

10 GOOD REASONS

why you should be a Catholic

Short, R. A.
- 10 good reasons -
ADV 9535





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2016

10 GOOD REASONS
WHY YOU SHOULD
BE A CATHOLIC

by
R. A. SHORT

Published by the
BELLARMINE PUBLISHING CO.
MOUND, MINNESOTA

Litho in the U.S.A.

*Dedicated to All
Who Seek
True Peace
Of Mind
And Soul*

Nihil Obstat: Walter H. Peters, S.T.L., Ph.D.
Censor Librorum

Imprimatur: ✠ William O. Brady, S.T.D., D.D.
Archbishop of St. Paul

The NIHIL OBSTAT and the IMPRIMATUR indicate only that this manuscript has been read before publication by one who is competent; that in the manuscript he has found nothing contrary to the faith of the Catholic Church nor to its moral teachings. In indicating that nothing such has been found there is no implication that those who grant the NIHIL OBSTAT or the IMPRIMATUR agree with all the contents, opinions or statements expressed in the manuscript.

FOREWORD

THIS BOOKLET PRESUMES, DEAR READER, THAT YOU BELIEVE IN GOD. Every sensible person believes in God for every sensible person is aware that without a Creator there could be no creation. Something cannot spring from nothing. An omnipotent God of infinite love and justice simply must be for the great universe with all its beauty and harmony to be. That is a rule of logic as basic and as inflexible as two and two make four. In addition to the evidence of logic the evidence of human experience proves the existence of God. Often down through the ages man has witnessed actual, unmistakable manifestations of His Presence, His power and His loving solicitude. So unmistakable were these manifestations Job, one of the foremost realists of ancient times, was compelled to write: "Only the fool will say in his heart there is no God." Today our foremost men of science are expressing this very same sentiment. Wrote Albert Einstein: "I admit a humble recognition of the illimitable superior Spirit who reveals himself in the slight details we are able to perceive with our frail and feeble minds."

Being aware of the Reality of God it is also to be presumed, dear reader, that you recognize the need for religion, for a way to give God the adoration and obedience which is His due. Reason insists and justice demands—God himself has decreed—that unless He is adored and His Will obeyed there will be no sharing in the great reward of life which is eternal happiness with Him in the life that lies beyond the grave. We like to think of ourselves as independent creatures but deep in our hearts we know that we are *dependent* creatures, dependent on God for everything good that comes out of life—and, of course, the one way of showing our dependency is through religion.

But this conscious need of religion raises a question: *Which religion?* In the world there are a variety of religions. There is Buddhism, Hinduism, Mohammedism and Taoism, and among the Christian religions there is Eastern Orthodoxy, Protestantism and Catholicism. Which of these religions is needed to give one the greatest possible assurance that God's Will is being complied with, the best possible guarantee of eternal salvation? *Which of these religions would God himself recommend?*

It is not always an easy question to answer, what with all the claims and counter claims; but it is the author's contention, a contention shared, incidentally, by more people than any other, that the religion most needed, the religion which can give you the greatest assurance that you are complying with the Divine Will, is the Catholic religion. There is a threefold basis for this contention: First and foremost Sacred Scripture, wherein the bulk of divine prophecy is recorded, provides a basis; secondly history, wherein the fulfillment of divine prophecy is recorded, provides a basis; and thirdly logic, wherein the affects of religion on people are evaluated, provides a basis. Put them all together, co-relate them as they should be co-related, and the justification for this contention will become ever so clear — consider them honestly and objectively, without the impediment of past prejudices, and you will find not one good reason why you should be a Catholic but TEN good reasons, the ten good reasons described in the following chapters of this booklet.

YOU NEED THE
ORIGIN
OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

Between 2300 and 3500 years ago, the Old Testament informs us, God revealed on several separate occasions that He would appear on earth in human flesh to personally effect, through teaching, through a sacrifice of propitiation for sin and through the establishment of a New Covenant Church, the salvation of mankind. Man had fallen into such a depraved state God had to take drastic measures, had to come personally to man's rescue, otherwise man would be hopelessly mired in his guilt and have to suffer the dire consequences—eternal banishment from heaven.

A little over 1900 years ago God kept His promise; *He appeared on earth in the Person of Jesus Christ.*

There can be no doubt that Jesus was in truth the promised Redeemer—God Incarnate. He fulfilled the divine prophecy right down to the smallest detail: He was born in the city of Bethlehem according to the prophecy, of a virgin according to the prophecy, promulgated divine truth according to the prophecy, performed miracles according to the prophecy, was crucified according to the prophecy, rose from the dead according to the prophecy and established a New Covenant Church according to the prophecy. As St. John the Apostle tells us in his eye-witness report: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God; and the Word was God . . . And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us. And we saw his glory—glory as of the only-begotten of the Father—full of grace and of truth." (*John 1:1-14*)

Jesus *had* to be God. Only God could have been so all wise, so all holy, *so all God-like*. Only God could have, in the brief span of three years, without schooling, without political power, without military conquest, without writing a single line or setting foot on a single foreign land, so profoundly affected the course of human conduct. *Only the actual coming of the Messiah could have so suddenly quieted the great expectancy of His Coming.*

Now what does all this have to do with the author's assertion that you need the origin of the Catholic Church? The point, dear reader, is this: Jesus was, for a fact, God Incarnate in the flesh; and Jesus did, for a fact, establish a New Covenant Church; *and the New Covenant Church established by Jesus is, for a fact, none other than the Catholic Church.* The point is: you need the origin of the Catholic Church because it is a *divine* origin, *because it certifies that the Catholic Church exists and functions not by man's authority but by God's authority.* No other church on the face of the earth can offer you this certification and the tremendous consolation that goes with it.

This is not idle sectarian presumption; history affirms in the most unequivocal language that the Catholic Church, or "Roman" Catholic Church if you prefer, is the Church personally founded and constituted by our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. History is filled with references to the "Catholic" Church that emerged out of Jerusalem nineteen hundred years ago, established its headquarters in Rome, then, despite many bloody persecutions, persisted down through the centuries, never once losing its identity as "the Catholic Church." History is filled with the most authoritative testimony proving that the apostles and Church Fathers were members of this same Catholic Church.

There is the Apostles' Creed, for example, in which it is written: "I believe in the holy Catholic Church . . ." There are the letters of Polycarp, disciple of the Apostle John, signed: "Polycarp, Catholic Bishop of Smyrna."

There is a letter by Ignatius of Antioch, illustrious Church Father of the second century, in which he states: "Where the bishop is, there let the multitude of believers be; even as where Jesus is, there is the Catholic Church." And there is the famous Nicene Creed, composed by the Church Fathers of the fourth century, which contains the declaration: "I believe in one, holy, catholic and apostolic Church . . ."

Acknowledging that Rome was the seat of highest authority in the infant Christian Church the same Ignatius quoted above wrote in the introduction of his *Ignatius to the Romans*: "Ignatius, also called Theophorus, to the Church that has found mercy in the transcendent Majesty of the Most High Father and of Jesus Christ, His only Son; the Church by the will of Him who willed all things that exist, beloved and illuminated through the faith and love of Jesus Christ our God; which also presides in the chief place of the Roman territory . . . presiding in love, maintaining the law of Christ, and bearer of the Father's name; her do I therefore salute in the name of Jesus Christ." And Ignatius was not the only Church Father who acknowledged that the infant Christian Church was synonymous with the "Roman" Catholic Church; Hegessippus, Tertullian, Caius, Hippilytus, Cyprian, Anthanasius, Augustine and a host of others also acknowledged it, as you will see in the following chapters of this booklet. Cyprian put it most succinctly. He called the Catholic Church headquartered in Rome the Church "whence the unity of the Christian priesthood has its source."

History does indeed furnish proof, overwhelming proof, of the divine origin of the Catholic Church; and in proving the divine origin of the Catholic Church history proves the strictly *human* origin of the other Christian churches. Observe, if you will, that in the historical accounts of primitive Christianity there is not even the slightest mention of a Coptic Church, a Greek or Russian

Orthodox Church, a Lutheran Church, an Anglican (Episcopal) Church, a Methodist Church, a Baptist Church, a Presbyterian Church, et al. Observe, if you will, that every single history of Christian development describes the Coptic churches as having been formed in the fifth century by one Dioscorus, the independent Greek and Russian Orthodox churches as having been formed in the eleventh century by one Michael Cerularius, the Protestant churches as having been formed in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries by Martin Luther, John Calvin, King Henry the Eighth, John Wesley, etc., and the Christian cults—Mormon, Christian Scientist, Jehovah's Witness, etc.—as having been formed in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries by Joseph Smith, Mary Baker Eddy, Charles Taze Russell, etc. *Observe, if you will, that every single one of these churches' founders were mortal humans the same as you and I.*

Could it be that the above churches are newly formed "branches" of the historic Catholic Church? No, that could not possibly be. A branch of something, as you well know, is always a member of that something, always allied with that something, always controlled in large measure by that something—illustration: the branch of a tree, the branch of a river, the branch of a business corporation, the branch of a state government. Hence in order for the above churches to qualify as "branches" of the historic Catholic Church they would perforce have to be in communion with it, which obviously they are not.

Could it be that they are of divine origin by virtue of "divine inspiration"? No again. Nothing could be more preposterous. Christ, you will recall, roundly condemned the idea of denominationalism (*Mark 3:25, Luke 11-17*) and pledged that it would never be identified with His true fold (*John 10:16*). To suggest, therefore, that He would inspire people to form new independent church groups—to suggest that He would sponsor denomination-

alism in His fold—is to accuse Him of the most flagrant inconsistency.

One last try: Could it be that they are of divine origin by virtue of the divine origin of the gospel they preach? That is to say, could they possibly belong to the *spirit* of the original Christian Church? No, here again we are faced with an appalling absurdity. *Think! How can divine origin be attributed to hundreds of different gospels, some of them as different as night and day, when the whole world knows that Christ promulgated only one Gospel?* By their own admission they preach different gospels, for by their own admission it is their disagreement over what constitutes Christ's whole and true Gospel which keeps them divided into separate denominations. If they were really in the spirit of the original Christian Church there would not be all these divergent precepts of faith, there would not be this arbitrariness, this self-appointed freedom to formulate and preach contrary gospels. Such arbitrariness, said the Apostle Paul, is thoroughly opposed to the spirit of the original Christian Church (*Rom. 16:17, Gal. 1:18, Eph. 4:4-5*).

No, one cannot, without wandering far afield of Sacred Scripture, history and logic, ascribe divine origin to any church but the Catholic Church. When all of the facts are scrutinized carefully and objectively she alone emerges as the Church personally founded, constituted and sanctioned by our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

YOU NEED THE
UNITY
OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

A careful analysis of those passages of Sacred Scripture which relate to the formation of the Christian Church reveals that Christ was particularly emphatic on one point: His Church, put on earth to represent the eternal unity of the Triune Godhead—Father, Son and Holy Spirit—would also be characterized by a perfect and enduring unity; would, in fact, be a *part* of the heavenly unity. Witness Christ's poignant prayer to God the Father:

“AND THE GLORY THAT THOU HAS GIVEN TO ME, I HAVE GIVEN TO THEM, THAT THEY MAY BE ONE, EVEN AS WE ARE ONE, I IN THEM AND THOU IN ME; THAT THEY MAY BE PERFECTED IN UNITY.” John 17: 22-23.

Nor was Christ any less explicit when He declared: “There shall be ONE fold and ONE Shepherd” (*John 10:16*). Nor was the Apostle Paul any less explicit when, writing to his converts in the faith, he said: “You are called in ONE body” (*Col. 3:15*). “ONE body . . . ONE spirit . . . ONE hope . . . ONE Lord . . . ONE faith . . . ONE baptism” (*Eph. 4:4-5*).

Unity—perfect, constant unity—was indeed part of the divine plan for the Church of Jesus Christ, and for good reason: “If a kingdom is divided against itself, that kingdom cannot stand. And if a house is divided against itself, that house cannot stand,” said our Blessed Lord (*Mark 3:24-25*). If His Church was to survive the centuries, and

He pledged that it would, it would have to remain indomitably, *invincibly* united.

All of which explains, dear reader, why you need the unity of the Catholic Church. The Catholic Church is the only church which has come down through the Christian centuries indomitably, invincibly united—united in all departments: in membership, in belief and in authority. *The Catholic Church is the only church which wears this trademark of the true Church of Jesus Christ.*

Wishful thinking? No, Catholic unity has long been recognized, even by many of her severest critics, as one of the most conspicuous facts, one of the great phenomena, of history. To say that Catholic unity is phenomenal, however, is to put it lightly. It is nothing short of miraculous, *miraculous in a way which clearly evidences the protecting Hand of God.* The Caesars killed 30 popes, hundreds of bishops and priests and countless lay members of the Church in their determination to destroy Catholic unity and eventually the Church itself—but the affect of their persecution was to make the Church stronger, more united than ever. The armies of Attila the Hun ravaged the Church horribly as they swarmed over Europe—until they were stopped cold on the steps of St. Peter's Basilica in Rome and turned back by one lone, unarmed figure, the Pope. The Protestant Reformation witnessed the martyrdom, especially in England, of tens of thousands of bishops, priests and members of monastic orders because they refused to break with the Pope and embrace the new state religions. Today, four centuries later, the Catholic Church is still in business in those countries, still united under the Vicar of Christ in Rome. Then it was Napoleon's turn. He solemnly vowed that he would "still the voice of the Pope forever." But Napoleon was fated to ask for the Pope's forgiveness and the Last Sacraments of the Church before he died. And in our own times we see Hitler, Stalin and Mao Tse Tung

attempting the disruption of Catholic unity — with similar success.

A miracle of cohesion indeed! Never in all the annals of the human race has a society been subjected to so much stress and still remained intact.

Now what of the other Christian churches? Can you ascribe real honest to goodness unity to Eastern Orthodoxy and Protestantism? Lo, what has become of the original Eastern Orthodox and Protestant churches? Look at their histories—in contrast to the nineteen hundred year old steadfast oneness of the Catholic Church the original Eastern Orthodox Church (Greek) has, in a relatively short time, become split into 14 separate jurisdictions. In the brief period of four hundred years the original Protestant churches (Lutheran and Anglican) have become divided and sub-divided into no less than 538 distinct and autonomous bodies.

And the divisions outside of the Catholic Church continue unabated. The records show that for every two Protestant bodies that merge in an attempt toward unity four new ones spring up on the sidelines. The situation has gotten so out of hand that many of the more conscientious Protestant leaders are admitting now that real unity within their ranks is a lost cause. And they have begun to cast wistful, envious eyes at the great, imperishable unity of the Mother Church of Christianity — *for never has it been more obvious than now that the perfect and constant unity Christ promised his Church is to be found only under her ancient and holy mantle.*

YOU NEED THE
UNIVERSALITY
OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

It is quite true that a considerable number of Christian churches have world-wide membership and can, therefore, boast of "universality." The major Protestant denominations are definitely active throughout the world, the Eastern Orthodox churches have adherents throughout the world and in recent years a few of the Christian cults have likewise spread throughout the world.

But be that as it may, dear reader, you still need the universality of the Catholic Church—because hers is a very special brand of universality. Hers is the *scriptural* brand of universality. *Hers is that special brand of universality which Christ said would distinguish His true Church on earth.*

The uniquely scriptural character of Catholic universality is easily proved. In Sacred Scripture Christ said to His infant Church: "This gospel shall be preached in the whole world, for a witness to all nations . . . Go, therefore, into all nations, baptizing them. . . . Go into the whole world and preach the gospel to every creature" (*Matt. 28:14, 28:18, Mark 16:15*). There was no provision for vacillation or procrastination in Our Lord's words; He was making it very clear that His Church was to undertake its evangelistic crusade in the world, that is acquire its universality, immediately, *without delay*. And His Church did not delay. Obedient to the divine directive the apostles and their disciples set out immediately after Christ's Ascension to plant the faith throughout the known world. "They went forth and preached every-

where, while the Lord worked withal and confirmed the Word by the signs that followed" (*Mark 16:20*).

Thus we see in Sacred Scripture that Christ's true Church was not only ordained to be a universal church but it acquired this characteristic at the very outset of Christianity—*just as the Catholic Church acquired her universality at the very outset of Christianity*. Thus we see in Sacred Scripture that Christ's true Church was not only commissioned to preach the gospel to every nation, but to baptize, that is *Christianize*, every nation—*just as the Catholic Church has Christianized every nation that has ever been Christianized by missionary effort*.*

That the Catholic Church accomplished these things is clearly borne out in every scholarly account of Christian development. Select from any first rate public library a complete and impartial history of Christian development and you will see that while the Coptic Church lay static in Egypt the Catholic Church, under the Bishop of Rome, the Pope, followed up the missionary advances of the Apostles by converting single handed the masses of all Eastern and Western Europe—accounting for the fact that Europe is still predominantly Catholic. Then in the middle ages while the schismatic Greek and Russian Orthodox churches were languishing in their precious nationalism the Catholic Church extended the faith of Christ to Asia and the hinterlands of Africa—accounting for the fact that today the majority of Christians on those continents are Catholic. Finally it will be observed that in the fifteenth, sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, while the newborn Protestant churches were busy setting themselves up as the state religion and commandeering Catholic properties in their respective countries, the Catholic Church, undaunted by these losses, crossed the oceans and planted Christianity on the North and South

*Some nations were Christianized by immigration—the U.S.A., for example.

American continents—accounting for the fact that today three-fifths of all Christians in North America and nineteen-twentieths of all Christians in South America are Catholic.

Yes, history proves conclusively that unlike the recently acquired “universality” of the other Christian bodies the universality of the Catholic Church spans the centuries, keeping pace with the advance of civilization and oftentimes spearheading the advance—*precisely as Christ ordered.*

But there is still another special quality about Catholic universality which should appeal to the earnest Christian, a quality which adds still more weight to the Church’s claim that hers is the only *real* Christian universality: It is uniform, evenly diffused throughout the world, so that it can rightly be said that the Catholic faith is not peculiar to any one race or clime but common to all races and all climes. Whereas Eastern Orthodoxy is concentrated for the most part in Russia and the Balkan countries, and whereas Protestantism is concentrated for the most part in the U.S.A. and Western Europe, the Catholic Church has proportionately large representation on every continent—*hers is a world-wide concentration.* Consult a reliable world religious census and see if this is not the case.

Proof that the Catholic Church is not peculiar to any one race or clime—proof that she is not a “Roman” Catholic Church—is seen not only in the geographical location and racial admixture of her membership but in the nationalities of her ruling hierarchy. Among the popes there have been Englishmen, Frenchmen, Germans, Spaniards, Greeks and Italians. Yes and there have been Jewish and Negro popes. Pope Victor, Pope Melchiades and Pope Gelasius were all Negroes. In the Church today there are a large number of Jewish, Negro, Indian and Oriental bishops and cardinals in addition to those of European nationality, so it is quite possible that there

will be another non-European pope before long. Talk about your United Nations—the Catholic Church has existed as a United Nations for two-thousand years.

Now let the author point out one more feature of the Church's universality, one that certainly should provoke some serious thinking in the minds of all: *her name*. Catholic means universal. Catholic is the name given to the true Christian Church by the apostles (Ref. Apostles' Creed), and Catholic is the name which has distinguished this Church from all others since the beginning of Christianity. Hence the great St. Augustine was inspired to write: "The very name Catholic, which not without cause among so many heretics that church alone has obtained; so that, although all heretics wish to be called Catholic, no heretic, if a stranger asks the way to the Catholic Church, dares to point out his own basilica or house" (*Ep. Fundam.* Chapter 4).

Yes, as St. Augustine pointed out, other churches do indeed wish to be called catholic, wish to be called universal, but when asked to identify the *true* Catholic Church, so named and so characterized by the Apostles and primitive Church Fathers, one church immediately comes to mind: not their own but the church headquartered in Rome and ruled from the Seat of Peter. As much as they resist the idea their basic intelligence tells them that they have no more legitimate claim to the name Catholic and the heritage that goes with it than a new automobile manufacturing firm has to the names Ford, Chrysler and General Motors and the heritage of achievement that goes with those names.

YOU NEED THE

AUTHORITY

OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

It goes without saying that God's Church on earth is deprived of His visible Presence, that is the sight of Him *as He is*. And it goes without saying that His Church on earth is also deprived of His audible Voice, that is the sound of His Voice *from His own Mouth*. Such intimate contact with God is quite obviously reserved only for the proven worthy: the blessed in heaven. Only on one brief occasion did God appear recognizable on earth, the occasion, as the Apostle Paul described it, when He appeared "in the brightness of His glory and the image of His Substance" to effect the redemption of mankind — when He appeared in the Person of Jesus Christ. And only on a rare few occasions has He spoken directly to earthly man.

It also goes without saying that despite the absence of God's visible Presence and audible Voice He rules supreme over His Church.

And how is God able to rule His Church on earth—how is He able, generation after generation, to manifest His divine Will to the faithful who are guided in the main by what they see and hear—without being seen or heard? Anyone familiar with Sacred Scripture knows the answer to that. In Sacred Scripture it is ever so clear that God rules His Church, manifests His Divine Will, *through personal representatives, through men of proven loyalty duly appointed by Him, duly indoctrinated in those precepts of faith which constitute His divine Will and duly authorized to teach in His Name.*

Thus when God established the Church of the Old

Covenant He chose Moses to be His personal representative, His *spokesman*, to the people. This was one of those rare occasions when God did actually speak out from heaven. And He decreed that this high office would be perpetuated in Aaron, and after Aaron in Aaron's "seed" (*Exodus 29:9*). And lest anyone get the notion that Moses and his successors in the Old Covenant Church lacked authority to pronounce what was binding on the conscience of man, God said:

"THEY SHALL SHOW THE TRUE JUDGMENT. AND THOU SHALT DO WHATEVER THEY SAY THAT PRESIDE IN THE PLACE WHICH THE LORD SHALL CHOOSE, AND WHAT THEY SHALL TEACH THEE . . . AND THOU SHALT FOLLOW THEIR SENTENCE . . . HE THAT WILL BE PROUD, AND REFUSE TO OBEY THEIR COMMANDMENT . . . THAT MAN SHALL DIE." Deut. 17:9-12.

And so it was when God, in the Person of Jesus Christ, established the Church of the New Covenant, the *Christian* Church. Anticipating His Sacrifice on the Cross and His subsequent Ascension into heaven, after which He no longer would be the visible, audible Shepherd of His flock, He appointed one of His apostles to that office. Simon Bar-Jona was the apostle's name, but inasmuch as Simon was destined to be the first human head of His Church, its corner-stone so to speak, Christ changed his name to Cephas, which in Aramaic, the language Christ spoke, means *rock*, and which in Greek, the language of the original New Testament Scriptures, is interpreted *Peter*. Addressing this humble fisherman Christ said: "Thou art Simon, the son of John; thou shalt be called Cephas" (*John 1:42*).

Despite the arguments of some sectarians that Cephas does not mean rock (singular) in the Aramaic language spoken by Christ we know for a fact that it does. For

one thing traditional Christianity has always held to this translation and for another thing the inhabitants of three small Syrian villages—Maalula, Bachaa and Giubbaadin—where the ancient Aramaic tongue is still spoken have verified it. The great burden of proof is all on the side of the Catholic interpretation.

Nor did Christ equivocate one little bit when He appointed Peter His Vicar on earth. In the presence of all His apostles and in His most peremptory tone of voice He said to Peter: "Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jona . . . thou art Cephas (or Peter), and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven" (*Math. 16:17-19*). "Feed my lambs . . . feed my sheep" (*John 21:15-17*).

That Christ gave the Apostle Peter pre-eminent authority over His infant Church can be further ascertained from two other factors: never once did Christ mention His Church until this occasion when He connected it with the name of Peter (selecting a leader is always the first step in forming an organized society) and after Christ was gone from their midst the other apostles accepted Peter's leadership without question giving him the presiding place every time they assembled in council.

In the course of time Peter's apostleship took him to Rome—he wrote his epistles from Rome, or "Babylon" as Rome was frequently called in those days (*1 Peter, 5:13*)—where he became the first Bishop of Rome and where he eventually suffered martyrdom. This is affirmed by the most reputable Protestant as well as Catholic historians. Wrote the eminent Protestant historian Cave in his *Historia Literaria*: "That Peter was at Rome, and held the See there for some time, we fearlessly affirm with the whole multitude of the ancients." And Peter's successor as Bishop of Rome was St. Linus (67-76), and after St.

Linus it was St. Cletus (76-88), and after St. Cletus it was St. Clement I (88-97) and after St. Clement I it was St. Evaristus (97-105)—*and so forth right on through the centuries in a continuous, uninterrupted succession to Pius XII of the present day.* This, too, is borne out in every reputable, scholarly history.

All of which boils down to one highly significant fact: the God-given authority to preside over the Christian Church which the Apostle Peter possessed and which his successors inherited has reposed in only one Christian church since Christianity began—the church called *Catholic*. Never in all the history of Christianity has any other church even as much as pretended that it owned the Seat of Peter. *Never has the head of any other church dared to step forth and proclaim to the world: "I, not the Pope of the Catholic Church, am Peter's successor, Christ's Vicar on earth!"*

And that, dear reader, is why you need the authority of the Catholic Church—because it is *God-given* authority, because when you pattern your faith on the directives of the Catholic Church you *know* you are abiding in the Will of God.

YOU NEED THE
BIBLE RELATIONSHIP
OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

As a professed Christian you very probably have read the Bible a great deal. As a professed Christian you very probably regard the Bible as one of your greatest sources, perhaps your greatest source, of spiritual comfort and inspiration. As one of the more ardent professed Christians you very probably consider yourself somewhat of an authority on the Bible, being able to quote hundreds of its passages accurately from memory.

But really how familiar are you with the *origin* of the Bible? Not the origin of the individual books of the Bible, for their authors are self-evident, but the combined work, the finished edition as Christians know it today. Who introduced the Jewish Old Testament into the Christian Bible? Who selected the 27 books of the New Testament? Who numbered their chapters and verses? Who first undertook to reproduce the Bible? In other words, to whom are you indebted for that Bible which is so dear to you? *Upon whose authority do you accept the Bible, particularly the New Testament, as the holy Word of God?*

These are important questions because unless you know the answers a *full* understanding and appreciation of the Bible is quite impossible. Unless you know the answers you can hardly call yourself an "authority" on the Bible.

"But of course, the Holy Bible was compiled by the primitive Christian Church," you may reply. "It is common knowledge that it was the Church Fathers who decided on the retention of the Jewish Old Testament

in the Christian Book of Scripture, who collected the writings of the apostles and their disciples—approximately 300 writings in all—and after careful examination concluded that 27 of them were divinely inspired and therefore entitled to Scriptural status . . . it is common knowledge that in the year 417 the Old Testament books and the 27 New Testament books were submitted to Innocent I, who was highest in authority at the time, for his ratification and that the scholarly Jerome translated the approved books into the universal Latin vernacular and joined them into a single volume for the first time.”

Yes, dear reader, all that is common knowledge. But permit the author to point out that while your information is correct information is not sufficient information to give you the whole and true picture. For the whole and true picture you need to learn more detail—you need to obtain a complete, fully documented history of the Bible and study *all* of the facts. Do this and you will be amazed at how the complexion of the picture will change.

Study all of the facts and you will discover, for example, that the Church Fathers who selected the books of the Bible were all professed Catholics, that Innocent I was none other than Pope Innocent I, that Jerome was none other than Saint Jerome, a holy Catholic monk, that Saint Jerome was commissioned to produce his famous original copy of the Bible, called the *Latin Vulgate*, by none other than Pope Damasus, under whom he once served as secretary, and that the scribes who undertook to reproduce Saint Jerome's original Bible were Catholic scribes, members of Catholic monastic orders every one of them.

You will discover, in short, that it was the Catholic Church, under the Bishop of Rome, the Pope, who gave the holy Bible to Christianity and none other. *It could not have been otherwise because the Catholic Church*

was the only organized Christian church then in existence. There were a few Arians and Apollinarians about at the time, true, but they were too scattered, too busy fighting charges of heresy, too concerned with their own survival to assist in the compilation of the Bible. Proof of this is seen in the fact that Arianism and Apollinarianism disappeared shortly thereafter.

Today's Christians do not generally realize it but the books of the Bible were without chapters and numbered verses until early in the thirteenth century. For this Christians can thank one Stephen Langton, a Catholic priest who later became the Cardinal Archbishop of Canterbury. He introduced chapters and verses into the so-called Parisian Bible about the year 1226 and after that they were employed in all Bibles, including the printed Hebrew Bible. Our modern chapter and verse divisions do not differ appreciably from those of Stephen Langton.

No competent Biblical scholar has ever denied that the Catholic Church is the mother of the Bible. Not even Martin Luther could bring himself to deny it. Wrote the founding father of Protestantism and the man generally recognized as the foremost Protestant Biblical authority: "We are compelled to concede to the Papists, that they have the Word of God, that we received it from them, and that without them we should have no knowledge of it at all" (*Commentary on St. John*, Chapter 14).

"But what about the reports describing the Catholic Church's suppression of the Bible?" you may ask. Those reports, dear friend in Christ, are a lot of bunk — pure, unadulterated bunk! Knowing how much the average person reveres the Bible the enemies of the Church deliberately circulate such reports to induce anti-Catholic sentiment. Honestly, would the Catholic Church spend three centuries collecting the books of the Bible, spend many more centuries laboriously copying it by hand and shed rivers of blood protecting those first few Bibles

from marauding heathen tribesmen if she did not value the Bible most highly? Honestly, would the Catholic Church base the liturgy of her divine worship on the Gospels and Epistles of the Bible, direct that her priests must kiss the Gospels and Epistles at Low Mass, incense them at High Mass and read them aloud to the congregation at all Masses if she did not recognize the sacredness of the Bible? Honestly, would the Catholic Church admonish her faithful to procure a Bible and reward them with a rich grant of indulgences each day they spend at least 15 minutes reading the Bible if she did not want them to know and love the Bible? Hardly! And if you investigated the Catholic Church you would find that she honors the Bible in many other ways. In fact if you investigated the Catholic Church you would be forced to conclude that she gives the Bible its highest place of honor.

History tells us that after the Catholic Church compiled the Bible back in Christian antiquity it remained her exclusive property for over a hundred years, until the formation of the Coptic Church late in the fifth century. Now if the Catholic Church has shown little respect for the Bible as her antagonists allege how, pray tell, can present day Christians be sure that she did not make a great lot of mischievous changes and omissions in the context of the Bible when she had it all to herself? How can Christianity be sure that the entire New Testament is not a big Catholic forgery?

The plain truth is: no one, absolutely no one, can be certain of the authenticity and divine inspiration of the Christian Bible without complete faith in the authority and integrity of the Catholic Church. Unless there is complete faith that the Catholic Church selected the genuine, divinely inspired writings of the apostles and their disciples and then reverently preserved them in all their original purity there can be no certainty at all in the convictions of those who regard the Bible as the holy

Word of God. Try as one might there is just no escaping these conclusions.

The obvious fact that the authority of the Bible rests on the authority of the Catholic Church is a source of great comfort to Catholics. *It establishes the authority of the Catholic Church as the pre-eminent Christian authority.* It explains why Catholics trust so implicitly in the Church's interpretation of the Bible, for obviously if she can give Christianity the true Scriptures she can also give Christianity the true *meaning* of the Scriptures. And it explains, dear reader, why the author is compelled to say that you too need the Bible relationship of the Catholic Church: as a Catholic Christian you would be a Bible Christian in the truest, fullest sense of the word.

YOU NEED THE
TRADITIONS
OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

Is the Bible a complete resume of the deeds and teachings of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ? No, dear reader, the Bible itself confesses that it is not — and it tells why:

“This is the disciple who bears witness concerning these things, and who has written these things, and we know that his witness is true. There are, however, many other things that Jesus did; but if every one of these should be written, not even the world itself, I think, could hold the books that would have to be written” (John 21:24-25).

Is the Bible a complete resume of those teachings of Christ that are *essential* to the Christian deposit of faith? No, again the Bible confesses that it is not and tells where the other essential precepts of Christian faith are to be found:

“Stand firm, and hold the traditions you have learned, whether by word or letter of ours” (2 Thess. 2:51). “And we charge you, brethren, in the name of Our Lord Jesus Christ, to withdraw from every brother who lives irregularly, and not according to the traditions received from us” (Thess. 3:6).

In other words, the apostles committed some of Christ’s teachings to writing and others they passed on by word of mouth, that is they committed them to “tradition.”

Did the primitive Church Fathers accept the unwritten

teachings of the apostles, the "traditions" that were handed down by word of mouth, as essential components of the Christian deposit of faith? Indeed they did:

ORIGEN: "Let the ecclesiastical teaching handed down by order of succession from the Apostles, and abiding till now in the Church, be observed; that only is to be believed the truth which no way differs from ecclesiastical and Apostolic tradition" (*De Princip.*, i.2PG,xi. 116).

GREGORY NYSSEN: "It is enough for the demonstration of our position to have the tradition which comes to us from the Fathers transmitted as an inheritance by succession from the Apostles through the saints that followed them" (*Contr. Eunom.* iv. PG,xlv. 653).

BASIL: "Of the doctrines and decrees we have some from written teaching; others we have received apportioned to us from the tradition of the Apostles in a mysterious manner, both of which [i.e. Scripture and tradition] have the same force" (*De Spir. S.* 663, PG,xxxii. 188).

CHRYSOSTOM: "It is evident that the Apostles did not communicate all in writing; they communicated . . . much without writing. Both deserve equal faith . . . It is tradition; ask no more" (*Hom. iv. in II Thess.*).

EPIPHANIUS: "We must also use tradition, since all cannot be got from the divine Scripture, wherefore the divine Apostles handed down some things in writings, others in tradition" (*Haer.* lxi. 6,PG, xli. 1048).

If space permitted we could call in the testimony of scores of other leaders of the primitive Christian Church

affirming that traditional teachings are just as essential to the Christian deposit of faith as scriptural teachings.

Now for the sixty-four dollar question: Did the Church Fathers affirm that the traditions handed down by the apostles and the traditions of the Catholic Church are in fact the *same* traditions? Well, let us see:

ANTHANASIUS: "But it will hardly be out of place to investigate likewise the ancient traditions, and the doctrines and faith of the Catholic Church, which the Lord communicated, the Apostles proclaimed, and the Fathers preserved; for on this has the Church been founded" (*First Letter to Serapion*, n. 28).

IRENAEUS: "The Catholic Church, having received the Apostolic teaching and faith, though spread over the whole world, guards it sedulously, as though dwelling in one house; and these truths she uniformly teaches, as having but one soul and one heart; these truths she proclaims and hands down as though she had but one mouth" (*Adv. Haer.*, I, x 2; IV).

LACTANTIUS: "The Catholic Church, therefore, is the only one that retains the true worship. This is the source of truth; this the dwelling place of faith; this the temple of God" (*Divine Institutions*, Book 4, Chap. 30).

AUGUSTINE: "These traditions of the Christian name, therefore, so numerous, so powerful, and most dear, justly keep a believing man in the Catholic Church."

Yes, dear reader, the traditions of the Catholic Church are indeed part and parcel of the true Christian deposit of faith. Some of them are not to be found in the Bible, and some of them are only vaguely inferred in the Bible,

but, nevertheless, they were taught by Christ Our Lord and handed down by His holy apostles — *they were prescribed by God to help you secure the eternal salvation of your soul.*

What are the apostolic traditions? There are quite a number of them, too many to describe in detail within the limited space of this pamphlet. But the author will cite a few. Veneration of the saints in heaven is one, the doctrine of Purgatory is one, the Church's teaching on Indulgences is one and the use of sacramentals such as holy water, blessed palm, etc. is another. Some are very important to a devout expression of faith and some are not so important *but collectively they are essential to a full expression of faith*; which is why Catholics cherish them all, for a *full* expression of faith is the kind of faith Christ asks of all his loyal followers.

YOU NEED THE
WORSHIP
OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

Catholics worship God in many ways: by assisting at Mass, by praying the Rosary, by making the Stations of the Cross, by singing His praises in innumerable hymns, litanies and psalms and by frequent private meditations. All are pleasing to God and all are spiritually rewarding. But the profoundest expression of Catholic worship, the *expression of worship most pleasing to God and for sake of which He pours out His most abundant graces*, is the Mass. In fact the Mass is so spiritually rewarding it is the center and heart, the *focal point*, of all Catholic worship.

It is primarily the Mass the author has reference to, dear reader, when he says you need the worship of the Catholic Church.

You see, the Mass is *not* what some of the Church's antagonists make it out to be. It is *not* "something the Pope dreamed up back in the middle ages to give the Catholic Church a distinctive form of worship service." It is *not* "a pagan ritual borrowed from the ancient Romans and embellished with overtones of Christian prayer and symbolism." In fact the hierarchy of the Catholic Church had nothing whatever to do with the origin of the Mass.

A little honest investigation will bear out that the Mass of the Catholic Church originated not with mortal man but with Jesus Christ — God himself. It was Christ who instituted the Mass, He who prescribed it as the central act of Christian worship, and no one else.

It all happened at the Last Supper. At the Last Supper Christ inaugurated the *Sacrifice of the New Law*, perfecting with the offering of His own flesh and blood the animal sacrifices of the Old Law. At this propitious moment, with His holy apostles gathered about Him, the Son of God took bread and wine, transformed those common substances into His own flesh and blood, offered them up to the heavenly Father for the remission of sin, gave them to His apostles to eat and drink, *then directed that they should perpetuate this divine rite for the spiritual benefit of future generations of the faithful:*

“AND WHILE THEY WERE AT SUPPER, JESUS TOOK BREAD, AND BLESSED AND BROKE, AND GAVE IT TO HIS DISCIPLES, AND SAID, ‘TAKE AND EAT; THIS IS MY BODY.’ AND TAKING A CUP, HE GAVE THANKS AND GAVE IT TO THEM SAYING, ‘ALL OF YOU DRINK OF THIS; FOR THIS IS MY BLOOD OF THE NEW COVENANT, WHICH IS BEING SHED FOR MANY UNTO THE FORGIVENESS OF SINS . . . DO THIS IN COMMEMORATION OF ME.” Matt. 26:26-28, Mark 14:22-24, Luke 22:19-20.

Now observe the liturgy of the Mass. Note that what took place at the Last Supper is precisely what takes place at the Mass: the four principal parts of the Last Supper — the Preparation, the Offering, the Consecration and the Holy Communion—are the four principal parts of the Mass, the actions of Christ at the Last Supper are the actions of the priest at Mass, the words pronounced by Christ at the Last Supper are the words pronounced by the priest at Mass, *the miracle performed by Christ at the Last Supper is the miracle performed by the priest at Mass.*

Yes, dear reader, if you will but observe the Mass carefully you will recognize that it is no ordinary church

service but is the great epoch of the Last Supper repeated, just as Christ directed that it should be repeated — it is Christ keeping His promise, through His Mystical Body the Church, to remain in the midst of His followers “all days, even unto the consummation of the world.”

But it is not really the priest who performs the miracle of bringing the true and living Christ to the altar; it is Christ who performs the miracle *through* the priest. It is Christ, the eternal High Priest, who really does the officiating at Mass. The congregation is oblivious of the priest's presence at the altar, being conscious only of the Divine High Priest's Presence.

Hence the Mass is in fact a living renewal not only of Christ's great love offering at the Last Supper but, since the Last Supper prefigured Calvary, it is also a living renewal, in an unbloody manner, of His great love offering on Calvary when He effected the Salvation of the human race. *The divine grace that flowed out on the world from Christ on the Cross continues to flow out on the world from Christ in the Mass.*

No wonder the Mass is the center and heart of all Catholic worship. No wonder Catholics flock to Mass in great droves, even before sun-up while the rest of Christendom sleeps. For to pay worshipful homage *directly* to God and to partake of His *real* life-giving Substance is a privilege and a joy which surpasses all expression.

The idea of Christ becoming actually *physically* present on the altar in such a way that the faithful can actually take Him Body and Blood, Soul and Divinity, into themselves does indeed strike some people as an absurd impossibility. But that is because they fail to take several prime factors into account: Christ's promise to perform the miracle (*John 6:52-55*), Christ's ability as God to perform the miracle either directly or through a human agency, and the testimony of the apostles and

Church Fathers confirming that such a miracle not only took place but continues to take place on the altars of the Catholic Church. Here is the testimony of Paul:

“The cup of blessing that we bless, is it not the sharing of the blood of Christ? And the bread that we break, is it not the partaking of the body of the Lord?” (1 Cor. 10:16). “For he who eats (the bread) and drinks (the wine) unworthily, without distinguishing the body of the Lord, eats and drinks judgment to himself” (1 Cor. 11:29).

And hear the testimony of the Church Fathers who called the Real Presence of Christ on the altar “the Holy Eucharist,” a name which it still bears in the Catholic Church:

JUSTIN MARTYR: “This food is known among us as the Eucharist . . . We do not receive these things as common bread and common drink; but as Jesus Christ our Saviour, being made flesh by the Word of God” (Apol. i,66,PG,vi,428).

CYRIL OF JERUSALEM: “Since then He has declared and said of the bread, ‘This is my body,’ who after that will venture to doubt? And seeing that He has affirmed and said, ‘This is my blood,’ who will raise a question and say it is not His blood?” (Cat. Mystag, 4,PG,1097).

The author could fill volumes with statements such as these by the primitive Church Fathers, but the above should suffice to establish the Mass as the central act of divine worship in the primitive Christian Church the same as it is in the Catholic Church today. The above should offer convincing proof that Christ prescribed the Mass and lives in the Mass for the sanctification and salvation of all who join with Him there.

YOU NEED THE
SACRAMENTS
OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

The Catholic Church teaches that Christ our Lord instituted seven holy rites, called sacraments, for His Church to administer to the faithful; further that these sacraments act as channels through which God dispenses special graces to the faithful; further that these special graces are not only helpful to salvation but in some instances *vital* to salvation; further that her seven sacraments and the seven sacraments instituted by Christ are the selfsame seven.

Protestantism disagrees arguing that Christ instituted not seven but only two sacraments, that His sacraments are not productive of grace but rather symbolize the grace that is already produced through faith, that consequently their reception by the faithful is not a prerequisite to salvation, faith in Jesus as personal Saviour alone being sufficient unto salvation. In short, Protestantism maintains that the sacraments of the Catholic Church and the importance she attaches to them is all wrong.

The question, therefore, that we should like to take up here is: Are the sacraments of the Catholic Church in truth the full complement of sacraments instituted by Jesus Christ? Are they really needed by the Christian faithful to secure their eternal salvation? Or is the Catholic position regarding Christ's sacraments all wrong as Protestantism maintains? It is an important question, one which every earnest Christian will want to have resolved, because if there is anything the earnest Christian must needs know it is the right way, the

divinely prescribed way, to eternal salvation. If it can be proved that the Catholic sacraments are an integral part of the divine plan of salvation then it behooves the earnest Christian to partake of them, even though it may involve the setting aside of some bitter prejudices. If, on the other hand, it cannot be proved then one is definitely just as well off without them—then it can be presumed that Protestantism is right in saying that the Catholic Church is wrong.

Now the purpose of this chapter, dear seeker after Christian truth, is to furnish proof, conclusive proof, that the Catholic Church is *not* wrong. Here it will be shown that, according to the Word of Jesus Christ and the example of His holy apostles, according to the mainstream of Christian belief and practice down through all the Christian centuries, the sacraments of the Catholic Church are indeed the true Christian sacraments and their reception by the faithful is indeed of paramount importance to salvation. Here it will be shown that you do indeed need the sacraments of the Catholic Church to enjoy the fullness of the faith of Jesus Christ.

Strong words, those, but let us review the seven sacraments of the Catholic Church, diligently comparing them first with the witness of Sacred Scripture and then with the witness of Christian tradition, and see if they are not justified. In other words, let us see some of this alleged proof.

First let us consider the Catholic Sacrament of Baptism. The Catholic Church holds that this sacrament was instituted by Christ to introduce the Holy Spirit of God into the soul, that is to initiate the soul into a new life of supernatural grace, thereby making the recipient a true child of God and heir to His everlasting kingdom. Sacred Scripture: *"Amen, amen, I say to you, unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God"* (John 3:5). And

the Catholic Church holds that this sacrament was ordered for infants as well as for adults. Sacred Scripture: *"Repent and be baptized EVERY ONE OF YOU in the name of Jesus Christ for the forgiveness of your sins; and you will receive the gift of the Holy Spirit. For to you is the promise AND TO YOUR CHILDREN"* (Acts 2:38-39).

Next take the Catholic Sacrament of Penance (the confessing of one's sins to a priest). The Catholic Church holds that Christ instituted this sacrament when He empowered the apostles, the first priests of His Church, to forgive sins. Christ to His apostles: *"Receive ye the Holy Spirit; whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them; and whose sins you shall retain, they shall be retained"* (John 20:22-23). The Catholic Church holds that this grant of power once given to the Church would always remain with the Church. Christ to His apostles: *"Heaven and earth will pass away, but my words will not pass away"* (Mark 13:31). *"Go, therefore, and make disciples of all nations . . . teaching them to observe all that I have commanded you; and behold, I am with you all days, even unto the consummation of the world"* (Matt. 28:19-20).

Next take the Catholic Sacrament of Holy Communion (the partaking of the actual Flesh and Blood, Soul and Divinity, of Jesus Christ under the appearance, or sacramental veil, of bread and wine). The Catholic Church holds that this most sublime sacrament, designed to keep the faithful nourished in divine grace, was promised to the Church by Christ at Capharnaum and given to the Church by Christ at the Last Supper. At Capharnaum: *"The bread that I will give is my flesh for the life of the world . . . He who eats my flesh and drinks my blood has life everlasting and I will raise him up on the last day"* (John 6:52-55). At the Last Supper: *"And having taken bread, he gave thanks and broke, and gave it to*

them, saying, 'This is my body, which is being given for you; do this in commemoration of me.' In like manner he took also the wine, saying, 'This is my blood' (Matt. 26:26-28, Mark 14:22-24, Luke 22:19-20). Verdict of the apostles: "The cup of blessing that we bless, is it not the sharing of the blood of Christ? And the bread that we break, is it not the partaking of the body of the Lord?" (I Cor. 10:16). Also see I Cor. 11:28-29.

Next take the Catholic Sacrament of Confirmation (when the Bishop lays his hand on the heads of the newly baptized and bestows his blessing). The Catholic Church holds that Christ instituted this sacrament to instill in the soul those special graces of the Holy Spirit which increase Christian resolve and zeal. Sacred Scripture: "And when Paul laid his hands on them, the Holy Spirit came upon them" (Acts 19:6). "Do not neglect the grace that is in thee, granted to thee by reason of prophecy with the laying on of hands of the presbyterate" (1 Tim. 4:14). "For this reason I admonish we break, is it not the partaking of the body of the Lord?" (I Cor. 10:16). Also see I Cor. 11:28-29.

Next take the Catholic Sacrament of Holy Orders (Ordination to the priesthood). The Catholic Church holds that Christ instituted this sacrament to give the priests of His Church the necessary power to offer the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass and the necessary grace to shoulder all the other burdens of their ministerial office. After instituting the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass Christ said to His first priests: "Do this in commemoration of me" (Luke 22:19). The Apostle Paul affirmed that ordination to the priesthood confers special powers and special graces from on High. To those he had ordained Paul said: "Take heed to yourselves and to the whole flock in which the Holy Spirit has placed you as bishops, to rule the Church of God" (Acts 20:28). Also see 2 Cor. 8:18-19.

Next take the Catholic Sacrament of Matrimony. The Catholic Church holds that Christ instituted this sacrament to make the marriage bond a holy and indissoluble bond, even as the bond between Him and His Church is holy and indissoluble. Christ to those who questioned the sacramental nature of matrimony: *"For this cause a man shall leave his father and mother, and cleave to his wife, and the two shall become one flesh . . . What therefore God has joined together let no man put asunder"* (Matt. 19:5-6). The Apostle Paul likens the union of man and wife to the union of Christ and His Church: *"But just as the Church is subject to Christ, so also let wives be to their husbands in all things. Husbands, love your wives, just as Christ also loved the Church, and delivered himself up for her"* (Eph. 5:24-25).

Lastly take the Catholic Sacrament of Extreme Unction (the anointing of the sick and dying). The Catholic Church holds that Christ instituted this sacrament to permit a final preparation for God's judgment. Sacred Scripture: *"And going forth, they preached that men should repent, and they cast out many devils, and anointed with oil many sick people, and healed them"* (Mark 6:12-13). *"Is anyone among you sick? Let him bring in the presbyters of the Church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord . . . and if he be in sins, they shall be forgiven him"* (James 5:14-15).

There you have it, good friend, the Word of Christ and the example of the apostles attesting both to the validity and the efficacy of the seven sacraments of the Catholic Church. In all seven of the Catholic sacraments, Sacred Scripture affirms, the essential characteristics of a valid Christian sacrament are conspicuously present: all seven involve an outward sign or ceremony, all seven were prescribed by Christ either directly or through His apostles and all seven confer a special grace from God.

Now what of the verdict of Christian tradition? Does the mainstream of Christian belief and practice down through the nineteen hundred years of Christian history concur? Yes it does — unequivocally. It is to be noted in Christian history that every single ancient and semi-ancient Christian body — Catholic, Coptic, Greek Orthodox and Russian Orthodox — hold to these same seven sacraments *and have always held to them*. It is to be noted that for the first fifteen hundred years all of Christianity concurred, that for the last four hundred years over four-fifths of Christianity has concurred. *Of all the Christian churches that have appeared on earth since the time of Christ, and there have been thousands, Protestantism alone has differed.*

By every test then we know that the Catholic Church is right. By every test we know that the sacraments of the Catholic Church are Christ's true sacraments, needed by you and by me, by *all* who seek eternal salvation in Jesus Christ our Lord.

YOU NEED THE
MARIOLOGY
OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

Do you agree that any sentiment which conforms with the Divine Sentiment is in good taste? Do you agree with the Apostle Paul that Christians should be "imitators of God, as very dear children" (*Eph. 5:1*)? If you do then you will also agree that the high honor accorded the Blessed Virgin Mary in the Catholic Church is a justified high honor. *Because it is a scripturally attested fact that God conferred on Mary not merely a high honor but His very highest honor: He selected her from all the women of the world to be the Mother of Jesus, to be the Wellspring from which Redemption would come to the human race:*

"NOW IN THE SIXTH MONTH THE ANGEL GABRIEL WAS SENT FROM GOD TO A TOWN OF GALILEE CALLED NAZARETH, TO A VIRGIN BETHROTHED TO A MAN NAMED JOSEPH, OF THE HOUSE OF DAVID, AND THE VIRGIN'S NAME WAS MARY. AND WHEN THE ANGEL HAD COME TO HER, HE SAID, 'HAIL, FULL OF GRACE, THE LORD IS WITH THEE, BLESSED ART THOU AMONG WOMEN . . . BEHOLD, THOU SHALT CONCEIVE IN THY WOMB AND SHALT BRING FORTH A SON; AND THOU SHALT CALL HIS NAME JESUS. HE SHALL BE GREAT, AND SHALL BE CALLED THE SON OF THE MOST HIGH; AND THE LORD GOD WILL GIVE HIM THE THRONE OF DAVID HIS FATHER; AND

HE SHALL BE KING OVER THE HOUSE OF JACOB FOREVER . . . THE HOLY SPIRIT SHALL COME UPON THEE AND THE POWER OF THE MOST HIGH SHALL OVERSHADOW THEE; AND THEREFORE THE HOLY ONE TO BE BORN SHALL BE CALLED THE SON OF GOD.' " Luke 1:26-35.

There you have the sum and the substance of the Mariology of the Catholic Church. There, dear reader, is the reason why you should join with Catholics in paying tribute to this singular vessel of devotion who became, by divine predilection, the Ark of the New Covenant. *The precedent was set by God himself.*

Think of the extreme high honor conferred on Mary by Our Lord God! He gave her the first human knowledge of the Coming of Salvation . . . for nine months He, Divinity, took up residence in her body . . . for many more months He fed at her breast, reposed in her arms, submitted to her guardianship, even subjected himself to her will (*Luke 2:51*). For her our Blessed Lord performed His first public miracle, even though the time for public miracles had not yet arrived (*John 2:1-11*). For her He gave His last thought as He hung dying on the Cross (*John 19:26-27*). It is difficult to imagine how God could have honored her more than He did.

But aren't Catholics going a little too far with their adulation of Mary when they call her "Mother of God" and "Mother of Christians?" No, dear reader, not unless Sacred Scripture was wrong in calling her Mother of God (*Luke 1:43*), not unless Christ himself was wrong in designating her Mother of Christians (*John 19:27*), not unless the vast majority of Christians since the beginning of Christianity have been wrong in calling her Mother of God and Mother of Christians.

Check the progress of Christianity and you will find that Protestants are the only ones who consider her un-

worthy of these titles—modern day Protestants that is; the old time Protestants considered her very worthy. Wrote Martin Luther in his *Deutsche Schriften*: “Therefore, in a word, all dignities are embraced in Mary when we call her the Mother of God.” Wrote John Calvin in his *Comm. sur l’Harm*: “We cannot acknowledge the blessings brought us by Jesus without acknowledging at the same time how highly God honored and enriched Mary in choosing her for the Mother of God.”

If you think the Catholic Church has gone overboard these past few centuries in its devotion to the Mother of our Divine Saviour—if you think the Catholic Church has introduced something new into the Christian order of things—consider the attitude of the primitive Church. Ambrose, one of the most illustrious of the primitive Church Fathers, had this to say about Mary: “Oh, the riches of Mary . . . As a cloud she waters the earth with the rain of Christ’s grace. For it has been written of her: ‘Lo, the Lord cometh seated upon a light cloud’ (Isa. 19:1) . . . She was indeed light who carried in her womb the Remission of Sins . . . Run after this good cloud, for within her she has brought forth a fountain to water the face of the earth . . . Prepare yourselves as vessels of the Lord that you may receive this fountain of living water, the source of virginity, the healing balm of integrity, the perfume of faith and the sweet flowering of gracious mercy” (*The Instruction of a Virgin*, PL, 16, 325–26). Then there is this beautiful eulogy by St. Germanus of Constantinople: “O Lady, all-chaste, all-good, rich in mercy, comfort of Christians, tender consoler of the afflicted, the ever-open refuge of sinners, do not leave us destitute of thy assistance . . . Shelter us under the wings of thy goodness. By thy intercession watch over us” (*Sermon at the consecration of a church to the Holy Mother of God*). If space permitted the author could quote similar statements by Ignatius, Poly-

carp, Irenaeus, Justin Martyr and many other venerable Fathers of the primitive Christian Church.

Need the author say more? It should be self-evident by now that you do indeed need the Mariology of the Catholic Church for a fuller, richer, more God-pleasing faith. For there is an old axiom which says: *To scorn the mother is to offend the son.* In the Catholic Church the Mother of God is not scorned as she is in hundreds of other "Christian" churches and because of this Catholics enjoy a special closeness to Him.

[For full explanation of such Catholic doctrines as the Immaculate Conception and the Assumption, read "Catholic Devotion to Mary Explained," by R. A. Short — Bellarmine Publ. Co. — 20c]

YOU NEED THE
PEACE
OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

Here is an intriguing question: Just what is it about the Catholic Church that gives her her great universal appeal? Everyone, even her bitterest enemies, will concede that she has that. The spectacle of her 475 million members from every walk of life, representing three-fifths of all Christianity, one-fifth of the total world population, is evidence which cannot easily be ignored.

Is the appeal of the Catholic Church due to her beautiful cathedrals and shrines, the greatest architectural works of art on the face of the earth? Is it due to the awe-inspiring splendor of her liturgies and processions, the most colorful sight outside of nature's own realm that man can witness? Or to take a look "inside" Catholicism does her popularity stem from her cogent, forceful and uncompromising teachings, the most comprehensive guide to living ever offered to mankind?

No doubt these things do command a certain admiration and probably contribute a great deal toward cultivating interest in the Catholic religion. People naturally lean toward the beautiful and the strong. But surprisingly it is not these that pull the trigger of final assent in the minds of millions of converts year after year all over the world. No, the main factor in the popularity of the Catholic Church is something vastly more alluring and positive.

Ask the Catholic convert sometime. He or she will tell you that their primary motive for embracing the Catholic faith is the incomparable PEACE the Catholic faith produces in the soul. Confusion and despair, loneliness

and melancholy, these have no place in the life of the Catholic. In the lives of devout Catholics they are, in fact, unknown states of mind.

There can be no such disorder in the soul when one is given a positive, consummate awareness of the Reality of God and His loving solicitude. And that is what the Catholic Church gives to her own. In the Catholic Church suspicion and guesswork are ruled out altogether. The whole order of creation is brought into clear and beautiful focus and the Catholic beholds in the midst of it all the sublime, the only completely reasonable purpose of his existence. No longer must he grope and flounder through life like a ship on a tempestuous sea without a compass. He knows where he is headed and he knows that he has a skilled and experienced navigator to take him there. His is a wonderful feeling of safety.

Nor does the Catholic rest his convictions on the authority of some fly-by-night theorist. He rests his convictions on the authority of a mighty two-thousand year old institution that has produced not only the world's greatest theological and metaphysical minds but legions of saints without parallel in the history of the human race. His convictions rest on the authority of that Church which alone can furnish positive historical proof that it was founded and constituted, not by some ambitious human, but by the God-man, Jesus Christ himself. In short, the Catholic has the supreme satisfaction of knowing that his convictions rest on the most reliable authority of all.

Yes, the peace of soul the Catholic Church gives her sons and daughters constitutes her real appeal; but it is a peace that must be traced to its first source to be fully understood and appreciated. The first source of this great blessing is found in the Church's vitals: the Mass, the sacraments, the benedictions, the rosaries, the Stations of the Cross and the litanies to God and His heavenly court. Especially is it to be found in the Mass,

for it is here that the Catholic faithful meet Christ their Saviour *face to face* in the Holy Eucharist. When a Catholic participates in these solemnities he is at once removed from all the superficialities of the world. He experiences an intimacy with God that is joyously real and quite beyond compare. His whole being is refreshed and exhilarated, as a draught of cool water refreshes and exhilarates a man just off a burning desert. He is given a new lease on life—he is given *peace*, the true peace that only complete reconciliation with God can produce.

Here is the explanation for the almost total absence of Catholics in mental hospitals. In the U.S.A., for example, less than three per cent of the people committed to mental hospitals during the ten year period just ended were Catholics, although Catholics comprised 27 per cent of the population. Also significant is the fact the Catholics comprised less than one per cent of the patients afflicted with paranoia (chronic hallucinations) and *dementia praecox* (deteriorated mentality). Then there is the 1952 report of the non-partisan World Health Organization, an affiliate of the United Nations, which gave the lowest suicide rate in the world to the countries with the highest percentage of Catholic population. What could be stronger proof of the stabilizing, strengthening influence of Catholicism on the mind?

Peace of mind and soul is indeed a most precious commodity. People strive for this more than for any thing else in this world. They look for it everywhere, in seclusion, in wealth, in power, in a great assortment of philosophical and philanthropical associations and in a great assortment of religions. But the place where most people find it is in the Catholic Church, *within the Mystical Body of Him who in very truth is the Fountainhead of all true peace.*

Questions and Answers

Do Catholics confess all the sordid details of their sins to the priest?

No. Catholics are instructed *not* to confess the details of their sins because it would serve no useful purpose. All that is expected of the penitent is the classification of sins committed, a sincere expression of sorrow and a firm resolve to avoid future occasions of sin.

What else takes place in the confessional?

The priest gives spiritual advice, specifies certain prayers of penance and then, while the penitent prays the Act of Contrition, bestows Absolution. The Absolution certifies that God, through His Church, has forgiven the penitent's sins.

What advantage does confessing one's sins to a priest in the Sacrament of Penance have over confessing directly to God in private prayer?

There are several advantages. First, there is the Church of God's guarantee of forgiveness which private confessions do not provide; secondly, there is the expert counseling which private confessions do not provide; thirdly, there is the sacramental grace which private confessions do not provide.

Why does the priest celebrate the Mass in Latin instead of the language of the people?

Latin is the one language which does not change over the centuries, therefore the Mass is celebrated in Latin to help preserve the original purity of the Mass liturgy. The congregation has a translation of the Mass Latin in their missal which they bring to Mass so they are able to follow and understand everything the priest says.

Is the Mass exclusively in Latin?

No. All parish announcements, the Scripture readings, the sermon and several prayers incidental to the Mass are in the language of the congregation.

If the Catholic religion is so spiritually rewarding how explain the Catholics who fall away and become Protestants?

There always has been and there always will be defections from God's true Church, people who set aside spiritual considerations in favor of material gain, to please non-believing wives, husbands and sweethearts, to show their disdain for authority or to gratify offended pride. When such people join another church they do not become a credit to that church.

Why are Catholics forbidden to attend non-Catholic church services?

To discourage hypocrisy. It would be very hypocritical for a Catholic to believe that his is the true Church of

Jesus Christ, which he must believe before he can call himself a Catholic, and then take part in the services of another church.

Would it not also be hypocritical for a Protestant to attend Catholic services?

No, because Protestants do not believe that any one Christian church is Christ's true Church. Protestants believe that Christ's true Church is an *interdenominational* church embracing all Christian churches, including the Catholic Church. Accordingly they feel, or should feel, just as much at home at Catholic services as at Protestant services.

Why are Catholics forbidden to join the Masonic Order?

The Masonic Order is out of bounds to Catholics for two reasons: (1) it has religious underpinnings that are thoroughly inimical to the Catholic conscience. For example: it espouses God negatively, identifying Him not as the Holy Trinity but as "The Great Architect of the Universe" — this in order to appease and attract Jews, Moslems, Pantheists and what not. In the Catholic conscience there can be no compromise, no appeasement, on the question of God's true identity; Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit must needs be recognized. (2) the Masonic Order has throughout its history opposed the Catholic Church. This opposition has not been so great in this country but in many other countries, notably France and Mexico, it has resulted in the closing of Catholic churches and schools and the confiscation of Church properties when Masons captured control of the civil government. Catholics are not the only Christian religionists who re-

gard membership in the Masonic Order as inimical to the Christian ideal. Lutherans and Baptists share this opinion.

Why don't Catholic priests marry?

Catholic priests do not marry for several reasons; first because Christ, the divine High Priest, is the model, the Archtype, for the Catholic priesthood and He lived a celibate life; secondly, because the Apostles endorsed the celibate life for priests (*1 Cor. 7:32-33*); and thirdly, because their rigorous schedule would impose a tremendous and unfair hardship on a wife. Clerical celibacy is not, however, a dogma of faith. In certain areas of the Catholic Church and under certain conditions priests are permitted to have wives.

What is the purpose of convents, monasteries and religious orders in the Catholic Church?

Convents and monasteries provide a refuge where Catholics who wish to dedicate their lives entirely to prayer and contemplation of God can do so without worldly distractions. Religious orders provide specialized services for the Church such as missionary work, teaching in schools, nursing, caring for the poor and aged, etc.

Why do Catholics abstain from eating meat on Friday?

Catholics make this sacrifice on Friday to commemorate and honor Christ's sacrifice on that day. It is a practice that dates back to the earliest days of the Church. Tertullian and Clement of Alexandria both mention it in their writings. Meatless Fridays do not imply that there

is anything wrong with eating meat. On other days Catholics eat just as much meat as other people.

Why is the Catholic Church opposed to divorce?

The Catholic Church is opposed to divorce because Christ opposed it (Matt. 19:4-8), because marriage is not just a contract between two people but a contract between two people and God, because divorce creates broken homes which are responsible for the greatest part of the world's loneliness and child delinquency.

Are not the marriage annulments granted by the Catholic Church a form of divorce?

No, the marriage annulments granted by the Catholic Church are declarations that the marriage, having been entered into under duress or false pretense, being therefore fraudulent, never did exist in fact.

Why is the Catholic Church opposed to birth control?

The Catholic Church is not opposed to birth control when it is accomplished by natural means, i.e., by abstinence and continence. She is opposed only to birth control by *unnatural* means, by the employment of chemicals, mechanical devices and deliberate physical impairment, because such means violate the Will of God by disrupting His creative processes and shames the human race by making human life an accident of carnal passion rather than an intention of parental love. Think of the many great statesmen, educators and religious leaders whose

entrance into the world was prevented by a cheap contraceptive. Think of the many people who owe their existence to the failure of a cheap contraceptive.

Why is the Catholic Church opposed to the marriage of Catholics to people of other religious faiths?

The Catholic Church does not strictly forbid the marriage of Catholics to people of other religious faiths but she does strongly advise against it, because the records show that opposing religious views is one of the chief causes of marital friction and divorce. The only way to avoid this calamity is for one or both of the partners to compromise, to give ground, on their religious feelings and that results in a calamity of another and graver sort: it results in the willful disobedience of what is believed to be the Will of God, that is it puts duty to wife and husband before duty to God.

Why do Catholics believe in the necessity of good works? Does not the Bible say that faith alone justifies?

Catholics believe in the necessity of good works, acts of charity, because Christ stated very categorically that they are a condition of salvation. Read Matthew 25:31-46. Nowhere in the Bible is it stated that faith alone justifies. When Paul wrote, "We reckon that a man is justified by faith independently of the works of the Law" (*Rom. 3:28*), he was referring to the works of the old Jewish Law, the rite of circumcision, for example. Had Paul meant that faith ruled out the necessity of charity he would not have written: "If I have all faith so as to move mountains, yet do not have charity, I am nothing" (*1 Cor.*

13:2). If faith ruled out the necessity of good works the Apostle James would not have written: "Just as the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without good works is dead" (*James 2:26*).

Why don't Catholics claim they are "saved" as many Protestants do?

Catholics do not go around boasting that they are saved because Sacred Scripture, the Apostles' Creed and plain elementary logic all assert that it is God, not we ourselves, who is the judge of whether or not we are saved, and His judgment is not made known to us until after our life in this world has been spent, until the complete record of our loyalty to Him is in His hands. Wrote the Apostle Paul: "I do not judge my own self. I have nothing on my conscience, yet I am not justified in judging myself; for he who judges me is the Lord. Therefore, pass no judgment before the time, until the Lord comes" (*1 Cor. 4:3-5*).

Is it true that Protestant missionaries are persecuted by the Catholic Church in Spain and Colombia?

Thousands of Protestant missionaries have been sent to predominantly Catholic countries in the past decade. The vast majority have conducted themselves in a dignified, respectful manner and have not been molested. A few radicals have openly, persistently, flaunted local ordinances and brazenly attacked the deep rooted religious faith of the populace with the result that they were run out of town or out of the country, the same as Catholic missionaries from the U.S.A. would be run out of town or out of the country if they entered Sweden, for example,

and openly attacked the Lutheran Church. Significant is the fact that the vast majority of Protestant missionaries in Spain, Colombia and other predominantly Catholic countries do not complain of being persecuted.

Why do Catholics build their own schools?

Catholics look upon the public school system in this country as good, efficient and essential to the American way of life, which is why Catholics give it their whole-hearted support. But the public schools do not provide instruction in the teachings of Jesus Christ, an area of learning which Catholics consider essential to the Catholic way of life. Therefore they build their own schools, not as a substitute for public schools but as a supplement to public schools. The American public can be thankful for this because it relieves the public tax burden by hundreds of millions of dollars.

What is the attitude of the Catholic Church toward science?

The answer to that is to be found in the great modern laboratories in the hundreds of Catholic universities throughout the world and the renowned scientists produced by those universities. Some of the greatest scientists were Catholic priests. Hauy, the father of scientific crystallography, was a Catholic priest. Ampere, the discoverer of a way to measure electricity, was a Catholic priest. Mendel, who pioneered the study of heredity, was a Catholic priest. Copernicus, world famous astronomer, was a Catholic priest. Chauliac, father of modern surgery, was a Catholic priest. Latrelle, foremost entomologist, was a Catholic priest. Gerbert, father of modern mathematics and inventor of the first mechanically operated calculating machine, was Pope Sylvester II.

What stand does the Catholic Church take on the Theory of Evolution?

The Catholic Church takes the same stand that all rationalists take; viz. that the Theory of Evolution is yet no more than a theory but one which affords an interesting and challenging field for experimental science. It is not very likely but should it be conclusively proved that the physical form of modern man, along with the physical form of other modern species of life, evolved from radically different physical forms, being shaped by many thousands of years, perhaps millions of years, of habit, environmental and genetical influences, it would in no way disturb the doctrinal precepts of the Catholic Church which hold that it is the soul of man, not his outward form, that distinguishes him as a special creation of God.

What is the Catholic attitude toward drinking alcoholic beverages?

Catholic moralists take the position that moderate drinking of alcohol beverages for sake of health or sociability is not wrong. If it was wrong Christ would not have provided wine for the wedding feast of Cana (*John 2:1-10*), nor would the Apostle Paul have recommended wine "for thy stomach's sake and thy frequent infirmities" (*1 Tim. 5:23*). Excessive drinking that results in drunkenness and deprivation, however, is considered a very grave sin, even as the Apostles considered it a very grave sin (*Rom. 13:13, Gal. 5:21*).

What is the Catholic attitude toward gambling?

When one can afford it gambling is not evil. When one *cannot* afford it, when there is the chance that wife and family will be deprived of the necessities of life and legitimate debts left unpaid, then gambling is definitely evil. If gambling was intrinsically evil in itself then the purchase of corporation stocks, businesses and certain types of insurance would be evil because they too involve financial risk, a gamble. Whether or not some forms of gambling should be outlawed or rigidly controlled should be left up to the civil authorities to decide because conditions vary in the different localities.

What is the Catholic attitude toward dancing and attending the theater?

The Catholic Church is vigorously opposed to sexy, suggestive forms of dancing that incite carnal passion but she holds that dignified, convivial and modest forms of dancing are both permissible and commendable. Likewise with motion pictures and stage plays. If they have an immoral plot, or a plot that strongly suggests or glorifies immorality, they are evil and can be occasions of sin. If they are good wholesome and educational entertainment they can be of great benefit. The Catholic Church holds that it is just as moral to witness a show with a good Christian theme in a public theater as it is to witness it in a church hall.

Wasn't the Protestant Reformation justified in view of the worldliness of the Catholic Church at the time?

No, the Protestant Reformation was not justified. Better that the Christian community be up to its neck in worldliness than be broken up into hundreds of separate and rival camps, crippled to the extent that a thousand years may pass before it can once again present a united front in the cause of Christ. For it only takes a little conscience and a little time for a unified Christian society to cure itself of worldliness — the Catholic Reformation brought about at the Council of Trent in 1545-63 proved that — but it takes a lot of conscience and consequently a lot of time for many separated Christian societies to cure themselves of the disease of isolationism — the ancient and still separated Coptic churches prove that. Take a good look at the state of affairs in the Christian community today and it will become immediately apparent that what Luther, King Henry the Eighth and the other leaders of the Protestant revolt accomplished was no reformation of the Christian ideal but a tragic deformation.

If the Pope is the Vicar of Christ on earth as Catholics claim why does he not emulate the simplicity of Christ instead of surrounding himself with pomp and luxury?

What pomp? What luxury? Is it pomp to work sixteen hours a day, shouldering the burden of the world's highest religious office, receiving a steady stream of tourists, pilgrims and statesmen in audience, worrying over the fate of millions of Christians being trodden under the heel of Communism? Is it luxury to live in a simple four room apartment and never be able to leave on vacation, a

virtual prisoner? The Pope is the Vicar of Christ all right — that has been proved elsewhere in this booklet — and he is living as simply as he can without jeopardizing the efficiency of his great office.

What is meant by the “Infallibility” of the Pope?

The Infallibility of the Pope means that he can make no mistake when, speaking *ex cathedra* as the successor of St. Peter the Apostle, he defines Christian doctrine. It means that he, the foremost authority in the Church of Jesus Christ, is protected by the Holy Spirit of God from errors of judgment that would result in the corruption of the deposit of faith bequeathed to the Church — accordingly as this protection was promised. To the Apostle Peter Our Lord said: “Whatever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven” (*Matt. 16:19*). To the Apostolic teaching authority of His Church Our Lord said: “The Advocate, the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, he will teach you all things, and bring to your mind whatever I have said to you . . . he will bear witness concerning me, and you also will bear witness, because from the beginning you are with me” (*John 15:26-27*). The Infallibility of the Pope does *not* mean that he is immune to errors of judgment in other matters or that he is incapable of committing sin.

If the Catholic religion became the dominant religion in the United States would it be tolerant of other religions?

If the Catholic Church became the dominant religion in the United States she would adopt the same policy to-

wards other religions as she does in countries now predominantly Catholic: she would not assist them but she would not constrain them. In Rome, in the very shadow of the Vatican, the Waldensian Church has existed for eight hundred years without interference from the Catholic Church. In Italy, France, Ireland, Portugal, Philippines and all of the South American countries the Catholic religion dominates and other religions enjoy perfect freedom. The Catholic Church holds that one of the inherent rights of man is the right to follow the dictates of his conscience.

If the Catholic Church believes in the inherent right of the individual to follow the dictates of his or her conscience how explain the cruel heresy trials of the Inquisition?

The heretics who were tried, tortured and sometimes executed during the Inquisitions that took place first in Italy and then later in Spain were not treated that way simply because of their religious nonconformity but primarily because their religious extremism led them to what was considered to be serious crimes against society and the state. For example, the Cathari and Albigensian sects of Italy repudiated marriage and advocated suicide. In Spain it was discovered that a group of Moors and pseudo-Jews had joined the Catholic Church and become priests and bishops in order to camouflage subversive activities against both Church and state. The Catholic Church exposed these radicals but the sentencing and the punishment were carried out by the state. The punishment inflicted may appear cruel and inhuman to the modern mind but at the time it was the conventional mode of punishment for the crimes committed. Our gallows, elec-

tric chairs and gas chambers will probably be looked back upon with equal horror a few hundred years from now. Our government's suppression of the Mormon polygamists and the Canadian government's suppression of the Doukhobor nudists will probably be looked back upon with equal horror by the "civil liberty" exponents of a few hundred years from now.

Do Catholics believe that Protestants and other non-Catholic religionists are ineligible for heaven?

Positively not. Catholics believe that those of other religious faiths who earnestly strive to comply with the Divine Will and who die repentant of their sins will share in the heavenly reward.

Why become a Catholic then if one can attain eternal salvation outside of the Catholic Church?

Other religionists who earnestly strive to comply with the Divine Will are *not* outside of the Catholic Church. They are not members of the visible Catholic Church but by implicit desire, because they are not aware that the visible Catholic Church is God's one true Church, they belong to the *soul* of the Catholic Church. If they were aware that the visible Catholic Church is God's one true Church they would have to belong to it in order to merit eternal salvation because if they did not they would not be earnestly striving to comply with the Divine Will. God would not have founded the Catholic Church if He did not will that all men should belong to it.

Does belonging to the visible Catholic Church have any advantages over belonging to the soul of the Catholic Church?

Definitely. In the visible Catholic Church resides the Real Presence of Christ, the whole and true Gospel of Christ and the full complement of the true Sacraments of Christ. These provide graces which bring one into closer communion with God, thereby increasing one's disposition to comply with the Will of God. That membership in the visible Catholic Church does bring about such a holy disposition is seen in the fact that 87 per cent of Catholics attend church regularly as compared to 56 per cent for Protestants (according to Protestant estimates) — is seen in the fact that many Catholics attend church daily as compared to scarce few Protestants who attend church daily — is seen in the fact that Catholic saints outnumber Protestant saints a hundred to one. In other words, a person can attain eternal salvation through membership in the soul of the Catholic Church but membership in the visible Catholic Church is the safer route.

So why not join the Catholic Church, dear reader, and share in this wonderful friendship with God, this joy of heart, this peace of soul? Why not "Go, show thyself to the priest" as our Blessed Saviour advised (Luke 5:14) and let him give you "the pearl of great price," the beautiful, the precious, the eternal Catholic Faith? Do this and 475 million Catholics promise you that you will never cease being thankful, never cease singing in your heart, "Ah sweet mystery of life at last I've found thee; ah at last I know the secret of it all."

**MAY GOD BLESS YOU AND
QUICKEN YOUR DECISION**

Said Christ to His followers:

**HE WHO DOES NOT GATHER WITH
ME SCATTERS. Matt. 12:30.**

You can gather with Christ by sending \$1.00 with the names and addresses of five unchurched people to Bellarmine Publishing Company, Mound, Minnesota. Each will be sent a copy of **TEN GOOD REASONS** promptly without mention of your name unless you request your name mentioned.

*What does it
profit a man
if he gain the
whole world, but
suffer the loss
of his own soul?*

Matt. 16:26