Roman Catholics in America Falsifying History and Poisoning the Minds of Protestant School Children

Thomas E. Watson



Roman Catholics in America Falsifying History

AND

Poisoning the Minds of Protestant School Children

By THOS. E. WATSON
Author of "The Story of France," "Napoleon," "Life and Times of Andrew Jackson," "Life and Times of Thomas Jefferson," "The Roman Catholic Hierarchy,' Etc.

Published by
THE TOM WATSON BOOK COMPANY,
Thomson, Ga.
1928

Copyright 1928 by
GEORGIA WATSON LEE BROWN,
Thomson, Ga.

Table of Contents

Roman Catholics in America Falsifying History....2
Poisoning the Minds of Protestant School Children....2
Roman Catholics in America Falsifying History And Poisoning the Minds of Protestant School Children....4
CATHOLIC TEXT BOOKS AND TEACHERS IN PROTESTANT SCHOOLS....5
PRIEST-RIDDEN IN CHURCH, HE IS READY TO BECOME PRIEST-RIDDEN IN STATE. 6
WHAT WERE THE “INDULGENCES”?....7
WHAT STARTED THE REFORMATION?....9
PAPAL TARIFF ON SINS....9
Catholics in American History....10
Poisoning the Fountain, to Papalize the Stream....13
PAPALIZED TENT-BOOKS!....15
“The Catholic Laymen’s Association” Re-writes History, Placing Fables Where Facts Belong....18
“WYCLIFFE DIED IN HIS BED”....18
DID THE POPE “BLESS” COPERNICUS AND HIS GREAT BOOK?....20
HOW ABOUT CRANMER AND LATIMER, THE PROTESTANT MARTYRS?....22
CRANMER’S “THOUSANDS” OF VICTIMS “AMONG YOUR FORBEARS AND MINE! 24

Roman Catholics in America Falsifying History And Poisoning the Minds of Protestant School Children

The author, Thomas Edward Watson (1856–1922), was an influential American politician, newspaper editor, publisher, and author from Georgia.

THIS year is the 400th since a venereally diseased Pope, at whose dissipations had exhausted the Vatican treasury, sent out monkish peddlers into sundry parts of Europe to sell, at public outcry, the papal pardons for sin, known as “Indulgences.”

Originally, an Indulgence was a financial deal, by which the Roman Catholic violator of church rules could square himself with the ecclesiastical lords; just as the peasants, under the Feudal System, could pay money to the landlord and escape menial service, or military conscription.

But as the Papal usurpation grew in power, it naturally grew also in greed.

Each successful aggression encouraged the popes to attempt another; and so it was that the Bishops of Rome finally became Gods-on-earth, in the eyes of devout, superstitious Catholics.

It logically follows that, if we have a God on earth, this God can forgive sins.

Inasmuch as the popes had, in the course of a thousand years, reached that monstrous height of self-assertion, they changed the original doctrine of Indulgence.

What had formerly been nothing more than the remission of *church penalties* (similar to the remission of a fine by one of our courts) became a *pardon for sin*.

This preposterous usurpation of God’s power was carried to such extreme lengths that the popes sold Indulgences which wiped out all crimes past, present, and future; and the price to be paid was set against each crime, in a regular scale, just as you would list the prices of a number of books, of horses, of goods in a store, or of saleable articles at a church fair.

When Pope Leo X. found his Vatican ducats running low, and sent out his peddlers loaded with Indulgences, it so happened that monks, of a peculiarly bold and brazen type, were selected as papal actioneers.

These peddling monks used language which would almost convince us that they themselves despised the business in which they were compelled to engage.

For instance, when Tetzel would “cry” his goods at auction, in the market-place, he would harangue the assembled rustics in words like these:

> "Lo! the heavens are open; if you enter not now, when will you enter"?
>
> For 12 pence you may redeem the soul of your father out of purgatory.
>
> If you had but one coat, you ought to strip yourself of it instantly, and sell it, in order to purchase such benefits.
>
> As soon as the money tinkles in the box, the souls in purgatory instantly escape torment and ascend to heaven." (See Robertson's "Charles V.," Vol. 1, p. 462.)

This Tetzel chanced to be peddling his pardon-papers in the neighborhood of a pious monk, named Martin Luther, who had found a copy of the Bible, among the musty manuscripts of the monastery, and he had been stimulated by the Bible to study Christianity *for himself*.

Therefore, when he heard Tetzel's blasphemous harangues, he was shocked, and when he read one of the papers in which Pop Leo granted as full a pardon for sin as God could grant, his indignation was stirred.

By the very words of the Indulgence, this licentious Pope undertook to remit not only the ecclesiastical censures, but "from all thy sins, transgressions, and excesses, how enormous soever they may be. I remit you all punishment which you may deserve in purgatory …… and restore you to that innocence which you possessed at baptism; so that, when you die, the gates of punishment shall be shut, and the gates of the paradise of delight instantly shall be opened, &c." (Robertson's "Charles V.," p. 462.)

Martin Luther, the pious monk, stood so well with the Roman Catholic high-priests and dignitaries, that he had been selected by them to take charge of a new College which the Elector of Saxony was opening in Wittenberg.

The Elector had asked them to choose their fittest teacher for this responsible and honorable post, and their unanimous choice had fallen upon Brother Martin.

Therefore, at the time Tetzel came into that part of Germany, peddling those pardons, Brother Martin had no cause of quarrel with his church.

He had no grievance, no grudge, no balked ambition.

He had all to gain, by remaining silent.

He had all to lose, by going out of his way to pick a quarrel with Tetzel and the Pope.

CATHOLIC TEXT BOOKS AND TEACHERS IN PROTESTANT SCHOOLS.

In the Public Schools, the Catholics have stealthily introduced text-books written by Jesuits; and your children are being taught that the Roman church was misunderstood in the past; that its doctrines are not fatal to humanity and Gospel religion; that its record is not saturated with the blood of the innocent millions, murdered by papal persecutors, *and that there never was such a monstrosity as the alleged sale of papal pardons of sins.*

The Catholics denounce secular education and public schools— why?

Because, under the papal system, the child is never to be permitted to do its own thinking.

Its plastic brain must be papalized, in order that the child— grown to manhood or womanhood—will be atrophied on one side of its mind.

In other words, Catholic education seeks to prevent the boy and girl from knowing any truth which may set in motion those dynamic *spurs of progress, namely, doubt, desire to see the other side, determination to investigate and form* INDEPENDENT OPINIONS.

Educate youth in this Catholic way, and the consequences are logical: the children graduate in *obedience*; feel no divine thirst for free knowledge; depend upon *Authority*, rather than upon investigation; cringe to the priest; look to him for guidance and control; lose mental self-reliance, and gradually cease to be liberals, progressives, democrats, republicans—*believers in the capacity of the people to govern themselves.*

A Catholic, imbued with the idea that he is not entitled to any voice in church affairs, and contented with the dependent position of the man who must silently pay and obey, *soon accepts the* POLITICAL *doctrine of his church*, also; and he comes to believe that he has no right to choose rulers, make laws, think for himself on public questions, or to take any initiative, whatever.

PRIEST-RIDDEN IN CHURCH, HE IS READY TO BECOME PRIEST-RIDDEN IN STATE.

Consequently, no Catholic country ever was democratic, or republican, until the Pope's power was broken.

Hierarchic Catholicism is the religion of emperors and kings, of empires and kingdoms; and you will easily see why this is so, if you will remember that *Popery is nothing but an adaptation of the organization of the Roman emperors and their Pagan priesthood.*

Consider how artfully the Pope's American subjects are serving him, in this profoundly important matter of educating the young!

Catholic children are not allowed to attend your schools; nor are your teachers and text-books allowed in *theirs*; yet, they send their children—*grown to be teachers*—into your schools, to teach your children; and they so manipulate the Superintendents and the Boards, that *Catholic text-books drive Protestant text-books out of the Protestant schools!*

It seems incredible, but it is so.

Consider the following extract from a letter concerning the Atlanta Schools:

Atlanta, Ga., April 17, 1917.

> Dear Sir: The history teacher at "Girls High" leaves the impression on the minds of the students that Robinson (the author of the textbook) is not a prejudiced man (such as you, for instance)

and is endeavoring to lessen the antagonism between the Roman Church and the Protestant churches.

I find on page 585 of the "Girls High" textbook (Outlines of European History, by Robinson and Breasted), and on page 391 of the "Boys High" textbook (History of Western Europe, by J. H. Robinson) the following passages, regarding the Indulgences sold by Tetzel:

> "The contribution to the church which was made in return for indulgences varied greatly; the rich were required to give a considerable sum, while the very poor were to receive these pardons gratis."

Did the "very poor" get them free? Also this statement:

"It is a common mistake of Protestants to suppose that the indulgence was forgiveness granted beforehand for sins to be committed in the future. THERE IS ABSOLUTELY NO FOUNDATION FOR THIS IDEA. A person proposing to sin could not possibly be contrite in the eyes of the church, and even if he secured indulgence it would, according to the theologians, have been quite worthless."

STUDENT.

Now, what do you think of that Papal dope, being administered to young Protestants, by the pro-Catholic teachers and the Catholic text-books, in your secular Public Schools?

Such prostitute teachers can do the pope more good than all the priests put together, because *such text-books and teachers can sow papal germs*, where the priests could never gain access to the fertile soil of youth!

WHAT WERE THE "INDULGENCES"?

The statement in this Public School "History" is a most unblushing falsehood, and it can be as easily exposed as that other papal falsehood about Queen Elizabeth and the English Episcopalians.

The Indulgences sold by Tetzel can he proved with the same historic accuracy that the Great Charter admits of; with the same accuracy as the Edict of Toleration which Henry of Navarre issued in behalf of the French Protestants, *and which caused the Jesuits to assassinate its enlightened and statesmanly author.*

The Catholic authorities themselves print the decree of Pope Innocent III, annulling and eternally damning the Great Charter of our liberties: and the Catholics themselves published the Scale of Prices for the Papal Pardon of Sins!

In Europe, it is not denied: in the United States, it *is* denied; in Europe, it is so notorious that it *can't* be denied: in the United States, the lack of information about the true inwardness of this European church is so deplorably universal, that it *can be* denied! NOT ONLY DENIED, BUT TAUGHT IN OUR PUBLIC SCHOOLS!

(The following authorities are a few of the many that can be cited to prove that the Indulgences sold by pope after pope, *for centuries*, were *pardons for sins*, not only past, but future; not only for living, *but for the dead*:

William H. Prescott's edition of "Robertson's Charles the Filth." Lippincott Co., 1884. Pages 400 and following, volume L., giving the origin of Indulgences under Pope Urban IL, and copying the Indulgences *verbatim*.

Coxe's "House of Austria," Vol. 1, page 430 and following. The author copies the actual words of the Indulgence, *verbatim*.

Markham's "History of Germany," John Murray's new and revised edition, 1869. Page 218:

> "At first these Indulgences were nothing more than the remission of *penance* for sin by which the Christian community was scandalized; but the horrible doctrine began at length to be introduced, that exemptions from the fires of purgatory might also be purchased, *not only on account of crimes already perpetrated, but even for those which the buyer* INTENDED TO COMMIT."

See also, Larned's "Seventy Centuries": Vol. II, p. 66.)

Menzel's "Germany from the Earliest Period: published in New York by the Catholic firm, P. F. Collier & Son, 1900. Page 872 (in Vol. II.) says:

> "On October 31, 1517, Luther publicly brought forward in the castle-church at Wittenberg, 95 theses against the Indulgence, the principal of which were, "that by sincere repentance and penance alone, *not by the payment of a sum of money*, could sins be remitted, and consequently, that the pope had no right to dispense absolution for money: moreover, that the pope, being merely the vice-regent of God upon earth, could only remit the external penance ordained by the church on earth, *not the eternal punishment rewarded to the sinner after death.*
>
> This bold assertion, like a spark of vivid light amid profound darkness, rendered the truth fully visible; once the spell of silence broken, thousands ventured to utter their secret thoughts; thousands became aware of facts of which they had before timidly doubted."

Timidly doubted, what?

They did not doubt that the pope could remit the *penalties* incurred for infractions of the church's *rules*. No!

What they had timidly doubted was the pope's power to take the place of God, and *forgive* sins: especially, when the sinner had not repented, but had only *paid money for the remission*.

Wolfgang Menzel's "Germany" is as thoroughly *standard*, as Gibbons' "Rome," Green's "England," Rawlinson's "Seven Great Monarchies," Thierry's "Norman Conquest," or Napier's "Peninsular War."

It goes to the American reader with *the o.k. of the great Catholic publishing house of Peter Collier & Son*: it tells the truth about those Indulgences, just as all other standard works tell it.

If Luther's quarrel with Pope Leo X. did *not* pivot on that very question, what was the pivot?

What was it that, as Menzel says, was like a flash of "vivid light amid profound darkness"?

If the popes had not been selling pardons for sin, how did Leo come to do it; and if Leo wasn't doing it, what aroused Martin Luther?

WHAT STARTED THE REFORMATION?

According to the Catholic textbook taught in the public schools, the Reformation was started about NOTHING.

Isn't it an infernal shame that your children should be officially *crammed with Jesuit lies*, meant to blind them as to the origin of modern progress, civil and religious liberty, popular education, free institutions, the abolition of serfdom, and the Emancipation of Woman?

We owe all of these inestimable blessings to the Reformation, which successfully began when Martin Luther *denied* that the popes could sell forgiveness for sins.

Having taken that bold step, the logic of events led him to take others, until he broke away from the Roman church, saying that it had no more right to imprison women, hide the Bible *and murder heretics*, than it had to sell pardons of sin.

Two of the grounds upon which the Roman church excommunicated Luther were that he *did* deny the church's right to burn heretics, and *did* deny the pope's authority to take money for the remission of sin.

The exact copy of the Indulgence issued by Pope Leo X. is also found in "The History of Protestantism," by Dr. J.A. Wylie. Cassell & Company, London, Paris, New York, and Melbourne. Vol. I., page 258.

D'Aubigne's "History of the Reformation," page 73, also copies the Indulgence, and gives a graphic account of how *the poor*, as well as the rich, were cheated out of their money.

None of the Indulgences were ever given away: they were all *sold*.

PAPAL TARIFF ON SINS.

The price list of papal pardons of sins can be found in the "History of Auricular Confession," by Count C. P. Lasteyrie. Vol. II. Page 132 et seq.

It is referred to in the "History of Sacerdotal Celibacy." By H. C. Lea, L. L. D., 1907. Vol. I., p. 411: Vol. II, p. 55, and 715.

See also the "Formulary of the Papal Penitentiary," pp. 95-100, Philadelphia, 1891.

An original copy of the first printed edition of this famous Price-list of Sins-whose official name is "Taxes of the Penitentiary'—is preserved in the British Museum.

The book itself and the list of prices are as provable as the Law of Habeas Corpus, or the first American Tariff.

Catholics in American History

THE Fort Worth *Record*, Tex., joyfully prints a string of lies told by "Father" Frank Park, in a recent spiel to the pope's band of American foot-kissers, the Knights of Columbus.

Said string of lies follows, as an exhibit of Roman mendacity, and of the willingness of our daily papers to publish the output of mendacious papal propaganda:

That America's liberty today is directly due to Catholics, and that ever since there has been such a country as the United States, Catholics have always been patriotic, loyal and true, was the contention of the speaker. The life of Columbus was reviewed from his birth in Italy down to the discovery of America, the saving of the liberty of the country by Lafayette and other Catholics: the financing of Washington's army by four Irishmen of Philadelphia, all Catholics, when starvation and exposure had almost ruined it, and other deeds of valor of direct bearing upon the formation and establishment of the United States as a country, were referred to.

> "It was a Catholic who discovered this country; it was a Catholic queen who financed the expedition that gave this country to the world as a civilized nation; it was Catholic soldiers who saved it from the iron hand of oppression, and it was. Catholic money that financed it in its darkest hour and clothed and fed its army in time of distress, and yet we, as Catholics, are charged with disloyalty," declared Father Park. "I often wonder why we Catholics, we Knights of Columbus, are questioned as to our loyalty when these facts show that America is our country."

Every one of those statements is a most unblushing, premeditated, inexcusable, unscrupulous falsehood.

The several discoveries of this continent, the first of which was by Scandinavian pagans, did not become important, so far as our national existence is concerned, *until successful colonisation took place*; and that was accomplished by the Protestants of England and the Huguenots of France.

This is a historical fact which no honest scholar will deny, and if "Father" Park is ignorant of it, he is unfit to discuss the subject.

No Catholic colony thrived: no good to this country is traceable to Columbus, On the contrary, he introduced slavery, and thus became morally responsible for the extermination of the natives of the West Indies.

The Puritans of New England and the Episcopalians of Virginia, together with the Scotch-Irish Presbyterians, the French Huguenots of the Carolinas, founded the Democratic Republic of the United States.

The Catholic church is the historic foe of Democracies and Republics, because her law and her system are monarchical, antidemocratic, and anti-liberal.

A church which laid its official curse upon the Great Charter of our liberties takes you for an ignoramus, when it claims to be the founder of this Government, whose Supreme Laws embrace the principles of the Great Charter.

A church which has for 20 years fought and scotched an Immigration bill, because *its reading test* would expose the fact that, *in Catholic countries the people are not taught to read*,* displays amazing effrontery, when it claims credit for our Government, based as it is, upon free education, free thought, free speech, free vote, and people's rule.

* **Note:** This was true up the the middle the 19th century. By the mid-to-late 1800s, the rise of secular, state-funded compulsory education (such as France's Jules Ferry laws in the 1880s) rapidly erased the religious literacy gap across Western and Southern Europe.

How asinine it is the gabble about Lafayette- saving the liberties of our country!

In the first place, LaFayette was *not* a Catholic, and I have published the evidence, again and again. He hated priests especially; he helped to overthrow them, and to confiscate the huge loot which they had got together in France.

He utterly detested, loathed, and despised the popish system, because it is a Pagan affair, imposed upon Christians who don't know its true nature, and who are never allowed to learn.

Such priests as "Father" Park keep the eyes of papal dupes securely sealed.

In the second place, LaFayette's share in Washington's success was almost negligible, not to compare with that of John Laurens, John Paul Jones, and the obscure Southern leaders, who won the Battle of King's Mountain.

In the third place, our *liberties* were not at stake in the Revolutionary War, which was fought because the Mother Country claimed the right to tax us, in England, on account of the extra expense incurred by her in defending us from the Catholic governments of Spain and France.

Had we been defeated in that War, *our liberties as English subjects would have remained*; and we would now perhaps have as much true democracy and home-rule as are at present enjoyed by Canada, Australia, and New Zealand.

The colonists who fought seven years for Independence, politically, never dreamed that we would lose personal, commercial, industrial, and political independence to American Corporations, the Money Power, and the usurping Federal Judiciary.

"Father" Park says that four Catholics financed the Revolutionary War.

No such thing happened. It is an impudent invention. Not one shred of historical evidence can be brought forward to sustain it.

Catholics helped to fight England, partly because England had recently fought the popes.

Scotch and Irish Catholics hated England intensely, because the Catholic attempt to recapture the British throne had been bloodily defeated, in Ireland, at the Battle of the Boyne; and, in England, at the Battle of Culloden.

This last occurred in 1745, just a few years before the Revolutionary War started.

France herself loaned the Colonies money, and encouraged adventurous young LaFayettes, Dillons, Lauzuns, etc., to come over on our side, because of the long, long struggle between Catholic Kings of France, and Protestant Kings of England.

Catholic loyalty, about which we are hearing so much tommyrot and slumgullion these days, *has never been tested in this country.*

There is no test until the pope is on one side and the Government on the other.

Then the test comes, and then you see the Catholics betray the Government in obedience to the pope.

Look at the French Catholics in Canada! They refuse to fight for their own Empire in this War, because the pope is now trying to revenge the Papacy on England, for its defiant breakaway from Rome during the Reformation.

Look at the Irish Catholics! They refuse to fight for their Empire, and have been traitorously fighting with the pope and the German despots.

England's main weakness today is the disloyalty of her Catholic subjects.

These papists have been enjoying all the immense privileges of British citizenship, and they are just as truly the subjects of the Empire as the Scotch are, but their priests ordered them not to enlist, and they have obeyed the mandates of their church.

Under the same circumstances, our Catholics will do the same.

If we go to war with the German despots, every Romanist chaplain will be a German spy, and every Catholic priest an instrument of treason.

That's what they are *now,* in Canada; that's what they are, in Ireland; and that's what they are, *at heart,* in this Union.

Their oaths bind them to the foreign potentate who despotically rules their foreign church.

They are papal subjects, FIRST, *and American subjects,* SECOND.

Poisoning the Fountain, to Papalize the Stream

THE American Book Company is, in fact, the School-book Trust; and it is controlled by Roman Catholics, of New York and Chicago. For many years, it has had a stranglehold upon the Southern States, because of its well-spent money. If circumstances make a case, it has bribed newspapers, State School Commissioners, County School officers, and Principals in high schools —not all, but enough to keep the Trust in full possession of its monopoly.

More than a million children are being educated in the Pope's parochial schools, where none but Catholic teachers are employed, and where every book used is thoroughly papist.

Not a line favorable to Protestant principles, or to democratic principles, can find a place in those Catholic text-books.

The pupils are taught to abhor everything antagonistic to popery, and admonished that their souls will be in danger of hell-fire, if they read any book, or paper which exposes Romanism.

Thus, Catholic education seals the mind of the Catholic child, and it becomes *closed* to anything but Catholic literature.

Let these millions of children, who are every year attending the parochial schools, grow into manhood and womanhood, to become fathers and mothers, *whose children, in their turn, will be* given the same anti-Protestant training, and you can see what a host of enemies our democratic institutions will have to contend with, in a few years.

But the Roman Catholics are not satisfied with the exclusive control of their own schools: *they have reached out and invaded ours.*

Into our Public Schools—and even into private Protestant schools—they have thrust their teachers, to subtly propagate popery.

They introduce symbols that are peculiarly popish, and in this way the minds of the Protestant children are familiarized with the system, and *silently taught* not to antagonize it.

The crucifix, the Madonna, the nun's garb, the priest's habit, the picture of Christ and the angels, the image of the Virgin, &c., artfully placed where the pupils constantly see them, *each silently* in favor of a foreign system which is nothing in the world but ancient Paganism masquerading under Christian names.

Heathen idolatry—borrowing the words, Christ, Mary, Joseph, Peter, Paul, &c.—comes into Christian lands, and impudently says, "Accept idolatry, and pay a high price for it, *because* I have condescended to change the names of Jove, Juno, Venus, Cybele, and Pluto, for those of Jehovah, Mary, Anne, Joseph, Peter, Paul, and Satan."

You remember the old lines of the poet who says that Vice is a monster of so frightful a mien that, when *first* seen, it excites horror, but seen *too often*, "we first *endure*, then pity, then *embrace*."

Those old familiar lines exactly fit the lesson I am trying to drive home.

Roman Catholicism, when first seen, with its images, prostrations, Latin mummeries, daytime candles, unmarried priests. walled-up women, fake miracles, medal swindles, adoration of a foreign Italian priest, utter abasement of the laity, inner secrets, night-hawk secret societies, armed military organizations; wafers made into gods, and then eaten; wine made into blood, and then drunken—all this excites disgust, loathing, horror, *when first seen*.

> "But, seen too oft, familiar with her face,
> We first endure, then pity, then embrace."

At public ceremonies of all kinds; in street parades so dear to the papist propaganda; in the "field mass"; in the celebration of every possible public function; in the display of papal statues, in paintings, signs, and emblems; in the indefatigable efforts of the priest to push himself on to every public stage, and to put his finger into every public pie; in the constant self-exhibitions of Ancient Hibernians. Knights of Columbus, Cardinals, bishops, chaplains, St. Patrick displays, and Columbus Day fanfaronade— at all times and places, Romanism shows its best face, hoping to lull its enemies into forgetfulness of its *worst*.

When it invades our Public Schools, with its County Superintendent, or its members of the City Board, or its "Sister" in the class-room, or its symbols displayed on the wall, the approach is insidious enough, God knows!

The greater menace, however, is in *the papalised text-book*.

If the mind of the Protestant child can be poisoned by papal dope *in the Protestant school*, then the Protestant academy becomes a nursery of Popery.

And the work of the papalized text-book in the Protestant school becomes even more effective for the designs of political popery than the Catholic text-book is, *because* a text-book, *plainly Catholic*, could not reach the Protestant schools and do missionary work among Protestant children.

The text-book which claims to be Protestant, but which is in fact, Catholic, does infinitely more harm than the books which are undisguisedly Catholic, on the same principle that the wolf, disguised as a sheep, is the most dangerous of all wolves to the flock.

Suppose the Protestant child can be educated to believe that there is no material difference between the past records of Romanism and Protestantism; and that Protestant churches, governments, monarchs, and official representatives committed crimes, in the name of religion, just as Rome must confess that she did, what follows?

It *naturally* follows that the child will grow up with the idea that the Romanism which was *once* dangerous to liberty, progress, and life, *perished from earth, ages ago*.

If the Protestant boy becomes a man, *in that belief*, he will be hard to move when he is asked to consider that Rome has never changed her laws, her system, her purposes, or her methods.

He will sneer at the Lutherans, who manifest the *zeal* of Martin Luther; at the Presbyterians, who display the fervor of John Knox; at the Episcopalians, who wear the militant garb of Latimer and Ridley; at the Baptists, who fight with the flaming swords of Bunyan and Roger Williams.

Such a Protestant pupil, grown to manhood, will be practically the friend of Popery and the foe of Protestantism, because his attitude of scornful indifference will influence others to believe that the Roman leopard must have changed its spots.

It cannot *now* be what it used to be, else this educated Protestant would not be so contemptuously unfriendly to anti-Catholic agitators.

PAPALIZED TENT-BOOKS!

A few days ago, I received a letter from an Atlanta schoolboy, containing the paragraph below:

> I showed Albert_____ of the Boys' High School (Atlanta) your statement to the effect that the Protestants had neither persecuted nor burnt Roman Catholics. He is the smartest boy in town, and when I said that, he immediately said you were wrong. I asked for proof, and he brought me his history text "Outlines of European History," by Robinson and Breasted, which is used in "Boys High" and "Girls High" of this city.
>
> The following is on page 618: "The Catholics, it should be noted, later suffered serious persecution under Elizabeth and James I, the Protestant successors of Mary. Death was the penalty fixed in many cases for those who obstinately refused to recognize the monarch as the rightful head of the English church, and heavy fines were imposed for failure to attend Protestant worship. Two hundred Catholic priests are said to have been executed under Elizabeth, Mary's sister, who succeeded her on the throne; others were tortured or perished miserably in prison."

For years, a Roman Catholic has been at the head of the County Board; for years, they have employed Catholic teachers; for years, the State School Superintendent has been deaf to every criticism of his methods, although his methods were Catholic and illegal!

Last year, one of the salaried officers of the State delivered addresses in the public schools, repeating the lesson she learned from the Catholic text-book which is taught in our Public Schools.

Miss Parish not only defended the use of the State's money in the Catholic *religious* schools, but she defended Bloody Queen Mary, and said that Queen Elizabeth had persecuted the Catholics, as ferociously as Mary did the Protestants.

Evidently Miss Parish got *her* lesson out of the same book that duped the boy.

Who are these authors, "Robinson and Breasted"? ?

There is an Illinois author named Breasted who is put down as an “Orientalist” in the well-known biographical encyclopedia, *Who’s Who*. He is an expert on Eastern languages, Egyptology, and Oriental history. The sketch—*prepared by himself*—makes no mention of his qualifications as an authority on English history, but specifies at length his studies and his works on Oriental subjects.

He doesn’t say a word about his qualifications for revolutionizing the history of England, and making Bloody Mary and Queen Elizabeth twin-sisters.

There are so many authors, named Robinson, whose biographies appear in *Who’s Who,* that it is impossible for me, without the aid of the text-book itself, to identify its co-author.

But, let us try to find out whether the authors, Breasted and Robinson, loaned their names to a deliberate falsehood.

If what the book says is a lie, we know why it was written, published, and introduced into the Public Schools.

My long introduction will have shown you *the reason* for poisoning the minds of the Protestant children, *if* they have been poisoned.

If Albert_____ had heard a *Catholic priest* accuse Queen Elizabeth of murdering Catholics on account of their religion, he would not have believed it; but when the boy was *taught this,* as a lesson in his school, what could he do but believe?

It never entered his head that the Catholic Book Trust could use our pretended Protestant *officials*, as papal proselyters.

Aren’t a majority of the Boards, the Principals, *et cetera,* all sound in their complacent Protestantism? So far as lips go, they are.

Then, when they adopt and teach a Catholic text-book, slyly padded with Catholic lies, what can the pupils do, *except to get their lessons out of the Catholic book?*

Thus do we build school-systems, and maintain them at enormous expense, only to find that we are furnishing academies for the propagation of popery!

In my day, the text-book on the “Outlines of History” was “Robbin’s.” A fine old work it is. No better one has ever been produced.

It was published by J. B. Lippincott in 1857, when I was three years old, and I studied it at the Steed High School, in Thomson.

What were we Protestants taught about Queen Mary at the Thomson High School, in 1869-70-71? This:

> “Mary, Edward’s sister, next ascended the throne in 1553. History has assigned to her the unenviable title of ‘bloody,’ from the persecutions and martyrdoms suffered by the Protestants in her reign. Her disposition was morose, tyrannical, and cruel, in the highest degree. Bent upon

> the restoration of the Catholic religion, she hesitated at no measures, however unjust, which were calculated to effect the object."

That summary is conservatively and impartially true. In a book of Outlines, Dr. Robbins could not go into the hideous details and tell how this frenzied Catholic queen, egged on by the pope, by the priests, and by her monstrous husband, Philip II. of Spain, burnt more than 280 men, women, and *children*, because they refused to say that priests could create God out of bread.

One of the men she burnt was the venerable Archbishop Cranmer, who, in part, was author of the "Great English Bible" whose translation, from the dead language into the living, gave such mortal offense to Rome.

Among the victims were "bishops, divines, country gentlemen, artificers, husbandmen, servants, laborers, wives, widows, spinsters, *two boys*, AND TWO INFANTS."

(Sanderson, "History of England," page 455. Published in 1893.)

“The Catholic Laymen’s Association” Re-writes History, Placing Fables Where Facts Belong

IT IS comical to see such men as compose the Catholic Laymen’s Association transforming themselves into megaphones, through which the Jesuit priests can talk “history” to the unwary.

Let us examine a few points in the Laymen’s historical discourses, and see how they agree with historical facts.

“WYCLIFFE DIED IN HIS BED”

Addressing a circular letter to my friend, Rev. S.G. Woodall, of the LaGrange, Ga., *Graphic*, the Laymen’s chairman, J.J. Farrell, thus repeats the lesson taught him by his Jesuit priest:

> “Wycliffe died in his bed, on the 31st of December, 1384, from a stroke of apoplexy received three days previous, on the 28th, **while he was assisting at the holy sacrifice of the Mass**.

Like the majority of our Protestant ministers, Mr. Woodall was born in a rural district, where books of reference are seldom found; therefore the Jesuits, who are megaphoning through the Laymen’s Association, deemed it safe to dispose of Wycliffe, in one deceptive sentence.

The impression sought to be made, in the case of the Great Reformer, is, that he lived at peace with Rome, and virtually died while celebrating Rome’s distinctive rite, the Mass.

Yet, anyone who has access to the Encyclopedia Britannica —before the Jesuits doctored the last edition—will at once realize how the Laymen have *evaded* the story of John Wycliffe.

(See the United Editors’ Encyclopedia, the Colombian, Johnson’s, Harmsworth’s, Appleton’s, Cassell’s, or any other, except those that the lying Jesuits have mutilated and changed—as they recently were permitted to do with the *Britannica*.)

Did Wycliffe live and die, a good papist, at peace with Rome?

Let us get at the facts, briefly: using the latest and best “Life” of the Reformer, by Prof. Gotthard Lechler, of the University of Leipzig. 1878.

On pages 165, 6, and 7, the learned German scholar states the causes which led Pope Gregory XI. *to seek the life of the English priest*.

The first great cause was that Wycliffe had contended that the Roman church had no moral right to own and enjoy such vast properties, *unless* the church used this property for *religious and charitable purposes*;

Secondly, Wycliffe contended that the Pope could not use the power of “the keys,” except in conformity with the gospel. In other words, the English priest appealed to the Bible, as Luther did at a much later date, and as the persecuted Minorites of Italy had done in the 13th century,

Thirdly, Wycliffe denied that every priest had free power to forgive all manner of sin.”

The Laymen's allusion to Wycliffe gives you no hint of this deep and *protestant* character of Wyclifian "heresy" nor do the Laymen give you any hint of the narrowness of *Wycliffe's escape from death by fire*—a fate which afterward overtook John Huss and Jerome, on account of this same Wycliffian "heresy."

The powerful Duke of Lancaster saved Wycliffe's life from papal vengeance by protecting him with a military escort at his trial, defying the bloodthirsty papal court, and taking Wycliffe away from London.

In practically the same manner, the Elector of Saxony protected Martin Luther and saved his life when the malignant papists were demanding that he be burned at the stake.

Did Wycliffe die of a stroke of "apoplexy," while he was "*assisting at the holy sacrifice of the Mass*"?

He did *not* have a stroke of apoplexy; he was *not* assisting at Mass, and he had contemptuously rejected the idea that the *Communion*, in bread and wine, is a "*sacrifice*."

Wycliffe had been *paralysed* in 1382, and was totally disabled from public ministrations: two years later, he received a second stroke, "while *hearing* Mass in his Parish church," and died soon afterwards, without having spoken a word.

(See Lechler's "John Wycliffe," pages 419 and 420.)

But did Wycliffe believe that the Communion was "*a holy sacrifice*," as these Jesuits indirectly assert?

Just the reverse is true.

Let me copy the Index references in the Lechler book, given under the word, *Transubstantiation*:

"*Renounced by W." (Wycliffe, of course*), pages 341, 343, 359.
Contrary to Scripture, 344.
Unsupported by early tradition, 345.
Opposed to the senses, 346.
Supported by *false* metaphysics, 346.
Consequences of, 347.
Blasphemy of, 349.
Openly attacked by W., 367.
His twelve theses, 368."

Now, what is your opinion of the *honesty* of such Catholic laymen, when they scatter literature which claims that John Wycliffe believed in "the holy sacrifice of the Mass," and received his fatal stroke while *assisting* at this "sacrifice"—*the supreme conquest that Popery makes over the mind of man?*

Let us turn to the last page cited in the Index of Professor Lechler's magnificent biography of "the Morning Star of the Protestant Reformation": it reads:

"In the summer of 1381, he (Wycliffe) published twelve short theses upon the Lord's Supper, and *against Transubstantiation, . . .*

These theses were the following:

(1.) The consecrated host which we see on the altar *is neither Christ nor any part of Him*, but the efficacious *sign of Him."*

The other eleven theses are variations of the same thought, the 12th declaring that *wheaten bread* is the only kind that should be used.

(Roman Catholicism, in many parts of America, makes the wafer out of *rice*: in Ireland and Belgium, out of *potatoes*.)

Wycliffe expressed substantially the Protestant idea, as to the Supper, and he uses our word *sacrament*, not "*sacrifice*."

The two words mean entirely different things.

Wycliffe's life was "always in danger" (page 417), but he kept himself so quietly, under his powerful protectors, that he "died in his bed"; yet, the rage of the papists, relentless and hyena-like, *desecrated his grave, burnt his bones, and scattered his ashes in waters of the brook.*

When you consider these undeniable historic facts, easily verified by reference to standard Histories of England, Histories of the Reformation, Histories of Martyrs, Biographies of the Reformers, and non-papalized Encyclopedias, what *do* you think of the honesty of these "Catholic Laymen," who have appointed themselves *your teachers*, in the province of Roman Catholic creed and record?

DID THE POPE "BLESS" COPERNICUS AND HIS GREAT BOOK?

Let us take up the next statement made by these self-appointed dissipators of "ignorance and prejudice."

Refuting the assertion that the Pope resisted the progress of scientific research and discovery, our conciliatory Catholic Laymen say:

> "Copernicus died in his bed, of dysentery, on the 24th of May, 1543, while in the act of reading the Pope's blessing for having dedicated to him that great scientific work of which Copernicus was the author and which caused the Ptolemaic system of astronomy to be discarded and the 'Copernican' system which is now accepted, to be substituted."

Of all the liars that ever served the Devil, the Jesuits are the chiefest. Their secret "theology" teaches them to lie, and it is a lesson which they *master.*

As every literary man knows, it used to be the custom of authors to court favor and patronage in high places, by dedicating their books to the great; and this dedication was ordinarily worded in terms of fulsome flattery.

The author's *hope* was that the dedication would secure him a gratuity in money, and also *protection*, from his enemies.

When we bear this in mind, the acts of the timorous astronomer, Copernicus, in dedicating his discovery to a *Pope*, become doubtfully affecting.

He didn't want to be imprisoned for more than a dozen years, as the Pope had *imprisoned the pioneer of physical research* Roger Bacon; he didn't want to be burnt at the stake, as the Pope had burnt the believer in a plurality of worlds, Giordano Bruno; and he had no relish for being tortured by the *Pope's Roman Inquisition, as Galileo was tortured for having discovered that the earth moved round the sun.*

Hoping to propitiate the fanatical and densely ignorant priests, Copernicus did dedicate his great work to the Pope; *but what happened?*

The Pope DAMNED THE BOOK, and had it listed in the catalogue of forbidden literature, which no Catholic can read, without being thereby automatically *(ipso facto) excommunicated and consigned to hell!*

I have two copies of the Index of Prohibited books, the official *Index Expurgatorious*; and "that great scientific work of which Copernicus was the author" is listed, in both, with the damned.

You will find the entry on page 72 of the "Index," published by the Pope's printers at the Vatican, in Rome, under Pope Pius VII, in 1776.

The Title-page exhibits the official character of the book—. which itself is dedicated to the memory of Pope Benedict XIV.— and the fly-leaf presents a picture of a bonfire being made out of prohibited books, with the priests feeding the holy flames by flinging into them such books as that of Copernicus, while two exceedingly fat cherubs, on wings, and with a trumpet in one hand, support the keys and the triple crown of the Pope.

Turning to page 72, we find the entry of "the great scientific work of which Copernicus was the author": the damnatory notice of it is *so* specific that even the Catholic Laymen of Georgia ought to know they will lose their precious souls, *if they dare to read "that great scientific work."*

If they *have* read it, they are even now, *ipso facto*, consigned to eternal perdition.

But again I ask you—what DO you think of the HONESTY of self-chosen eradicators of "ignorance and prejudice"?

Inasmuch as the death of Copernicus has always been considered one of the most touching scenes in biographical literature. I will here copy the simple facts, given in the Ninth Edition of the *Britannica*, published in 1890, by Funk & Wagnalls, who were not then papal colporteurs:

"The work was printed at Nuremberg . . . The impression had just been completed when Copernicus 'was seized with dysentery, followed by *paralysis*.

For some time he lingered, and on the day of his death, only a few hours before he expired, a copy of his work . . . arrived, and was placed in his hands.

He touched it, and seemed conscious of what it was; but after regarding it for an instant, he relapsed into a state of insensibility, which soon terminated in death."

The writer of this article on Copernicus cites a long list of authorities, and his statements have never been disputed.

But they leave the Catholic Laymen in bad plight—don't they?

The friend who was supervising the printing at Nuremberg sent the dying author a first—perhaps *the* very first—copy; and Copernicus roused himself, just a moment, and *seemed* to know the child of his brain; then he passed into unconsciousness.

These Catholic Laymen allowed their Jesuit prompters to make them say that Copernicus *was reading the Pope's letter,* at the time of his death; when, in fact, the Pope had not seen the book, and Copernicus was too far gone to even read a word of his own immortal work.

Too far gone to feel *the thrill of authorship,* he could only gaze on his book, without even being able to open it.

These self-appointed instructors of Protestant "ignorance and prejudice" have lent their names to the statement that the Pope "*blessed a work which the Pope's own official Index shows that he* DAMNED!

What are we to think of such Catholic Laymen? Are they the *innocent* dupes of their priests?

HOW ABOUT CRANMER AND LATIMER, THE PROTESTANT MARTYRS?

The Chairman of the Committee of Catholic Laymen is so well pleased with his setting us right on Wycliffe and Copernicus, that he proceeds, with cheerful alacrity, to reconstruct our notions about Cranmer and Latimer, who were burnt at the stake by that loveable type of Catholic Christianity, Queen Mary:

Chairman Farrell says:

> "Cranmer and Latimer were both tried, condemned and executed in **strict compliance with the forms of English laws, laws too, which Cranmer himself had forced through Parliament** and which he was most energetic in executing, first on Catholics like More and Fisher and Lady Salisbury, who would not acknowledge Henry as Pope, then on Protestants who would not subscribe to the Catholic doctrine of the Real Presence, finally on both Catholics and Protestants who would not adhere to the Established church that was Cranmer's pet scheme under Edward VI. **The victims of this man's unscrupulous measures among your forbears and mine, number thousands, hundreds of whom were brought to the stake, while others were beheaded, tortured, 'ripped up,' parboiled.**"

Chairman Farrell then trails off into a lengthy diatribe against Cranmer, whom the priests killed, and now hate, because he was so actively *instrumental in giving the people a Bible that they could read*. The papists wanted the Book to stay buried in the dead Latin language; and Cranmer was one of those who determined that it should begin to *live in English.*

The Protestant Bibles, printed in plain English, *forced the Catholics to print theirs in English*; but they have never forgiven the men who compelled them to do this; and they insert, in every copy of *their* English Bible, a fly-leaf "Admonition," warning the lay brothers and sisters *not to read it.*

(Chairman Farrell never read the Bible: none of these “Catholic Laymen” has read it: they meekly take the priests’ word for what’s in it.)

Before citing you to any Protestant authority on the manner in which Bloody (Queen Mary murdered Cranmer, who was Archbishop of Canterbury, and who had been the closest friend of King Henry VIII, I will refer you to *the Catholic historian*, Dr. John Lingard; and you may judge from his book how truthful these Laymen are, in saying that “Cranmer and Latimer were both tried in strict compliance with the forms of English law.”

On page 401, Dr. Lingard clearly states that, while Cranmer had “proposed” a law to punish Catholics for professing a belief in Transubstantiation and “the papal supremacy,” the proposition did not become a law, owing to the death of the young King, Edward VI, son of Henry VIII.

Therefore, the standard Catholic historian knocks the pins from under these Laymen, who allege that Cranmer and Latimer were the victims of “laws which Cranmer himself had forced through Parliament.”

Dr. Lingard expressly states (page 401) that Queen Mary revived the hideous old laws against the Lollards—*laws that were obsolete before Cranmer was born!*

Cranmer, therefore, had nothing whatever to do with the making of the “law” under which the Romanists murdered him.

As to the trials, Dr. Lingard states that the Protestants were haled before the Roman prelate, Gardiner, who presided in a *papal court* with *sixteen Catholic bishops*; and this ECCLESIASTICAL INQUISITION began to burn “heretics.”

Cranmer himself was served with a summons to APPEAR BEFORE THE POPE, in 80 days; and both Latimer and Ridley *were condemned to death by the Roman bishops* of Lincoln, Gloucester, and Bristol, acting as commissioners for the Pope’s legate. (See Lingard, page 402.)

Do the Catholic Laymen of Georgia hold that *this* proceeding was “a trial,” according to the strict forms of English laws”?

Is that the kind of trial which the Protestants may again expect, when the Pope’s treason-gangs “Make America Catholic”?

Who condemned Archbishop Cranmer? *Where* was it done?

Dr. Lingard tells you with a robust Englishman’s innate love of Truth:

“AT ROME, on the expiration of the eighty days, the royal proctors demanded judgment; and PAUL,” (THE POPE) “*in a private consistory*, PRONOUNCED THE USUAL SENTENCE.”

Tried by an Italian priest, in Rome, in private, and in the absence of the accused, without hearing a word in his defense!

"The usual sentence," *was death*, of course; and Cranmer was so terrified by it, that his courage failed him.

He piteously pleaded for life, offering to recant; but the Queen was inexorable, and the old man went to his terrible ordeal at the stake, redeeming by a heroic fortitude in the flames, the many errors of his career, and the momentary weakness which had unmanned him.

May I repeat my question: *What is to be thought of the* HONESTY *of these Catholic Laymen, when they so shamelessly belie the facts of history?*

I confute them with *the Catholic historian*; but if you will consult the Protestant authorities, your feeling of amazement and disgust at the lies of these Catholic Laymen will be deepened.

(Read Knight, Green, Aubrey, Turner, Hume, Froude, Hallam, Harmsworth, Foxe, Strickland, Burnett, Sanderson, or any other standard work.)

CRANMER'S "THOUSANDS" OF VICTIMS "AMONG YOUR FORBEARS AND MINE!

Cranmer was the Catholic prelate who granted to the Catholic King, Henry VIII, a divorce from his Catholic wife, Catherine of Aragon, after the Italian Pope had played politics with the king's application for several years.

(In our own day, we have seen the Italian Pope grant divorces to the rich Drexels of Philadelphia, and to the rich Crokers of New York; and Cranmer knew that the Italian Popes had recently granted divorces to their own bastard children, and to such usable kings as Louis XII. of France: but the Pope of Henry Eighth's day was so completely in the power of Catherine's nephew, the Emperor Charles V., that King Henry could not get his divorce.)

The fact that Cranmer ignored the Italian Pope and gave the king a dissolution of his marriage, *was another reason why the Papists thirsted for his blood.*

Our Catholic Laymen inherit this holy Roman hatred, and they now tell us that Cranmer did great execution "among your forbears and mine," burning a few, beheading a few, torturing a few, ripping up a few, and parboiling a few!

Then Cranmer was *almost* as bad as Pope Innocent III, who instituted "religious" massacres of men, women, and children; set up the Inquisition in Rome, and roasted "heretics" by slow fires, after having racked their joints apart with hideous engines, *made for the purpose, by the Holy Roman church*.

Like all Protestants of those days, Cranmer had been reared and educated in *Popery*, and had been taught that *religious murder* was godly.

He could not at once emancipate himself entirely from his Catholic education—the force of which we now see illustrated by "the Catholic Laymen of Georgia."

On page 380, Dr. John Lingard's *Catholic* history brings the worst charges against the erring Cranmer; and these are the very words of that Romanist historian:

> "*Several* were put to death for preaching new doctrines: one of these, a woman named Bocher, would have been spared, but Cranmer urged the king to put his signature to the warrant. Another victim was Von Parris, a Dutchman, and a surgeon in London. He denied the divinity of Christ . . . and the unhappy man was committed to the flames."

That's the worst. Dr. Lingard hated Cranmer's memory, as all good Papists do; but the Doctor was *an honest man*.

Against Cranmer's memory, he brings no charges of "thousands" of victims: no charges of "torture": no charge of "parboiling."

The solitary case mentioned—Mrs. Bocher's—is bad enough, God knows, but it happened in an age when Rome had taught all Christendom to murder human beings in the name of Christ. (She was not a Catholic, but an extreme schismatic.)

As to the Dutchman who denied the divinity of Christ, he could not have dwelt in Maryland under Lord Baltimore's charter, nor in Mexico under the rule of Dictator Diaz and the infamous Archbishop Mora —of whom Cardinal Gibbons is so extremely fond.

Under Diaz and Mora, *eight* Protestants were publicly burnt, on the Square, at Texacapa, in November, 1895, not because they denied the divinity of Christ, but *because they denied the divinity of the Italian Pope*.

Do the Catholic Laymen of Georgia remember *this* case?

Among those eight victims of papal fire in 1895, were five men, two women, AND ONE LITTLE GIRL!

It was *the law of your foreign church* that murdered those Mexicans—the same satanic law which massacred the Albigenses, the Huguenots, the Waldensians, the Lollards, the Presbyterians, the Baptists, and the Episcopalians.

That infernal law *remains* on the statute book of your foreign church; and, if you American foot-kissers succeed in your many-sided efforts to "*Make America Catholic*," THAT LAW WILL DELUGE THIS COUNTRY WITH INNOCENT BLOOD.

There is not a kingdom in Europe that has not run red, in consequence of Rome's murderous laws and Inquisition.

From Portugal and Spain, to the British Isles; from the Northern limits of Bohemia, to the sunny plains of Southern France; from the shores of the Mediterranean Sea, to the stormy waves of the Baltic, your hellish system of Popery has glutted itself on human agony and human blood.

THE END

This PDF file was created on November 15, 2026, by James A. Arendt, from articles on https://jamesjpn.net/ Please share it with all your loved ones.