

Study for the Month of June 2013

## ***The Papacy Series-Part V***

Nathaniel Fajardo  
Whole Gospel Ministries  
PO Box 1764 Loma Linda, CA 92354  
Tel (951) 685-1956 (leave a message) email: [natfajardo777@yahoo.com](mailto:natfajardo777@yahoo.com)  
Web: [www.wholegospelministries.org](http://www.wholegospelministries.org)  
-----

### ***“American Freedom and Catholic Power”***

This is the title of the book authored by Paul Blanshard, published by The Beacon Press, Boston, U.S. A., Seventh Printing, September, 1949. It is another book we strongly recommend be read by serious students of Biblical prophecy: the *Contents* page of this book immediately reveal why, thus, we introduce it immediately, as follows (all emphasis added):

1. “PERSONAL PROLOGUE: The Duty To Speak
2. HOW THE HIERARCHY WORKS
3. CHURCH, STATE AND DEMOCRACY
4. EDUCATION AND THE CATHOLIC MIND
5. PUBLIC SCHOOLS AND PUBLIC MONEY
6. THE CHURCH AND MEDICINE
7. SEX, BIRTH CONTROL AND EUGENICS
8. MARRIAGE, DIVORCE AND ANNULMENT
9. CENSORSHIP AND BOYCOTT
10. SCIENCE, SCHOLARSHIP AND SUPERSTITION
11. FASCISM, COMMUNISM AND LABOR
12. THE CATHOLIC PLAN FOR AMERICA
13. TOLERANCE, APPEASEMENT AND FREEDOM”

First, let us consider important updates pertinent to this topic:

1. The Pew Research Center (see *Refreshing News* on the web), reports that as of 2010, there are nearly 1.2 billion Catholics, comprising 50% of all Christians worldwide and 16% of the world’s total population. The country with the largest population in the world, Brazil, was 65% Catholic in 2010, down from 74% in 2000. The country with the second largest Catholic population, Mexico, dipped from 89% in 2000 to 85% in 2010. Over the past century, the number of Catholics around the world has more than tripled, according to a study by the same authoritative research center. Wikipedia says: “With more than 77.7 million registered members,” the Roman Catholic Church “is the largest single religious denomination in the U.S. , comprising 25% of the population. The U.S. has the fourth largest Catholic population in the world, *after Brazil, Mexico, and the Philippines*. It is also the largest Catholic minority population, and the largest English-speaking Catholic population.
2. Global Balita (<http://globalbalita.com/2013/05/12/the-philippines-unholy-trinity/>), in its May 13, 2013 issue published a commentary by Mariano

Patalinjug ([MarPatalinjug@aol.com](mailto:MarPatalinjug@aol.com)) in its Opinion column entitled, “**The Philippines’ Unholy Trinity**,” said (all caps in the original):

“True: Rather than diminishing, dynastic rule will probably ‘tighten its grip’ on the Philippines.

“At the risk of being repetitious, my Distilled Diagnosis of why the Philippines continues to be left in the backwaters is that it is caught in the vise-like grip of a PLUTOCRATIC-POLITICO-CLERICO CONSPIRACY, whose overarching Agenda is to perpetuate itself in wealth and power, the better to manipulate and exploit the Filipino people.

“[A good analogy is France of centuries ago, which that fateful day in 1789\*, was also caught in the vise-like grip of a ROYAL-ARISTOCRATIC-CLERICO CONSPIRACY, the process reducing the French people to the status of serfs.]

“The first leg of this sinister Philippine ‘Unholy Trinity’ are the Plutocrats, who are in bed with the second leg, the Politicos. *The third leg is the Roman Church, acting through its political arm, The Catholic Bishops Conference of the Philippines.* [emphasis mine].

“It is this Unholy Trinity which, at bottom, is responsible for the country having deservedly earned the sobriquet ‘The Sick Man of Asia.’ . . . .”

“Plutocrats,” “Politicos,” and the “Roman Church,” according to this journalist’s “distilled diagnosis” make up the “unholy trinity” that renders the Philippines as “the sick man of Asia.” Ah! If he only knew the prophecies of Daniel and Revelation!

Referring to **Rev. 16: 13, 14** Ellen G. White, wielding the inspired pen accurately reveals, Biblically and historically, what the real triumvirate or grand three-fold union of the last days will be arrayed against God’s law, particularly the Sabbath day memorial of creation defined in the fourth commandment, and against His faithful remnant. Quotes below may also be found in the devotional, *Maranatha*, pp. 190, 191 (emphasis mine):

“By the decree enforcing the institution of the papacy in violation of the law of God, our nation [the United States] will disconnect herself fully from righteousness. When *Protestantism* shall stretch her hand across the gulf to grasp the hand of the *Roman power*, when she shall reach over the abyss to clasp the hand of *spiritualism*, when under the influence of *this three-fold union*, our country shall repudiate every principle of its Constitution as a Protestant and republican government, and shall make provision for the propagation of papal falsehoods and delusions, then we may know that the time has come for the marvelous working of Satan and that the end is near.” - Testimonies, Vol. 5, p. 451.

“Through the two great errors, the *immortality of the soul* and *Sunday sacredness*, Satan will bring the people under his deceptions. While the former [teaching that the soul is immortal] lays the foundation of spiritualism, the latter [Sunday sacredness] creates a bond of sympathy with Rome. The Protestants [today’s evangelical mainstream] of the United States will be foremost in stretching their hands across the gulf to grasp the hand of spiritualism; they will reach over the abyss to clasp hands with the Roman power; and under this three-fold union, this country will follow in the steps of Rome in trampling upon the right of conscience. . . .

“*Papists, Protestants, and worldlings* will alike accept the form of godliness without the power, and they will see in this union a grand movement for the conversion

of the world and the ushering in of the long-expected millennium.” – *The Great Controversy*, (1911 ed.), pp. 588, 589.

3. Reuters, Wed., May 22, 2013 reported from Rome, headlined:

**“Pope Francis Urges China’s Catholics Stay Loyal to Vatican.”**

“Pope Francis on Wednesday urged Catholics in China to remain loyal to the Vatican, whose authority is challenged by China’s Communist leaders. China’s Catholics number between 8 and 12 million are divided between the state-sanctioned Catholic Patriotic Association, which has installed bishops without Vatican approval, and an ‘underground wing loyal to the Vatican that rejects state control. Francis’ predecessor, Pope Benedict XVI, made May 24 a day dedicated to prayer for China’s Catholics. Francis said at his weekly audience in St. Peter’s Square that he prayed that China’s Catholics would receive ‘the grace to announce with humility and joy to be faithful to the Church and St. Peter’s successor (the pope).’

“China and the Vatican broke off formal diplomatic relations shortly after the Communist took power in China in 1949. Benedict had encouraged the two sides of the divided Chinese Church to reconcile, and engaged in low-key dialogue with Beijing about political ties. But last July the Vatican condemned the appointment of a Chinese Catholic bishop without its approval. One of Rome’s own newly-ordained bishops, Thaddeus Ma Daquin, has been held under house arrest since the time that he was leaving the Catholic Patriotic Association. The Vatican has previously condemned what it called ‘external pressures and constrictions.’” – (Reporting by Catherine Hornby; Editing by Kevin Liffey)."

-----

As our past issues on this series on the Papacy clearly show, more and more responsible and courageous writers, journalists, and publications are awakening to what E. G. White, in her writings, as well as the Protestant Reformers centuries earlier, were warning regarding the papal power and its prophesied role in these last days. They just don’t (yet) have the full light of the three angels’ messages as Seventh-day Adventists have had increasingly since after 1844 but of which an increasing number of the younger generation vaguely know or are interested in as much as they should.

As E. G. White wrote: “The people of our land need to be aroused to resist the advances of this most dangerous foe to civil and religious liberty.” – *Vol. 4 Spirit of Prophecy*, p. 382, (1884 edition).

We now reprint Blanshard’s *Personal Prologue: The Duty to Speak*, pp. 3-7 of his book, *American Freedom and Catholic Power*. With facts from authoritative sources to back up his observant mind, love for truth, country, and the principles of democracy and the democratic institutions of America, and the courage to speak up and be identified, Blanshard and his scholarly works belong to a vanishing breed of writers and journalists. He wrote:

“Probably no phase of our life is in greater need of candid discussion than that of the relationship of the Roman Catholic Church to American institutions, *and certainly no important factor in our life has been more consistently neglected by responsible writers.*

“The Catholic issue is not an easy subject to discuss objectively because most Americans have automatically accepted their attitudes on the subject from their parents,

and they do not want those attitudes disturbed. They are Catholic or they are not Catholic. If they are Catholic, they tend to view their own Church with favor, and its critics with suspicion. If they are not Catholic, they tend to reverse the process and view all distinctively Catholic policies with doubt. American Catholics and American non-Catholics both tend to leave the discussion of religious differences to denominational bigots; and many Americans have never had an opportunity to hear a reasoned and temperate discussion of the place of Catholic power in our national life.

*“The policy of mutual silence about religious differences is a reasonable policy in matters of personal faith; but when it comes to matter of political, medical and educational principles, silence may be directly contrary to public welfare. When a church enters the arena of controversial social policy and attempts to control the judgment of its own people (and other people) on foreign affairs, social hygiene, public education and modern science, it must be reckoned with as an organ of political and cultural power. It is in that sense that I shall discuss Catholic power in this book. The Catholic problem as I see it is not primarily a religious problem. It is an institutional and political problem. It is a matter of the use and abuse of power by an organization that is not only a church but a state within a state, and a state above a state.*

“There is no doubt that the American Catholic hierarchy has entered the political arena, and that it is becoming more and more aggressive in extending the frontiers of the Catholic authority into the fields of medicine, education and foreign policy. In the name of religion, the hierarchy fights birth control and divorce laws in all states. It tells Catholic doctors, nurses, *judges*, teachers and *legislators* [emphasis mine] what they can and cannot do in many of the controversial phases of their professional conduct. It segregates Catholic children from the rest of the community in a separate school system, and censors the cultural diet of these children. It uses the *political* power of some 26 million\* official American Catholics to bring American foreign policy into line with Vatican *temporal* interests. [italics. mine].

### The Fear Factor

“These things should be talked about freely because they are too big to be ignored. Yet it must be admitted that millions of Americans are afraid to talk about them frankly and openly. Part of the reluctance to speak comes from fear, fear of Catholic reprisals. As we shall see in this book, the Catholic hierarchy in this country has great power as a pressure group, and no editor, politician, publisher, merchant or motion-picture producer can express defiance openly---or publicize documented facts---without risking his future.

### Misunderstanding the Nature of Tolerance

“But fear will not entirely explain the current silence [written in 1949!] on the Catholic issue. Some of the reluctance of Americans to speak is due to a misunderstanding the nature of tolerance. *Tolerance should mean complete charity toward men of all races and creeds, complete open-mindedness toward all ideas, and complete willingness to allow peaceful expression of conflicting views.* This is what most Americans think they mean when they say that they believe in tolerance.

“When they come to apply tolerance to the world of religion, however, they often forget its affirmative implications and fall back on the negative cliché, ‘You should never criticize another man’s religion.’ Now, that innocent-sounding doctrine, born of the

noblest sentiments, is full of danger to the *democratic* way of life. It ignores the duty of every good citizen to stand for the truth in every field of thought. It fails to take account of the fact that a large part of what men call religion is also politics, social hygiene and economics. Silence about 'another man's religion' may mean acquiescence in second-rate medicine, inferior education and antidemocratic government.

Prepared to be called "Anti Catholic"

"I believe that every American ---Catholic and non-Catholic---has a duty to speak on the Catholic question, because the issues involved go to the heart of our culture and our citizenship. Plain speaking on this question involves many risks of bitterness, misunderstanding and even fanaticism, but the risks of silence are even greater. Any critic of the policies of the Catholic hierarchy must steel himself to being called 'anti Catholic,' because it is part of the hierarchy's strategy of defense to place that brand upon all its opponents; and any critic must also reconcile himself to being called an enemy of the Catholic people, because the hierarchy constantly identifies its clerical ambitions with the supposed wishes of its people.

Not Citizens of America but Subjects of Rome

"It is important, therefore, to distinguish between the American Catholic people and their Roman-controlled priests. The Catholic people of the United States fight and die for the same concept of freedom as do other true Americans; they believe in the same fundamental ideals of democracy. If the controlled their own Church, the Catholic problem would soon disappear because, in the atmosphere of American freedom, they would adjust their Church's policies to American realities.

"Unfortunately, the Catholic people of the United States are not citizens but *subjects* [itals in the original] of their own religious commonwealth. The secular as well as the religious policies of the Church are made in *Rome* by an organization that is alien in spirit and control. The American Catholic people themselves have no representatives of their own choosing either in their local hierarchy or in the Roman high command; and they are compelled by the very nature of their Church's authoritarian structure to accept nonreligious as well as religious policies that have been imposed upon them from abroad.

"It is for this reason I am addressing Catholics fully as much as non-Catholics in this book. American freedom is *their* [itals in original] freedom, and any curtailment of that freedom by clerical power is an even more serious matter for them than it is for non-Catholics. I know that many Catholics are as deeply disturbed as I am about the social policies of their Church's rulers; and that are finding it increasingly difficult to reconcile their convictions as American democrats with the philosophy of their priests, their hierarchy and their Pope.

\*\*"It is scarcely necessary to say that no man has a right to address the Catholic issue if he is incapable of appreciating the mighty achievements of the Church in the past. No fair-minded man can fail to render homage to the Church's lofty moral purpose and the heroic sacrifices of its devoted servants in all ages. I do not question the sincerity of that purpose or belittle the devotion it has inspired in the hearts of men. I only hope that someday the institution that has inspired such supreme devotion will be divorced from an antidemocratic and an alien system of control.

“Some readers who accept every fact that I have recorded in these pages may still question the wisdom of discussing these matters in public at the present time, because of the critical international situation which finds the Western democracies pitted against a Russian communist aggressor [time of Stalin]. These critics would keep silent about the antidemocratic program of the Vatican until the present crisis is resolved, because they regard the Catholic Church, with all its faults, as a necessary bulwark against militant communism. I respect the sincerity of this view, and I share with most Americans the conviction that Russian aggression must be met with determined resistance.

“But I do not believe that fear of one authoritarian power justifies *compromise* with another, especially when the compromise may be used to strengthen *clerical fascism* [italics mine] in many countries. Certainly in this country the acceptance of *any* form of authoritarian control weakens the democratic spirit; and one encroachment of the democratic way of life may be used as a precedent for another. In the long run the capacity to defend American democracy against communist dictatorship must be based upon a free culture, and I believe that the facts that I have marshaled in these pages demonstrate the *impossibility* [italics mine] of reconciling a free culture with the present policies of the Vatican.

“I have tried in this book to put down plain facts about the Catholic question, facts that every American should know. The method of treatment is self-evident. It is not a history but a contemporary review. It is a book not about the Catholic faith but about the cultural, political, and economic policies of the rulers of the Catholic Church. Wherever possible I have let the Catholic hierarchy speak for itself. There is a Catholic source for almost every major fact in this book, and the documents, dates, publishers, and official Imprimatur are all listed, with due acknowledgements, in the Notes at the end of the book.

“I have seen many things that I described here, because I am not unfamiliar with Catholic participation in big-city politics, and because I have lived in Mexico and Italy, and visited Spain and Quebec. But this is not a personal narrative, and I have not permitted personal observation to interfere with the documentary approach.

“Some portions of this book, now completely revised and re-written, appeared in *The Nation* in twelve installments, ending on June 4, 1948. They provoked an instant and fiery response from the Catholic hierarchy throughout the United States, and an *equally ardent defense in liberal and academic circles*. [italics mine]. I salute *The Nation* and its gallant editor, Freda Kirchwey, for meeting the attack with unfailing courage; and I salute the distinguished Americans, headed by Archibald McLeish, who publicly supported *The Nation* in asserting its right to discuss a fundamental social issue. *Such fortitude is all too rare in American life today*, and the fact that it exists is a hopeful augury for the Catholic people and for American freedom.

“It is impossible to adequately acknowledge the great debt which I owe to hundreds of friends and advisers, Catholic and non-Catholic, who have helped me with valuable suggestions for this book. Although I am wholly responsible for the opinions expressed and for any possible errors in the text, I have had the assistance of some of the most distinguished and scholarly critics who ever united in attempt to make a book factually impregnable. When the first draft of the manuscript had been completed, it was submitted for scrutiny and criticism to a panel of experts which included George La Piana, Professor Emeritus of Church History at Harvard; Giovanni Pioli of Milan, former vice-rector of the Propaganda Pontifical College for Roman Catholic Missions, Rome;

Edwin McNeill Poteat, former president of Colgate-Rochester Divinity School; and a leading American Catholic author.

“The two chapters on education were reviewed by one of America’s foremost authorities on educational problems. The two chapters on ‘The Church and Medicine’ and ‘Sex, Birth Control and Eugenics’ were reviewed by the dean of American gynecologists, Robert Latou Dickinson, M.D., former president of the American Gynecological Society. Many other specialists and nonspecialists have contributed their suggestions and counsel, and I am grateful for their interest and assistance.” – Blanshard, *American Freedom and Catholic Power*, pp. 3-7.

-----  
***Facts of Faith* by Christian Edwardson**

Another equally courageous and scholarly author on this vital and sensitive, if not now even more highly controversial subject, Christian Edwardson, in his book ***Facts of Faith***, Southern Publishing Asso., Nashville, TN., USA (1943) wrote in the chapter “*Americanism Versus Romanism*,” pp. 256-262:

“Some say, What is it! Are not Roman Catholics as good as Protestants? Yes, certainly they are. As individuals there is no distinction before the law, and as neighbors they are loved and respected. We, however, are not speaking of individuals, but of a *church organization* that claims certain rights of jurisdiction in civil affairs, and whose avowed principles are diametrically opposed to liberty of speech, liberty of press, and religious liberty in general, as understood by the founders of this republic and incorporated into its fundamental laws. This we shall now prove (1) from official Catholic documents, (2) from the actual application of their principles to civil governments.

“OFFICIAL CATHOLIC DOCUMENTS

“Pope Leo XIII, in an encyclical letter, *Immortale Dei*, November 1, 1885, outlines ‘the Christian constitution of states,’ by saying that ‘the state’ should profess the Catholic religion, and that the Roman pontiffs should have ‘the power of making laws.’ ‘And assuredly all ought to hold that it was not without a singular disposition of God’s providence that this power of the Church was provided with a civil sovereignty as the surest safeguard of her independence.’

“He [Pope Leo XIII] says of the Middle Ages: ‘[then] church and state were happily united.’ – *The Great Encyclical Letters of Pope Leo XIII*, ‘pp. 113, 114, 119. Benziger Bros., 1903.

‘Sad it is to call to mind how the harmful and lamentable rage for innovations which rose to a climax in the sixteenth century. . . . spread amongst all classes of society. From this source, as from a fountain-head, burst forth all those later tenets of unbridled license. . . .

‘Amongst these principles the main one lays down that as of all men are alike by race and nature . . . that each is free to think on every subject just as he may choose . . . In a society grounded upon such maxims, all government is nothing more nor less than the will of the people . . .

‘And it is part of this theory . . . . that everyone is to be free to follow whatever religion he prefers, or none at all if he disapprove of all . . . .

‘Now when the state rests on foundations like those just named---and for the time being they are greatly in favor—it readily appears into what and how unrightful a position the Church is driven . . . . They who administer the civil power . . . defiantly put aside the most sacred decrees of the Church . . . .

‘The sovereignty of the people . . . .is doubtless a doctrine . . . which lacks reasonable proof.’ – *Id*, pp. 120-123.

‘The theory ‘that the church be separated from the state,’ Pope Leo further calls a ‘fatal error,’ ‘a great folly, a sheer injustice,’ and ‘shameless liberty.’ – *Id*, pp. 124, 125.

‘In his next encyclical letter , of June 20, 1888, he calls it ‘the fatal theory of he need of separation between Church and state,’ ‘the greatest perversion of liberty,’ and ‘that fatal principle of the separation of church and state.’ – *Id*, pp. 148, 159.

‘In his letter of January 6, 1895, he says: ‘It would be very erroneous to draw the conclusion that in America is to be sought the type of the most favorable 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. . . . 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.*’ –*Id*., pp. 323, 324.

‘Among the many authorities that could be cited, we have chosen that of Pope Leo XIII, because he is not a medieval, but a modern, exponent of papal doctrines, which no Roman Catholic would deny. Anyone familiar with the phraseology of the [American] Declaration of Independence of the Federal Constitution cannot help but see in the expressions of Pope Leo a declared opposition [itals in original] to the fundamental principles upon which our government is founded. He urges his followers not to be content with attending to their religious duties, but ‘Catholics should extend their efforts beyond the restricted sphere, and give their attention to national politics.’ – *Id*., p. 131.

‘It is the duty of all Catholics . . . . to strive that liberty of action shall not transgress the bounds marked out by nature and the law of God [i.e., papal law]; to endeavor to bring back all civil society to the pattern and form of Christianity which We have described. . . . Both these objects will be carried into effect without fail if all will follow the guidance of the Apostolic See as their rule of life and obey the bishops.’ –*Id*., p. 132

‘Especially with reference to the so-called ‘**Liberties**’ [emphasis mine] which are so greatly coveted in these days, all must stand by the judgment of the Apostolic See.’ –*Id*., p. 130.

‘In his encyclical letter of Jan. 10, 1890, on ‘The Chief Duty of Christians as Citizens’ (id., pp. 180-207) he urges all Catholics to *put forth united action in politics in order to change the governmental policies* so as to bring them into harmony with the papal principles. He says:

‘As to those who mean to take part in public affairs they should avoid. . . . leading the lives of cowards, untouched in the fight . . . .Honor, then, to those who shrink not from the entering the arena as often as need calls, believing and being convinced that the violence of injustice will be brought to an end and finally give way to the sanctity of right and religion.’ – *Id*., pp. 199-201.



“They are urged to support (in elections) only those men who will stand by the principles of union of church and state:

‘The Church cannot give countenance or favor to those whom she knows to be imbued with the spirit of hostility to her; who refuse openly to respect her rights; who make it their aim and purpose to tear asunder the alliance that should, by the very nature of things, connect the interests of religion with those of the state. On the contrary, she is (as she is bound to be) the upholder of those who are themselves imbued with the right way of thinking as to the relations between church and state, and who strive to make them work in perfect accord for the common good. These precepts contain the abiding principle by which every Catholic should shape his conduct in regard to public life. In short, where the Church does not forbid taking part in public affairs, it is fit and proper to give support to men of acknowledged worth, and who pledge themselves to deserve well in the Catholic cause, and on no account may it be allowed to prefer to them any such individuals as are hostile to religion . . . Whence it appears how urgent is the duty to maintain perfect union of minds.’ – *Id.*, 198.

‘Union of minds, therefore, requires, together with a perfect accord in the one faith, **complete submission and obedience of will to the Church and to the Roman Pontiff, as to God himself.**’ [emphasis mine]” – *Id.*, p. 193.

‘The political prudence of the Roman Pontiff embraces diverse and multiform things; for it is his charge not only to rule the Church, but generally so to regulate the actions of Christian citizens . . . The faithful should imitate the practical political wisdom of the ecclesiastical authority.’ – *Id.*, p. 202.

‘But if the laws of state are manifestly at variance with divine law [papal law, that is], containing enactments hurtful to the Church . . . or if they violate in the person of the supreme Pontiff the authority of Jesus Christ [?!], then, truly, to resist becomes a positive duty, to obey, a crime.’ – *Id.*, p. 185.

‘If, then, a civil government strives . . . to put God aside, . . . it deflects woefully from its right course and from the injunctions of nature. Nor should such a gathering together and association of men be accounted as a commonwealth, but only as a deceitful imitation and make-believe of civil organization.’ – *Id.*, p. 181.

“These are the exact statements of Pope Leo XIII, taken from his authentic records, published by the Catholics under the seal of the Church; and they show that the Papacy stands for the same principles today as it did in the Dark Ages [598-1798 A.D.]. How truthfully the Pontiff says: ‘And in truth, wherever the Church has set her foot, she has straightway changed the face of things.’ – *Id.*, p. 107.

“A letter from the Vatican outlining the plans of Pope Leo XIII respecting the United States was published in the New York Sun, July 11, 1892, and contains the following significant statement:

‘What the church has done in the past for others, she will now do for the United States . . . . He [the pope] hails in the United States, and in their young and flourishing church the source of new life for Europeans . . . . If the United States succeed in solving the many problems that puzzle us, Europe will follow her example.’ – ‘*New York Sun*,’ July 11, 1892; quoted in ‘*Liberty*,’ 1907, No. 4., p. 10.

“How remarkably this coincides with the prophetic prediction: ‘His deadly wound was healed: and all the world wondered after the beast.’ Rev. 13: 3. Yes, it is true that ‘as America, the land of religious liberty, shall unite with the Papacy in forcing the conscience and compelling men to honor the false sabbath, the people of every country of the globe will be led to follow her example.’ – *‘Testimonies,’ Vol. VI, p. 18.* This country led the world from despotism to liberty, and it will lead the way back.

“The doctrine of Pope Leo XIII is the doctrine of the Catholic Church, and it is taught in her schools in the United States. One of their schoolbooks, ‘Manual of Christian Doctrine, by a Seminary Professor,’ printed by J.J. McVey, Philadelphia, 1915, and carrying the sanction of the Catholic Censor and the seal of the Church, has this to say concerning the ‘Relations of Church and State’:

‘Why is the Church superior to the state?  
‘Because the end to which the Church tends is the noblest of all ends.  
‘What right has the pope in virtue of his supremacy?  
‘The right to annul those laws or acts of government that would injure the salvation of souls or attack the natural rights of citizens.  
‘What then is the principle obligation of the heads of states?  
‘Their principle obligation is to practice the Catholic religion themselves, and, as they are in power, to protect and defend it.  
‘Has the State the right and the duty to proscribe schism or heresy?  
‘Yes, it has the right and duty to do so.  
‘May the state separate itself from the Church?  
‘No, because it may not withdraw from the supreme rule of Christ.  
‘What name is given to the doctrine that the state has neither the right nor the duty to be united to the Church to protect it?  
‘This doctrine is called *Liberalism*. It is founded principally on the fact that modern society rests on *liberty of conscience and of worship, on liberty of speech and of the press*.  
‘Why is Liberalism to be condemned?  
‘Because it denies all subordination of the state to the Church.’ – pp. 131-133.

“We respectfully ask: With such avowed principles taught in Catholic schoolbooks, would it be safe to allow Romanized textbooks to be used in our public schools? Pope Leo IV sets for the same papal doctrine. We read:

‘On February 15, 1559, appeared the Bull *Quum ex apostolatus officio* of which the most important heads are these:

(1) The Pope as representative of Christ on earth has complete authority over princes and kingdoms, and may judge the same.

(2) All monarchs, who are guilty of heresy or schism, are irrevocably deposed, without the necessity of judicial formalities. They are deprived forever if their right to rule, and fall under the sentence of death. If they repent, they are to be confined to a monastery for the term of their life, with bread and water as their only fare.

(3) No man is to help an heretical or schismatical prince. The monarch guilty of this sin is to lose his kingdom in favor of rulers obedient to the Pope.’ – *‘Life and Times of Hildebrand,’ Arnold Harris Matthews, D.D., p. 288. London: 1910; quoted in Facts of Faith, pp. 256-262.*

(To be continued next month)

