

Francis, Lon
ADP2350

How to Win

in any

RELIGIOUS

DISCUSSION

Lon Francis



How To Win In Any Religious Discussion

Second Edition, 10,000

April 15, 1953

Printed and distributed by Our Sunday Visitor
Huntington, Indiana



Nihil Obstat:
VERY REV. MSGR. T. E. DILLON
Censor Librorum

Imprimatur:
✠ JOHN FRANCIS NOLL, D.D.
Bishop of Fort Wayne

Dear Reader:

MANY of you have hitherto refrained from engaging in any kind of discussion of religion with a non-Catholic friend because you have felt unequal to it.

This booklet should be of great help. It points out that you need only to be able to *disprove* two theses: (1) that "all religions are equally good," as the 75,000,000 unchurched people of our nation hold; (2) that "The Bible is or can be the only rule of faith," as all Protestants erroneously teach; and to *prove* the thesis; (3) that revealed religion, like all other truths in any field, must be guaranteed by competent authority, which also assures its accurate interpretation, as all Catholics believe.

If you are not a member of a Discussion Club, form one, and analyze this pamphlet thoroughly.

Acquaintance with the three points mentioned above will suggest many questions which you might ask the non-Catholic, and you will find he will not be able to answer them any more than you have been able to answer his questions in the past.

It is easy for anyone—even a child—to ask many questions, even though he may be able to answer very few. Hence you should do some questioning instead of giving that right entirely to your non-Catholic acquaintance.

LON FRANCIS



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2016

<https://archive.org/details/howtowininanyrel00fran>

How to Win in Any Religious Discussion

Those Neither Protestant Nor Catholic

IN religious discussions we must take into account whether our opponent is one among 75,000,000 in our country who belongs to no religious body; or whether he is a member of some Protestant church, which holds a great deal in common with our own. The 75,000,000, hardly acquainted with the ABC's of religion, regard all religions as human and, therefore, consistently believe that none of them is necessary for salvation. No *human* religion can, of itself, lead one to a supernatural end. These, therefore, hold that "one religion is as good as another."

If all religions are human, then one is, substantially, as good as another. But if one had a divine Founder and all the others human founders, then there is an infinite difference between the former and all the rest. Hence if you can successfully disprove the thesis that "all religions are equally good," you will make a good start in disposing for a hearing the one who is neither Catholic nor Protestant by profession. He needs to know that Christ was divine. That can be proved historically, and also from the utterances of infidels, who agree that Jesus was the most perfect man who ever lived.

The 5,200,000 Jews in the United States need, like the 75,000,000 unchurched, proof that Christ was divine, and instituted a divine plan of salvation.

Infidel writers refer to Jesus as the most perfect of all human beings. But could He have been "perfect" if He declared Himself God, and was not? Would He not have been an arch-deceiver? If Christ was divine and founded a religion that too must be divine.

Proof of the Divinity of Christ

It should be easy to prove the divinity of Christ to any unprejudiced person, even to the Jew, because he accepts the Old Testament, in which he reads of many prophets foretelling Christ's coming, and speaking of Him as "God," "The Anointed One," the "Prince of Peace."

These prophets also identified Christ as the Messiah, and foretold His birth of a *Virgin* Mother (Isaias 7:14); His birth at *Bethlehem* (Micheas 5:2); His sojourn in *Egypt* (Osee 11:1); His triumphant reception into Jerusalem, riding on an ass (Zacharias 9:9); His *betrayal* for thirty pieces of silver (Ibid. 11:12); His sacrificial *death* (Isaias 33:12); His *treatment* before the High Priests (Isaias 50:6); the giving to Him of vinegar and gall as a drink (Psalm 68:22); the scourging and the piercing of His hands

and feet (Psalm 21:17-18); the dividing of His garments after His death (Psalm 21:19).

If one did not know that all these things were contained in the *Old Testament*, one would assume that they were written after His death.

Christ was not only the worker of many miracles, such as the curing of the blind, the deaf and the crippled, the calming of the storm, the feeding of the multitudes with five loaves, the raising of Lazarus to life and later rising from His own tomb by His own power. He predicted practically every phase of His passion and death, predicted the treason of Judas, the denial by Peter, the destruction of Jerusalem (which was fulfilled to the letter), the persecution of His Apostles and their followers.

No fact of history is better attested than that of the Resurrection. Contemporaries tell us that to make sure that He actually had died His heart was pierced with a lance after He had hung on the cross for three hours. All four Evangelists, contemporaries, including John, who witnessed both His death and resurrection, describe the same in detail.

Christ appeared to the eleven Apostles, to disciples on their way to Emmaus, to 500 other people after His resurrection. Thomas was as skeptical as any one today and insisted that he have an opportunity to put his finger into the wounds of Christ's hands and feet, and his hand into His side Christ gave him that opportunity, where-

upon he acknowledged Him to be "my Lord and my God."

The 40,000,000 Protestants

It, in addition, you can disprove a *second thesis*, namely, that the "Bible and the Bible only is the 'rule of faith,' you will have disproved the main tenet of every Protestant sect—and that thesis is easy to disprove.

If you will be able to prove the correctness of a *third thesis*, namely, that the teaching of Christ's Church must be accepted from a duly constituted Teaching Authority, you will have proved a fundamental tenet of Christianity accepted universally for fifteen centuries, and still held by all Catholics.

"*One God, one faith, one baptism.*"—Saint Paul. (Eph. 4:5)

Fully two-thirds of the American people do not know the ABC's of religion simply because they have never had any instruction in it. They pass judgment on all churches by what they see—in other words, by Externals. They note that all religions have church edifices which look pretty much alike; that they have clergymen who dress pretty much alike; that they all have the Bible; that nearly all admit members through the rite of Baptism; that they all have some form of Communion service. But even with these many similarities the Catholic Church differs quite substantially from all the rest.

(1) While all churches do have

clergymen, the Catholic clergyman, known as "a priest," is ordained by means of a special Sacrament instituted by Christ, known as "Holy Orders" which makes him, in the words of Saint Paul, "another Christ." His principal office is to continue Christ's priesthood, and not merely his ministry of preaching and teaching. Augustine Britten, the well known English Protestant, declares the Mass is "the one thing that matters."

The Protestant minister can cease being a minister, but the Catholic priest cannot throw off his priestly character. Speaking of the priest Saint Paul writes, "Every high priest taken from among men is ordained for men in the things that appertain to God, that he may offer gifts and sacrifices for sins." (Heb. 5:1)

To the apostles, not to others, Christ gave the injunction, "Do ye this (what He had done at the Last Supper) in commemoration of me." It was through the Mass that Christ was to be "a priest *forever* according to the order of Melchisedech."

In his Epistle to the Hebrews Saint Paul calls attention to the fact that the churches conducted under the auspices of the new religion, which he had embraced, "have an altar," at which the sacrifice, known as the Mass, which Christ instituted at the Last Supper, is offered every day.

For three centuries Catholics had no churches in most of the

Roman Empire, because of the bitter successive persecutions waged against their religion by ten pagan Roman emperors. They built an underground city and held their services in the catacombs where tombs of martyrs were used as altars.

(2) While it is true that all Christian churches use the Bible, that book is our book, written by sons of the Catholic Church. The world has no other answer to the question, "How do you know that the canon of the Bible is genuine and inspired?", than that "The Catholic Church said so in the fourth century."

(3) While it is also true that the rite of Baptism is performed in nearly all Christian churches, it is our Baptism. Christ instituted Baptism as a Sacrament to confer supernatural life on the soul and to enroll the applicant as a member of His kingdom on earth.

Most non-Catholics do not know why they are Baptists or Presbyterians or Methodists—at least not from the Bible. Many Episcopalians having been taught to believe that their church is a branch of the Catholic Church may be honest in their belief, but fail to realize that a branch must be like the trunk in all things. Saint Paul notes that as there is only one God, so there can be only "one faith and one Baptism" recognized by God, no matter how closely other religious bodies may resemble His.

I

Are All Religions Equally Good?

Some Are Better Than Others

The average man, even though uninstructed in religion generally, would not hold all religions to be equally good, even if all were human. He certainly would not place religions of human origin in the category with a religion of divine origin, with a religion provided by God Himself with supernatural aids to salvation. If he were sure that one religion was of divine origin and supernaturally endowed, he would regard its difference from all others not only as accidental, but as substantial.

Would any Christian maintain that pagan religions are as good as the Christian? Would he rate Buddhism, Shintoism, and Confucianism as on the same plane as Christianity? The Mohammedans, as a class, pray more than the average Christian does, but that does not make Mohammedanism the true religion.

Mahatma Ghandi had a very poor estimate of the Christian religion because so many of its members live according to standards lower than he himself followed, but that did not make his religion true. The lives of many Catholics would suffer by comparison with the lives of many Protestants and with the lives of many who are unaffiliated with any of the churches, but that does not make the Catholic religion false.

The orthodox Protestant can-

not believe that the Unitarian religion is as good as his own, because it denies the fundamental teaching of Christianity—the divinity of Christ.

Self-Evident Truths

Without attempting to prove the divine origin of the Catholic religion, you may deduce its priority of claim by considering certain self-evident truths, such as these:

(1) Only God can offer Heaven to anyone on any terms.

(2) A supernatural end can be reached only by supernatural means, which only God can supply.

(3) A religion based on the principle of “private judgment” nullifies the whole purpose of Christ’s coming.

If these things be so self-evident, how do you account for the indefensible attitude of most Americans?

(a) Deep seated prejudice, inherited through many generations, is one explanation. Prejudice implies a pre-judgment, and it is accentuated by the very name “Protestant.” We have, in political prejudices something akin to religious prejudice in “the solid South.”

(b) Unpreparedness to accept the consequences of subscribing to the correct attitude would be another.

(c) The predisposition to believe all religions to be human. If that were true, no one of them would be necessary.

Preachers help or give encouragement to the last group, constituted of more than one-half of

all Americans, by eulogizing the non-Christian on the occasion of funerals.

II

Is The Bible The Sole Rule of Faith?

(1) Since Christ did not write anything nor order His Apostles to write anything, the first thing which you must ask the Protestant to prove is the genuineness and the inspiration of the Bible. Catholics consistently profess belief in both, but Protestants do so very inconsistently, because they could not possibly know from any source except the Catholic that the writings contained in the New Testament, for instance, were authored by those to whom they are credited, and that they were also written under the inspiration of God.

There is absolutely no other way of proving the divine authority of the Bible. The Catholic Church settled the matter at a Council held in France in the late fourth century. Protestantism did not come into being until twelve centuries later, and during that time Catholics had the Bible all to themselves; Therefore

(2) The Protestant would have to be able to prove that the New Testament, which was written in Greek, with the exception of Matthew's gospel, written in Hebrew, and received from the Catholic Church in the sixteenth century, was transcribed without error and then *correctly trans-*

lated into modern languages. He would have to prove that the Catholic Church, which he claims could not be trusted, never tampered with the Scriptures, never altered them to suit her purpose, never added to, nor removed passages. The Church could have done that without any Protestant today being the wiser.

What if it be asked: "But would there not be a way of comparing the modern version of our Bible with the original?" The answer is "No," because the original writings have been lost. There are three fourth century "copies" of the original, one possessed by the Vatican, and the other two by the British Museum. One would have to prove by external authority that even these were accurately copied from the originals.

The Bible used by Luther or Calvin might have been a thousandth copy made from previous copies, done by hand on parchment. How could he be absolutely certain that it conformed perfectly with the original text?

(3) But who is there who ever found the true faith by Bible reading? We are sure that you could not find any who found his particular brand of religion, whether it be Methodist, Presbyterian, or

Baptist, in the Bible. People usually begin to read the Bible after they will have already chosen the religion they profess. But it is an historical fact that the best Christians in the world—the primitive Christians — instructed by the Apostles and their immediate successors, the Christians who provided, some say, millions of martyrs, did not become Christians by Bible reading for the simple reason that the Bible did not exist, in its present form, until the late fourth century. It was much later before it could be brought to parish churches, much less to individuals.

During the next twelve centuries very few people could have the Bible because there was no printing press to run off many copies at one time. If any one during those years wanted a copy of the Bible he would have had to copy by hand the entire Scriptures from Genesis to Revelations on parchment (for paper was not invented until the thirteenth century). The material itself would have cost him quite a fortune, and he would have consumed years of time making only one copy from the text that belonged to some one else.

(4) But the ones who did copy the Bible by hand, to provide a copy for at least every monastic church, were the members of Religious Orders. That task was assigned to them as a life's job. If the Catholic Church had not taken steps to preserve the "word of God" our modern generation would not have it, nor would the

people of Luther's time have had it.

The printing press was invented in the year 1438, just forty-five years before Luther's birth. The one who invented it was John Guttenberg, a Catholic, and the first work he ran off his press was the Bible. People are observing the fifth centenary of that achievement in this year 1952.

A Catholic Book

Hence the Bible is a *Catholic book*, the writings of which were declared inspired after the examination of many other reputedly inspired works, and credited to the ones whose names they bear. It was the Catholic Church which preserved it for all the world, just as it was she who preserved the classics of antiquity for the modern world—also copying them over and over, word by word.

(5) When Protestants accept the Bible as the "word of God" without question, they acknowledge, without realizing it, that the Catholic Church spoke with infallible authority when she fixed the canon of the New Testament.

(6) Just as it required an infallible voice to declare definitely that the Bible, as we have it, was written under the inspiration of God, so it requires an infallible voice (a Supreme Court) to render the proper interpretation of texts which have given rise to a great deal of dispute.

If you and I differ concerning the correct interpretation of any text relating to faith or morals, we might both be wrong, but only one

of us could be right. Now apply that to the hundreds of different religious sects, speaking so discordantly, each insisting that it is right.

(7) The fact that throughout centuries people could not read nor write because there was no book, not even the Bible, to read, would make it clear that God never intended that people should receive their faith by reading a book.

Today in most countries half civilized the majority of the people can read, but that was not true a hundred years ago, not even in England. Spain until recent years had a high state of illiteracy, but, according to the Encyclopedia Americana, the population of England a century ago was no more literate than that of Spain in the same era.

(8) The charge that Luther had never seen the Bible until after he left the Catholic Church, that

Catholics are not allowed to read the Bible, is pure fable and fiction. As a priest Luther was obliged to devote at least an hour a day to reading the Bible. Between the time of the invention of the printing press and his apostasy many editions of the Bible had been printed in German and circulated throughout Germany, which was then entirely Catholic.

(9) How about the charge that the Church was guilty of "Bible-burning" on several occasions? Of course, it was not the Church, but some local ecclesiastic who ordered people to burn what he was certain were faulty versions of the Bible, and, therefore, were not entitled to be called "the word of God."

God Himself would be the first to resent any tampering with the Scriptures, and then crediting the altered text to Him. Not even a human author would permit you to misquote him.

III

Is An Infallible Authority Needed?

CHRIST'S last words to the Apostles were "Go *teach* all nations, . . . and behold I am with you all days even to the end of the world" (Matt. 28:19-20).

As we have remarked He wrote no portion of the Bible Himself, and did not ask any of His Apostles or followers to write. Only Matthew, John, Peter, James and Jude of the original Apostles did any writing. Paul wrote many letters to supplement instructions which he

had first given to a group of converts, whether in Corinth, or Galatia, or Rome.

Because Christ, even after His ascension, selected Paul as an Apostle, his writings were written under divine protection, but they were written to special congregations, and written without orders from Christ. The Catholic Church believes them to be truly inspired, but she, as we have intimated, is

the only Church that can consistently teach that.

No other Church would even know that any of these Apostles wrote, if the Catholic Church had not said so and then preserved their writings. Christ had told His Apostles—and since He said He would be with them until the end of the world He included their successors—“he who hears you, hears Me” (Luke 10:16). He had told them “whatsoever you shall bind on earth shall be bound also in Heaven” (Matt. 16:19).

He regarded the Apostles as a corporate body and, as is very clearly stated in Holy Scripture, appointed one of their number to take His place. He was to return to Heaven soon after their three years of schooling by Him would be over. To this one He said “I shall give to thee the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven” (Matt. 16:19). He had changed this Apostle’s name from Simon to “Cephas,” which means “a rock.”

The English translation of the Hebrew text could be misleading, and the Protestant sects, in order to do away with Peter’s primacy, have seen to it that it does mislead. But Christ did not speak in English or in Latin, or in Greek, but in Hebrew, and in that language the text read: “Thou art *Cephas* and upon this *Cephas* I shall build My Church” (Matt. 16:18).

There is nothing obscure about that utterance, and primitive Christianity and Christians for fifteen centuries, had interpreted that text just as Catholics interpret it today.

They could not all have been wrong all the time, or Christ would not have kept His promises and, therefore, would not have been God. One of these promises, also made to Peter, was: “I have prayed for thee that thy faith shall not fail” (Luke 22:32).

Christ, the Good Shepherd, after His Resurrection, entrusted to Peter His entire sheepfold “feed My lambs, feed My sheep” (John 21:15-17).

To all the apostles, who were a corporate body, which would have successors until the end of time, Christ said, “Behold I am with you all days even unto the end of the world”; “He who hears you, hears Me”; “I shall send to you the Holy Ghost, the Spirit of Truth, Who will keep you in truth.” (Matt: 28:20; Luke 10:16; John 14:16-17)

What About ‘Bad’ Catholics?

Most people base their judgment of the Catholic Church on the lives of Catholics whom they know. They apply the standard, “by their fruits you shall know them.” But the trouble is that they pass over the many good Catholics and take account only of the bad.

Christ instituted His Church to save sinners, and therefore sinners will always be plentiful in the Church. Bad apples are often found on a very good tree, but they owe their badness not to the tree, but to a worm that has gotten into them or to the sting of an insect—in other words, to outside influences.

There is nothing more clear to the Catholic, even from his exper-



(TRIBUNE Photo)

Partaking of Communion, Donald Webber, Darlene Wallin, Judith Woltersdorf and Roger Eklove kneel at altar in St. John's Evangelical Lutheran church during Good Friday services. Conducting the rites are the Rev. John H. Lutz (left) and the Rev. Henry Blake.


(Story on page 1)

HE PREFERS DARKNESS



ORR

© 1960 by
The Chicago Tribune.



TIMELY PURCHASE OF A
FAMOUS MAKER'S ENTIRE STOCK
OF FABULOUS SUITS THAT
SHOULD SELL FROM 45.00 TO 69.95

29⁹⁰

A GREAT TRIUMPH! Come see a fabulous collection of DISTINGUISHED DESIGNER SUITS! Walking suits! Fitted suits! Costume suits! Gentry Box suits! To close out his entire stock of fine suitings this manufacturer gave us a simply ridiculous low price! Select from Oscar Kahn tweeds...fine Sharktics...novelty Crepes...luxury Worsteds; all loomed of the finest DOMESTIC AND IMPORTED WOOLENS. Everything's new, fresh, superb! Glorious colors: beiges, greys, lush blues, zingy plaids; plenty black and navy.

SUITS, SECOND FLOOR

Sorry, no mail or phone orders
Charge it if you like!

Lane
Bryant

Wabash & Washington — Also Oak Park

ience, than that every member who will live in accordance with the teachings and moral demands of his Church will be holy. There are many hangers-on in the Catholic Church, and the Church permits them to hang on in order that they may, by attending divine services, by hearing sermons, be converted to better ways. If they were put out of the Church, they could not have the same opportunity of saving their souls that they have by being retained even as dead members.

He had promised to send to His Church the "Holy Spirit, the Spirit of Truth, Who will abide with you forever" (John 14:16-17).

If the Holy Spirit guides and directs and teaches through the Church, then it speaks with infallible authority whenever it pronounces, for the entire Christian world, on matters relating to faith or morals. The spokesman for the Church is not infallible when speaking on any other matter.

How few in the world get their information about other things except on authority. The children who attend our schools are not merely provided with a textbook, but they have a live teacher to defend it, and interpret it. If you have not traveled around the world, how would you know, except on authority, that there is such a city as London, or Paris, or Budapest, or Jerusalem?

You believe that the sun is 93,000,000 miles away from the earth, but did you arrive at that knowledge on your own, or do you not

accept it on the authority of the astronomer? You use the radio, or have a television set, but neither is of your own invention. You use them without even trying to understand how they operate.

You are well aware that people of opposing political parties regard very few things in the same light. They are, on principle, one against the other.

You know how the solid south has felt since the Civil War. What if you were to read the story of that war composed by two authors, one a southerner and the other a northerner? Would you find perfect agreement?

Now it is the same about reading the Bible. People read their prejudices into it, find in it what they prefer, and reject even its most pleasant teachings if they realize that their particular sect could not have them because of lack of apostolic succession.

Primitive Christianity

They have heard that Protestantism restored primitive Christianity, but they have never seen any convincing proof of that. In fact it did away with the most cherished beliefs and practices of primitive Christianity, such as the Real Presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist, the Mass, the Sacrament of Penance for the forgiveness of sins committed after Baptism, Prayers for the Dead, and many other things.

One need not go to the Catholic Church for proof of this. The Orthodox Churches which, through the Catholic Church, can be traced

to Apostolic times, still believe in and use our seven sacraments.

We find reference to all these things in the Catacombs under the city of Rome where the candidates for martyrdom lived and worshipped. They attended Mass and received Holy Communion every day, as Catholics today understand these things.

Since, through the ages, the average person could not discover his own faith, he had to accept it on the authority of the Universal Church. Since he had no Bible to read he could not have found his faith by reading the Bible; and if you will reflect a bit, you will admit that even you did not find your particular brand of Christianity, whether it be Catholic or Protestant, by Bible-reading.

St. Peter calls Christ "the Son of the living God" (Matt. 16:16), and St. Paul speaks of the Church as "The Church of the living God," called the "pillar and ground of truth" (1 Tim. 3:15). This living Church of the living God is charged to speak in the name of God and has, through the centuries, been the source of that unity for which Christ prayed in His last prayer to His Heavenly Father, the unity which can exist only under "one fold and one shepherd" (John 10:16).

Essentially Different

The Catholic Church regards itself as essentially different from all other religions, in that it is a living "organism," as distinguished from a mere religious organization. The Catholic religion has an offic-

ial spokesman, who can speak the Church's mind and even Christ's mind, because He has promised it protection from error.

The Need of Infallibility

The Infallibility of the Church and, therefore, of the spokesman for the Church, as understood by Catholics, is an absolute necessity if we would have certainty in our faith, and that unity for which Christ implored His Heavenly Father in His last prayer on earth.

When Clare Boothe Luce was receiving instructions from Monsignor Sheen, she told him that she would not be interested in the Catholic Church if it could not guarantee with absolute certainty the things which she was expected to believe. She did not want the Monsignor's opinion nor that of any one else. In other words, she wanted to be taught by an infallible Church.

Arnold Lunn, the Englishman, who had been raised an Anglican, became an agnostic because he saw such wide differences in that church. He was certain that any work of God designed to lead man to salvation must have as much unity as any other work of God—so visible in nature. He felt that Christ's words: "He who believeth not will be condemned" (John 3:18), would be unreasonable if man were not absolutely certain concerning the correctness of the things which he was to believe.

Intellectuals who repudiate Infallibility usually indicate by what they write that they do not understand its meaning. They under-

stand it to mean that the Pope can do no wrong; that even as an individual, he cannot sin; that no matter on what subject he writes he can make no mistake; that Catholics must accept without hesitation every pronouncement of the Pope on whatever subject he speaks.

Now, of course, Infallibility does not mean any of these things. It is not the endowment of a man, *but of the office* he holds as Vicar of Christ. He is declared to be "protected from error" by God when he *officially* pronounces on matters of faith and morals for all of Christendom. Evidently, therefore, Infallibility is not something which the Pope can personally boast of; it is not given for his sake, but for the sake of the people who would be misled if, as universal teacher, he taught them wrong on matters relating to faith and morals.

We believe that it is the easiest doctrine of the Catholic Church to accept. We believe that a divine institution would become human if it did not have Infallibility.

Did not Christ say "You shall *know the truth* and the truth shall make you free" (John 8:32)? He emphasized two things in that sentence, namely, that His followers would definitely know the truth and not be ever searching for it; and that knowing the truth would make their minds free from error, from doubt.

Could you think of a God establishing a Church to embrace all nations and to last to the end of time, and then to be entirely for-

gotten by Him without any divine protection? But did not Christ say that He would be with His Church "all days even unto the end of the world" (Matt. 28:20)? Did He not promise to send the Holy Spirit to guide and protect it, and to keep it in truth (John 16:13)? Did He not tell the first Pope that He prayed for him that his faith might not fail (Luke 22:32)? With what did He expect Peter to feed His flock if not the truth—"feed My lambs, feed My sheep" (John 21:16-17)?

All Protestants claim that they believe in an Infallible Bible, but they actually accept it as infallible on the "infallibility of the Catholic Church," which officially declared it to be genuine and inspired—and that is the only argument by which any one can prove the reliability of the Bible. While they accept the Bible on the sole authority of the Catholic Church, they do not like to admit it. But by repudiating the Infallibility of that authority, they have made the Bible very "fallible" through their interpretations, resulting in a babel of confusion throughout the non-Catholic world.

Questions like the following are frequently asked by non-Catholics. The brief answers appended here will prove helpful to you in answering your non-Catholic friends.

Q—*Would an ex-Cathedra pronouncement on faith and morals promulgated by an unholy Pope be Infallible?*

A—Yes. We have said that he speaks not as a private person, but as the official representative of

Christ, when divine protection is granted to him as promised not for his benefit, but for the benefit of hundreds of millions.

Q—How is it that Infallibility is rather a recent dogma of the Catholic Church?

A—It is not a new dogma. It was always believed throughout Christendom. The decisions of General Councils beginning with the Council of Nice in 325 were held to be authoritative and final because

they represented the teaching Church with the Pope as its head.

What happened in the year 1878 was merely an official "definition" of Infallibility, and the official promulgation of it.

The hundreds of Bishops who attended that Council had all believed in it, though there were some who thought because of the disturbed state of society with the Franco-Prussian War on, and the then recent imprisonment of Pope Pius IX in Italy, a definition of it in that year might be untimely.

Further Explanations

(1) For Him Who Holds that All Religions are Equally Good, Or That None Is Necessary.

OF those who hold that one religion is as good as another, some are affiliated with the religion which their parents followed, or to which a good friend or neighbor belongs. But the majority of them maintain that they can lead just as good a life whether formally attached to any religion or not, and hence remain aloof from all. How must we answer them?

You should tell them that the way to salvation depends entirely on Almighty God; that He does not owe His Heavenly Home to any creature now living in this world; that if He offers Heaven it evidently must be on His own terms.

Then you should ask your inquirer whether he would not take the trouble to determine for himself, by accepting the gospel story as *history*, if not as inspired,

whether Christ, Who proved His divinity, did not actually found a definite way of salvation.

If He did, then there is no other way; then it matters not what our preference may be, or how well we live independently of the terms established by Him.

What if you took to a school classroom a beautiful ring or a watch and offered it to the child who would work a certain arithmetical problem on the blackboard for you. But Johnny gets up and says that he is going to get that gift, but not by working that problem. He is going to get it by spelling for you. Mary stands up to say that she is going to get it, but not by working the problem which you require, but by reading for you.

Now you are the boss. You do not owe that prize to any child in the classroom, and you have dictated the terms. You did not offer it for spelling or reading and,

therefore, it matters little whether Johnny spells perfectly and Mary reads perfectly. Neither fulfilled your terms.

(2) *For The Bible Christian.*

Of those who hold that the Bible is the rule of faith very few accept the entire doctrinal teaching even of the New Testament. "Reformers" even lifted out of the context a verse from the Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans, and another from his Epistle to the Galatians, in which it is said in substance that all one needs for salvation is "to believe in Christ." The modern way of saying that is "you must take Christ as your personal Savior, and you will be saved."

If those two texts represent the one necessary demand for the acquisition of everlasting life then why bother about the rest of the Bible?

There is absolutely nothing said about this purported essential to salvation in the Apostles' Creed, in the Nicene Creed, in the Athanasian Creed, all of which were written in the "golden era of the Church," the era often referred to as "primitive Christianity." The Creeds are absolutely silent on the question of "faith alone."

Christ's Own Answer

Christ was asked quite pointedly by a young man what he must do to attain everlasting life. Did He tell him that he needed only to believe in Him? He evidently did believe in Him or he would not have come to Him to have that matter settled. Christ rather told him that

he must "keep the Commandments" (Matt. 19:17).

On still another occasion Christ told an assembly of people very definitely that His believers might call on Him and yet not enter the Kingdom of Heaven. He said: "Not every one who saith to me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the Kingdom of Heaven, but he who doeth the will of My Father Who is in Heaven" (Matt. 7:21).

All through the Bible we read that no matter how much faith we have, we must still observe the Commandments. In the New Testament it is made clear that in addition to Baptism and Faith and the observance of the Commandments, we must also belong to God's Church.

St. Paul tells us that if we have faith sufficient to move mountains, it will avail us nothing unless we also have charity; and by "charity" he meant love of God (1 Cor. 13:2-3). This is clear from another utterance: "If I should distribute all my goods to feed the poor, and have not charity, it profiteth me nothing" (1 Cor. 13:3). Ordinarily we assume that "feeding the poor" would be a work of charity.

St. Paul closes this lesson with the words: "Faith, hope and charity, these three, but the greatest of these is charity" (1 Cor. 13:13).

St. John, in his epistles, makes that lesson extremely clear.

Luther simply *wanted* his religion to be distinguished by that one article of faith; he wanted it so ardently that he tampered with

the epistles from which those verses were taken, and added to the first the word "alone," and to the second the word "only." His would be a very easy way of salvation, and that is why it is preached by nearly all Protestant sects today. But it is not Christ's way of salvation.

Billy Graham now, as Billy Sunday did some years back, "receives into the church" several hundred in one evening. For the most part they are ignorant of the ABC's of religion; for the most part they are probably not even baptized, but they momentarily "repent of their sins and take Christ as their Savior." They may be living in an invalid marriage, which Christ calls "adultery."

(3) *For the Authoritative Way.*

One who receives his religion from an authority, protected by Almighty God from teaching error, evidently wants to know all that he is expected to believe and do.

Some Scripture Texts Overlooked

AND I say to thee: Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it—Matt. 16:18.

And if he will not hear them; tell the church. And if he will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as the heathen and publican—Matt. 18:17.

And Jesus coming, spoke to them, saying: All power is given to Me in heaven and in earth.

That is why one who is interested in the Catholic faith is subjected to a long period of instructions. He is not received blindly into the Church. He is made acquainted with the whole Catholic system of doctrine, of morality, and the Sacraments as means of grace.

"Belief" is not enough as most Protestants hold; "doing" is not enough as most of the unchurched hold, but "believing" and "doing" and procuring the help with which to supernaturalize one's works, are all needed.

God does not live in a human order, while we do. If He has destined us to a divine order, then we must be elevated to that plane by some ordinance established by Christ. The end for which we are destined and the means by which it must be attained must be of the same nature. Since our end is supernatural, we need supernatural means to reach it, and these means can come only from God through His Church.

Going therefore, teach ye all nations; baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.

Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world—Matt. 28:18-20.

And He said to them: Go ye into the whole world, and preach the

gospel to every creature—Mark 16: 15.

He that heareth you, heareth Me; and he that despiseth you, despiseth Me; and he that despiseth Me, despiseth Him that sent Me—Luke 10:16.

But when He, the Spirit of Truth, is come, He will teach you all truth. For He shall not speak of Himself, but what things soever He shall hear, He shall speak; and the things that are to come, He shall show you.—John 16:13.

Take heed to yourselves, and to the whole flock, wherein the Holy

Ghost hath placed you bishops, to rule the church of God, which He hath purchased with His own blood—Act 20:28.

Obey your prelates, and be subject to them. For they watch as being to render an account of your souls; that they may do this with joy and not with grief. For this is not expedient for you—Hebr. 13: 17.

We are of God. He that knoweth God, heareth us. He that is not of God, heareth us not. By this we know the spirit of truth and the spirit of error—1 John 4:6.

791577

