever was granted. The case was bitterly fought until the hierarchy became fearful of an unfavorable court decision and finally decided (in August, 1962) not to operate the school any longer *as a state supported school*.

The Bremond school case was typical of what is going on in many parts of the country, wherever Catholics can get hold of our free public schools. In many instances they are not able to capture the school completely, but when they begin to get a grip on any school they keep tightening their grip as hard as they can. In addition to the two thousand plus garbed nuns now teaching in the free public schools in the United States, a large number of the "free public" schools are still staffed by teachers who have been "disrobed" while retaining virtually all of their power over the schools, as they have done in some parts of the nation.



3. *More recently Roman Catholics have made an all-out fight to obtain taxes to support their parochial schools, even though the Supreme Court has declared such to be unconstitutional.* On January 4, 1958 the presidents of 28 Jesuit colleges and universities agreed that, "if federal aid is deemed necessary, 'it should be made on an across-the-board basis,' for all students and all institutions."<sup>9</sup> At that time they were merely saying that "if" federal aid was to be made available for the public schools, then the Catholic schools should come in for their share of such funds. Since then, they have made an all-out drive to obtain such funds. Only three days before President Kennedy took office, Cardinal Spellman blasted his program on federal aid to education, saying,

No Catholic schools. . . are included in the task force proposal. . . For many millions of American parents, this means that they will be taxed more than ever before for the education of their children but that they cannot expect any return from their taxes, unless they are willing to transfer their children to a public grade or high school. . . These recommendations are unfair to most parents of the nation's 6. 8 million parochial and private school children. Such legislation would discriminate against a multitude of America's children because their parents choose to exercise their constitutional right to educate them in accordance with their religious beliefs."<sup>10</sup>

Catholics know that such aid is unconstitutional. In a lengthy memorandum made public on March 29, 1961, the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare in consultation with the Justice Department, declared that across-the-board grants or loans to sectarian schools violate the Constitution. In preparing its case against government loans or grants the government relied heavily upon the 1947 Everson Bus Case in New Jersey, which said,

The "establishment of religion" clause of the First Amendment means at least this: Neither a state nor the Federal Government can set up a church. Neither pass laws which aid one religion, aid all religions, or prefer one religion over another. . . No tax in any amount, large or small, can be levied to support any religious activities or institutions, whatever they may be called, or whatever form they may adopt to teach or to prac-

---

<sup>9</sup>*The National Catholic Register*, January 12, 1958.

<sup>10</sup>*Associated Press*, January 17, 1961.

tice religion. Neither a state nor the Federal Government can, openly or secretly, participate in the affairs of any religious organizations or groups and *vice versa*. In the words of Jefferson, the clause against the establishment of religion by law intended to erect "a wall of separation between the Church and State."

The memorandum further pointed out,

The Supreme Court has ruled that the first amendment to the Constitution forbids public funds "to support religious institutions" or "finance religious groups. . . . Across-the-board grants to church schools are equally invalid. A loan represents a grant of credit. When made at a rate of interest below what is normally available to the borrower, it also constitutes a grant of the interest payments which are saved. These benefits plainly have the purpose of providing financial advantage or convenience. And like the broad grant, the across-the-board loan would inevitably facilitate religious instruction."

In the face of such statements made by the two departments of the federal government the Roman hierarchy in this country is still trying to circumvent the Constitution. In fact it has been trying to do this ever since the decision of the Supreme Court in the Everson Case. The day after the nomination of Kennedy for the presidency, "Father" Earnest A. Flusche, according to reporter Mary Jo Nelson, called for a "reinterpretation" of the Constitution so as to allow tax funds for Catholic Schools.<sup>11</sup>

An editorial appearing in *The National Catholic Register* (Feb. 12, 1961), quoted Archbishop Alter of Cincinnati, speaking for the NCWC Department of Education, as saying,

The day will come when the current interpretation of the Supreme Court will be replaced by a more logical, more historically consistent and more equitable one.

In a meeting on March 1, 1961, the National Catholic Welfare Conference, represented by the five cardinals and twelve bishops and archbishops, served an ultimatum on Congress, vowing,

In the event that a federal aid program is enacted which excludes children in private schools, these children will be the victims of discriminatory legislation. *There will be no alternative but to oppose such discrimination.* [Emphasis added.]

Thus, the ruling hierarchy of the Roman Church in this

---

<sup>11</sup>*Oklahoma City Times*, July 13, 1960.

country sets itself squarely against the Constitution of the United States. This is un-American.

### III. Catholicism and the State

Volumes have been written on this subject, much of which is very fuzzy. In our efforts to separate the real facts from generalizations, certain conclusions are inevitable. These are here summarized under three headings.

#### 1. *Catholics deplore the separation of "church and state."*

This is seen in the fact that they always unite the two wherever they can. The popes have stated their opposition to the separation of the church and state in so many words. In his *Syllabus of Errors*, Pope Pius IX said,

[It is an error to say] The Church is to be separated from the state, and the state from the Church.<sup>12</sup>

Pope Pius X said,

We, in accord with the supreme authority which We [the Pope] hold from God, disprove and condemn the established law which separates the French state from the Church.<sup>13</sup>

The separation of a Catholic country and the Catholic Church is criminal, we are told by good authority.

Between the Church and a non-Christian or a Christian, *but non-Catholic*, State a condition of separation. . . is to be expected. . . *Such a separation for a Catholic State would be criminal*, as ignoring the sacred obligations of the State.<sup>14</sup> [Emphasis added.]

More recently another authority said,

. . . a separation [of church and state] is never the ideal in theory. Under certain historical circumstances it may be the best form of the relation between Church and state in a secularized civilization. This is so especially when the majority of the citizens no longer belong to the established Church. . ."<sup>15</sup>

#### 2. *Wherever possible the Vatican signs a concordat with the*

---

<sup>12</sup>*The Sources of Catholic Dogma*, p. 440.

<sup>13</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 506.

<sup>14</sup>*The Catholic Encyclopedia*, vol. xiv, p. 253.

<sup>15</sup>*The State In Catholic Thought*, p. 600.

*state*. Many such are in force today in the Western European countries as well as in some Latin American countries.

*"The Concordat Between Spain and the Holy See"* is one of the more recent and perhaps the most familiar. Let us look at some of the articles in it.

ARTICLE III: The Spanish state recognizes the international legal personality of the Holy See and of the State of the Vatican City.

ARTICLE IX (Par. 3): The Spanish State undertakes to provide for the financial needs of the dioceses that may be erected in the future, adequately augmenting the endowment stipulated in Article XIX.

ARTICLE XIX (Par. 3): The State, faithfully following the national tradition, shall annually grant subsidies for the building and preservation of parish and rectoral churches and Seminaries, the upkeep of Orders, Congregations and ecclesiastical Institutes engaging in missionary activities, and the care of monasteries of outstanding historical importance in Spain; and likewise to help maintain the Spanish College of St. Joseph and the Spanish church and residence of Montserrat, *in* Rome.

(Par. 4): The State shall lend the Church its co-operation to create and finance benevolent institutions for the aged, sick, and disabled clergy. It shall likewise provide adequate pensions for residential prelates who resign their posts for reasons of age or health.

ARTICLE XXVI: In all educational institutions of whatever kind or grade, and whether or not belonging to the State, the teaching shall conform to the principles of Dogma and Morals of the Catholic Church.

The Ordinaries shall freely exercise their mission of supervising the said educational establishments in matters concerning the purity of the faith, morals, and religious education.

The Ordinaries may demand the banning or withdrawal of books, publications, and teaching material opposed to Catholic Dogma and Morals.

ARTICLE XXVII (Par. 1): The Spanish State guarantees the teaching of the Catholic religion as an ordinary and compulsory subject in all teaching establishments, whether or not belonging to the State, and of whatever kind or grade.

The children of non-Catholic parents shall be dispensed from such lessons at the request of their parents or guardians.

ARTICLE XXIX: The State shall take care that in the institutions and services which form public opinion, and more particularly in radio and television programmes, a proper place shall be given to the exposition and defense of religious truth by priests and religious, by agreement with the respective Ordinary.

ADDENDUM VII—ARTICLE VI: The profession and practice of the Catholic Religion, which is that of the Spanish State, shall enjoy official protection.

No one shall be molested for his religious beliefs or in the *private practice* of his worship. *No other external ceremonies or manifestations than those of the Catholic Religion shall be permitted.*<sup>16</sup> [Emphasis added.]

3. *The Catholic Church demands that the state support the Catholic religion.* This doctrine is succinctly set forth in the following words:

The State must also protect the [Catholic] Church in the exercise of her functions, for the reason that the State is bound to protect all the rights of its citizens, and among these their religious rights, which as a matter of fact would be insecure and fruitless were not the Church protected. The State is even under obligation to promote the spiritual interests of the [Roman Catholic] Church.<sup>17</sup>

The above statements from authoritative Catholic sources not only show that the Roman Catholic Church is un-American in doctrine, but actually anti-American in practice.

#### IV. Catholicism and Censorship

1. *The Roman hierarchy, through its board of censors, exercises a strong control over most all publishers in this country.* It is difficult to buy space in any large newspaper for the purpose of opposing any of the Knights of Columbus ads that are being run in so many of the papers and magazines throughout the nation. Although we talk about a free country and a free press, we have neither. In denouncing the Communists we can say anything we like through any publication, on any radio, or television program; but we must walk as if we were treading on eggs when we even incidentally mention the grip Roman Catholicism has on our nation.

POAU thus relates how Catholics bring pressure upon newspapers and advertisers to prevent anything from being published contrary to Catholic doctrine:

---

<sup>16</sup>Copies of this Concordat may be obtained by writing to the Spanish Embassy, Washington, D. C.

<sup>17</sup>*The Catholic Encyclopedia*, vol. xiv, p. 252.

One of the largest drug firms in the United States, Johnson and Johnson, has withdrawn its dignified and non-suggestive advertisement for contraceptives from leading American family magazines because of Roman Catholic pressure. The critical attack on the advertising was led by the Jesuit magazine *America* which launched its campaign in the issue of November 4, 1961, and triumphantly announced its total victory in the issue of December 16th.

Johnson and Johnson planned a series of advertisements in *Family Circle* and *Prescription Health*, aimed at young couples who desire to have knowledge concerning more effective methods of child spacing. The advertisement was in no way sensational.

Both Johnson and Johnson and *Family Circle* retreated under the threat of a Catholic boycott. They dropped all birth control ads without any public show of resistance.<sup>18</sup>

Occasionally some magazine or newspaper is bold enough to speak out against the efforts of the hierarchy to control the freedom of the press. The editor of *Harper's Magazine* (October 1956) criticized the "National Organization for Decent Literature," saying,

A little band of Catholics is now conducting a shocking attack on the rights of their fellow citizens. They are engaged in an un-American activity which is as flagrant as anything the Communist party ever attempted—and which is, in fact, very similar to Communist tactics. . . .

This group calls itself the National Organization for Decent Literature. Its headquarters are in Chicago; its director is the Very Reverend Monsignor Thomas Fitzgerald. Its main purpose is to make it impossible for anybody to buy books and other publications which it does not like. Among them are the works of some of the most distinguished authors now alive—for example, winners of the Nobel Prize, the Pulitzer Prize, and the National Book Award.

Harper's editor hedged in the above criticism by referring to NODL as "*a little band of Catholics*," as though it did not represent the hierarchy. This is an erroneous conclusion. The flourishing NODL functions with the blessings of the hierarchy, which it represents. It was "set up in 1938 to combat indecent periodical literature,"<sup>19</sup> so it claims.

The American Civil Liberties Union (a somewhat distasteful

---

<sup>18</sup>*Church and State*, Feb. 1962.

<sup>19</sup>1959 *National Catholic Almanac*, p. 525.

"left-wing" organization) blasted NODL for its "self-election" as keeper "of the conscience of the whole country."

The American Civil Liberties Union said. . . a Roman Catholic group is actively engaged in "censorship of what the American people. . . may read."

The ACLU statement said the actions of the National Organization for Decent Literature are "seriously violative of the principle of freedom. . ."

The ACLU said that NODL uses a "reading community of mothers of the Roman Catholic faith in the Chicago area" to evaluate literature as to its suitability for youth.

The NODL has "prepared blacklists, threatened and imposed general boycotts and awarded unofficial certificates of compliance. . ."

"A fundamental objection of these extended activities of the NODL," said the statement, "is that the judgment of a particular group is being imposed upon the freedom of choice of the whole community."

"The novel which may be thought by a committee of Catholic mothers to be unsuitable for a Roman Catholic adolescent is thus made unavailable to the non-Catholic. It is plainly necessary to challenge the NODL as keeper, by self-election, of the conscience of the whole country."<sup>20</sup>

If NODL functioned in the limited sphere and manner it pretends, it might serve a good purpose, but what it actually does is to try to prevent any publication from being circulated which in any way pictures Roman Catholicism in an unfavorable manner.

If there is any doubt about Rome's efforts to curtail the freedom of the press, this doubt was removed when Pope John XXIII, early in December of 1959, met with the union of Catholic jurists and called for curbs on the press. The Roman dictator called for "due limitations" on what he labeled the "liberty of the press and the law." Concerning these restrictions *The Washington Post* editorialized,

Pope John XXIII has in effect counselled the rewriting of the Constitution of the United States along with the organic law of many countries. . . His advocacy of legal restriction. . . cannot but cause deep misgivings among many persons who shun anti-Catholic bigotry. . . Who is to interpret for purposes of law what undermines "the religious and moral foundations of the life of the people?" The Catholic Church? The Methodist Church? The Presbyterians, or Mormons, or Orthodox Jews?

---

<sup>20</sup>*The Miami Herald*, May 7, 1957.

When any religious organization seeks to extend its primacy in spiritual affairs, through an attempt to write its views into temporal law, it invites a dangerous and divisive reaction. One may suspect that some American Catholics will be very much concerned privately about the effect of the Pope's statement. . . . No religious organization has the right, at least in the United States, to impose its doctrines upon others through the medium of public policy.

2. *The Catholic hierarchy forbids its people to attend the religious services of other people.* A classic example was widely publicized in 1957 regarding the twenty-two Roman Catholic high school graduates at Moundsville, West Virginia, who were told by their priest that they could not attend the baccalaureate services, which were being held at the Methodist Church, "because their religious convictions would not allow them to do so." In 1957, when Billy Graham was in his New York crusade all Roman Catholics in the diocese were forbidden to attend the services, to view the speaker on television, or listen to him on the radio. At the same time Catholic workers busied themselves mingling with those who were attending and distributing tens of thousands of pieces of Catholic literature, in an attempt to turn the people away from Mr. Graham. More recently *The Indiana Catholic and Record*, "official" voice of the Indianapolis diocese, declared,

The believing, practicing Catholic has no more business at the Billy Graham Crusade than a Trappist monk at a Yom Kippur ceremony.<sup>21</sup>

While we are not attempting to defend Billy Graham, or anything he teaches, we are firm believers in his right to preach and teach what he believes, and also in the right of the people to hear him if they choose to do so. This is the American way.

Pope John XXIII must accept the responsibility for the following decree:

Even laymen should with legitimate means resist non-Catholics who dare to spread among the people attacks on the Catholic Faith. *They should do this even if it creates difficulties and they should strive to instill their principles in the minds of others.* [Emphasis added.] Catholics are forbidden to enter the halls and churches of non-Catholics to attend their rites.<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>21</sup>*The Louisville Courier Journal*, Oct. 14, 1959.

<sup>22</sup>*The National Catholic Register*, Feb. 7, 1960.



3. *Catholicism exercises a considerable measure of control over the motion picture industry.* It is not unusual to see a Protestant minister portrayed in some absurd or ridiculous role, but one rarely sees a Catholic priest or nun pictured in any movie except in the most favorable light. They may be a little impetuous at times and even a little inconsiderate, but in the end they are nearly always portrayed as quite intellectual and godly. Almost never are they seen playing the role of some naive or base character.

For years Roman Catholics have had their own Board of Censors who label all motion pictures in one of the following categories:

Class A—Section I—Morally Unobjectionable for General Patronage.

Class A—Section II—Morally Unobjectionable for Adults and Adolescents.

Class A—Section III—Morally Unobjectionable for Adults.

Class A—Section IV—Morally Unobjectionable for Adults, With Reservations.

Class B—Morally Objectionable In Part for All.

Class C—Condemned.

Any preacher or any individual has the right to appraise any picture or book as he sees fit, but to set up a board which functions as an authoritarian body over any free enterprise is un-American. Yet, this is exactly what Roman Catholics have done. They have assumed the authority to tell the American people what pictures they may see and what they may not. The result has been that those who have kowtowed to this self-appointed board of censors have submitted to a form of blackmail.

## V. Catholicism in Retrospect

1. *The crusades in the middle ages were ruthless.* So many crimes and murders were committed in the name of "religion"

during the crusades that historians are weighed down in their efforts to describe them. Concerning one such incident, a reliable historian says,

The violence of the papal legate, Peter of Castelnau, was avenged by his murder. Innocent at once proclaimed a crusade, offering the sunny lands of the South, and heaven hereafter, to all who would engage in the holy war. The crusaders, led by Arnold, Abbot of Citeaux, and Simon de Montfort, fulfilled their commission with inhuman cruelty. Their thirst for blood and their unbounded rapacity continued to rage. . . . Heresy, however, was not uprooted by all this brutality.<sup>23</sup>

2. *Catholicism was ruthless in the inquisition.* Never have the Communists been more cruel in their massacres than were the Roman Catholics during the inquisitions, which encompassed nearly all of western Europe, where Protestantism had gained any appreciable numbers. Enough blood was shed in these persecutions to incarnadine all the rivers of Europe. One minor incident was thus described:

When they had killed the admiral, they threw him out at a window into the street, where his head was cut off, and sent to the pope. The savage papists, still raging against him, cut off his arms and private members, and, after dragging him three days through the streets, hung him by the heels without the city. After him they slew many great and honorable persons who were Protestants; as Count Rochfoucault, Telinius, the admiral's son-in-law, Antonius, Clarimontus, marquis of Ravely, Lewes Bussius, Bandineus, Pluvialius, Burneus, etc., and falling upon the common people they continued the slaughter for many days; in the three first they slew of all ranks and conditions to the number of ten thousand. The bodies were thrown into the rivers, and blood ran through the streets with a strong current, and the river appeared presently like a stream of blood. So furious was their hellish rage, that they slew all papists whom they suspected to be not very staunch to their diabolical religion. From Paris the destruction spread to all quarters of the realm.<sup>24</sup>

3. *The decrees of excommunication in the middle ages were ruthless.* The horrible inquisition stemmed largely from such decrees as the following:

We excommunicate and anathematize every heresy that raises itself against the holy, orthodox and Catholic faith. . . . Those condemned, being handed over to the secular rulers or their bailiffs, let them be abandoned,

---

<sup>23</sup>*History of the Christian Church*, p. 194.

<sup>24</sup>*Fox's Book of Martyrs*, p. 47.

to be punished with due justice. . . . But those who are only suspected. . . *unless they prove their innocence by a proper defense*, let them be anathematized and avoided by all until they have made suitable satisfaction. . . . Secular authorities, whatever office they may hold, shall be admonished and induced and *if necessary compelled*. . . to take an oath that they will strive in good faith and to the best of their ability to *exterminate* in the territories subject to their jurisdiction *all heretics pointed out by the Church; so that whenever anyone shall have assumed authority, whether spiritual or temporal, let him be bound to confirm this decree by oath*. [Emphasis added.] But if a temporal ruler, after having been rejected and admonished by the Church, should neglect to cleanse his territory of this heretical foulness, let him be excommunicated by the metropolitan and the other bishops of the province. If he refuses to make satisfaction within a year, let the matter be made known to the supreme pontiff, that he may declare the ruler's vassals absolved from their allegiance and may offer the territory to be ruled by Catholics, who on the extermination of the heretics may possess it without hindrance and preserve it in the purity of faith. . . .<sup>25</sup>

Between 1941 and 1945 it is estimated that some 750, 000 Orthodox Serbs and Jews<sup>26</sup> were brutally massacred by the Croatian Ustashi, "a nazi-facist movement under the leadership of the notorious Ante Pavelic. In proportion to population, these Nazi puppets exceeded even what the Nazi themselves had done in Germany. And those they did not exterminate, they sought—by fire and sword—to convert to Roman Catholicism."<sup>27</sup> Alois Cardinal Stepinac was closely aligned with the butcher Ante Pavelic to compel the Serbs to accept Roman Catholicism or death in the most inhumane fashion.

## VI. Pope Pius IX and the Syllabus of Errors

The Syllabus of Errors compiled by Pope Pius IX has been a source of embarrassment to modern Catholics—especially in the United States. One writer said,

Leo XIII summed him [Pius IX] up very aptly when he said of him in private: "In 1846 he dashed madly ahead only to dash just as madly back again two years later." His die-hard conservatism, his blindness to abuses within the Pontifical State, his hatred for anything new, which showed through many points of the much-disputed syllabus, hastened the

---

<sup>25</sup>*Disciplinary Decrees of the General Councils*, pp. 242, 243.

<sup>26</sup>The percentage of Jews was relatively small in Croatia.

<sup>27</sup>*Genocide In Satellite Croatia*. (See inside of jacket.)

fall of the Pontifical State. Thus, Pius, however much his personal misfortune may be understood, was not an innocent sufferer and martyr at the hands of events. He himself characterized his own obstinacy when he confessed: "I am a stone: where I fall, there I lie." History forcibly removed this stone. . . whose monarchical authority showed itself to have outlived its usefulness by the end of this pontificate. . . ."<sup>28</sup>

Since the Syllabus of Errors was formulated by an "infallible" Pope in 1864, and approved by an "infallible" council in 1870, most writers try to justify the document on the ground that the decrees were against "modernism" which was then threatening the Catholic Church. But no matter how we look at it, the edicts of this Syllabus cannot be reconciled with our American ideals— not to speak of Christianity. They are un-American, no matter how hard the Knights of Columbus and the hierarchy try to explain them away.

Following are a few articles from this document.<sup>29</sup> Since all of the articles in the Syllabus are catalogued as *errors*, it is necessary to keep this in mind when reading the Syllabus. To help the reader to remember this we are inserting in brackets the term, "It is an error to say that" before each article.

No. 15: —[It is an error to say that] Every man is free to embrace and profess that religion which he, led by the light of reason, thinks to be the true religion.

No. 20: —[It is an error to say that] The ecclesiastical power should not exercise its authority without the permission and assent of the civil government.

No. 23: —[It is an error to say that] The Roman Pontiffs and the Ecumenical Councils have trespassed the limits of their powers, have usurped the rights of princes, and have ever erred in defining matters of faith and morals.

No. 24: —[It is an error to say that] The Church does not have the power of using force, nor does it have any temporal power, direct or indirect.

No. 27: —[It is an error to say that] The sacred ministers of the Church and the Roman Pontiff should be entirely excluded from all administration and dominion over temporal things.

No. 42: —[It is an error to say that] In a conflict between the laws of both powers, the civil law prevails.

---

<sup>28</sup>*Encyclopedia of the Papacy*, p. 230.

<sup>29</sup>*The Sources of Catholic Dogma*, pp. 437-442.

No. 43: —[It is an error to say that] The lay [state] power has the authority of rescinding, of declaring and making void the solemn agreements (commonly, concordats) made with the Apostolic See concerning the use of rights pertaining to ecclesiastical immunity, without its consent and even against its protest.

This means that the state has not the right of asserting its own laws when they conflict with ecclesiastical laws; i.e., laws made by the Roman Catholic Church.

No. 53: —[It is an error to say that] The laws which pertain to the protection of the status of religious orders and their rights and duties should be abrogated; indeed, the civil government can furnish aid to all those who wish to abandon the institute of the religious life which they once accepted, and to break their solemn vows; and likewise, it can suppress these same religious orders, as well as collegiate churches and simple benefices, even those of the right of patronage, and can lay claim to, and subject their property and revenues to the administration and will of the civil power.

This means that the state has not the right to assist any who may wish to abandon monasteries or convents.

No. 54: —[It is an error to say that] Kings and princes are not only exempt from the jurisdiction of the Church, but they also are superior to the Church in deciding questions of jurisdiction.

No. 55: —[It is an error to say that] The Church is to be separated from the state, and the state from the Church.

This is entirely contrary to our American ideals of separation of Church and state. It is un-American.

No. 67: —[It is an error to say that] By natural law the bond of matrimony is not indissoluble, and in various cases divorce, properly so-called, can be sanctioned by civil authority.

This means that the state has not the right to sanction divorce in any case, but the Pope does have the right to dissolve a marriage when he thinks it will be to the advantage of the Catholic Church to do so.

No. 71: —[It is an error to say that] The formula of the Council of Trent does not oblige under penalty of nullity where the civil law prescribes another formula, and wishes to validate a marriage by the intervention of this new formula.

Thus, the state has not the right to uphold any marriage solemnized except according to the form prescribed by the Council

of Trent, even though it be according to a form sanctioned by the civil law.

No. 73: —[It is an error to say that] A true marriage can exist between Christians by virtue of a purely civil contract; and it is false to assert that the contract of marriage between Christians is always a sacrament; or, that there is no contract if the sacrament is excluded.

The state has no right, so we are given to understand, to recognize the marriage of any Catholic as valid unless performed by a Catholic priest, and the "sacrament" is included.

No. 77: —[It is an error to say that] In this age of ours it is no longer expedient that the Catholic religion should be the only religion of the state, to the exclusion of all other cults whatsoever.

According to this "infallible" claim, Roman Catholicism should be the only religion recognized by any government.

No. 78: —[It is an error to say that] Hence in certain regions of Catholic name, it has been laudably sanctioned by law that men immigrating there be allowed to have public exercises of any form of worship of their own.

Thus the Catholic Church asserts its right to demand that the Catholic religion be the only religion of the state, to the exclusion of all others.

No. 80: —[It is an error to say that] The Roman Pontiff can and should reconcile and adapt himself to progress, liberalism, and the modern civilization.

Until the hierarchy in the United States denounces the *Syllabus of Errors*, the decrees of the Dark Ages, and the practices in Spain and other Catholic countries, we must regard the hierarchy as un-American. We might be inclined to think that Catholics in America today do not believe as did Pope Pius IX, but fear to speak out lest they incur the wrath of the "infallible" Vicar of Christ, but almost every act of the hierarchy in this country runs counter to our American ideals. It is an open secret that the hierarchy in America is doing everything possible to bring about a closer tie between the state and the Roman Catholic Church.

## VII. Catholicism as It Is Today

1. *Perhaps Spain more nearly represents Roman Catholicism today than any other country in the world.* Being nominally about 99 per cent Catholic, and ruled by a government of absolutism, Spain is very much like the European countries during the Middle Ages. Here there was no Reformation; and here no liberties whatever are granted to those who do not conform to the Romanish Church. *The Louisville Courier-Journal* (April 10, 1957), in commenting on the passing of Cardinal Segura, said,

Cardinal Segura's death at 76 takes from the Spanish scene one of the most remarkable clerics of our time, a man whose more extreme views, as one critic put it, "would have had a timely ring if they had been uttered in 1552."

According to the same newspaper account, the Cardinal suggested publicly "that a revival of the Inquisition would be a good thing."

Cardinal Segura, when asked how much liberty Protestants should be allowed, replied, "None." This is the attitude in pagan Spain today. This is the policy of the Roman hierarchy wherever it has sufficient power. If it is not, then we call upon the papacy to renounce *officially* the decrees of the Middle Ages and to restate *officially* the policies of the Roman Catholic Church of today! Inasmuch as the hierarchy still boasts that "Rome never changes," we must conclude that the Roman Catholic Church is the same in principle and ideals today as it was during the period of the Inquisition, which the papacy still tries to "explain" but has never repudiated.

As late as January, 1960, Pope John XXIII wrote a letter to Generalissimo Francisco Franco lauding Spain on its "Catholicity." In his letter the Pope said,

We wish to assure Your Excellency of our fullest gratitude, reiterating the love and esteem that we have always professed toward that noble country whose strong Catholicity affords us, as Supreme Pastor of the universal Church, particular comfort and satisfaction.<sup>30</sup>

---

<sup>30</sup>*The National Catholic Register*, January 17, 1960.

2. *"The Catholic Church is the same the world over."* In September of 1958, we editorially commented: "The American hierarchy keeps trying to tell us that Catholicism is different in this country, that American Catholics do not want to change our constitution, that they owe no allegiance to the Pope that would in any way interfere with their loyalty to our American way of life. The best way for them to prove that they are sincere is to renounce the decisions of the general councils in the past, the persecutions of non-Catholics, and renounce any and all allegiance to the Pope of Rome, and clearly declare that the American church is independent of any and all alliances of any kind with the Vatican State or with the Roman dictator. We could devoutly wish that Catholics in this country would take this stand. If they would, the *Voice of Freedom* would be among the first to praise them for such a worthy and courageous act. But we doubt that this will ever happen. We believe that many of the hierarchy, and most of the priests and laity would like to do so. But such a bold move for freedom would require more courage than it did for Henry VIII to renounce his allegiance and that of the English Church to the self-styled "Vicar of Christ."

The above appeal provoked Dale Frances, then editor of the *Lone Star Catholic*, to reply:

While I feel sure that no educated Protestant takes it seriously, the virulent little magazine, *Voice of Freedom*, . . . in its most recent issue called upon the Catholics of the United States to free themselves from the bonds of their Roman masters and added that if this were done then their fellow-Americans would accept them without reservation. The magazine went on to say that the editors were certain the majority of Catholics and even priests and members of the hierarchy want to shed their connections with the Vatican, but that they simply needed courage to make the step.

I am certain the average Protestant is not as deluded as the editors of this publication but the truth is the Catholic Church is the same the world over and there is not a single good Catholic in the world, let alone priest or bishop, who wants it any other way. As a matter of fact, anyone who would want it changed would by this very attitude cease being Catholic.<sup>31</sup>

---

<sup>31</sup>*Operation Understanding*, Sept. 28, 1958.



If Mr. Francis is correct (and he may be), then we must think of Roman Catholics in the United States just as we think of Catholics in Spain, Portugal, Italy and in the Latin American countries. We must also believe that when Catholics get the power in this country, which they already have in some of the other countries, the same results will follow. This is exactly what we have been charging all along; but we have wishfully hoped that the priests and the masses of the people did not feel this way about it. Hence, our strong appeal to Catholics in America to free themselves from the Roman hierarchy and to act upon their own volition, without being slaves to a foreign dictator. It was this appeal that caused Mr. Francis to denounce the *Voice of Freedom* as a "virulent little magazine," which "no educated Protestant takes. . . seriously."

### VIII. Conclusion

The following definition of Americanism is significant. It represents the views of the Vatican Church today:

Americanism, a term rightly employed, according to Leo XIII in his letter to the hierarchy in the United States. . . to express the characteristic qualities which reflect honor on the American people, or on their condition, customs, and laws, but *wrongly employed to express certain opinions* that are not in accordance with Catholic principles, as, for instance,. . . *that time-honored methods of dealing with Protestants are now antiquated.*<sup>32</sup> [Emphasis added.]

In so many words we are given to understand that true "Americanism" has not antiquated the "time honored methods" used by Catholics in "dealing with [exterminating] Protestants." Truly, "Rome never changes," at least in some respects.

Although volumes might be written showing that Roman Catholicism is un-American, we close this chapter with the two following quotations:

---

<sup>32</sup>*The New Catholic Dictionary*, p. 37.

*The Roman Catholic view.* "The real glory attached to being a citizen of the U.S.A. is that it always comes second. Being a Roman Catholic comes first."<sup>33</sup>

*The American View:* "We have room in this country for but one flag—the stars and stripes. We have room for but one loyalty—loyalty to the United States. . . There can be no 50-50 Americanism. There is room here for only 100 per cent Americanism—only for those who are Americans and nothing else. (Theodore Roosevelt.)"<sup>34</sup>

---

<sup>33</sup>*Commonweal*, December 2, 1949.

<sup>34</sup>*The Last Message to the American Society*, January 3, 1919.

## CHAPTER XI

### Catholicism Is Intolerant

Roman Catholicism is, to say the least of it, *one* of the most intolerant and dictatorial religions in the world today. It is a system of *absolutism*. As such it is diametrically opposed to our American way of life. There is no way to reconcile the two. If one system is right, the other is wrong. Roman Catholicism is at home in a country ruled by an absolute dictatorship, *if that dictatorship happens to be in accord with the papacy*—as it is in Catholic Spain. But it is wholly out of place in a democratic country. In a system of this kind Catholicism bides its time until it can change the entire concept of free government.

Roman Catholicism claims to exist by absolute, divine right. The Pope, *who assumes* the role of the Vicar of Christ, speaks with all the authority of God himself.<sup>1</sup> Since the Roman Pontiff—as per his claim—is "infallible," no one can question his decrees. His power "is supreme." His authority is "independent of every human authority, civil and ecclesiastical."<sup>2</sup>

In support of our charge of Catholic intolerance let us note (1) what the ecumenical councils have said, (2) what the popes have said, (3) what Catholic theologians have said, and (4) what Catholic editors and writers have said.

We start with the councils because they had their beginning much earlier than did the popes. Actually, it was not until the eighth general council (869-70) that a pope was even mentioned in any of the ecumenical decrees. However, the idea of "infallibility" began to crystalize more than three centuries earlier—and before any one was ever recognized as pope. Boniface I, Bishop of Rome (418-22), wrote, ". . . there must be no withdrawal

---

<sup>1</sup>*Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent*, p. 122.

<sup>2</sup>Canon 218.

from our judgment. For it has never been allowed that that be discussed again which has once been decided by the Apostolic See."<sup>3</sup>

### I. What the Councils Have Said

#### 1. *Bishops are exalted above all earthly rulers.*

Those who have by divine grace been raised to the episcopal dignity, shall be duly honored by the secular princes. Under no circumstances shall they go a great distance from their Churches to meet these gentlemen, or on meeting them dismount from their horses and greet them by bending the knee.<sup>4</sup>

This edict, issued by the Fourth Council of Constantinople (869-70), is completely contrary to our American ideals. Yet the principle here laid down is practiced by all Catholics (and many Protestants) in this country at this present time. In our democratic America today we often see pictures of our state dignitaries bowing before the bishops of the Roman Catholic Church. But never do we see a Catholic prelate bowing to any one else—*except a superior in the Catholic Church*. This practice is not only opposed to our democratic government, it is also opposed to the teaching of the apostle Peter, whom Catholics regard as the first Pope. When he went to preach to the first Gentiles, "Cornelius met him and, falling at his feet, made obeisance to him. But Peter raised him up saying, 'Get up, I myself also am a man.'"<sup>5</sup>

#### 2. *Clerics are above the law.* The tenth general council (usually referred to as the Second Lateran, held in 1139) placed all clerics above the civil law. It decreed:

If anyone at the instigation of the devil incurs the guilt of this sacrilege, namely, that he has laid violent hands on a cleric or monk, he shall be anathematized and no bishop shall dare absolve him.<sup>6</sup>

In a Catholic-dominated country, like Italy, one may criticize the head of the civil government without incurring any legal pen-

<sup>3</sup>*The Sources of Catholic Dogma*, p. 48.

<sup>4</sup>*Disciplinary Decrees of the General Councils*, p. 169.

<sup>5</sup>Acts 10:25, 26. (Confraternity-Douay Version.)

<sup>6</sup>*Disciplinary Decrees of the General Councils*, p. 204.

alties, but it is a violation of the law to speak disparagingly of the Pope. The following *is not an edict of the "middle ages"*; it was enacted in February of 1958, and *is the law today*.

Article Eight of the Lateran Treaty states: "Italy, considering the person of the Sovereign Pontiff *as sacred* and inviolable, declares that any and every attempt against him, as well as any incitement to commit such, is punishable by the same penalties as attempts against the person of the King [Italy now has no king] or incitement to commit the same. *Public offenses or insults* committed in Italian territory against the person of the Sovereign Pontiff, *whether by deed or spoken or written word*, are punishable by the same penalties as similar offenses and injuries against the person of the King."<sup>7</sup> [Emphasis added.]

3. *The Council calls upon the state to enforce its decrees.* The Second Lateran Council demanded, under penalty of excommunication, that the secular powers enforce its decrees.

Those who, simulating a species of religious zeal, reject the sacrament of the body and blood of the Lord, the baptism of infants, the priesthood, and other ecclesiastical orders, as well as matrimony, we condemn and cast out of the Church as heretics, and ordain that they be restrained by the civil power.<sup>8</sup>

4. *The Council rejects all taxes not approved by the bishop.* The Second Lateran Council called upon the civil rulers not only to enforce its decrees, but to relieve the Catholic Church of all taxes, except those approved by the bishop.

. . . it must be considered a very serious matter that in different parts of the world rulers and magistrates of cities, as well as others who have authority, frequently impose so many burdens on the churches and so oppress them with heavy and repeated exactions. . . Wherefore, we forbid under penalty of anathema that they do such things in the future, except with the consent of the bishop and clergy and then only in extraordinary cases. . .<sup>9</sup>

5. *Ecclesiastical discipline demands "corporal punishment."*

Though ecclesiastical discipline. . . does not inflict bloody punishments, it is, however, *aided by the ordinances of Catholic princes*, for men often seek a salutary remedy for their souls only when they fear that *some severe corporal punishment will be imposed upon them*.

Wherefore, since. . . the perversity of the heretics. . . has assumed such proportions that they practice their wickedness no longer in secret as

---

<sup>7</sup>1959 *National Catholic Almanac*, p. 51.

<sup>8</sup>*Disciplinary Decrees of the General Councils*, p. 210.

<sup>9</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 230.

some do, but preach their error publicly and thus mislead the simple and the weak, we decree that they and all who defend and receive them are anathematized, and under penalty of anathema we forbid everyone to give them shelter, to admit them to his land, or to transact business with them.

...

We decree likewise that those who hire or patronize them throughout the regions in which they rave so madly, shall be publicly denounced in the churches. . . nor shall they be restored to the communion of the Church till they have abjured that pestiferous society and its heresy. Those who are bound to them by any agreement are hereby released from the obligation of fealty, deference, and all service so long as they (the heretics) continue in their iniquity. These and all the faithful we command in remission of their sins that they vigorously oppose such pests and *defend with arms* the Christian people. Let their possessions be confiscated and let the princes be allowed to *reduce to slavery men of this kind*. Those who may in conflict with these heretics die in true repentance, let them not doubt that they will receive the remission of their sins and the fruit of eternal reward.<sup>10</sup> [Emphasis added.]

6. *The Council demands the "extermination" of all heretics.* The Fourth Lateran Council even sought to "compel" the secular authorities, if necessary, to exterminate all heretics. In a lengthy decree, threatening excommunication of any secular ruler who refused "to cleanse his territory of this heretical foulness," the council thus decreed:

Secular authorities, whatever office they may hold, shall be. . . if necessary, compelled by ecclesiastical censure. . . to take an oath that they will strive in good faith and to the best of their ability to exterminate in the territories subject to their jurisdiction all heretics pointed out by the Church. . .<sup>11</sup>

It was the above decree that culminated in the great and terrible Inquisition, writing one of the blackest pages in all of European history.

7. *Clerics are forbidden to take an oath of allegiance to a secular ruler.* Although the Fourth Lateran Council would compel secular rulers to take an oath to carry out the decrees of the council, the same council forbade any of the clerics to take an oath of allegiance to any earthly rulers. The 43rd decree of this council said,

---

<sup>10</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 234, 235.

<sup>11</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 242, 243.

Some laymen (that is, princes) attempt to usurp too much of the divine right when they compel ecclesiastical persons. . . to take an oath of fidelity to them. Wherefore. . . we forbid by the authority of the sacred council that such clerics be forced by secular persons to take an oath of this kind.<sup>12</sup>

8. *The council of Vienne (1311) legislated concerning the Inquisition.* Apparently, some of the clerics had become so rash in carrying out their vengeance on heretics during the Inquisition that sentiment was building up against the papal church to the extent a general rebellion was feared. To counteract this threat the council tempered its orders regarding the punishments of heretics.

Wherefore, that the work of the inquisition may be the more *successful* the more earnestly and cautiously it is executed, we decree that it be conducted by the diocesan bishops and by the inquisitors appointed by the Apostolic See. . . . Wherefore, in virtue of holy obedience and with the threat of eternal malediction, we command the bishop and the inquisitor and those whom they may choose as substitutes, that they proceed discreetly and promptly against those suspected of heresy and do not maliciously or fraudulently anchor that stain of iniquity upon an innocent party. . . . Lastly, we decree, with the approval of the holy council, *that all statutes of our predecessors dealing with the inquisition and not in conflict with the above*, shall remain in force.<sup>13</sup> [It was possible for a pope then to teach error.]

The council had no thought of putting an end to the Inquisition but merely giving it a slight semblance of "justice."

9. *Bishops are immune from seizure or arrest.* The Council of Vienne made it an offense, carrying the penalty of excommunication, for anyone to strike or seize (i.e., arrest) a bishop.

If anyone has at the instigation of the devil rashly and with injurious effect struck or forcibly seized [arrested] any bishop or commanded that these things be done or approved them when done by others or been an accomplice or given advice in this matter or knowingly defended one guilty of such conduct and did not incur excommunication under decrees already published, let him be excommunicated by the authority of the present constitution, any custom to the contrary notwithstanding. . . .<sup>14</sup>

10. *The pope is elevated above all earthly powers.* It is in-

---

<sup>12</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 274.

<sup>13</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 398-400.

<sup>14</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 402.

conceivable that any human being could be exalted to the position ascribed to the Pope by Catholic canon law, which says,

The power of the Roman Pontiff is not limited to a right of inspection or direction. . . it is *supreme* by reason of rank. No authority on earth is superior or even equal to it; no one can judge him but God; no appeal can be taken from his mandates. . . it [the Pope's authority] is *independent* of every human authority, civil and ecclesiastical, affecting temporal as well as spiritual matters, conferring by the very nature of the jurisdiction the right to *extraterritoriality*.<sup>15</sup>

"Extraterritoriality" is thus defined: "1. freedom from the jurisdiction of the country in which one lives, as in the case of an ambassador or foreign agent. 2. jurisdiction of a country over its citizens in foreign lands."<sup>16</sup> Please read this definition again and think of all that it implies.

The exalted position of the Pope was anticipated by the apostle Paul when he wrote, "Let no man beguile you in any wise: for it will not be, except the falling away come first, and the man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition, he that opposeth and exalteth himself against all that is called God or that is worshipped; so that he sitteth in the temple of God, setting himself forth as God."<sup>17</sup> The Pope and only the Pope fits this prediction.

## II. What the Popes Have Said

### *POPE BONIFACE VIII—*

1. *The "material sword" of the state must be wielded at the will and sufferance "of the priest."*

. . . in this power of his [the Pope's] are two swords, namely spiritual and temporal. . . Therefore, each is in the power of the Church, that is, a spiritual and a material sword. But the latter, indeed, must be exercised *for* the Church, the former *by* the Church. The former (by the hand) of the priest, the latter by the hand of kings and soldiers, but *at the will and sufferance of the priest*. For it is necessary that a sword be under a sword

---

<sup>15</sup>Canon 218.

<sup>16</sup>*Webster's New World Dictionary*, p. 517.

<sup>17</sup>2 Thes. 2:3, 4.



and that temporal authority be subject to spiritual power.<sup>18</sup> [Emphasis added.]

2. *In order to be saved, it is necessary for "every human creature" to be entirely "subject to the Roman Pontiff."*

Furthermore, we declare, say, define, and proclaim to every human creature that they by necessity for salvation are entirely subject to the Roman Pontiff.<sup>19</sup>

*POPE PIUS IV—*

*Pope claims to "exercise" the "authority of God Himself."*

We. . . relying on and supported by the authority of God Himself. . . *which we also exercise on earth*, summon a holy, ecumenical and general council to the city of Trent.<sup>20</sup> [Emphasis added.]

*POPE GREGORY XVI—*

1. *"Liberty of conscience" is called "insanity."*

And so from this most rotten source of indifferentism flows that absurd and erroneous opinion, or rather insanity, that liberty of conscience must be claimed and defended for anyone.<sup>21</sup>

2. *It is the "most shameless liberty" on the part of "those who desire that the Church be separated from the state."* Hence, the Pope bemoans the fact that he cannot foresee any "joyful omens."

Nor can we foresee more joyful omens for religion and the state from the wishes of those who desire that the Church be separated from the State, and that the mutual concord of the government with the sacred ministry be broken. For it is certain that that concord [union of church and state] is greatly feared by lovers of this most shameless liberty, which [i.e., the union of church and state] has always been fortunate and salutary for the ecclesiastical and the civil welfare.<sup>22</sup>

3. *It is "a very mournful thing" to seek for truth "outside of the Catholic Church."*

But it is a very mournful thing. . . that truth must be sought outside of the Catholic Church in which truth itself is found far from even the slightest defilement of error.<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup>"Unam Sanctam" (Unity and Power of the Church), Nov. 18, 1302.

<sup>19</sup>*in loc. cit.*

<sup>20</sup>*Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent*, p. 122.

<sup>21</sup>"Mirari vos arbitramur" (Indifferentism), Aug. 15, 1832.

<sup>22</sup>*in loc. cit.*

<sup>23</sup>"Singulari nos affecerant gaudio" (The False Doctrines of Felicite de Lamennais), to the Bishops of France, June 25, 1834.

What thinking person can read the decrees of the councils and the popes and yet believe this statement?

*POPE PIUS IX—*

1. *It is a grave sin for any to dare "think in their hearts otherwise than it has been defined by Us."*

Wherefore, if any should presume to think in their hearts otherwise than as it has been defined by Us [the Pope], which God avert, let them know and understand. . . that by their own act they subject themselves to the penalties established by law, if, what they think in their hearts, they should dare to signify by word or writing or any other external means.<sup>24</sup>

It should be remembered that this was a decree by an "infallible" pope who rules over a church which now *lectures* all of us in the United States on intolerance. Could a non-Catholic possibly be more intolerant than the Romish Church?

2. *There is no salvation "outside the Apostolic Roman Church."*

For, it must be held by faith that outside the Apostolic Roman Church, no one can be saved; that this is the only ark of salvation; that he who shall not have entered therein will perish in the flood.<sup>25</sup>

This is still the *official* Catholic teaching. Outside the "Roman Church" one cannot be saved—call them "separated brethren," or whatever you wish. (Consult the *1964 National Catholic Almanac*, p. 241.)

3. *The "Roman Pontiff" not only claims to be the "Vicar of Christ" but "the father and teacher of all Christians."*

. . . the holy Apostolic See and the Roman Pontiff have the primacy over the whole world, and that the same Roman Pontiff is the successor of St. Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, and the true vicar of Christ, the head of the whole Church, the father and teacher of all Christians; and that to him, in the person of St. Peter, was given by our Lord Jesus Christ the full power of feeding, ruling, and governing the whole Church. . . .<sup>26</sup>

In the light of this statement, all non-Catholics must recog-

---

<sup>24</sup>"Ineffabilis Deus" (Definition of the Immaculate Conception), Dec. 8, 1854.

<sup>25</sup>"Singulari quadem" (Rationalism and Indifferentism), Dec. 9, 1854.      <sup>26</sup>"D o g m a t i c Constitution on the Church of Christ, July 18, 1870.

nize the Pope as *their* "father and teacher," else be denounced as non-Christians.

4. *The Pope claims "infallibility."*

. . . the Roman Pontiff, when he speaks *ex cathedra*. . . possesses that infallibility with which the divine Redeemer wished that His church be endowed in defining doctrine on faith and morals; and so such definitions of the Roman Pontiff of themselves, but not from the consensus of the Church, are unalterable.<sup>27</sup>

*The following canon is predicated upon the above definition of the Pope's "infallibility."*

But if anyone presumes to contradict this definition of Ours, which may God forbid: let him be anathema.<sup>28</sup>

*POPE LEO XIII—*

1. *"It is necessary for every one. . . to have the same opinion as that held by the Apostolic See."*

. . . in forming opinion, it is necessary to comprehend and hold with a firm judgment whatever the Roman Pontiffs have handed down, and shall hand down, and to profess each publicly as often as occasion demands. And specifically regarding the so-called *liberties* so sought after in recent times, it is necessary for everyone to stand by the judgment of the Apostolic See, and to have the same opinion as that held by it.<sup>29</sup>

2. *"Indiscriminate freedom" is not "lawful."*

. . . it is by no means lawful to demand, to defend, and to grant indiscriminate freedom of thought, writing, teaching, and likewise of belief, as if so many rights which nature has given to man.<sup>30</sup>

3. *Loyalty to the Catholic Church takes precedence over one's loyalty to the state.*

If the laws of the state are openly at variance with divine right, if they impose any injury upon the [Roman Catholic] Church, or oppose those duties which are of religion, or violate the authority of Jesus Christ in *the Supreme Pontiff*, then indeed to resist is a duty, to obey a crime. . .<sup>31</sup>

4. *No one may interpret the "Holy Scriptures" contrary to the "Mother Church."*

<sup>27</sup>*The Church Teacher*, p. 102.

<sup>28</sup>*The Sources of Catholic Dogma*, p. 457.

<sup>29</sup>"Immortale Dei" (The Christian Constitution of States), Nov. 1, 1885.

<sup>30</sup>"Libertas, praestantissimum" (Bounds of Liberty, and Human Action), June 20, 1888.

<sup>31</sup>"Sapientiae christianae" (Love for Church and Fatherland), Jan. 10, 1890,

The Synod of the Vatican adopted the teaching of the Fathers, when, as it renewed the decree of Trent<sup>32</sup> on the interpretation of the divine Word, it declared this to be its mind, that *in matters of faith and morals, which pertain to the building up of Christian doctrine, that is to be held as the true sense of Holy Scripture which Mother Church has held and holds, whose prerogative it is to judge of the true sense and interpretation of Scripture; and, therefore, it is permitted to no one to interpret the Holy Scripture against this sense. . .*<sup>33</sup> [Emphasis by the translator.]

5. *The Pope not only wants "liberty" for himself in the United States, but the protection of the laws of the land to propagate the Catholic doctrine.*

For the Church amongst you, unopposed by the Constitution and government of your nation [the United States], fettered by no hostile legislation, protected against violence by the common laws and the impartiality of the tribunals, is free to live and act without hindrance. Yet, though all this is true, it would be very erroneous to draw the conclusion that in America is to be sought the type of the most desirable status of the Church, or that it would be universally lawful or expedient for State and Church to be, as in America, dissevered and divorced. The fact that Catholicity with you is in good condition, nay, is even enjoying a prosperous growth, is by all means to be attributed to the fecundity with which God has endowed His Church, in virtue of which unless men or circumstances interfere, she spontaneously expands and propagates herself; *but she would bring forth more abundant fruits if, in addition to liberty, she enjoyed the favor of the laws and the patronage of the public authority.* [Emphasis added.]

For Our part We have left nothing undone, as far as circumstances permitted, to preserve and more solidly establish amongst you [in the United States] the Catholic religion. . .<sup>34</sup>

6. *"Those opinions. . . indicated by the name of Americanism" are disapproved.*

We cannot approve the opinions which some comprise under the head of Americanism. . . For it raises the suspicion that there are some among you who conceive and desire a church in America different from that which is in the rest of the world. One in the unity of doctrine as in the unity of government, such is the Catholic Church. . . one which is rightly called Roman. . .<sup>35</sup> [For more than four centuries all of the popes have been Italians.]

---

<sup>32</sup>*Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent* (Fourth Session), pp. 18, 19.

<sup>33</sup>"Providentissimus Deus" (*The Study of Holy Scripture*), Nov. 1893.

<sup>34</sup>"Longinque Oceani" (*Catholicity in the United States*), Jan. 6, 1895, *The Great Encyclical Letters of Pope Leo XIII*, pp. 323, 324.

<sup>35</sup>"Testem benevolentiae" (*True and False Americanism In Religion*), Jan. 22, 1899. *Ibid.*, p. 452.

*7. Pope holds the place of God on earth.*

*We hold upon this earth the place of God almighty, who will have all men to be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth. . .*<sup>36</sup> [Meaning the teaching of Roman Catholicism.]

*POPE PIUS X—*

*Separation of church and state was condemned by the Pope who has now been canonized.*

We, in accord with the supreme authority which We hold from God, disprove and condemn the established law which separates the French state from the [Catholic] Church.<sup>37</sup>

If wrong to separate the *French* state from the Roman Catholic Church then it would be wrong to separate any other state from it.

Juan Peron was a good "dictator" in Argentina until he sought to separate the state from the Catholic Church. Then he was driven out and a law enacted making it necessary for one to be a Roman Catholic before one could qualify for the office of president in that country. What kind of a howl would go up if Congress attempted to pass a law making it mandatory that one be a Protestant before being able to qualify for the office of president in the United States!

*POPE PIUS XI—*

*The Catholic Church maintains it has "the right and duty of passing judgment with supreme authority on. . . social and economic problems."*

The principle which Leo XIII clearly established long ago must be laid down, that there rest in us the right and the duty of passing judgment with supreme authority on these social and economic problems.<sup>38</sup>

If the papacy can pass "judgment with *supreme authority* on . . . social and economic problems," then what is to prevent the

---

<sup>36</sup>"Praeclara Gratulationis Publicae" (The Reunion of Christendom), June 20, 1894.

<sup>37</sup>"Vehementer nos" (The Separation of Church and State), to the clergy and people of France, February 11, 1906.

<sup>38</sup>"Quadragesimo anno" (The Authority of the Church in Social and Economic Affairs), May 15, 1931.

papacy from passing "judgment with supreme authority" on any other matters of its choosing?

*POPE PIUS XII—*

*After the Pope has expressed his opinion on any subject "it cannot any longer be considered a question of free discussion."*

But if the Supreme Pontiffs in their acts, after due consideration, express an opinion on a hitherto controversial matter, it is clear to all that this matter, according to the mind and will of the same Pontiffs, cannot any longer be considered a question of free discussion among the theologians.<sup>39</sup>

*POPE JOHN XXIII—*

1. *The Catholic Church maintains "its right and duty to advise laymen on how to vote."*

The (Catholic) Church must maintain its right and duty to advise laymen on how to vote in elections.<sup>40</sup>

2. *Catholics should "resist non-Catholics. . . even if it creates difficulties."*

Even laymen should with legitimate means resist non-Catholics who dare to spread among the people attacks on the Catholic Faith. *They should do this even if it creates difficulties and they should strive to instill their principles in the minds of others.* Catholics are forbidden to enter the halls and churches of non-Catholics to attend their rites.<sup>41</sup> [Emphasis added.]

III. What Catholic Theologians Have Said

1. *"THE REV." BERTRAND L. CONWAY— "Freedom of thought" is "severely limited."*

We have no right to believe what is false. . . Infallibility is the corrective of error in matters of belief, conduct and worship. . . It is like the compass on the modern ocean liner or aeroplane, that points out the true course in the darkness and in the fog. . . The scope of the so-called "freedom of thought" is thus severely limited.<sup>42</sup> [Emphasis added.]

2. *JAMES CARDINAL GIBBONS—*

*"They wished to be rid of her yoke."*

---

<sup>39</sup>"*Humani generis*" (Some False Opinions that Threaten to Undermine the Foundations of Catholic Doctrine), Aug. 12, 1950.

<sup>40</sup>Time, "The Rules of Rome," Feb. 8, 1960, pp. 76, 79.

<sup>41</sup>*The National Catholic Register* (Diocesan Council of Rome, Jan. 1960), Feb. 7, 1960.

<sup>42</sup>*The Question Box* (1929 edition), p. 97.

The conflict between Church and State has never died out, because the Church has felt it to be her duty, in every age, to raise her voice against the despotic and arbitrary measures of princes. Many of them chafed under the salutary discipline of the [Roman Catholic] Church. They wished to be rid of her yoke.<sup>43</sup>

#### IV. What Other Catholic Writers Have Said

##### 1. RYAN AND BOLAND—

*"The State should officially recognize the Catholic religion as the religion of the commonwealth."*

The State should officially recognize the Catholic religion as the religion of the commonwealth; accordingly it should invite the blessing and the ceremonial participation of the Church for certain important public functions, as the opening of legislative sessions, the erection of public buildings, etc., and delegate its officials to attend certain of the more important festival celebrations of the [Catholic] Church; it should recognize and sanction the laws of the [Catholic] Church; and it should protect the rights of the [Catholic] Church, and the religious as well as the other rights of the [Catholic] Church's members. . . . Should such persons [other than Roman Catholics] be permitted to practice their own form of worship? *If these are carried on within the family, or in such an inconspicuous manner as to be an occasion neither of scandal nor of perversion to the faithful, they may properly be tolerated by the State*<sup>44</sup> [From a textbook still in use in Catholic schools in the U. S.]

##### 2. OFFICIAL WORLD ORGAN OF JESUITRY—

*"The Roman Catholic Church. . . must demand the right of freedom for herself alone."*

The Roman Catholic Church, convinced, through its divine prerogative, of being the only true church, must demand the right of freedom for herself alone, because such a right can only be possessed by truth, never by error. As to other religions, the Church will certainly never draw the sword, but she will require by legitimate means that they shall not be allowed to propagate false doctrine. Consequently, in a state where the majority of people are Catholic, the Church will require that legal existence be denied to error, and that if religious minorities actually exist, they shall have only a *de facto* existence without opportunity to spread their beliefs. . . . In some countries, Catholics will be obliged to ask full religious freedom for all, resigned at being forced to cohabit where they alone should rightfully be allowed to live. But in doing this the Church does not renounce her thesis, which remains the most imperative of her laws,

---

<sup>43</sup>*The Faith of Our Fathers*, p. 231.

<sup>44</sup>*Catholic Principles of Politics*, pp. 316, 317.

but merely adapts herself to *de facto* conditions, which must be taken into account in practical affairs. . . . The Church cannot blush for her own want of tolerance, as she asserts it in principle and applies it in practice.<sup>45</sup>

### V. An Inevitable Conclusion

If all of these quotations are not enough to convince us that the Roman Catholic Church is intolerant, then just what would it take to do so? If any one seeks to excuse these statements on the grounds they do not represent the Roman Church today, then we should like to know when and where a single one of these has ever been repudiated by the papacy? Being (according to its claims) an "infallible" church, it never has and never can rescind any of its decrees or official pronouncements. However, we must give the hierarchy credit for trying to *explain* all of them in order to make them more palatable—which is no easy job among enlightened people.

The conclusion is inevitable: the church that lectures us on "bigotry" and "intolerance" is the most *intolerant* church in the United States— if not in all the world!

---

<sup>45</sup>*Civiltà Cattolica*, Rome: April, 1948.



## **CHAPTER XII**

### **Catholicism Is Pernicious**

When we charge Roman Catholics with seeking to bring all men into bondage to the papacy we are not making a blanket charge against the entire membership of the Romish Church. It is the hierarchy that we indict. No doubt many of its members, especially in the United States, would like to see some liberalization in the system of the hierarchy, but thus far they have had very little success in affecting any significant changes. The system has become so fixed with the passing of the centuries that it shapes its members, rather than being shaped by its members. In short, its "faithful" members have become slaves to the system. It is axiomatic that those who are most devoted to the papal system feel a greater obligation to promote its interests. In their eager enthusiasm it is but natural that they should think that any opposition to Catholicism should be crushed; and all too frequently it appears that the end justifies the means.

#### **I. Catholic Tactics**

We have taken notice of the efficiency and effectiveness of the well-planned propaganda of the Romish system. All such propaganda—whether it be in print, pictures, or in person—is cleverly designed. Its aim is to make the very best impression possible on the general public, including the masses of Catholics themselves. But when the Roman Pontiff feels constrained to strike a blow at any opposition he can do so with all the fury of Lucifer. As an illustration, read the bulls, decrees, and encyclicals of the popes in ages past, some of which have already been cited in this work. As long as the popes had the power to suppress heresy they exercised that power to the fullest. Then they referred to all non-Catholics as "schismatics and heretics." Now they are

called "separated brethren." But this same church which boasts it can "never teach error" still exercises firm control in all Catholic countries, *as far as it can*.

## II. Catholic Double-Talk

Members of all Catholic orders are thoroughly schooled in the art of propaganda. They know how to create the most favorable impression, as long their words and deeds are not challenged. As a result of their preparation and training, they usually succeed quite well in carrying out their assignments. Through their works of benevolence and manifestations of piety, the masses are lead to believe that the Catholic Church is thoroughly American in every respect. When this sort of an impression can be created in any community Catholicism can and does achieve its purposes without bringing upon itself unfavorable criticism. But when one dares to cross swords with the clergy he can expect to meet with strong resistance. We have had many demonstrations of the wrath of the Catholic priests in recent years, especially where we have challenged their power and schemes.

In 1960 the author was invited to deliver a series of lectures on the *Preservation Of Our Religious Freedom* in West Plains, Missouri. The church that invited us advertised the lectures in the local newspaper and with large placards placed in store windows. No mention was made of Catholicism in the advertising. On the day of our arrival an "unknown" party went about over the city and apologetically informed the business men who were displaying the placards that "We have decided to remove these window cards, since they are only creating confusion." Supposing the party was a representative of those who had placed the cards in their windows, many of the business concerns acquiesced in their removal. There were some, however, who refused. Later, the managers of some of the places that refused to allow their placards to be removed received some telephone calls threatening

them with a boycott by the Catholic Church. We were not able to learn immediately who the person was that removed the window cards. But after the lectures were over and we were gone, it appeared that the local priest had done it himself—after taking off his Roman collar and clerical garb. A few days after the lectures he inserted the following paid ad in the local paper:

### **TO THE PUBLIC—CATHOLICS EXPRESS THANKS**

Every community is menaced from time to time by those who would disrupt its harmony by promoting ill feeling and distrust. Our community deserves credit for refusing to participate in recent ill-will campaigns. It is indicative of its maturity. We wish to express our deep appreciation for this wonderful spirit and pledge ourselves to maintaining it. For this reason we have been steadfast in our resolution of not debating with these factions. It would only create turmoil and be detrimental to our community. There is no reasoning with the prejudiced. We think it much better to assure the public that anyone is welcome at any time to attend our services and to seek information through the proper channels without obligation or cost. Certainly this is more logical than giving heed to those who have been expelled from our church or to those who are totally ignorant of our faith. We promise to co-operate in all civic projects as we have done in the past.

Since this was a deliberate effort to make it appear that the lectures had been poorly attended, and that the people generally should be congratulated on their good sense for staying away, those who had so faithfully supported the lectures felt compelled to answer the priest through the same paper, which they did in good fashion.

Roman Catholic priests can appear very pious when it serves their purpose. They can also be very crafty when they want to be. It was not only poor Americanism but poor Christianity for the priest to try to make it appear that he was a representative of those who had printed and distributed the placards, which he did for the sole purpose of destroying them. It was neither good Americanism nor good Christianity to insert such an ad in the paper to create the impression that we were either a disgruntled, excommunicated Catholic or else "totally ignorant" of the Catholic teaching. The priest also showed bad taste when he declared

that we were so unreasonable and prejudiced that it was out of the question to talk to us. The truth is, at no time did he even attempt to talk to us. Never, as far as we were able to learn, did he come to our lectures or give us an opportunity to meet him face to face to discuss the merits of Catholicism; and apparently he did not know, else he hoped to discount the fact that about 500 were in attendance every night. Furthermore, at no time did we ever say anything about wanting a debate—though we would never run from a public debate.

Another case illustrative of the unscrupulous acts of Roman Catholic proponents occurred July 31, 1958, in Battle Creek, Michigan, concerning which, Clyde Balderson, Jr., wrote:

O. C. Lambert was lecturing on "The Errors of Roman Catholicism." He had been speaking only about ten minutes when he was interrupted by Catholic priests in the audience. They had entered along with some twenty-five or thirty Catholics, most of them were members of the Knights of Columbus, according to reports. The Catholics had arrived one or two at a time to create the impression that they knew nothing about the coming of others. While the congregation was praying, some of the disturbers began to march up and down the aisles, talking loudly. . . . The confusion became so bad that the congregation was forced to call the police. When two policemen arrived they stated that they did not have the power to do anything unless there was an actual fight. When asked if they were Catholics, they denied that they were. Later it was learned that both of the policemen were Roman Catholics.

The meeting was completely broken up by this priest-lead group of Catholics. It was necessary to call the state patrol to keep order the next evening, so the lectures might continue. The local authorities refused to do anything at all about it.<sup>1</sup>

If we should assume that every word of every lecture by Lambert was one hundred percent erroneous, the Catholic priests still had no right to create disorder and confusion where a group of people had met in their own building to discuss matters which they sincerely believed to be of concern to us all. Since this is a free country, every man should have a right to speak to those who wish to hear him—as long as he is not advocating the overthrow of our government by subversion or by force of arms.

---

<sup>1</sup>*Voice of Freedom*, October 1958; pp. 147, 148.

### III. Canon Law Versus Civil Law

Roman Catholics *publicly* advocate American ideals and good citizenship, yet they do not scruple to run counter to any law if it is not in harmony with their own canons. They seek to explain this on the ground that their canon laws are divine and, therefore, take precedence over all human laws. It is true that God's laws are above all human laws, but God's laws and Rome's canon laws are very different. These latter laws were made by uninspired men, and were intended solely for the Catholic Church.

1. *Catholic marriage laws often run counter to our civil laws.* Rome's law says that "all baptized persons, inclusive of heretics and schismatics, are subject to the provisions of canon law in regard to their marriages."<sup>2</sup> This same canon goes on to explain that "the [Roman Catholic] Church possesses the power to punish those of its subjects who violate the laws affecting marriage." Thus, if one has ever been "baptized" by the Roman Catholic Church, even though he had no will whatever in the matter, he is forever subject to Rome's canon laws, regardless of where he is or what his wishes may be.

As we observed in chapter X, the non-Catholic must agree in writing not to interfere with the faith of the Catholic spouse in any way. On the other hand, Catholic canon law declares that "particular law can require. . . the guaranty of the Catholic party to strive for the conversion of the non-Catholic party and to avoid the giving of consent before a non-Catholic minister."<sup>3</sup>

Since the laws of some states refuse to support the agreements made by non-Catholics who marry Catholics, the canon laws make it quite clear that such agreements must be made in such a way that they cannot be challenged, even by the laws of any state.<sup>4</sup> Too many homes have been destroyed, too many

---

<sup>2</sup>Canon Law 1016.

<sup>3</sup>Canon Law 1061.

<sup>4</sup>*in loc. cit.*

lives have been wrecked, and too much trouble has been created for couples to sign such uncharitable and un-Christian agreements.

2. *Roman Catholics are unscrupulous in their attitude toward divorce.* We deplore the mockery so many have made of their marriages. They have taken their vows entirely too lightly; all too many marriages have failed, and too many children have been orphaned, because of the unfaithfulness of those who have taken the sacred vows of marriage. But such weaknesses on the part of some individuals do not justify the acts of the Catholic Church. Jesus allowed one—but only one—ground for divorce and remarriage.<sup>5</sup> Christians should never take advantage of the laws of any state to counter God's law. However, there are many who do not adhere to the teachings of Christ, and feel that they have a right to appeal to our state laws.

Whether we agree with these laws or not, the Roman Catholic practice is not the answer. They do not recognize divorce on *any* ground, yet they will *annul* any marriage where it seems to be in the interest of the Romish Church. If an annulment is *not* in the interest of the Catholic Church, then it is never allowed; it does not matter whether it is on a scriptural ground or not. But *if* it seems expedient, the hierarchy may annul any marriage and allow the divorcee to "remarry"—with all the rites and blessings of the Catholic Church. With them the laws of the state regarding divorce and remarriage have no validity. If any official other than a priest says the ceremony for one who has ever been "baptized" into the Catholic Church, it is not marriage at all, but "the beginning of a scandalous concubinage." In short, Roman Catholics disregard both marriage and divorce, unless they conform to the approval of the hierarchy. *The laws of the land* have no meaning for them. In this respect they are in direct opposition to the laws of the state and our American ideals.

---

<sup>5</sup>Mat 5:32.

3. *Roman Catholicism often runs counter to the laws of the state which have to do with the morals of our country.* The laws forbidding the sale of liquor and the laws against gambling have been flouted in this country for years. It was the Roman Catholic Church, primarily, that destroyed the Eighteenth Amendment to the Constitution. Al Smith who was nominated for the presidency on the Democratic ticket in 1928 was a prime mover in the destruction of this amendment.

Dale Francis recently summarized the Catholic position in these words:

Historically, this country has been under Protestant domination. The Protestant majority has not hesitated to impose its concept of morality on the whole nation. The best example of this was the imposition or prohibition on the entire nation, an implementation of the Protestant moral position that all alcoholic beverages are evil. This same Protestant dictation of its moral position on the whole community exists through local option in many parts of the country yet today.

Protestant morality is imposed on the whole community in many other ways. Gambling is considered evil *per se* by evangelical Christianity; therefore, in many areas even the most innocent forms of gambling are forbidden by law.<sup>6</sup>

It has been difficult for the various states to enforce the laws against gambling because the Roman Catholics have brazenly violated them in the very face of the authorities. They have operated their immoral and illegal practices in the name of religion. In so doing they are destroying the moral fiber of our nation.

4. *Rome's efforts to gain control of our nation are pernicious.* In previous chapters we have noted some of Rome's devices to gain her ends: such, for example, as the increased birth rate, the control of all education, the destruction of our immigration laws, and a "reinterpretation" of our Constitution. A number of bills have been introduced in the Congress to grant a federal allotment to parents for each child born into the family. Although the wording of the bills, along with the speeches made and the articles written in favor of them, sound quite humanitarian, the

---

<sup>6</sup>*Operation Understanding*, May 1, 1960.

end result is to encourage bigger families, especially among Catholics who are already increasing through procreation much more rapidly than non-Catholics.

#### IV. Catholic Efforts to Circumvent the Law

One of the largest and busiest groups of lobbyists in Washington is maintained the year round by the Roman Catholic Church. Great numbers are always on hand to scrutinize every bill introduced by Congress and to apply pressure when they see fit.

1. *Catholic educators are committed to the defeat of any federal aid to the public schools unless the Catholic schools get equal aid.* If they can get the same aid as the public schools, then they can soon have enough schools and teachers to accommodate all of their children, so as to indoctrinate them in their sectarian religion. They can then pull all of their children out of the public schools and put them in their own schools, as required by their own canon law, then thumb their noses at us as "saps"— being compelled by a minority religion to pay for their sectarian schools.

2. *Wherever possible, Catholics seek to gain control of the public school boards.* In recent years they have gained control of many such boards, even when they were sending their own children to the parochial schools. Frequently *public school superintendents* and public school *teachers* send their children to Catholic parochial schools. Take for example the case in San Antonio, Texas in 1960:

East Central School District now has the honor and distinction of four school board members who do not send a single child to the district schools. These members are Donal Cover, Ted Huth, Albert H. Nuebauer, and Henry J. Mainz, who constitute a board majority. District voters yesterday elected Nuebauer and Mainz over incumbent boardmen Arthur Schaefer and J. W. Stevens, who do have children in East Central schools.

The St. Hedwig area, largely Catholic, Polish, and rural, preserved its record of not backing candidates in favor of spending money on public



schools. Nuebauer and Mainz lost in two of the three district boxes. Only the St. Hedwig area, which went for them about 4-1, made it possible for these two men to win. School Superintendent Alfred Teltschik said last night that he did not expect to fill out his contract to June 30, 1961, and did not expect the district to retain its accreditation.<sup>7</sup>

The Catholic hierarchy is opposed to our public schools, and to our American way of life; and when the opportunity presents itself it does not scruple to do everything possible to remold all of our institutions in conformity with the papal system.

3. *Roman Catholics seek to "capture" our public schools completely and turn them into parochial schools*<sup>8</sup> If such schools—which are fully supported by the state—are "public," then why is it that no withholding tax is deducted from the salaries paid to the teachers? Why is it that the school buses must pick up the children and take them to school an hour early in order to study catechism and say mass before the *regular* school day begins? Why is it that they continue to line the school buildings with Catholic pictures, crucifixes and statues? Why is it that the teachers still wear their clerical garbs? Why is it that they will even hang those in effigy who try to correct a situation of this land—as was done in March of 1959 at Bremond, Texas? And why is it that they list such as parochial schools in their *Official Directory*? And if such schools are "public," why is it that Roman Catholics will spend so much money on law suits to keep control over them?

### V. Catholic Schemes to Get Control

Let us never underestimate Catholic strength and cunning. There is scarcely any scheme they have not tried in order to gain their ends. Where such devices prove effective they make use of them repeatedly. If such are ineffective, they are soon laid aside and others are contrived.

---

<sup>7</sup>*San Antonio Express and News*, April 3, 1960.

<sup>8</sup>See Chapter X, Sec. II, Paragraph 2, "Wherever possible Catholics take over our free public schools. . ."

1. *Roman Catholics have gained control of many of their hospitals by devious methods.* It is easy to get the people of any community to contribute to the erection and operation of a hospital when one is needed. After a hospital is built, however, it is sometimes hard to find an organization to operate it, since public hospitals are usually run at a loss. Hospitals operated by a municipal or county government are frequently kicked about like a (political) football. Hence, a community is often glad for some responsible religious organization to take over and operate its hospitals. Roman Catholics know this, and generally have a few key individuals ready to accept the handout. With their strong organization they can always find the means—*usually in the community*—to run a hospital when once they get possession of it. Furthermore, since Catholics pay peon wages they can operate much cheaper than others. Most of them: hospitals are listed as "charity" institutions and removed from the tax rolls by the city, county, state, and federal governments. However, it usually costs as much when one goes to a Catholic hospital as it does at any other hospital. Frequently it costs more. Roman Catholics are successful in securing large gifts from non-Catholics for their hospitals, yet they are all used as bases for the dissemination of Catholic propaganda.

2. *Catholics gain control of all news media wherever possible.* The Catholic press is always on the job to pick up every bit of news as soon as it is released and to report it in such a way as to create the most favorable impression for the hierarchy. A large number of the newspapers are either owned or else controlled by Roman Catholics. When a paper refuses to kowtow to Catholic pressure it is at once threatened with boycott. Such threats are sometimes very malicious.

## **VI. Catholics Organize for Action**

In October of 1959 the *Voice of Freedom* carried a review of the 1959 edition of the *Metropolitan Catholic Telephone*

*Guide*, published by *The Catholic News*, N. Y. This article, which we are here reproducing in full, shows how Catholics organize for action.

### **MORE THAN A TELEPHONE BOOK**

This large 265-page directory is much more than a "telephone" book. Its listings include the names and addresses of all Roman Catholic hierarchical functionaries, churches, etc., in the tri-state metropolitan New York area from Camden, N. J., northward to Bridgeport, Conn., and lower New York State.

That this book lists every Roman Catholic Church, seminary, convent, hospital, nursery, settlement house, retreat house, sanitarium, monastery, missionary headquarters, publication, college and university, high school, parochial school, commercial school, military school, etc., and the priests, *et al.*, in charge of each unit, is telling enough evidence of the vast extent of the Catholic Church's religious, educational, propaganda, and social-service operations in this most heavily-populated and decisive area in North America.

Statistically, there are 1, 493 Roman Catholic schools and colleges, 1, 389 Roman Catholic Churches, and 873 miscellaneous Roman Catholic institutions in this one area. They are operated by 6, 131 priests, 1, 854 "brothers" and 22, 453 "sisters." They serve a laity of 5, 814, 212 Roman Catholics. These figures contrast with the 1956 totals of 1, 376 schools and colleges, 1, 339 churches, 853 miscellaneous institutions, 6, 659 priests (the only declining number), 1, 701 "brothers" and 21, 771 "sisters." The laity numbered 5, 092, 047.

That the directory contains hundreds of commercial advertisements of products and services, many by firms exclusively devoted to the Roman Catholic "trade," is interesting but not too important. More than a dozen firms were listed proclaiming their bingo supplies, "chuck-a-luck" cages, stage money, penny pitch,

raffle drums, parimutuels, "Las Vegas" and "Monte Carlo" games, change-counting machines, etc., including one which advertises "Route (your bazaars, carnivals, bingos) through Institutional Commodity Services of the Archdiocese of New York."

The pages of "Catholic Organizations and Activities" describe an amazing list of intriguing organizations within organizations. The effect of this program is both penetrative and divisive. In establishing its own cells on the inside the hierarchy can exert influence and control in these governmental, commercial, professional and occupational groups. At the same time, Catholic members of these groups can be carefully enclaved and protected from associations and influences which might lessen their devotion to the Catholic Church.

For example, the A. C. T. U. (Association of Catholic Trade Unionists) is set up to "install Christian principles, as outlined in the Papal Encyclicals, into the economic order." The Catholic Club of New York, whose 450 members meet at the elite Park Lane Hotel, the 1, 200 members of the Carroll Club, and the 21 Catholic Laymen's First Friday clubs, whose purpose is "practical Catholic Action," all cater to Catholic businessmen and women.

Besides the Archdiocese Committee on Scouting (both Boy and Girl Scouts), there is a National Catholic Committee on Scouting, whose meetings are "held in connection with the meetings of the National Council, Boy Scouts of America."

The actors have their Catholic Actors Guild of America (1, 250 members); the Catholics Accountants Guild (one of 600 such guilds of accountants in the nation); the Catholic Apostolate of Radio, TV, and Advertising (hdq., naturally, on Madison Avenue for the 2, 500 members); the Guild of Catholic Lawyers' 850 members who "advance Catholic philosophy and doctrine in the practice of law"; the Appollonia Guild of Catholic dentists; several guilds for Catholic executives and employees of insurance companies; a Catholic Institute of the Food Trade and a guild for

Catholic executives in the liquor, beer, and wine industry; guilds for Catholic librarians, poets, doctors, psychiatrists, employees of airlines, railroad employees, etc.

The Catholic Institute of the Press "foster(s) Christian principles and action among working members of the communications field." Some 543 Catholic publishers and officers of newspapers, magazines, and books, belong to the Catholic Press Association. For authors there is the Catholic Writers' Guild. Each of the metropolitan daily newspapers—*New York Times*, *New York Herald Tribune*, *New York Daily News*, etc.—has its own Catholic Action society. Also the larger department stores.

The kind of apparatus depicted in this directory makes the vaunted "cells" of the Communist Party look like emaciated foundlings. One can imagine what the Party would give to have the vital services of the city and the nation infiltrated with such an apparatus as this.

The Catholic Court Attaches Guild's 1, 900 members in 49, branches "foster a true spirit of Catholicism in our courts," and have a special Catholic Action Committee to enforce this. The 1, 200 members of the Catholic Guild of the Department of Finance and Office of Comptroller of the City of New York (with offices in Room 719 of the Municipal Bldg.) list as their purposes "Catholic Action;. . . [and] to keep informed of local and world activities from the Catholic viewpoint."

Eight hundred belong to the Catholic Guild of Office of President, Borough of Manhattan.

The New York City Department of Welfare has its Catholic guild (1, 300 members); 2, 000 Catholic doctors, nurses, interns, and other employees of the New York City Department of Hospitals are organized in 16 municipal chapters. . . this is in addition to the staffs of the many hospitals owned and operated by the Roman Catholic Church.

The Catholic policemen, numbering 10, 500 of the city's 21, 000 man force, have their own Catholic Action Society.

The New York Department of Water Supply, Gas & Electricity's services could easily be controlled through its Catholic Guild of 1, 100 members. Likewise the 3, 000 in the New York Sanitation Department Holy Name Society.

Manhattan is an island. The Catholic Guild of Triborough Bridge and Tunnel Authority would come in handy for political "Catholic Action" here, too.

Four thousand firemen are members of the New York City Fire Department Holy Name Society. There are 6, 500 in the New York Post Office Catholic Society.

Catholic employees and officials of the Consolidated Edison Co. and the New York Telephone Co. are organized for Catholic Action.

The purpose of the Catholic Teachers' Association of the Archdiocese of New York, Inc., is "*Religious* training for *public* school children." Note the words "Religious" and "public." These 3, 500 Catholic teachers are employed by the City for teaching in its tax-supported public schools—*not* Roman Catholic parochial schools.

Administrative and civil service employees of the State of New York whose offices are in New York City, have their Dongan Guild whose 2, 000 members "advance Catholic interests . . . foster a true Catholic spirit among the members and engage in Catholic Action."

It is true that Catholic Action in the U. S. A. (though not in Mexico or Canada) has for a long time been quite innocuous. But those who study its real purpose and activities in Europe will see the dangers to our democratic government and way of life.

Each of the organizations named here—and this is not a complete list—has its own priest who is its "spiritual advisor" or

"moderator." This is necessary from the hierarchical viewpoint, just as it has seemed necessary for the Communist Party to have an ideological "commissar" attached to every party cell, every regiment, every factory, seeing to it that orders are transmitted "from on high" and that the faithful hew to the line.

In the pre-war fascist states, as well as Spain and other clerically dominated countries today, the same Roman Catholic Church has its guilds for all industries, all businessmen, all labor unionists, and all professions. It has a clerical "advisor" in each plant and regiment and aboard each warship.

In New York there is a Coordinating Committee of Catholic Lay Organizations whose purpose is "to enable policy discussion, formation and *unified action* among 60 Catholic organizations in the Archdiocese." Naturally, the Committee meets at Cardinal Spellman's Administrative Building, 451 Madison Avenue. Cardinal Spellman owes his appointment to the Pope whose utterances carry the authority of Jesus Christ for all the "faithful."

### **VII. Catholic "Secular Institutes"**

A rather new and perhaps quite effective organization called "secular institutes" is now operating with super secrecy. Its importance may have far reaching effects on all of the American people in the years ahead. It is referred to as "God's (meaning the Pope's) Secret Service." Here is the story in brief.

#### **A NEW VATICAN PLAN**

"Secular" has been one of the most sinister terms the Roman Catholics could think of to hurl at our public schools. For years they have used the word "secular" (i.e., worldly or godless) to denounce them. Now the hierarchy employs the term to designate a newly formed organization called "secular institutes." To disguise and minimize its mission, the name is (purposely, we think) usually begun with a small letter. It will doubtless prove

to be one of the most successful plans spawned by that most determined group in many a year.

Secular institutes are "clearly denned societies, with clearly defined purposes. There is nothing haphazard or hazy about them." The announced purpose of the scheme is "to capture the world. . .without the world's knowing that it has been engaged in battle." It is designed to speed the accomplishment of their long-avowed mission *in* such a way as not to arouse any unfavorable reactions to their religious workers under the traditional plan and habit. Their members live and work "as one with the neighborhood in appearance," unrobed and unmarked; yet they are as fully dedicated and consecrated tools of the Vatican as those who wear distinctive garb and live behind monastery walls.

The potential threat of this organization staggers the imagination. In the months and years ahead Catholic priests and nuns will be working at our elbow in key places in every important area of our American life. They can be anywhere, *everywhere*, in any office or in any position that will promote their plans. Name any crucial place and they will be there, carrying on their treasonable work for the Roman Hierarchy. They may not fully realize the significance of their job, but *they will be there*—as "silent and unknown soldiers of the army" of the Vatican. Even the F. B. I. will have no more clever organization than this.

Ernest F. Miller, C.S.S. R., tells what it means to belong to this new order.<sup>9</sup> To encourage their young people, especially, who "are not attracted to marriage" to "accept the vocation of the religious life," this new scheme is presented under the tide, "Teen-agers and the Secular Institutes." It is a clever appeal, directed largely to young women, with the promise of possible sainthood.

The Roman Catholic hierarchy has been alarmed at the reluctance of present-day young people to become monks and nuns.

---

<sup>9</sup>*The Liquorian* magazine, January, 1957, pp. 10-14.



Young Americans particularly, so the article says, do not feel drawn to the religious life, and they know that "it is a mark against them." Three hindrances are mentioned: (1) They are "mentally and emotionally allergic to the voluminous and intricate robes that are worn by the nuns and to the heavy and cumbersome habits that are worn by priests." (2) They "have claustrophobia to the extent of not wishing to imprison themselves within high walls" of the kind of community life in the convent or monastery. (3) "Living a single life does not appeal to them. They have no liking for living alone." So, to eliminate all objections as far as possible, the idea of the secular institute was born. Members, however, are encouraged to stay unmarried, free and unencumbered in order to do their best work.

Mr. Miller admits, "without a doubt the name *secular* institute is an uninspired name. In fact, there are few names of any institution in the Church or out of it more unimaginative and more unimpressive." This "uninspired name" was chosen "without a doubt" because it is actually innocent-sounding to non-Catholics and would not be likely to arouse the curiosity of those who know nothing about it.

In order to present the significance of the secular institute, we have condensed the article to answer a few simple questions in Mr. Miller's own words.

1. *What are secular institutes?* "*Secular institutes* are societies, clearly denned societies, with clearly defined purposes. There is nothing haphazard or hazy about them. They are not mere poor imitations of the traditional religious order of congregations. They are a special adaption of the evangelical counsels and the corporal and spiritual works of mercy to the needs, to the *particular* needs of the present day."

2. *Is the secular institute something new?* "A new vocation has arisen. This new vocation, this new form of religious life is known as the secular institute. It is the most recently devised way

of following in the footsteps of Christ [Catholicism] and of becoming a saint. It is the most modern way of working for the conversion of the world [to Roman Catholicism]. And it has the full approval of the Holy See."

3. *What is the purpose of secular institutes?* "The primary purpose of a girl's joining a secular institute is to infiltrate the world with the teachings of Christianity [Roman Catholicism] and to do this in such a way as not to arouse suspicion on the part of those who have no belief in Christianity [Roman Catholicism] or at best a watered-down and false belief in Christianity, which unfortunately is the case of a large number of baptized Christians. The idea of the secular institute is to capture the world for Christ [the Roman Catholic Church], without the world's knowing it has been engaged in battle."

4. *What sort of life is required of those who are members of the secular institute?* ". . . it is a life that is led both in the world and in the convent or in the monastery. That may sound like a contradiction. It is not. The word *secular* means of the world. The word *institute* means an organization or a society with a definite purpose and with rules to be observed as in a religious order or congregation. So, a secular institute is a society of people living in the world and yet attempting to live up to the ideals and aspirations of those who are actual members of approved religious orders. It is an attempt to accomplish the high things that are accomplished by the Jesuits and the Benedictines and the Augustinians without actually becoming a Jesuit or a Benedictine or an Augustinian."

5. *How do the members of the secular institute do their work?* "The secular institute does the work of the nun and the monk without binding its subjects to the conformity and the community life of the nun and the monk. Take the example of the girl who belongs to a secular institute. She is in the world, oftentimes living at home, without giving the appearance of belonging

to any special type of religious congregation at all. If one were not told that she is a member of a secular institute, one would never guess that such is the case. She would affect no black veils, no long gowns or dresses, no starched and stiff coifs and wimples. She would be one of the neighborhood in her appearance."

6. *Where do members of secular institutes live?* ". . . secular institutes have community centers, homes where those members live (wearing the clothes of the people of the world, of course) who have no special reason for living outside the community. . . . It is not to be thought that all members of the *secular institute* always live at home with their family; or that the work of the *secular institute* is always merely to influence society by the example of right living."

7. *Where and how do the members of the secular institute do their work?* "[A member] may teach in public schools or do the clerical work in diocesan chanceries or provide for the housekeeping in the homes of bishops. . . . She follows a particular land of life, a life according to a rule, whether it be a home with her parents, or in a hospital as a nurse, or in a factory as a worker, or in a department store as a clerk behind the counter, only with the approbation of her superior. She does nothing without either direct or at least indirect approval."

8. *What kind of soldiers are the members of the secular institute?* "Every army must have various kinds of troops—those who openly show themselves by uniform and action as the army of the nation; and those who generally promote the cause of victory silently and unknown. The members of the *secular institute* are oftentimes the silent and unknown soldiers of the army of Christ [meaning, the Roman Catholic Church]. And it is recognized by the high officials of this army, including the highest of

them all, the Holy Father himself, that their contribution to victory is just as great as that of the troops in uniform."

The "silent and unknown soldiers" of the Roman Catholic Church are reminiscent of the "fifth column" of Franco's army during the civil war in Spain. In the months and years ahead all of us may find a member of a *secular institute* working at our elbow, and passing secret information on to Rome regarding every activity and walk of life in America.<sup>10</sup>

### "THEY 'LEAD THREE LIVES'"

Under the blazing headlines of "God's Secret Service," *Our Sunday Visitor* (February 19, 1961), "The National Catholic Action Weekly," featured an article on Secular Institutes. [It began the words with capital letters.] It carried a two line subheading all the way across the page, which read, "Laymen in Secular Institutes Find They 'Lead Three Lives. '" This front page lead article was written by Mary A. Grice, with the approval of course, of Bishop Leo A. Pursley, editor.

"Externally, these people appear no different than the bachelor next door or the attractive, but single, librarian," we are told. "These persons actually can be called members of God's *Secret Service* or God's *Underground*."

They work "at ordinary occupations as clerks, laborers, stenographers, and business and professional persons. For the most part their religious profession is unknown even to their family and closest friends." At the time this article was written there were nine of these "Secular Institutes," all of which came into existence in this country since 1949, with the blessings and approval of Pope Pius XII.

"*This silent army*," we are further told, "treads in the regions inaccessible to clergy and other religions. For this reason they are anonymous."

---

<sup>10</sup>*Voice of Freedom*, December 1957, pp. 179, 180.

Institute members wear no special garb. They dress in keeping with their social and economic status. Women members wear jewelry and cosmetics and men don ordinary business suits and sports wear. They may live with their families, relatives, alone or with others in an apartment, or in a common house belonging to the institute.

A Secret organization, designated as God's [meaning the Pope's] secret service," "silent army," "fifth column," etc., could be very dangerous. There is nothing like it in the church of the living God. The only other place where we could find anything of a similar nature is in the Communist party.

## EPILOGUE

Most of the material used in this book was gathered and arranged before the death of Pope Pius XII. Its publication has been delayed, however, partly because we had vainly hoped that Vatican Council II, in its efforts to "aggiornamento" (up-date) the Roman Catholic Church, might make some conciliations regarding its fundamental teachings. But after three sessions now, little has been done to change the "unchanging church," other than to give it a slight face-lifting.

### **Pronouncements After the Second Session**

No actions were finalized during the first session of Vatican Council II. The second session acted on only two measures. In the February (1964) issue of *Voice of Freedom* we made the following observations on the accomplishments of the Council.

"The Second Session of Vatican Council II met on September 29 at the call of Pope Paul VI for the purpose of bringing about a number of 'great reforms,' to 'modernize' the (Catholic) Church, and seek out ways and means of bringing about 'Christian unity.' The session closed on December 4, after more than 500 speeches had been made by the 2, 300 bishops in attendance.

"The net results of the nine weeks and four days of deliberation were: (1) priests were granted the privilege of saying a part of the Mass in the vernacular, at the discretion of the bishop of each diocese—but only after such changes had been approved by the Vatican. (2) Action was taken to make greater use of the news media for the purpose of spreading the teachings and influence of the Roman Catholic Church.

"These two measures constitute the sum total of the much heralded 'reforms' made after two complete sessions (more than 18 weeks in all) of Vatican Council II. The third session will

meet again in September of this year, for almost three months. We wonder what 'great reforms' will then be announced.

"The day the second session of the Council adjourned, Pope Paul read a letter to all the bishops, extending their permanent role of authority. A report by the UPI said:

Pope Paul VI, in a historic document read at the close of the Ecumenical Council today, granting bishops sweeping new powers dealing with such varied subjects as [of all things] outdoor masses and marriages between Catholics and non-Catholics. . . .

The proclamation listed 40 powers which the Pope gave the bishops on a permanent basis. It also listed new personal privileges that they may exercise. One of the powers concerning marriage is the right of a bishop to give special dispensation for mixed marriages between Catholics and others. Prior to this papal decree bishops had this power, but it had been given to them at regular intervals on a temporary basis. Now it is permanent.

"To our way of thinking, this does not note any very 'great and sweeping changes.' But let us read on:

One important new privilege is for bishops to preach or hear confession in any part of the world. This privilege previously was reserved to cardinals, with bishops only having these rights within their own diocese.

Other powers for the most part covered faculties which bishops in the past routinely applied for to the Vatican in each case.

"Some specific privileges and powers listed in the *Motu Proprio* are:

The right to celebrate Mass at any hour of the day, including evening.

The right to give permission to priests to celebrate Mass twice a day on week days or even three times on Sunday, if needed.

The right to permit chaplains of hospitals, prisons and orphanages to administer the sacrament of confirmation. This is usually administered only by a bishop.

The right to allow priests to take liquid between Masses, even if the required period of an hour has not been passed. This is important in tropical missionary countries.

The right to admit illegitimate children to seminaries.

"After a careful reading of the above, we wonder just what all of this has done to bring about a closer unity between Catholics and non-Catholics? What have these 'reforms' to do with' any basic changes in the Catholic Church? Actually, the Pope

relinquished none of his power. He merely extended some special privileges to the bishops on a permanent basis, rather than on a temporary basis. He could withdraw such powers just as easily and just as quickly as he granted them, should he ever see fit to do so.

"But what effect will these changes have in bringing about a closer unity in the religious world. What has the Catholic Church really given up in order to achieve 'Christian unity'? Saying a part of the Mass in the vernacular was granted solely for the purpose of making the Romish Church more popular with the masses. The time had come when the people wanted to know at least something of what was going on.

"As for making greater use of the news media to spread the teachings of the Roman Catholic Church, we hardly see how Catholics can be more effective in this respect than they already are. But we suppose ways and means will be found for doing so.

"As for granting bishops the privilege of making exceptions in dispensing the right of Catholics to marry non-Catholics, this seems to be the only logical course to follow. For example, when a Catholic wanted to marry Henry Ford II, why shouldn't a special dispensation have been granted for that marriage (which was worth millions of dollars to the Catholic Church) even though it has now gone on the rocks? If some prominent individual in politics, social circles, or in show business, who is a non-Catholic, should want to marry a Catholic, why shouldn't a bishop be glad to grant a special dispensation?

"This type of 'reform' actually changes nothing, except to make the Catholic religion a little more palliative to rational people. But if Roman Catholics are going to make their church more acceptable to non-Catholics, they are going to have to give up some of their dogmas; they will have to reverse some of their decrees; they will have to change some of their canon laws.



"All along, we have speculated that this would not happen. As long as Catholics contend that it is impossible for the Romish Church to teach error, then it cannot change any of its doctrines, its dogmas, its edicts or its decrees, because this would be an admission that Catholics can teach error—*that they actually have taught error*.

"Once such an admission is made, then everything that Catholics now teach or ever have taught, will be subject to debate. Such an admission cannot be granted on the part of the papacy. The Roman Church merely adapts to the times and customs of the day. But as for any genuine reforms, any real changes in its purposes, its aims, its dogmas, or its decrees, we are not too optimistic about any such taking place.

"Many non-Catholics got their hopes built up in recent months when they thought the Catholic Church was going to make an about-face. By this time they should know better. In fact they should have known better from the beginning, and would have had they been acquainted with the real teachings of the Catholic Church, which is as irreformable today as ever."

### **Pronouncements After the Third Session**

On November 22, the day after the adjournment of the third session of the Council, a press release by UPI from Vatican City thus summed up the latest decrees:

The pontiff, acting on his own authority, proclaimed the Virgin Mary "the mother of the church." This action drew a standing ovation from the 2, 156 cardinals, archbishops and bishops gathered in St. Peter's Basilica for the end of the third council session.

Pope Paul, in closing the sometimes stormy but productive third session, promised that the next meeting will be the last. He set no date for the fourth and final session as he spoke from his throne in front of the main confessional altar.

The three decrees promulgated Saturday after weeks of discussion were milestones in church history. Observers said the doctrine sharing the Pope's authority with bishops was the most important since the church proclaimed the infallibility of the Pope.

The three decrees:

*De ecclesia [on the church]:* —This includes the doctrine on the collegiality of bishops and which the pontiff described as the most important work of the council. It states that archbishops and bishops share responsibility with the pontiff for the rule of the church.

Council conservatives, who opposed the issue down to the final vote, feared it would lessen the supremacy of the pontiff. Other important sectors of the document's eight chapters stress the dignity of laymen and their role in the modern church and the majesty of the church itself.

*On ecumenism:* —This is a charter for promoting Christian unity as expounded by the late John XXIII. It lays down practical principles for Catholic communication with "separated brethren" as the Catholics refer to other Christian faiths. [Until recently all others were called "schismatics and heretics." Ed.] It encourages common prayer and other forms of cooperation to further understanding and mutual aid in tackling world social problems. [The Associated Press account here added, ". . . *under special circumstances.*" We will keep our fingers crossed until we learn what those "special circumstances" are. Ed.]

*On Eastern churches:* —This decree encourages autonomy for Catholics of eastern rites and prepares the way for interdenominational worship and communion.<sup>11</sup>

Since the fourth session of the first Vatican Council devoted several chapters to the "Dogmatic Constitution of the [Roman Catholic] Church," it would appear that the infallible Pope, supported by (what is now considered) an infallible Council, it would hardly be necessary for Vatican Council II to devote so many more chapters to an effort to explain the same subject. It is not reasonable to suppose that the church "which can never teach error" has to keep on denning and redefining its doctrines. There has never been any need for "updating" the Bible, or anything which Christ and the apostles taught. The gospel which they taught was "delivered once for all" to the saints.

The church set forth in the New Testament never has and never can be "up-dated," because it never has and never will get out of date. From the very beginning God planned it to serve all men of every age. This is why he made it so simple.

The eight chapters approved by the third session of the Council probably contain more words than the entire New Testa-

---

<sup>11</sup>*The Dallas Morning News*, Nov. 22, 1964.

ment. As yet we have seen only a summary of these chapters, but what we have seen is much more complicated than anything in the New Testament.

### **Vote on Religious Freedom Must Still Wait**

Before the beginning of the third session, the Pope announced there would be a sweeping declaration made on the subject of "religious freedom." But after bringing this subject up on several occasions, it was passed over until the next session of the Council. Likely it cannot be deferred much longer. But when it is voted on we predict it will fall far short of religious freedom as we know it in the United States.

We doubt if freedom to "proselyte" Catholics will be permitted in Spain, or in any other predominantly Catholic country. There is not much likelihood that anything of an evangelical nature—aimed at making new converts—will be approved. With the signing of the peace treaty following World War II, religious freedom was guaranteed to all in Italy. Nevertheless, the concordat signed between the "Holy See" and Mussolini in 1929 has never been abrogated. Protestants are still forbidden to attack the Catholic religion, or to make any accusations whatever against the Pope. Hence, it is fairly certain that when Rome does make its long *talked about* declaration on religious freedom, it will be so worded as to give a semblance of change in Catholic tolerance without any real substance.

In view of the latest report on the much discussed Vatican Council, called to "update" the Roman Catholic Church, we find but very little in it to alter any of the conclusions we have observed in the foregoing chapters.

# Bibliography

## SCRIPTURE SOURCES

- American Standard Version*, New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1901.  
*Confraternity-Douay Version*, New York: Catholic Book Publishing House, 1957.  
*King James Version*, 1611.  
Kleist, James A. and Lilly, Joseph L., *The New Testament*, Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Co., 1956.  
Knox, Ronald, *The New Testament of Our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ*, New York: Sheed and Ward, 1954.  
Williams, Charles B., *The New Testament; A Private Translation In The Language of the People*; Chicago: Moody Press, 1958.

## GREEK SOURCES

- Green, Thomas Sheldon, *A Greek-English Lexicon to the New Testament*, Boston: H. L. Hastings, 1885.  
Hudson, Charles F., *A Critical Creek-English Lexicon*, Boston: Hastings, 1891.  
Thayer, Joseph Henry, *Greek English-Lexicon*, New York: American Book Co., 1889.  
Tischendorf, Constantinus de, *Vetus Testamentum Graece, Iuxta LXX Interpretes* (The Septuagint); Sixth Edition; Two Volumes, Lipsiae; F. A. Brockhaus, 1880.  
Wescott, Brooke Foss, and Hort, Fenton John Anthony, *The New Testament*, New York: The Macmillan Co., 1924.

## ENCYCLOPEDIAS

- Encyclopedia Britannica*, Encyclopedia Britannica, Inc., Chicago, Toronto, and London:1956.  
*Encyclopedia, The Catholic*, The Encyclopedia Press, Inc., New York: 1913.  
Kuhner, Hans, *Encyclopedia of the Papacy* (one volume); New York: Philosophical Library, 1958.

## GENERAL SOURCES

- Abbo, John A., and Hannan, Jerome D., *The Sacred Canons*, St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1957.  
Attwater, Donald, *A Catholic Dictionary*, New York: The Macmillan Company, 1958.  
Attwater, Donald, *A Dictionary of Saints*, New York: P. J. Kennedy & Sons, 1958.

- Blanshard, Paul, *American Freedom and Catholic Power*, Boston: The Beacon Press, 1949, 1958.
- Bouscaren, T. Lincoln, S. J., *The Canon Law Digest*, Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Co., Vol. I, 1958; Vol. II, 1956; Vol. III, 1954.
- Bouscaren, T. Lincoln, S. J., O'Connor, James I., S. J., *The Canon Law Digest*, Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Co., Vol. IV, 1958; Vol. V, 1963.
- Bower, Archibald, Esq., *The History of the Popes* (3 vols.); Philadelphia: Griffith and Simon, 1845.
- Brandt, John L., *America or Rome, Christ or the Pope*, St. Louis: Christian Board of Publication, 1895.
- Campbell, A., *The Millennial Harbinger*, Bethany, (W. Va.): Printed and Published by the Editor (36 volumes), 1830-1866.
- Campbell, A., and Purcell, John B., *Campbell-Purcell Debate*, Cincinnati: U. P. James, 1857.
- Chiniquy, Charles, *The Priest, The Woman and The Confessional*, Chicago: Adam Craig, 1888.
- Clarkson, John F., S. J., Edwards, John H., S. J., Kelly, William J., S. J., Welch, John J., S.J., *The Church Teaches*, St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1960.
- Conway, Rev. Bartrand L., *The Question Box*, New York: Paulist Press, 1929.
- Cronin, John P., *Catholic Social Action*, Milwaukee: The Bruce Pub. Co., 1948.
- Denziger, Henry, *Enchiridion Symbolorum [The Sources of Catholic Dogma; tr. by Roy J. Deferrari]*, St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1955.
- Donovan, Rev. J., tr., *The Catechism of The Council of Trent*, "Published by command of Pope Pius the Fifth," New York: The Catholic Publication Society, 1829.
- Durant, Will, *The Story of Civilization*, Vol. VI, *The Reformation*, 1957; Vol. VII, *The Age of Reason*, New York: Simon and Schuster, 1960.
- Fisher, George Park, *History of the Christian Church*, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1916.
- Forbush, William Byron, *Fox's Book of Martyrs*, Philadelphia: The John C. Winston Company, 1926.
- Foy, Felician A., *National Catholic Almanac*, Paterson (N. J.): St. Anthony's Guild, 1959, 1960, 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964, 1965.
- Friend, Joseph H., and Guralnik, David B., *Webster's New World Dictionary*, Cleveland and New York: The World Publishing Company, 1958.
- Gibbons, James Cardinal, *The Faith of Our Fathers*, Baltimore: John Murphy Company, 1879.
- Leuret, Francois, and Bon, Henri, *Modern Miraculous Cures*, London: Peter Davies, 1957.

- Liguori, St. Alphonsus Maria de, *The Glories of Mary*, Parts I and II, Baltimore and Dublin: Helicon Press, 1962.
- Leo XIII, Pope, *The Great Encyclical Letters of Leo XIII* (Edited by Rev. John J. Wynne, S. J.), New York: Benziger Bros., 1903.
- Manhattan, Avro, *Catholic Imperialism and World Freedom*, London: Watts & Co., 1959.
- Mann, Rev. Horace K., *The Lives of The Popes* (18 vols.), St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1925.
- Marvin, E. M., *Errors of the Papacy*, St. Louis: Advocate Publishing House, 1878.
- McCarthy, Michael J. F., *Priests and People in Ireland*, Dublin: Hodges, Figgis and Co., Ltd., 1903.
- McGarvey, J. W., *Evidence of Christianity*, Cincinnati: The Standard Publishing Co., 1886.
- McLoughlin, Emmett, *American Culture and Catholic Schools*, New York: Lyle Stuart, 1960.
- McLoughlin, Emmett, *Crime and Immorality in the Catholic Church*, New York: Lyle Stuart, 1962.
- Montano, Walter M., *Behind The Purple Curtain*, Los Angeles: Cowman Publications, Inc., 1950.
- Mosheim, John Laurence Von, *Institutes of Ecclesiastical History*, Edited by William Stubbs, London: Spottswode and Co., 1863.
- Newman, Jeremiah, *What Is Catholic Action?* Westminster: The Newman Press, 1958.
- O'Brien, John A., *The Faith of Millions*, Huntington: Our Sunday Visitor, 1958.
- Fallen, Conde B., and Wynne, John J., *The New Catholic Dictionary* (Vatican Edition), New York: The Universal Knowledge Foundation, 1929.
- Paris, Edmond, *Genocide In Satellite Croatia*, Chicago: The American Institute for Balkan Affairs, 1961.
- Pius XII, Pope, *Guide For Living* (Arranged by Maurice Quinlan), London: Evans Brothers Limited, 1958.
- Rommen, Heinrich A., *The State In Catholic Thought*, St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1955.
- Ryan, John A., and Boland, Francis J., *Catholic Principles of Politics*, New York: The Macmillan Company, 1952.
- Salmon, George, *The Infallibility of the Church*, A Reprint, Searcy (Arkansas): James D. Bales, 1948.
- Schroeder, Rev., H. J., *Disciplinary Decrees of the General Councils*, St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1937.
- Schroeder, Rev. H. J., *Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent*, St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1955.

- Shepherd, J. W., *The Church, The Falling Away and the Restoration*, Cincinnati: F. L. Rowe, 1929.
- Stevens, Eldred, and Beevers, Eric, *Stevens-Beevers Debate*, Nashville: Williams Printing Company, 1953.
- Wallace, Foy E., Jr., *Bulwarks of Faith*, Oklahoma City: Foy E. Wallace, Jr., Publications, 1951.
- Wright, Richard, *Pagan Spain*, New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957.

### MAGAZINES AND NEWSPAPERS

- Associated Press.
- Catholic Digest*; New York.
- Catholic Men*; Washington, D. C.
- Chicago Sun-Times*; Chicago.
- Church and State*; Washington, D. C.
- Commonweal, The*; New York.
- Civiltà Cattolica*; Rome.
- Convert, The*; McKeesport, Pa.
- Dallas Morning News, The*; Dallas.
- Eternity*; Philadelphia.
- Fort Lauderdale News and Sun-Sentinel*; Fort Lauderdale, Fla.
- Fort Worth Press*; Fort Worth.
- Harper's*; New York.
- Louisville Courier Journal, The*; Louisville.
- Messenger, The Catholic*; Davenport.
- Miami Herald, The*; Miami.
- News, The Catholic*; New York.
- Oklahoma City Times*; Oklahoma City.
- Our Sunday Visitor*; Huntington.
- Register, The National Catholic*; Denver.
- San Antonio Express and News*; San Antonio.
- Time*; New York.
- Voice of Freedom*; Nashville.
- Washington Post, The*; Washington.
- Witness, The*; Dubuque, Iowa.