

Cath. Ch. - Infallibility  
1041/27

1806

# The Infallibility of The Pope.

A Lecture by Rev. Peter C. Yorke.



San Francisco:  
Catholic Truth Society

## CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY.



The Catholic Truth Society is an association established for the purpose of spreading the truth about the Catholic Church by means of literature and lectures. Catholic literature in popular form is the most powerful means of spreading Catholic truth. The general public will not read long and exhaustive treatises on religious questions, but brief, well-written pamphlets will rarely fail to interest and instruct. The Truth Society aims at popularizing Catholic literature. It publishes numerous pamphlets on every phase of Catholic thought and it furnishes them at nominal cost. All interested in the dissemination of Catholic truth are invited to lend their aid in the circulation of these publications. It is our duty, as Catholics, to assist in spreading and defending Catholic truth. Copies of the publications of the Society are mailed regularly to members. Any person may become a member by paying an annual fee of one dollar.

# The Infallibility of The Pope.

---

**A Lecture.**

---

**By Rev. Peter C. Yorke.**

---

The subject of my lecture is "The Infallibility of the Pope." Like all the dogmas of the Catholic Church, this one has been misrepresented. Indeed, there are few non-Catholics who have correct ideas of what it means. My object to-night will be to explain the doctrine as fully as I can, to set before you the chief reasons which support it, and to consider its bearings on that allegiance which we owe the Republic, and which we give in as full measure and as freely and unreservedly as any other denomination in the land.

## A Witness to Truth.

Many of you ladies and gentlemen remember the outcry which was made, over a quarter of a century ago, when it was proposed in the Vatican Council to define the doctrine of Papal infallibility. The wise men of the period prophesied all kinds of trouble; but the Church was not afraid. Those who are familiar with her history know of her splendid courage. She believes that she possesses the truth, and she is not

afraid to say what the truth is. From the earliest times, when questions arose about the extent of dogmas, and about their relations one to another, or to human science; when men and nations were divided in opinion, then the Church spoke. It did not matter that heretics shook the dust from their feet and went out from her. It did not matter that whole nations threw off her yoke and settled into schism. It did not matter that emperors and kings smote the chief pastor and harassed the flock. Like a mother her soul yearned after her rebellious children, and her heart was sore for the faithful slain before her eyes. Still she could not keep silent. She has been set for a sign and a testimony unto the truth, and speak she must. Greater than princes, kings, nations—aye, greater than the blood of her bravest and her best, is that of which she is the witness—the truth of the living God.

### The Results of Protest.

And so in our generation when the need arose she proclaimed the truth as it is in Christ Jesus. The need came from the logical development of thought since the Reformation. You know that in the sixteenth century the reformers went out of the Catholic Church to found churches of their own. They appealed to the Bible as the sole and supreme judge in matters of religion, and rejected the authority of the Pope. You all know too, what the result was. They divided into numerous sects, each heartily hating the other and united only in their common hostility to Rome. As long as the chief Protestant churches were State churches and were protected by law, and as long as conformity with their teachings were enforced by fines, imprisonment, stripes and death, a certain permanency was assured them. But during this nineteenth century the old penal laws have been repealed. The bond between Church and State has grown much weaker, and, as a consequence, Protestantism has had full scope to go to its logical extreme. At first it protested against the Church, then it protested

against the Bible, soon it protested against Christ, and finally it protested against God. I do not say these things to offend the feelings of Protestants or to imply that all Protestants reject the Bible, or Christ or God. I merely wish to draw your attention to the fact that the original protest against the Church has produced all these other protests; that the result of the Protestant Reformation was a divided Christendom. Each of the reformers appealed to the Bible as the sole rule of faith and proclaimed the principle of private judgment, and of course each of them had his own opinion about religion, and the result was that sect after sect sprang up all over Europe, each claiming to be the true sect and each anathematizing all the others. It is a very peculiar thing that, though all the Protestant churches believe in the right of private judgment, believe that a man should have an open Bible and that he should search it diligently, and that it is lawful for him to draw his own conclusions therefrom—it is a very peculiar thing that very few of the churches carry out their belief in practice. Thus you know that when a very estimable lady of this city was in Calvary Presbyterian church, and from her study of the Bible and the assistance of prayer came to the conclusion that infant damnation was a doctrine to which she could not subscribe, they tried her for heresy and she had to leave that church. You know that in all of the other churches as soon as any man puts his principles into action and takes his Bible, studies it carefully and arrives at a conclusion different from that which is laid down in the creeds of the church, they immediately try him for heresy and if he does not want to go out, he is made to go out.

### Indifference.

Now, the result of all this has been what is commonly called indifference. Men—sensible men—who have made a success in business and who think for themselves, look upon all these churches, each one

contradicting the other, each one intolerant of the other, and come to the conclusion that either they are all false or that one religion is as good as another. No other country in the world has shown this tendency to a greater extent than our own, for though we have here 65,000,000 of people who should all be either Catholics or Protestants, 45,000,000 of them do not pretend to belong to any church. But, by the last census, there are only 20,000,000 church members in these United States, and of these 20,000,000 half are Catholics. So when it comes down to an examination of what has been the result of private judgment and an open Bible, we find that out of a population, say of 50,000,000, who should be Protestant by descent or by training, only 10,000,000 of them believe in the dogmas or in the churches of their fathers.

#### Loss of Idea of Revelation.

I need not dwell upon the practical result of this. It is the perfectly natural man who thinks that religion is all very good in its way, but that after all it is merely a human opinion. It is something that has grown up in the course of time, without any sanction behind it except perhaps the personality of the person who preaches it and his eloquence which is successful in drawing crowds. As a matter of fact, all over the United States to-day—and what is true of the United States is true in a great measure of Europe—the old idea of revelation, the old idea of religion is practically dead. The old idea of religion as a message from God to man has faded out of men's hearts. Men seem to have forgotten all about it in the strife for success, or in the babble of confusing voices; that old word which worked wonders in the days of yore, which moved strong men's hearts to endure all things for the sake of the faith, that word which swayed princes and kings is no longer heard, "Thus saith the Lord."

### St. Peter's Office.

It was to meet this widespread idea that religion was nothing but a matter of human speculation, and that there was no speaking of God to man, that the Vatican Council was called some twenty-five years ago. As I told you, the Church is the witness to the truth. Peter's rock stands out as it were a watch-tower, and from it the sentinel looks out over all the world. His eyes are keen and he is wise with the wisdom of nineteen hundred years. He looks out upon the race of men, like a vast ocean all around him, heaving and tossing under the contrary winds. He knows which way the current sets. He knows what is needful for the times, and so it was that when in our generation he saw the tide of indifferentism threatening to sweep thousands—aye, millions—away from the faith, he lifted up his voice and warned the world against this tendency. It was nothing to him that the world loved its own. It was nothing to him that the world had made an idol of this indifferentism. It was nothing to him that a thousand contradictory voices rose up against him. He was set upon the watch tower to do God's work, and he would do it although he should die as forty of his predecessors died before him.

### The Vatican Council.

So, though the clouds hung dark over all Europe, though Prussia had gathered her armies upon the frontiers of France; though the Spanish nation was in a chronic revolution; though Italy had rebelled against him who had saved Italy in the days of old; though there seemed to be no help from man, he whose strength is in the hands of the Almighty was not timorous of heart. From the East and from the West, from Europe, Asia, Africa, America and the isles of the sea he called the successors of the Apostles. Seven or eight hundred Bishops gathered around him. They spoke with the wisdom of the Holy Ghost, and they declared that it had seemed good to them and to that

same Holy Ghost to proclaim to the world that there was a revelation; that there was a speaking from God to man; that that revelation was true, and that that revelation was infallible.

### What is Revelation.

Let me explain, for a moment, what is meant by revelation. You know that from the earliest times men's minds have been occupied with the question, "What is truth?" You remember in the Passion of our Lord, where Pilate spoke to Him and said, "What is truth?" and he did not wait for an answer. It has been the same with all men from the beginning. They have asked, "What is truth?" and in their hurry to give a reply, they have missed the answer. We are, in this world, something like men sitting in a hall or a room. You hear from the outside sounds. Sometimes, as now, it is the tinkling of a bell. You hear various noises coming to your ears. You ask yourselves what causes these noises? Some of you may say, "It is a street car." Some of you may think it is a peddler; some of you may give some other reason, each one fashioning to himself, from what his senses tell him, what he considers the best explanation of these noises that come to his ears.

While you may be debating here with one another as to what these noises really mean, and what causes them, someone who has been outside, and who has seen what has caused these noises, may come from the outside into this hall and inform you of it.

In the first case, that is to say, when you used your own minds and your own conjectures to describe and to explain these noises, you are said to reason.

In the second case, when the man comes in and gives you on his authority the explanation of these noises, you are said to believe.

One is reason; the other is faith.

### Messengers of Revelation.

If, while you are in this hall, and cannot get out,



these noises continue; and one side of the audience believes there is one cause for them, and the other side believes there is another, two men come before you and both of them say that they have been outside and that they know the real cause of the noise, and one says it is one thing and the other says it is another, your explanation immediately will be that either or both are telling what is not true, or that one of them is mistaken. The two of them cannot be true at the same time. If one says the ringing of the bell is caused by a street car, and the other says it is caused by a peddler, it is quite possible that both of them may be false. But it cannot be possible that the two of them can be true. So, therefore, when anyone comes to you and asks for your belief, and asks for your faith, and demands that you believe him concerning what he has seen in some other place, the first thing you must require of him is that his tale be consistent. He cannot tell one story to one side of the house and another story to another side of the house. His message must be one, and his message must be of such a nature that it is consistent in itself. Moreover, you can generally tell from your reason, not exactly what may be the cause of the noise, but you may tell something of the nature of the noise. For instance, we are listening to something now like the tinkling of a bell. If a man said to you from this platform that the noise was caused by somebody blowing a horn you would not believe him. You would say, "The nature of the noise is not such as to be caused by a horn. Whatever it is caused by, the proximate cause of it is a bell."

So, when a man comes and tells you about religion, or about anything else, and asks you for your belief, another condition you must put upon him is that his story be reasonable. It may not be necessary for your reason to pick out every step in the process. It is not necessary for you to be able to prove everything by your senses; but you must insist that whatever is told you must not be contrary to reason.

### Human Faith.

In this world we are shut in as an audience in this hall. We are each of us imprisoned within our five senses. We only come in contact with exterior things through touch, sight, hearing, taste and smell. We have no other means of knowing, except what we learn from word of mouth on the authority of others. By the senses we know very many things. By belief we know still more things.

Some people imagine that it is irrational to believe. They say that faith is against reason; that it does not become the dignity of a rational man to give credence to anyone else. Yet how could we exist unless we gave credence to others? How many of you would be present in this hall this evening if you did not believe others? How many of you would be able to go about your daily work unless you put faith in others? For instance, there are thousands of things which we have never seen, and yet we believe. Many of us have not seen a land called Australia, yet we firmly believe that it exists. Very few of us have ever seen the Transvaal, yet we hear of it every day and we have not the slightest doubt in our minds that there is such a place, and a very difficult place too. So, as a matter of fact, we have to take it for granted that belief, that the giving credence to others, is not against reason, but is part of that very reason itself.

### God and Man.

When we come to religion we find, as I said, that we are inclosed in this world as this audience is in this hall. We have no direct communication with God. No man has ever seen Him. Man cannot look on Him and live, but though we are poor, miserable creatures whose days are few and full of trouble, still we have thoughts and desires after God. We are like the tree in the old fable, whose roots were in the earth reaching down even to hell, but whose head was in the heavens. We have desires and aspirations in us which go above this mortal, this earthly sphere.

We wish to know about God. We wish to learn of Him, and we desire to hear His truth.

So, from the beginning, just as you may have been speculating here on the cause of noises and sounds that occurred in the street, mankind has been speculating about the things that are beyond the sky. Many think sometimes that we are far from God. But, ladies and gentlemen, the more we meditate, the more we look on nature, the more we gaze on the sky, which is the work of His hands, the nearer and the closer we feel God to be to us. He is not, as it were, a far-away God. We cannot look on the things which His hands have made, and not feel that He is directing them and preserving them. Our very reason teaches us of these things, and from the things which He made, and which show forth His glory, we try to fathom out what manner of God He is.

And I say, from the beginning, there have been various opinions among men. Some have confounded Him with His works. Some have made statues and images of Him, and have fallen down and adored them. Some have deified the sun and moon and the host of heaven. Some of them have explained God almost out of existence, yet, no matter how they dealt with Him, all of them recognize that there was something beyond this earth, something above us, something outside of us, something that has made us, and something to which, in the long run, we must come and give an account.

### Is there a Revelation?

Now, the question arises, has that God ever spoken to man? Has He ever sent any one from the beyond who knows what God is, and who knows how to explain Him, and how to tell of His truths; to make a revelation, to draw aside the veil, to make, as it were, the walls transparent, so that we should see what causes all those sounds beyond? Has any one ever come to reveal God to us?

Ladies and gentlemen, you know that Christianity

claims to be a revelation. You know that Christianity claims to be the truth, not made up by human reason, but the truth as it was sent from God to man; that that truth was sent by a messenger, namely, Jesus Christ; that He came and gave proof of the divinity of His message, and that, therefore, we believe that this message came really and truly from the beyond, was really and truly a communication from God to man, a revealing of Himself and the telling of the truth which He wished us to believe. It is not necessary for my argument to enter upon the proof of this. I am speaking now to Christians, those who believe that Christ was not a mere humanly inspired seer, but that He was a prophet, that He was sent by God, and that God gave Him credentials to prove that His message was a true one. It would be another lecture and another subject altogether to prove to those who do not believe in the divine mission of Christ, that He was divinely sent, and that His miracles put the seal of God's testimony on the truth of His Holy Word.

### Christ's Message.

But supposing that Christ's message comes really from God, let us consider for a few moments what must be the meaning of that message. In the first place, that message must be one. Just as the person who comes in from the street and purports to tell you what is happening on the outside must be consistent, so you must demand that the revelation which comes from the beyond which comes from God, must be one. It must be the same yesterday, to-day, and forever. It must be the same for all classes of men. It must be the same for the white man and the black, for the yellow man and the red. It must be the same for prince and for peasant, for rich and for poor. If it is true, if it is God's truth, it must be immutable and it must be one.

### The Certainty of Revelation.

This revelation must also be certain. If it is a

message from God, we are bound to obey it. I don't suppose there is any sensible man who thinks of standing on his rights as against God. God made him and He gave him human reason, and as long as revelation comes up to the requirements of that human reason, and as long as God makes it manifest to any man that He speaks, then that man must believe. He is bound to believe, just as the child is bound to believe its parent when that parent tells it anything. So man is bound to believe God, because God can speak nothing but truth, and because God has power to command.

### The Infallibility of Revelation.

Now, if revelation comes to us with a claim on our belief, that revelation must have never erred, because if it could err, if the messenger whom God sent could corrupt that revelation, could change its terms, and could say what was not true, then we would be bound by God's authority to believe a lie. God cannot do this. God is infinite truth. God cannot command us to do what is wrong. Therefore, if God sends revelation with the command that it is to be believed, that revelation must always, at all times and under all circumstances be absolutely and unqualifiedly true.

Hence if God has appointed anybody of men, or has appointed any man, to be the mouthpiece of that revelation, to be His messenger, as it were, between Himself and mankind, that messenger must be infallible. If he makes a mistake, if he can corrupt the message, then it is no longer God's revelation. And if it is not God's revelation, then the authority of God is invoked a second time to protect and diffuse a lie.

### The Church.

Now, let us come and ask ourselves whether there is such a revelation? All Christians say there is. All Christians say that this revelation was made by Christ, and that it is held now in some way in Christendom and that we have in various shapes and forms a mes-

sage from God. You will remark, in the first place, that Christendom is divided into two great parts. You have first the Catholic Church, and then you have the various Protestant denominations. Now, notice. Outside of the Catholic Church there is not a single denomination that claims infallibility. Each one of them claims to have a revelation, each one of them claims to have the message from God to man, each one claims to be the sole depository of that revelation, yet not a single one of them claims that that revelation is infallible. If they are not infallible, if they make a mistake, what is the use of a revelation; if a man can corrupt God's word and still claim belief for it, what is the use of God speaking at all? Are we to think that He spoke nineteen hundred years ago and then that His voice has been dead ever since? Are we to think that He spoke in order that His gracious purpose might be defeated? Are we to think that He sent His Son upon earth in order that, when that Son should go back to sit at His right hand in glory, the work which He came to build up should be torn down and scattered abroad? Surely human reason will not consent to such a supposition. We believe that it is reasonable to suppose that God has spoken, and we believe it reasonable, on the other hand, to suppose that God has never spoken at all. But it is not reasonable to suppose that God, having spoken; was not able to preserve His own word intact.

If there is a revelation, that revelation must be in the hands of some infallible authority. Now, let us see if Christ, during His mortal life, appointed any one to guard His revelation and to act as its mouth-piece.

You will remember, both in reading the Scripture and in hearing it read, that Christ came to found a Church. He speaks of that Church as a kingdom. He speaks of it as a sheepfold. He speaks of it as a city. He speaks of it in various other ways, all of which imply that it was to be some kind of a society. You know that He was not to remain always upon

earth. His mission ended in thirty-three years. He did not leave the small kingdom in which He was born and in which His work was done. Therefore, if He was to teach God's message to men, and if He was to bring God's truth to all men (and if it be for one man it must be for all men), He could only do it by means of some society or some organization which would carry on the work when He had returned to His Father.

### The Apostles.

We find that the three years of His ministry, the three years of His public life, were occupied almost entirely in founding this society. He gathered twelve poor fishermen together. He brought them around with Him, He trained them; and those who are familiar with the Scriptures know how difficult it was to train them. They were poor, they were ignorant, they were filled up with all kinds of ideas about what Christ was to do. And so, for the time, instead of listening to His instructions, instead of trying to reach those who were outside, they were asking Him to call down fire from heaven to burn them up, because they would not listen to them, or they were quarreling among themselves for the good places.

We read of this in the Sacred Scripture, and we read that our Lord, no less than four or five times, was compelled to rebuke them; and He even took a little child and put it in their midst, and said to them: "Unless you become as a child, a little child, you cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven." But the example did not seem to have much effect upon them, because the next day we find them going up and asking Him who will be the greatest in the kingdom of heaven.

### The Hierarchy.

Now, mark the answer. Christ does not say to them there will be no greatest in the kingdom of heaven. If He had wished to stop their quarreling he

could have said at once, "In the kingdom of heaven you are all equal." But He did not say, "In the kingdom of heaven you are all equal;" but again He took a little child, and said to them: "He that would become the greatest in the kingdom of heaven, let him become as this little child."

Then you remember the incident of the two sons of Zebedee. They received no satisfaction from our Lord in asking who would be the greatest in the kingdom of heaven; so they got their mother to go and say to our Lord, to ask Him plain and outright, that one should sit on His right hand and the other on His left hand.

Our Lord in reply did not say, "No one shall sit at My right hand," or "No one shall sit at My left hand," but He said: "To sit at My right hand or my left hand is not Mine to give, but it is his to whom the Father hath given it." Which shows that in this kingdom which was to be founded Christ meant that there were to be officers and dignities, and that some of them should sit at His right hand, just as the Viceroy and Prime Ministers sat at the right hands of the great Kings of the East, but that such honor was not given by self-presumption, but was given to him for whom the Father hath reserved it in the eternal decrees of His all-wise providence.

### The Duties of the Chiefs.

The last time we find the Apostles quarreling about place and power was at the last supper. Even in the very supper room of our Lord, St. Luke tells us that a contention arose among them which of them should be the greater. An incident happened a little while before, the true meaning of which they did not know, but they were talking with one another about it. There were two persons in the company to whom our Lord seemed especially attached. One of them was John, the beloved disciple, who lay upon His breast at the last supper; and the other was St. Peter. And the query arose among the Apostles as to which should be the greater. And again Christ rebuked them. He



did not tell them that none among them should be the greater. He said to them: "Let him who is great among you be as your servant." He was the greatest of them all; everyone admits that. Our Lord, Who founded the Apostleship, was greater than any Apostle. He calls their attention to His own example. A few moments before, He had gone around the room and with a towel girded around His waist He had knelt down and washed the feet of the Apostles. And then, when they began to quarrel, He said: "Let him that is greater among you act as the minister; let him who is chief among you become as one who serves." "I came among you," He said, "not to be ministered unto, but to minister. I am the Christ. I am your Chief. I am your Master. Yet I have given you an example of humility, so that in the days to come he that is greatest among you must have the heart of a little child, and must have the humble will and disposition to serve his brethren even in the most menial office."

It is very singular how men can pervert this incident, and try to make a proof out of it that Christ meant that there were to be no officers or dignitaries in His Church. The whole significance of the incident depends upon the fact that there were to be officers and that there were to be dignitaries. It would require very little humility to be a minister where all are equal. But it requires a great deal of humility for a man who has been set on a pinnacle of authority to come down and be as a little child.

#### St. Peter's Exaltation.

But the incident is not closed yet. After telling them the disposition they really should have, Christ turns to St. Peter, and He says: "Simon, Simon! Satan hath desired you, hath got you by asking from God, that he might sift you as wheat in the winnowing." He meant that the hour was at hand when the powers of darkness should have their sway, and when He should die for the salvation of the world.

He meant that in that hour His little Church was not to be spared, that Satan had asked it from God, and that God, for His own inscrutable reasons, had given them into his hands, in order that cowardice and terror might fill their hearts and they might betray their Master and flee away.

But Christ continued: "But I have prayed"—He did not say "for you" "for all the Apostles"—He said, "but I have prayed for thee, Simon Peter. I have prayed for thee, that thy faith may not fail, and when thou art converted, do thou make strong thy brethren"—the brethren who a few minutes before had been quarreling about who was to be the greatest; they had been asking one another who was to be the chief of the kingdom of God. This was Christ's answer: They were the men who would follow the Master even to death; they had promised to die for Him, and in their presumption they were already dividing the spoils of the kingdom. And Christ tells them: You are all in the hands of Satan, and in a few hours he will sift you, just as the wheat is sifted in the winnowing. But there is one of you, one out of the eleven, for whom I have prayed, and whose faith shall never fail and who will have the making of you boasters and braggarts strong again when the stress and storm are past. That one, ladies and gentlemen, that one who had to rally the routed army of Christ, that one who was given authority to renew the faith in the hearts of the disciples, that one who was thus set before them all, was Simon Peter, the Prince of the Apostles.

### The Great Confession.

This is not the first time that Christ had spoken to them in such a manner. While He was still in Galilee, before He had come down to Jerusalem, He retired to the foot of Mount Hermon, and there gathered His Apostles around Him. You know that when Christ established this little society, He did not reveal Himself fully at once. He did not tell immediately who

He was or what His purpose was on earth. He let it sink into their minds little by little, and He allowed them to find out as much as they could for themselves. They were poor men, ignorant men, uneducated men, illiterate men, and He had to teach them very slowly.

So it came to pass that near the close of His earthly mission He was at the foot of Mount Hermon. Rumors had been going around the country about Him. At that time, as you know, the Jews were subject to Rome, and they were not willing subjects. They were always patriotic, always loved the glories of the house of David, and were always looking forward to the time when the Son of David should come and revive those glories. As a result they were restless under Roman domination, and they had prophets rising up here and there, and leading them on to fruitless rebellions and attacks upon the Roman power.

So when Christ passed from Galilee, men asked, "Who is He?" And some of them said that He was John the Baptist, others said He was Elias, and others still said He was Jeremias, the prophet. The popular belief was that these prophets were to return and precede the Messiah, or the Christ, who was to lead them on to victory.

So, when Christ gathered His disciples about Him, and some men had said that it was Jeremias, and some that it was Elias, and others still that it was John the Baptist, or others of the prophets, He asked them, "Who do you say that I am?" And Simon Petr answered and said: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." It had dawned upon his mind that he was dealing not with a mere man. It had dawned upon him that the day had come at last, the long expected day of the nations, when the heavens were to open, and the Son of God was to come down upon earth. He had pierced through the outer vesture; He had pierced through the veil of flesh; He had pierced through the human guise that hid the Godhead, and he declared in his new-born faith: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God."

### The Great Promise.

Then our Lord said to him: "Blessed art thou, Simon, son of Jonas, because flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but My Father, who is in heaven. And I say unto thee that thou art the rock, and upon this rock will I build My church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And to thee will I give the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth shall be bound also in heaven."

If we are to believe that our Lord was serious that He came on earth with a serious purpose to fulfill, we must believe that these words mean something. If they mean nothing at all, if they are mere compliments, as it were, passed between our Blessed Lord and Saint Peter, then they were the most misleading words that ever have been penned by man.

Let us see what they imply: They imply that Christ was about to build this church; that is to say, that He was about to found a society. That society was to carry on His work when He was to go. He was going to build that society so strong, so firm, that the very gates of hell should not prevail against it. And how did He intend to make it strong? How did He intend to make it firm? How did He intend to make it so solid that the gates of hell should not prevail against it? Only in one way, just as the good architect does when he wishes to build his house strong and solid and firm—he goes right down to the living rock. And so Christ was to build His church upon a rock, and that rock was Saint Peter.

### The Center of Unity.

Let us remember that the society which Christ established had for its chief object to teach revelation. His chief object in coming to earth was to bring a message from God to us. His main purpose, therefore, in founding this society, was to have an organization which would carry out His message; to have an organization which would be able to say,

“This is what Christ taught.” Now, you understand, that when a human society is founded, especially a society which is to teach a certain set of dogmas, there is always danger of schism and division. Men begin to inquire, and to speculate, and to compare, and the result is that some of them get one idea about the truth and some of them get another idea about the truth. And, as a matter of fact, all the old philosophers who founded schools to carry on their work saw—some of them with their own eyes—those schools split up into various sections, and the sections splitting into still smaller sects. It is human nature; it is a thing which is bound to come infallibly from the constitution of man’s mind, that if any society be made the repository of truth, the members of that society are bound to split up and divide on the meaning of the truth.

So, in founding His Church, Christ had to face this difficulty. He had to face the difficulty of leaving His truth in the hands of a body of men and then to provide that these men would not split up into several sections and entirely lose His truth. It was against that He was providing when He spoke of founding His Church upon the rock—a foundation itself that holds the edifice together, a foundation itself which makes the edifice one. If a house is founded upon the solid rock there is no fear of its falling asunder, no matter what winds may blow nor what rains may beat. And so, in order to preserve His Church one, in order to remove it from all occasions for schism and heresy, in order to make it last to the end of time as the depository of His truth, He founded it upon that rock, which is St. Peter and his successors.

### Proved by History.

Now the office of St. Peter and of his successors is to preserve the Church one, by preserving the truth, which Christ gave to the Church, one. You will discover how this is worked out in history. Every sect which has separated from the rock of Peter has

split into still smaller sects. When the reformers began there were only two or three parties among them. To-day, in the United States alone, there are two hundred and forty-two different kinds of Christian religions. There has been only one Church, one community, which has remained one, and which has held the truth; that Church has remained one, and has held the truth simply because it was founded upon the rock, because it is in communion with the See which Peter founded.

I will not dwell longer upon this, as the time is getting late; I will not dwell longer on the historical proofs that Peter, as the head of the Church and the rock upon which the Church was built, had successors, and that these successors were the reigning Pontiffs. I come now to that feature of the Pope as the successor of St. Peter, which is intimately connected with this fact of teaching revelation.

### The Pope's Infallibility.

Let me run back for a moment. You remember I said to you that revelation was God's explanation to man of the things that be; that the explanation as coming from God must be one, must be true. Now, if God appointed a mouthpiece of that revelation, if He appointed any one to guard it—and He has appointed it in His Church and in the head of the Church—then that person must be infallible. If the Pope as the guardian of revelation, and as the authentic mouthpiece of revelation could, when proclaiming that revelation speak an untruth, then the gates of hell would have prevailed against the rock of Peter.

I do not know any more signal victory which the powers of evil could have achieved than if thousands, millions of men believed, as they do believe, that God has appointed (as He has appointed) the Pontif to be the guardian and depository of revelation, and the Pontiff in proclaiming that revelation could lead these millions of men astray, then Satan hath prevailed

against God, and Christ's good purpose has come to naught.

But we cannot believe this, and, therefore, we hold as a necessary consequence of the idea of revelation, as a truth that common sense itself demands that if there is a revelation, and if that revelation is in the Catholic Church, if the Pope is the head of the Church with authority to speak, then that Pope, when he so speaks, must be infallible.

### **Infallability not Impeccability.**

From this you will see at once that infallibility does not mean that the Pope never sins. When some good people hear about infallibility, their hair stands up on end at once, and they bring up a list of this Pope and the other Pope that was a bad man, they say; and they say; "How could these people be infallible?" There is only one answer to it. The Pope is a man like unto other men. We have had some two hundred and fifty Popes. There were twelve Apostles, and one of them was a traitor. Can we expect that there should be less among the Popes? There were seven deacons, and one of them was a very bad man. Shall we be surprised if we find three or four among the Popes? They can find (we admit it with sorrow) men among the Popes who were unworthy of their sacred office. But through nineteen hundred years they can count them all on the fingers of one hand.

### **The Bad Popes.**

Our separated brethren are fond of, as it is commonly said, rubbing this into us. They think they have a good point to make against the old Church when they talk of this one and the other one who was not a credit to his station. But let us remember this: When the time comes that a Methodist Bishop, or a Presbyterian preacher, or a Congregational pastor shall have as much power as the Pope of Rome, when they shall be kings over a certain territory, and when they shall have the whole world believing that they

are the vicars of Jesus Christ; when things come to this condition, and when bishops or pastors or Presbyterians come through as unscathed as the Popes have, then they may have reason to talk. Those men who speak of the Popes do not seem to realize in those far-off days, when a few Popes were bad, all the terrible temptation that was thrown in their way. And when to-day we find those men who are so anxious to make out that the Popes were not angels, when we find themselves not proving their angelic nature; we can say to them, in homely phrase, "It is not good to holler until you are out of the woods."

#### The Case of David.

But anyhow, the doctrine of infallibility has nothing whatsoever to do with the person and character of the Pontiff. But men may say, "Can it be possible that Almighty God will make a man, a bad man, the channel of His infallibility?" God's ways are very mysterious. Who are we that we shall say that He should do this and He should not do that? Anyhow, people who believe in the inspiration of the Bible have no right to taunt Catholics with this argument, because we must remember that the man who composed most of the Psalms, the sweet singer of Israel, was King David, whose words are looked upon as the word of God, as His inspired word—His infallible word. When we find that David stole his friend's wife and then murdered his friend; when we find that he was a robber and adulterer, we can say, "When you prove that God did not use David as the channel of His inspiration, it will be time enough to talk about God not using bad Popes as the channel of His infallibility."

#### Infallibility not Inspiration.

Infallibility does not mean inspiration. By inspiration we mean much the same as revelation. It means that God inspired the man with thoughts and with ideas which are the thoughts and the ideas of God,



and that in that state he may speak these thoughts and ideas, or he may write them down, and thus spoken or written, they are God's words.

Now, we do not believe when the Pope speaks infallibly he is inspired by God. We do not believe that God puts in his mind thoughts or ideas which He has to speak. Infallibility is not inspiration. Infallibility simply means the power of not failing, the power of not saying that this is the truth when it is not the truth. Infallibility, to come down to the last analysis, means simply this: That when the Pope says that a certain doctrine has been revealed already by Jesus Christ, when he declares that doctrine to the whole Church, then we believe that God protects him so that he cannot make a mistake. He deals with a question of fact. The question of fact comes before him in this shape: Is it true that Christ said so and so? Is it true that Christ told the Church to teach this doctrine? We believe that when the Pope says, "Yes, it is true that Christ told the Church to teach that doctrine," the Pope cannot make a mistake; because, if he could make a mistake and say to the whole world in the plenitude of his authority as the representative of Christ, and as the governing power of the whole Church, "Christ taught this," when really He did not teach it, would it not be true then that Christ's revelation had failed, and that power which He placed in His Church to save it from error had, "de facto," led into error.

If the Pope is not infallible when he thus speaks, then the idea of a revelation is completely lost. And it is in this sense and in this sense only, to preserve the certainty of revelation that we hold that the Pope is infallible.

### "Ex Cathedra."

Now, there is another thing that we must remember: The Pope is not always infallible. For instance, the Supreme Court of this State, or of this country, is made up of men. When they give their opinion on a

point of law, their opinion is conclusive. But it does not follow from this that all their opinions are judgments. It does not follow that all the opinions they give cannot be reviewed. For instance they may utter very many opinions when they are reading the morning paper at breakfast, but nobody thinks of putting down those opinions as decisions of the Supreme Court. They may write letters to their friends. They may even have the misfortune of writing a book, and some of them may write a historical book. But that does not prove that what they say in that letter or in that book is not subject to revision. There is only one writer of a book who is infallible; there is only one writer whose opinions, no matter what they are, are not subject to revision, and that is the writer who makes it a point to pitch into the Pope of Rome.

So the Pope in his ordinary character as a man, or in his ordinary character as a scholar, may give vent to opinions—even on theological questions—may put them down in books, may even write them in letters and send them here and there. It does not follow that these opinions are infallible. He can make a mistake in them, just as any other man can, and many of the Popes have made mistakes in this way. But when the Pope acts as Supreme Court, when he speaks, as they say, “*ex cathedra*”—which means when he speaks “from the chair,” or, as they say in the Supreme Court, “from the bench,” when he speaks as the teacher of Christendom, and speaks for faith and morality, then, and then only, it is that he is infallible.

### Not Science.

Another point we must remember, that our blessed Lord did not come on earth to teach, for instance, the spelling book. He did not come on earth to teach science. He did not come on earth to give a new theory of political government. He came on earth to teach religion, and He Himself says that we should give to Cæsar what is Cæsar’s, and that we should give to God what is God’s. Therefore, when the Pope speaks

infallibly his subject must not be any of those things about which Christ has given no revelation. He may be as fallible in his spelling as some of his opponents. If he wants to he may even spell phonetically, and his attribute of infallibility is not touched thereby.

He may give false opinions about the sciences. He may teach, for instance, that the earth is flat, or that the sun moves around it; and still that has nothing to do with his infallibility. Christ has not promised any assistance in the teaching of science; and, therefore, when the Pope teaches science he does it like any other ordinary man, and his opinion is just as much open to criticism and correction as that of any other man.

But when he speaks as the supreme teacher of Christendom, and defines the matter of faith and morals, that there is something which we should believe and something which God tells us should be done, then, in order to preserve the unity and the purity and the identity of Christ's revelation, we can then believe, and common sense backs us up in our belief, that the Pope should be infallible.

There is one other point that I want to touch upon, but I am afraid I have kept you too long already.

### Civil Allegiance.

Twenty-five years ago, when the Pope had defined this doctrine of infallibility, you remember, a great hubbub was raised that Catholics could not be loyal citizens. Some of the politicians, for aims of their own—for they always have aims of their own—got it into their heads that it would be a splendid cry to go to the country with, that Catholics were divided in their allegiance, and that they were divided through this wicked old Pope of Rome, who wanted them to bow down before him and believe that every word he said was true. They gravely told the people: "The Pope is now declared infallible. Therefore, whenever the Pope says 'Boo!' all the Catholics have to hide their heads. They have no longer any free will of

their own. They can no longer have an opinion about politics or science or anything else; the Pope does all their thinking for them. They may rent out their brains to Protestant scholars. They have no further use for them, because now Rome will simply say to them, 'Do this,' and they will have to do it."

I am sorry to say that this idea of Papal infallibility is not yet extinct. There are a great many people who cling to it, though perhaps in another form. Their idea—and I have heard it expressed by men who are supposed to be men of light and leading—is that all Catholics have, as it were, wires attached to them, and that when the Pope, and especially the Jesuits, begin to pull these wires the Catholics must jump as these wires are pulled. This is a common idea about the doctrine of infallibility.

Let me say right here that twenty-five years ago the great Cardinal Manning, the friend of the poor, the friend of the workingman telegraphed across to America, when a pamphlet was brought out attacking the loyalty of Catholics. His words were: "The civil allegiance of Catholics is the same after the definition of infallibility as it was before it. And the civil allegiance of Catholics is as undivided as the civil allegiance of any other body of men."

Now let me ask, in the name of common sense, what connection can there be between our civil allegiance and the fact that the Pope can say that Christ revealed this or revealed that? Every man who believes in the Bible, believes that the words of Christ are infallible. He believes that they are the very words that Christ spoke. Would any one be so foolish as to say that a man who goes to his Bible and believes in the infallibility of the words contained there, must be a bad citizen? And what more do we say the Pope can do? He can merely say what Christ has already said. And if, in nineteen hundred years, the words of Christ have gone out to the world and have been as a fruitful seed falling into the furrows of time, so that men and nations have sprung up there-

from all free, all independent, all working out their own destiny without interference, from His word and from His gospel, are we to say that in these later days that gospel is to destroy the people?

### Authority and Infallibility.

There are two things which non-Catholics always confound, and that is the authority of the Pope with the infallibility of the Pope. We believe that, besides being the guardian of revelation, the Pope is head of the Church. He has authority in spiritual matters. He has not, by the commission of Christ, the smallest shred or tatter of temporal authority. No matter how many quotations men may bring from the middle ages, and no matter how they may season them and salt them and no spice them to suit modern taste, it cannot be proved that it was ever taught as a doctrine of the Catholic Church that the Pope had temporal authority over temporal things. The very men whom modern scholarship digs out of their graves and wires their bones together as a bogie man to frighten the American people—those very men wrote with their own hands and with their almost inspired pens that the power of the Pope was purely a spiritual power. This authority, this spiritual authority of the Pope we believe we are bound to obey. We believe that he is to the whole world what the Bishop is to his diocese. You never yet saw a society that did not have some kind of a government. If five or six men unite for any purpose they have to elect a head, and they must have by-laws, and they must have some one to enforce those by-laws.

So in the Catholic Church we have the Pope as the Supreme governor, who oversees all things connected with the Church, and it is his care that all things should go well in the Church. Then we have under him the Bishops who are in the various dioceses over which they are placed what the Pope is to the world. We believe that when the Pope speaks and directs **that this should be done and that should be done and**

the other should be done in spiritual affairs, that it is our duty to obey him. But at the same time, we never think of saying that he never makes a mistake in those matters. He is not infallible in his acts; he is not infallible in his deeds; he is not infallible in his policy. He has prudence—a prudence supernatural—a prudence which has been the wonder of the whole world; but he may make mistakes in his public policy. And, though you find Catholics obeying him, and obeying him readily, you find that they also retain their Christian liberty to protest. And I am greatly afraid that if some of these people who imagine that the Pope does nothing but sit up in the dome of St. Peter's in Rome and pull all the strings, were sitting in his place for a half hour, and had to deal with the children of the Church, using their Christian liberty of saying what they think, that they would not find it a very easy position.

So, therefore, if the Pope tells us to do this or tells us to do that we have always, of course to receive his commands with reverence, and with respect, just as a dutiful child will receive the commands of his father. But there is one thing, and the Catholic Church guards it and will guard it to the very end. That between God and a man's conscience neither Pope nor priest nor king can come.

### Conscience.

God gave us our reason to tell us, to interpret to us His divine laws, both natural and revealed. And if at any time that reason, that conscience tells us that some command given to us is wrong and should not be done, it does not matter who gives the command, we should not do it. And if our conscience tells us that a certain line of action is the right one, and that it is incumbent upon us to carry it out, even though that line carries us straight from the Pope, if we do not do it we shall suffer damnation.

The Catholic theory of conscience is the only theory which is compatible with free men. There are some

who would deliver us, bound hand and foot, to the State. What is the State? State means condition, and there are all sorts and kinds of conditions. These United States form a State. Turkey is a State. Armenia is a State, and a sad state, too. Those men who speak about the rights of the State are very careful not to define what the State means. And one of them has said that if the State should prohibit him from paying his worship to Almighty God he would meekly close up his hands together, cast down his eyes and retire into his closet.

Therefore, when the State in Turkey goes out into the mountains and slaughters the unfortunate Christians because they are Christians we are wrong in raising the voice of indignation. The business of these Armenians is to fold their hands and cast down their eyes and bend their necks so that the Kurdish horsemen shall ride over them.

Now the Catholic theory of conscience is that a man has the right before God to preserve that conscience inviolate, and, though he be torn limb from limb, and though like the martyrs, he suffer all the agonies of a thousand deaths, it is not lawful for him to basely surrender his reason or to betray the conscience which God gave him into his charge.

### Allegiance.

As I have said, the infallibility of the Pope has absolutely nothing to do with our civil or our temporal allegiance. And I will conclude now by reiterating that neither has the authority of the Pope, that spiritual authority of the Pope, anything to do with our civil or our temporal allegiance either. We are as free and as undivided in that allegiance as is any other class in the community which believes that there is a God above them. And I think that history bears out what I say. For nigh three months men have been endeavoring to find some proof against the loyalty of Catholics and, let me ask you, though they have had one hundred and twenty years of national

existence in this land, have they dared to produce one traitor? If infallibility makes us disloyal, if because we love the Pope we cannot be true to the flag, surely one hundred and twenty years must have brought out at least one Benedict Arnold.

Ah, thank God; no!

### Sheridan and the Parson.

One of those who wrote against the Church and who ransacked his notes which were taken years and years ago, and which have been lying in innocuous desuetude ever since, said if that man, whose name we cannot hear without cheering—that sterling little soldier of whom every Catholic is proud, Phil Sheridan, had been met on that day when he was sweeping down the valley of the Shenandoah by a Catholic priest he might have turned back. I happened to be reading the memoirs of Phil Sheridan, I am a very peaceful man, and like all peaceful men I like to read about battles. I was reading that on that day at Winchester, when Sheridan was riding in full speed to retrieve the battle, he met a clergyman—and it was not a Catholic clergyman either; it was the parson who was chaplain of the regiment, and Sheridan stopped him and asked him where he was going. He did not answer the question, but he said, “Everything will be all right, general, when you get there.” But Sheridan remarks, and very justly, that though his words were very consoling, the parson didn’t stop in his ride for the rear.

As I said if there were anything in our principles or in our teachings which would make us disloyal to this republic they would have brought the proof of it long before this. But from the fact that they have not, from the fact that our record is clean, from the fact that we have no traitor amongst us, I say that men who attack us should think twice before putting their pens to paper. Infallibility, the power of the Pope, only makes us the better citizens. Let us remember that if we have a State at all, if we have a



political existence, if we have civilized governments, if we have liberty, we owe it to the struggle which the old Church made.

You remember that when the barbarians came down from the North and swept out Roman civilization, buried it under the ashes of its noblest monuments, it was then that the Popes rose to the occasion; it was then that they went out and met the barbarian flood, and turned it aside into the paths of peace. They sent out missionaries to teach these wild men of the forest, and to raise them up in the arts of civilized life. There is not a language which we speak that the Church of God did not first put into writing.

There is not an art which flourishes amongst us that has not its beginning in the cloisters. There is not a government nor a liberty of the people for which Popes have not fought to keep intact and for which, in fact, many of them have laid down their lives.

The history of the Papacy is a glorious history. Conjure up to your mind's eye that wonderful procession which stretches back unbroken to the very cradle of empire. A long line and a glorious line they form; strong men, with heads uplifted, many with the red robes which tell of the martyr's death. They have not had wealth or arms to support them, and yet they have guided the destinies of the world. They were but poor bishops left in a decayed capital, yet they lifted Europe out of the dust. To-day a representative of that glorious line sits a captive in his so-called palace, the Vatican, yet almost four hundred millions of hearts beat lovingly for him, and their eyes are turned with affection toward the figure of Leo the Thirteenth.

He sums up, as it were, all that the old Popes have been, and his word has always been lifted up in behalf of the people. Men speak about the difference between the Pope and our American Constitution. Men say that Papal ideas are not in accordance with

our American laws. Yet this Pope, Leo XIII, who desires not favor from any man by speaking untruth, has said publicly to the nations of Europe, "Look at the Constitution of the United States; there is your model."

They tell us that the Papacy is failing. They have specified the hour and the day, and they assure us that this doctrine of infallibility has been the last nail driven in the Pope's coffin. It seems to me otherwise. It seems to me that when we consider the world today how men and women are looking for the truth, earnestly searching for it, tossed about by every wind, tossed about in that unstable sea of human opinion, that it is a glorious thing that they can turn their eyes to the old rock of Peter which rises high and secure above every wave. For two thousand years, almost, it has braved the seas. The gates of hell have surged against it and have surged in vain. The Emperors of Rome tried to sweep it away in a torrent of blood, but Rome went and the old rock remained. The barbarian flood almost overwhelmed it, but that flood settled down around about it, and the rock of Peter rose, more glorious, more imposing than ever before. In our days men's voices and men's pens are lifted up against it, but they cannot prevail against its adamant sides.

The storms of centuries have not shattered it nor scarred it. Are men's words to rend it asunder now? No, ladies and gentlemen; it has been placed by the right of God, it has been placed to outlast all storms, to outlast all time. Its guardian is Peter, upon whose head there are no gray hairs, whose youth is renewed like unto the youth of the eagle, whose feet are as the feet of harts and underneath whom are the everlasting arms of God.

learn 2  
teach 3

go west zone

bring 2  
take 3

oldest 2  
eldest 3

further 2  
further 3

new pair shoes

with women

raise the window

lift

be held on to branch

only also to

to 8 yrs. Jane Pull out

The weight of the skeleton alone  
was 58 lbs

