


# The Relation of Church and State



This is from chapter XIII of a book written in 1941 entitled, "[Our Priceless Heritage Christian Doctrine In Contrast With Romanism](#)" by Henry M. Woods, D.D, LL.D.

---

*What does the Word of God teach concerning the relation of Church and State?*

The Word of God teaches clearly that Christian ministers and people, being citizens, should render all due respect and obedience to rulers and to the laws of the land. Since the spheres of Church and State are wholly different, they should be kept separate and distinct, neither infringing on the sphere of the other. The Church should faithfully discharge its spiritual duties, and not attempt to control the State; and the State should faithfully discharge its civil and political duties, and not attempt to control the Church.

*What Scriptures prove that this is the correct relation?*

Our Lord Jesus Christ's own words: "My Kingdom is not of this world!" Again, "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's." John 18:36, Mark 12:17, Luke 20:25.

Also Matthew 17:24-27, which records that our Lord, although He was King of heaven and earth, yet obeyed the laws and paid tribute to the Roman Emperor.

The apostles also, following Christ's precepts and example, enjoined obedience to the civil government and respect to all rulers.

"Let every soul be subject to the higher powers (i.e., civil rulers) . For there is no power but of God; the powers that be are ordained of God." Rom. 13:1-7, I Tim. 2:1, 2.

“Put them in mind to be subject to principalities and powers, to obey magistrates, to be ready to carry good work.” Titus 3:1.

“Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord’s sake; whether it be to the King as supreme, or unto governors as unto them that are sent by him for the punishment of evil doers, and for the praise of them that do well.”

“Honor all men. Love the brotherhood. Fear God. Honor the King.” I Peter 2:13-17.

### **The Pope’s claims conflict with Scripture, and Deny duty to civil laws and rulers.**

*What is the teaching of the Church of Rome concerning the relation of Church and State?*

The Church of Rome’s teaching is exactly opposite to that of Holy Scripture, and to the practice of the Christian Church for several centuries. Rome holds that the State should be subject to the Church, and that the pope should be supreme over all civil rulers. The Roman Church asserts that “the pope can change kingdoms, take them from one and give them to another, as the sovereign spiritual prince.” “The authority of Kings is of human right, and the clergy are *exempt from their jurisdiction.*” Bellarmine, *De Pontif.*, Rom. 5:2, 6. Boniface VIII, *Bull. Unam. Sanctam.*, Leo XIII, Encyclical Letter *Immortale Dez.*

“The clergy cannot be judged by any secular judge, although they do *not observe the civil laws*, i.e., although they violate the laws of their country! Bellarmine, *De Cleric.*, 1:28: ‘The goods of the clergy as well ecclesiastical as secular, are *free, and ought of good right to be so, from the tribute of secular princes.*’ *De Cleric.*, 1:28.

Note how the papal dogmas directly contradict Christ and the Scriptures. The Church of Rome says:

“The authority of Kings is of human right.” God’s Word declares, “They are *ordained of God.*” Rom. 13:1, 2.

Christ and His apostles paid tribute to the Roman government. The Church of Rome says, that pope and priests ought not to pay tribute.

The popes contradict St. Peter. They say the clergy are “exempt from the jurisdiction of Kings and rulers.” St. Peter enjoins clergy as well as laity, “Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord’s sake”; both to Kings and to governors.

St. Paul enjoins: “Wherefore we must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience sake. For this cause pay ye tribute also: for they (civil rulers) are God’s ministers, attending continually upon this very thing.” Rom. 13:5, 6.

The Apostles thus declare that it is a solemn obligation of all Christians,

ministers and people, to obey the laws and to pay taxes; and that because rulers and magistrates are God's ministers in civil government. It is plain, therefore, that concerning the relation of Church and State, the Church of Rome's dogmas quoted above put the papal Church into direct conflict with the teachings of Christ and Holy Scripture, thus creating a condition which is hostile to the civil government that protects the Church and to which all Christians owe allegiance.

*Does the pope still maintain this attitude of disobedience toward the teachings of Holy Scripture and toward the civil government of the land?*

He does. In a letter addressed to the bishops of France dated February 11, 1906, pope Pius X declared: "That it is necessary to separate Church and State is a thesis *absolutely false, a most pernicious error.*" He is thus, by implication, repeating the claim that the State should be subject to his control.

### **Pope Gregory VII**

*When did this false teaching concerning the relation of Church and State fully develop?*

In the Dark Ages under Hildebrand, who as Gregory VII, was pope from 1073 to 1085,—a time of utter ignorance and disorder.\* We have already seen that his claims to absolute authority in Church and State were *based on fraudulent documents*, the so-called "Donation of Constantine," and the "Decretals of Isidore," which *later popes and reputable Catholic leaders acknowledge were forgeries.*

\* The Papacy probably attained its highest power under Innocent III at the time of the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215. This Council was attended not only by the Church leaders of every country, but also by representatives of the civil governments of Europe. It condemned all heretics to death, and forced the civil governments to swear to destroy all whom the pope condemned! *The Century Cyclopedia*, Vol. IX, page 529. Dallmann's *How Peter Became Pope*, page 61.

*What has been the result of this false teaching of the Roman Church, claiming absolute power for the pope over civil rulers and governments, as well as over the Church?*

History shows that the arrogant claims of popes,<sup>1</sup> and their unholy ambition to rule without regard to the rights of others, have been like firebrands cast into Europe, often destroying the peace and prosperity of Kingdoms, causing endless intrigues, rebellions, war and bloodshed; in England, France, Germany, Italy, Holland, etc. There was constant meddling in the internal affairs of almost every country by the pope and his emissaries to the great injury and distress of both rulers and people. See the struggle between Henry II of England and Thomas Becket, who opposed needed reforms; the wars of the Guelphs and Ghibellines in Germany and Italy, which lasted 300 years, till the end of the 15th century; the Thirty Years War from 1618 to 1648, etc., etc. Note also the anathemas and bitter denunciations by the Pope, of the

Treaty of Westphalia, which sought to promote religious peace and peace among nations.

<sup>1</sup> The Emperor Charles V's Spanish minister wrote from Genoa in 1527: "I have lived 25 years in Italy, and have observed that *the pope has been the sole cause of all the wars and miseries during that time.*" (Ang. Brief, 310.) This is the testimony of one Romanist to another. (Italics ours.)

### **The Thirty Years War, and the Treaty of Westphalia**

The Thirty Years War was a fierce religious and political struggle, which involved not only Germany, but the whole of Central Europe. The immediate cause of the war was the oppression of the Bohemian people by Austria, which forced Bohemia to revolt in May, 1618. On one side were the Catholic League and Wallenstein, the Austrian General, chief leaders; on the other side King Christian of Denmark and Gustavus Adolphus II, King of Sweden. Victory and defeat alternated with both parties, until in 1648 the Treaty of Westphalia finally brought peace to war-torn Europe. By this Treaty, Switzerland and Holland became independent of the German Empire. France received Alsace and other possessions, and the territory of Sweden was enlarged. The peace of Ausburg, 1555, was ratified, including Calvinists as well as Lutherans and the sovereignty of the Papacy, and the oppressive power of Innocent X were brought to an end.

*Have later popes continued to hold the unjustifiable position of Gregory VII regarding the relation of Church and State?*

They have. Such is the inordinate lust for power of the human heart when uncontrolled by the Spirit of God, that later popes, regardless of the plain teachings of Holy Scripture and the fundamental rights of rulers and people, have continued to hold these absurd and false claims. A brief glance at the record of subsequent popes will show this.

### **Innocent III**

Innocent III, on becoming pope in 1198, with childish extravagance proclaimed: "I sit on high above Kings and all princes. This steward is the Viceroy of God, the Successor of Peter; he stands in the midst between God and men. He is the Judge of all, but is judged by no one. Christ has committed the whole world to the government of the popes! I alone enjoy the plenitude of power. The pope *holds the place of the true God!*" Ang. Brief, 93.

A gloss in the Canon Law of the Church called the pope "*Our Lord God!*"

### **Boniface VIII**

Pursuing the policy of his predecessors in 1302, Pope Boniface VIII declared: "In her (the Church) are two swords, the spiritual and the temporal. Both are in the power of the Church. The former by the hand of the priest, the latter by the hand of princes and Kings, but at the nod and sufferance of the priest. The one sword must be subject to the other, the *temporal authority to*

*the spiritual."*

Again, "We declare and pronounce that it is absolutely necessary to salvation that every human being be subject to the Roman Pontiff."

(What is really necessary for salvation and the maintenance of true religion is for our Romanist friends to discard their mistaken subjection to the Papacy, and return to the Lord Jesus Christ as the true and only Head of the Christian Church.)

But Boniface's absurd claims soon got him into trouble. Becoming involved in a quarrel with King Philip IV of France, Boniface was accused of many crimes, was imprisoned in his own palace, and died soon after (A.D. 1303).

#### **Paul IV**

Declaring the cruel Inquisition to be the chief support of the papacy in Italy, Paul IV in 1558 issued the Bull, "*Cum ex apostolatus officio*," asserting that "the pope as God's representative, has full power over nations and Kingdoms; he judges all, and can be judged in this world by none. All princes and monarchs, as soon as they fall into heresy, are deposed, and incur sentence of death. If repentant, they are to be imprisoned the rest of their lives, and do penance on bread and water. No one may give aid to a heretical prince, and any monarch who dares to do so, forfeits his dominions and property, which lapse to princes who are obedient to the pope!"

#### **Paul V**

Pope Paul V allowed himself to be called "Vice-God!" Dallmann's *How Peter Became Pope*, page 98.

#### **Innocent X**

Opposing the spirit of religious tolerance ushered in by the Peace of Westphalia, 1 October 24, 1648, Pope Innocent X (1644-1655), "speaking as the very mouthpiece of God," said in a papal bull, "We therefore, decree and declare by these peace pacts (that is, the pact of Osnabruck of August, 1648, and that of Westphalia, October, 1648), that everything herein contained are, and forever will be, null, void, invalid, iniquitous, unjust, damnable, reprobate, inane, and altogether lacking in force; that no one is, or ever will be, obliged to observe them, even if bound thereto by oath. (Note that the pope, *sanctions the breakings of a solemn oath to God!*) —they must therefore be forever held as if they had never been issued, as never existing, and as never made."

It should be carefully observed that the pope here, as always, "runs true to form." Though professing to be the representative of the "Prince of Peace" on earth, and to have a sincere interest in the welfare of the European nations, Innocent X refused to sanction a sorely needed treaty of peace, and deliberately encouraged the continuance of war. He was more anxious to press his selfish claims to power than he was to heal the wounds of bloodshed and violence from which Europe had suffered for more than three decades.

## Pius IX

Holding the same pernicious opinion of the relation of Church and State, Pius IX in 1864 wrote—"In case of conflicting laws, enacted by the two powers, temporal and spiritual, to hold that the civil law should prevail is an error." That is, the pope's opinion must *override the laws of the land!*

## Leo XIII

Leo XIII officially declared—"Over the mighty multitude God has set rulers with power to govern, and He has willed that one of them should be head of all," i.e., the pope. Going out of his way to criticize the American Government he said, "It would be very erroneous to draw the conclusion that the most desirable status for the Church is to be sought in America. It is an error to hold that it would be universally lawful or expedient for State and Church to be dissevered and divorced as in America." Again Leo said in substance, "There must be complete obedience to the Roman Pontiff as to God Himself, for we hold upon earth the place of God Almighty!" Remember that this awful blasphemy was uttered in the 20th century, for Leo XIII died July, 1903.

*Does not conflict with civil governments inevitably grow out of the false claims of supremacy which the Papacy has constantly made for itself?*

It does. See the false claim of Leo XIII that "we hold on earth the place of God Almighty"; or the claim made for the priest in the Confessional, that what he hears, "he *knows as God.*" Or the false assertion that "the Pope here on earth *is Christ.*" (Il Papa quz in terra e Christo.) L. Lucantonio, *La Supernazionalita del Papato*, page 71. This book was recently published and dedicated to Cardinal Gasparri, Papal Secretary of State under Pius XI.

*How do these papal claims accord with the basic principles of the Constitution of the United States, and with the practice of the U.S. Government from its beginning?*

They do not accord at all, but directly conflict with the basic principles of the United States Constitution, which clearly affirms the entire separation of Church and State, which declares the equality before the law of all religious systems, that all may enjoy the inalienable right to worship God according to the dictates of conscience; and especially forbids that partiality or special privilege be shown toward any religious system whatever.

Moreover, had not the papal See distinctly expressed its disapproval of the American Constitution, when Leo XIII went out of his way to criticize the U. S. Government, saying, "It would be very erroneous to draw the conclusion that in America is to be sought the most desirable status for the Church. It is an error to hold that it would be universally lawful or expedient for the State and Church to be, *as in America, dissevered and divorced?*"

Remember, too, that the pope claims to be a spiritual ruler, who has absolute control over every Church member's conscience, and who holds over him the

power of eternal life or death!

It is apparent in what an impossible situation an honest citizen of a free Republic finds himself who, while pledging his unswerving loyalty to his own government, also solemnly pledges loyalty to an autocratic and unscriptural alien government, whose fundamental principals are totally different!

The chief matters over which the Church of Rome claimed control, and so came into collision with the State, in addition to the right to interfere in political affairs whenever it saw fit to do so, were Education, and Marriage (Matrimony). The Church also bitterly opposed distribution of the Bible among the people.

## **Education**

*The Roman Church has always been keen to criticize severely what it considers defects in education by the State. But can any defect in State education remotely compare to the colossal falsehood and fraud on which the Popes' claim to supreme power are based?*

The Church of Rome continually denounces the Public School system of the United States, and Pius IX declared in substance that education outside of the Roman Church was a damnable heresy. But who can approve the intolerance and selfishness which led the Roman hierarchy to oppose a school system that gives the children of the poor an opportunity to gain an education, and which promotes sympathy and friendliness among all classes of society? Remember, too, that many men who have become leaders in commerce, industry and political life owe the beginnings of that life to the public school system. It may reasonably be asked, if the Roman Church is so bitterly opposed to the school system of the nation, why do so many Romanists seek and obtain positions as teachers in the public schools? Surely if loyal to the teachings of their Church superiors, such teachers cannot contribute much to the efficiency of the schools in which they are employed. In 1933 Romanists secured the passage of a law in the New York State legislature, purporting to be against "intolerance" (!) which makes it a grave offense, punishable with fine and imprisonment, even to inquire about the religious affiliations of applicants for teachers' positions. Thus, contrary to the spirit of the U.S. Constitution, American citizens in New York State are deprived of one of the safeguards of civil and religious liberty, viz.: the right of free speech and inquiry, and by this law teachers, who are unfriendly to the public school system, may be forced upon the public schools, contrary to the wishes of the majority of the citizens of the community. Such a law should never be allowed to remain on the statute book!

Notice should be taken of the Encyclical Letter of Pius XI on the Christian Education of Youth, Dec. 31, 1929, in which the claim is made that education should belong exclusively to the Roman Church; and the rash charge is made that the State in the matter of education "violates rights conferred by God on the family"; and makes the boast that the Roman Church has "ever protected and defended these rights." One may well ask, What did education In the Church of Rome do for the ignorant masses of Spain and of Italy, prior to the coming of Victor Emmanuel in 1870, or for Latin America and the Philippines?

In countries where education has been controlled by the Roman Church a far greater degree of illiteracy is found than in other countries, as statistics published by these countries show. For instance, Brazil reported 75.5% of its people illiterate, and Portugal 68%. Whereas in countries where education is not controlled by the Roman Church, the rate of illiteracy is low: as in Finland and Norway only 1%; and in Great Britain less than 1%! In reply to the boast as to what the Roman Church has accomplished in education, let the report of Governor-general W. H. Taft to the U. S. Government be read, showing the shocking conditions in the Philippines, for which the Roman friars were largely responsible.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Cardinal Manning attributed the Revolution in Italy, by which the pope lost control of "the States of the Church," largely to the *immorality of the priesthood* and to the neglect of educating the people. The papal States were considered the worst governed regions in Europe. Poverty and ignorance prevailed among the people who hailed Napoleon, and later Victor Emmanuel, as welcome deliverers. The expression "Prisoner of the Vatican" was not true to the facts; it was a pretext used by the pope to win sympathy, as if he were a martyr. As a matter of fact, he had liberty to go where he pleased. Pius IX, a weak pope, was *dominated by Cardinal Antonelli*, whose lack of religion and morals was notorious. It is reported on good authority that the Cardinal on his death-bed refused the sacraments, saying that he had never believed in them. After his death his illegitimate children sued his estate for their share of the property to which, according to Italian law, they were entitled, and which they received.

A well-known writer on social and economic questions in Brazil declares: "It is true that if our country had been peopled by a Protestant nation, there would be no illiteracy in Brazil. Because it was colonized by a Catholic nation, illiteracy in Brazil reaches the highest percentage, known among nations called civilized. In Europe there is practically no illiteracy in Protestant lands: in Catholic countries of the Old World illiteracy is intense. Since the rural population of Brazil is ninety percent illiterate, how can the Catholics of Brazil consider themselves 'benefactors of national education?' " Mario Pinto Serva, *Revista do Brazil*, No. 77, 1922.

## **Marriage**

### **The Church of Rome opposes the laws of the State controlling marriage**

It took the Church of Rome many centuries to discover that there were seven sacraments instead of the two taught by the Word of God, and at the Council of Florence in 1439 "Matrimony" was placed among them. The Protestant or Reformed Church refused to recognize Marriage as a sacrament, because Christ, the only Head of the Church, did not so recognize it. The laws of the United States, originally made by Protestant leaders, carefully guarded the marriage bond. The deplorable laxness of marriage laws in recent years was in no sense due to Protestant influence, as has been wrongly charged, but was due to irreligious legislators who, in spite of earnest protests, lowered the Christian standard of Marriage and Divorce. No marriage performed according to the law of the land by a Protestant minister or a civil magistrate is regarded as valid by the Church of Rome; only those performed by a Roman



priest are recognized. The Syllabus of Errors, published by Pius IX in 1864, declared: "Whoever says that marriages should be contracted according to the civil law, and not according to the directions of the Council of Trent, let him be anathema" (accursed). Roman bishops have called the married life of parties married by a Protestant minister, or a civil magistrate, concubinage; in saying this they were merely echoing the harsh and unjustifiable statement of Pius IX, who declared that such marriages were a "shameful and abominable concubinage." *Allocution* of September, 1852. Bishop Colohan of Cork, wrote in the *Catholic Bulletin*, January, 1917, page 25, to the same effect. Such discourteous and untrue denunciations only injure the Church whose representatives are guilty of them!

### **The Church of Rome "Annuls" Marriage, but does not grant divorce**

The Roman Church while maintaining a legalistic regularity, discarded in the administration of its marriage law the moral principles and legal rules which the State established for the control of fraud. Thus, those salutary principles concerning the validity of contracts and the suppression of fraud, which the experience of mankind has found absolutely necessary, have been disregarded by the Papacy to the great injury of society and of the good name of the Christian faith. Roman dignitaries grow eloquent concerning the sanctity of marriage and the evils of divorce; but under the name of "annulment" the Church finds reason sufficient for granting permanent separation. A pre-nuptial agreement between the contracting parties to separate permanently should the marriage prove undesirable, has been considered sufficient cause for annulment. Witness the Case of the Duke of Marlborough, and that of Marconi in 1927.

The boasted doctrine of the Roman Church, which is supposed to teach marital sanctity and high moral conduct received stunning blows through papal misconduct in the 16th century.

In both Church and State morality was at a low ebb, for Alexander VI and his illegitimate son, Caesar Borgia, were guilty of gross crimes. Caesar caused his own brother to be murdered, and his body to be thrown into the Tiber. He caused his brother-in-law to be stabbed on the palace steps, and, as his victim was recovering, broke into his bedroom and had him strangled. He killed his father's favorite, Peroto, while taking refuge under the pope's mantle, and the pope's face was sprinkled with his blood. Finally the pope lost his life by drinking a poisoned cup which he caused his steward to prepare for one of his cardinals, who succeeded in bribing the steward to give the cup to the pope."

Pope Julius II's immorality was flagrant. Though a priest and monk, he was the father of 3 daughters illegitimately, the marriage of one of whom, Lucretia, he twice dissolved.

Pope Clement VII was also guilty of breaking the laws of God and of the Church. When Henry VIII of England appealed to him to divorce Catherine of Aragon, because she bore him no son, he refused, as contrary to the law of the Church and because Catherine's nephew, Charles V, as Emperor, was considered all-powerful. Clement himself was born out of wedlock, but was

made legitimate by a dispensation of his cousin, Pope Leo X. Clement married his young relative, Catherine de Medici,' then 14 years of age, to Prince Henry of France, and Margaret of Parma, the illegitimate daughter of Charles V, to Alessandro the Moor; and after the latter's death, Charles V and Pope Paul IV married her to Ottavio Farnese, the illegitimate grandson of Pope Paul III! In view of these facts, the Roman Church had no cause for boasting. The unchaste lives of its dignitaries not only struck a blow at the sanctity of marriage and demoralized society, but led an unbelieving world to scoff at the Christian religion.

The Roman Church has shown a ruthless disregard of the rights and feelings of non-Catholics whenever its members happened to be in a majority in the community, or the judge a Catholic lacking in Christian feeling. No matter how much suffering it caused to an innocent contracting party, the Church law was enforced, if it was to the Church's advantage to do so.

In Quebec, Canada, in 1934, a Roman Catholic judge annulled a marriage between a Protestant and a Romanist, the ceremony of which had been performed 25 years before by a Protestant minister! This was directly contrary to the laws of Canada and of the British Empire. How could a judge, who had solemnly sworn to uphold the law of the land, do such an unchristian act, which tended to break up a family, was contrary to the laws of the British Empire, and contrary to the dictates of humanity? Why? Because of bondage to a foreign pope, who ignored the Word of God, which he professed to obey!

Regarding the duty of obedience of members of the Roman Communion to the laws of the country, the advice of the Rev. Mr. Ryan, already quoted, seems strangely at variance with Christian precepts. He said in substance: "In deciding whether an obnoxious law ought to be obeyed (St. Peter made no exception of obnoxious laws), the non-Catholic citizen may consult his Bible, or his minister, or merely his own conscience; in a similar situation the Catholic may consult his priest, his bishop, or the pope!" That is, Mr. Ryan declares that an erring human being should be the Catholic's guide, rather than the Holy Spirit speaking through the Scriptures and the God-given conscience! Here appears one of the "impassable gulfs" which separate Romanism from the true Christian faith!

### **The Popes Curse Bible Societies**

The popes of Rome have bitterly cursed the Bible Societies for obeying God's command, "Holding forth the Word of Life," and thus enabling the people of all lands to "Search the Scriptures."

Who can estimate the vast blessing which these noble institutions and their faithful colporteurs have brought to the nations of the earth by the distribution of God's Holy Word! Think of the splendid work of the British and Foreign Bible Society, the American Bible Society, the Bible Society of Scotland, and others, in translating the Holy Scriptures into over 1000 languages and dialects and in circulating millions of Bibles and Gospels year by year! This unselfish, life-giving service is truly one that angels may rejoice over, yet Pius VI in 1816, denounced these societies as a "horrible invention, which undermined the foundation of religion!" Leo XII cursed the

Bible Societies in 1824. Pius VIII repeated the anathema, "for preaching the gospel of the deal in the language of the people!" In 1844 Gregory XVI again condemned these societies and the Evangelical Alliance; and Pius IX denounced "those cunning and infamous societies, which call themselves Bible Societies, and give the Scriptures to inexperienced youth"; as if there were no Holy Spirit who gave the Word, "to guide them into all truth!" John 16:13.

And in this 20th century wherever Romanism dominates, the same opposition to the distribution of the Holy Scriptures is seen. Colporteurs often report that Roman priests desecrate and burn Bibles, and denounce and persecute God's faithful servants for obeying His command, just as was done in the Dark Ages. But still the glorious work goes on; the good seed of the Kingdom is sown far and wide; the living Christ, the Incarnate Word, and the Bible, God's written Word, go forth, "conquering and to conquer," for His promise to the Church is sure, "My Word shall not return unto Me void"; "The earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea!" Isa. 55:11, 11:9, Hab. 2:14.

In April, 1941, propagandists advertised widely in the secular Press that the Roman Church was now issuing a new translation of the Holy Scriptures—this fact is published especially for Protestant consumption, and to deceive ignorant people who do not know the Church's record of bitter hostility to the Word of God for centuries.

Showing this hostility to the Bible, the British Minister to Chile relates that on one occasion the misplaced zeal of the hierarchy burnt even its own version of the Scriptures! The Minister wrote that when Rev. Kenelm Vaughan visited Chile to collect funds for Westminster Cathedral, he brought to that land a large stock of Spanish (Douay) New Testaments for distribution. But alas! he was met on the frontier by an emissary of the Archbishop of Santiago with instructions that the testaments must all be burnt before Rev. Vaughan could enter the Province—which was promptly done! *The Church Times*, Sept. 22, 1922, p. 291.

The Rev. Dr. Cahill is reported by a Roman Catholic paper to have declared with more heat than wisdom, that "he would rather have a Catholic to read the worst books of immorality than the Protestant Bible—that forgery of God's Word!" He thus "runs true to form!" *Roman Catholic Tablet*, Dec. 17, 1853, p. 804.

The excuse which Roman Catholic clergy often allege for their hostility to the work of Bible distribution, viz.: that what they curse and denounce is the Protestant Bible, is altogether without foundation. For the Protestant translations of the Scriptures have been made with the utmost care by learned and devout men, and are thoroughly trustworthy versions. The real ground of objection is, the Church of Rome fears the Bible, because it exposes Rome's many errors! Cardinal Bellarmine expressed the hostility of the Church of Rome toward the Bible when he falsely said: "that Holy Scripture does NOT CONTAIN ALL THAT IS NECESSARY TO SALVATION; that it is NOT SUFFICIENT"; and "that it is NOT FOR THE PEOPLE TO READ!"

Reasonable men should base their beliefs concerning the relation of Church

and State, and all other matters, on the Word of God and on the facts of history. For God clearly says in His Word, "Should not a people seek to their God? To the Law and to the Testimony? If they speak not according to this Word, it is because there is no light in them!" Isa. 8:19, 20. Again the Bible enjoins: "Prove all things, hold fast that which is good!" I Thess. 5:21. Test every dogma of men by the Word of God, and not by man's word or human tradition. Sad to say, the Church of Rome is deceived and led captive by tradition! Hear the testimony of an honest, able Roman Catholic, who says, "the Dogmatic Commission of the Vatican Council proclaims that 'the existence of Tradition has nothing to do with evidence! That objections taken from history are not valid when contradicted by ecclesiastical decrees!' That is, men's mere unproven statements must prevail over historic fact! Did not pope Pius IX, deceived by such sophistries, say, "I am Tradition! La Tradizione son' io." Thus also Fénelon declared, "The Church is supreme over fact as over doctrine!" Cardinal Newman fell into the same error when he spoke of "doctrines which lie beyond the evidence of history," and which Roman Catholics receive, not because they are "proved by reason or history, but because Revelation has declared them by the pope." But the pope's words are not Revelation! True Revelation is the Word of God, the Bible, given by the Holy Spirit, and nothing else! Acton, History, pp. 515, 549.

We respectfully urge our Catholic friends to take God's Holy Word alone as their rule of faith, and the Holy Spirit as their guide. Trusting Tradition and relying on pope and priest, men forsake God, and sink deeper and deeper into the quicksands of error. But trusting in Christ and His Holy Spirit, and guided by the Word of God, the light and joy of heaven shall fill their souls! Thank God, there are many Roman priests and laymen who are finding out this blessed truth, and are rejoicing in the liberty wherewith Christ makes His people free; Christ "delivers them from the bondage of corruption," and brings them "into the glorious liberty of the sons of God!"