

WHAT IS ROMAN CATHOLICISM?

You have fine Roman Catholic friends? So do I, since childhood. Many are Irish. Who doesn't love the Irish? You would love Brazilian Roman Catholics as well, if you knew them. Our question is not, Who are the Roman Catholics? but, What is Roman Catholicism? We write, not of the — **ics**, but of the — **ism**. Doctrinal questions are not personal issues. As a doctrine, what's wrong with Romanism?

ITS WRONG UNIVERSE. Gilbert Chesterton, brightest wit of Rome's British converts, once said: "It is more important for a landlady to know a new boarder's theory of the universe than to know how much money he has." What, then, is Rome's theory of the universe? Rome is wrong if Jesus is right, Jesus whom William Sanday once called: "One who has never been convicted of error." The Savior tells of a universe of three inhabited worlds, heaven, earth and hell. Catholic priests add two more worlds, limbo and purgatory. These two non-existent worlds are exploited every hour of the day and night by a merciless hierarchy and add to the miseries of clerical enslavement of their adepts.

"I would have told you," said Jesus if things were different from the universe he revealed, John 14:2. He told us of no limbo, no purgatory. Then they don't exist. Limbo is that fake world of Romanism where unbaptized babies go at death. There they are denied the "ineffable vision" forever, for the lack of a pint of holy water. There is no more terrible and cruel doctrine in all paganism.

There is no limbo, because there is really no infant baptism. Baptism is an act requiring intelligence, responsibility, faith and devotion. It is an act of faith's obedience, a vow of holiness, and is memory's sweet symbol of the acts and facts that gave us salvation. No infant can qualify. No infant ever was baptized. None can be. An infant is as incapable of baptism as of marriage, voting, running for office, playing tennis, practising law, bearing arms or breaking the record in pole vaulting. These and baptism are not the acts of infants. The ceremony is counterfeit. Jesus never baptized an infant for he never baptized at all — his apostles did the baptizing, **OF DISCIPLES**, John 4:2. Christ never practiced infant baptism, never commanded it, never permitted it, for he demanded the baptism of believers, disciples, Mat. 28:19. Luke says: "they that gladly received his word were baptized," Acts 2:41. To offer regeneration by this illicit act — the only regeneration Rome does offer is that "sacrament" — is sin. Infant bap-

tism is the worst sin of these post-apostolic centuries, a cumulative sin against children, against homes, against churches, against society, against nations, against God. E. Y. Mullins said infant baptism caused World War I. It left Europe pagan, an entire population "baptized" (?) in unconscious nullity, incapable of the moral stamina the crisis called for, twice in a quarter of a century. Infant baptism inoculates against real baptism and against the salvation that precedes genuine baptism, prepares for it and leads on after baptism to morals and spirituality.

How blessedly different is our Baptist faith as to infants. That great old country preacher, J. H. Anderson, would say: "The Baptists believe that all dying infants are saved, by the death and atonement of Christ. All living infants are lost and, coming to the age of accountability, make their own responsible decisions for themselves." That is vital Baptist truth, believed by none of the Catholic sects and few Protestant ones. We glory in our faith that dying infants of Catholics, Protestants, Jews, Buddhists, Mohammedans, pagans all or atheists, are all eternally saved by Christ in the moment of death, and are taken directly to him in heaven where their personality unfolds as he wills. These babies come to God by "the new and living way" of Calvary, by him who is "the propitiation for the sins of the whole world," including all the sin they have, Adamic, original, hereditary — none is personal. What a joy it is to be a missionary and say to Catholics everywhere: "There is no limbo to hold dead babies forever away from God."

Nor does the other fake world of purgatory exist. If it did, says Jesus, "I would have told you." He told not a word about purgatory. There is none. The pope is always mouthing about capitalism. Yet there is no more futile capitalism known to men than the capitalism of the vast payments for masses, said or sung to **take souls out of a place where they are not, for the place does not exist.** Add to that awful swindle, the riches invested in images whose use in worship the moral law forbids in the sternest language in all the Bible, and in their use on tens of thousands of altars, and you have a capitalism that might well bring every priest on earth, face in the dust in shame for this religious life utterly unknown to revealed Christianity. Yes. God's Moral Law forbids images in worship, forbids bowing to them, forbids this costly service that it takes to give them this artificial value. Image worship is immoral, God being the

judge. Yet that fact is kept from the knowledge of the users of many Catholic catechisms, that present a fake Decalog which leaves out the longest and sternest commandment of all and adds things God never commanded any time, anywhere.

ITS WRONG TRINITY. Catholics worship a wholly different Trinity from that we read of in the New Testament. The Trinity of popular Catholicism has four Persons. The first person, in power, in appeal and in the affections of the worshippers is the Virgin Mary. Priests say she has "delegated omnipotence." If she has it, God doesn't have it. The President of a nation delegates his authority to a constitutional substitute when he leaves the nation on diplomatic errands. When he delegates it, it is not his till he takes over again. If God delegated his omnipotence to Mary, he no longer has it, just as you don't have your money when you turn it over to a bank's keeping. Catholicism is fast developing an Oriental female deity. That always becomes the most fierce and corrupting of all forms of idolatry. Of course, if Mary was the Mother of God she was first the Wife of God. First wife, then mother. Her other children, named in the Bible (Mat. 13:55), were the Brothers of God and the Sisters of God; and there were all the other kinfolks, the Grandmother of God, God's Great Uncle, Step-Niece, Sister-in-law and Third Cousin. The whole language is not far from blasphemy, alien to Scripture and utterly ridiculous. It is one of those ambitious and tendentious additions to Scripture that the Bible especially condemns with a curse, Rev. 22:18.

Baptists believe, exactly and in proportion, every thing Christ and the Bible say about his mother, all that and nothing more. They believe a virgin of Nazareth, Mary by name, bore the Son of Man without a man's begetting. They honor her as did her Son and count her earth's most blessed and holy woman. But still a woman, even as He said: "WOMAN, what have I to do with thee?" Mary was a sinner saved by grace, for she "rejoiced in God her Savior," Luke 1:47. She was a believer, for Elizabeth said to her: "Blessed is she that believed," Luke 1:45. And the only command in all literature that we know to have been given by Mary, as Ruskin said, the Catholics don't even pretend to obey: "Whatsoever he saith unto you, DO IT." It is Baptists who honor Mary, obeying Jesus.

Their Trinity is not our Trinity, their medieval art being the judge. I suppose I have visited a thousand Catholic churches, in many lands. Step well inside the door, in churches of the Latin world, including many older churches in the United States. You will see overhead a painting of the Trinity. The Father is always an old man, senile, white-haired, long white beard thinned out. In some other paintings, his face is hard and cruel, as he pushes sinners into hell or tries to keep them from escaping from purgatory, while the Virgin lends them a helping hand and rebukes Father and Son for their intoler-

ance. That is blasphemy. If Mary has love, she got it from God, her Creator, who has in infinite degree what she has in finite limits. All she has he gave and did not miss it. Such art is an affront to God.

Nor is God old. "The heavens shall wax old as doth a garment; but thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail," Heb. 1:11, 12. That is why the Moral Law forbids all images and likenesses for use in worship. The artists reduce deity to the level of their benighted imaginations, making a false god in their own image, yea the image of their senility. The Son, in prophecy, is called "the Ancient of Days," but that merely affirms his eternity. The Eternal is never old. His is the maturity of eternal youth.

"Time" and one other of our current magazines — was it "Coronet"? — point out that one of the main causes of juvenile delinquency is that he who is the source of all goodness is painted as an effeminate and long-haired weakling, while the gangster, the bandit and the horse thief are shown in manly form. The Bible plainly says that "if a man has long hair, it is a shame," I Cor. 11:14. Jesus was no shameful incarnation of God. He was earth's manliest Man, "strong Son of God, immortal love." Men did not wear long hair in his time. That was a trait of later, pusillanimous medievalism. Ignorant artists painted the Savior according to the vain styles of their corrupt courts, of which none was more corrupt and vain than the papal court. Every such painting is an insult to Jesus and to your intelligence.

The Catholic artist hardly knows what to do with the Holy Spirit. He is a Stranger. Sometimes he is a dove, sometimes a fire. Twelve apostles are seen, with Mary sticking up highest of all and in the center, as tongues of fire sit on the thirteen. There is no such history in the Bible. When the Spirit came, he fell indiscriminatingly on all the 120 members of that church. The cloven tongues, like as of fire, "sat upon each of them," Acts 2:3. Nor is Mary highest or central. She comes next to last in the list, with her other children, the brethren of Jesus, Acts 1:13. And she is never mentioned again in revealed Christianity. The whole Bible is tortured, twisted and torn by priests, and put together again, in papal art, to their taste. The result is a false Christianity. This is the Romanism of its nominal millions, not the parlor or platform Romanism of trained proselytizers of Protestants, or of Knights of Columbus ads.

ITS WRONG SAVIOR. Auto-salvation is what Rome offers, achieved by the sinner through the Church (not in any Bible meaning of that word). Primarily it is salvation by sacraments: Rome invented seven, Protestants kept two, the Bible and the Baptists have none. The word is pagan in origin and idea. Sacraments, ritual, priestcraft, its confessional, supererogatory (doing more than duty requires, which no one does) works and merit of the saints (not in the Bible meaning of the word), transferable from the dead to the living by some sacerdotal conjure, "good works" (mostly not good at all, because done

in disobedience to God) are factors in this life that leads to purgatory, which with masses, with burning maybe for centuries in a place that does not exist, and with more treasury of merit manipulated by priests, complete the price one pays for salvation by and by. "Thou shalt call his name Jesus for HE shall save" — not he and the Church, nor he and the Virgin, nor he and the sacraments, nor he and the "saints" (canonized by popes, some of which "saints" were murderous villains, burning real saints at the stake). Christ saves, Christ alone, saves the believer, saves in this life, saves forever, "unto the uttermost." Salvation is the very first thing in eternal life, received at faith. It is the new birth, and birth gives life its birthday, its beginning. **"He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life."** "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved." "There is none other name," said Peter, "neither is there salvation in any other," Acts 4:12. Jesus saves.

How different from Catholic despair is the salvation of believers. The Spirit becomes a witness to our spirits that we are the sons of God. Catholics deny that anybody is saved in this life. You live and die with no salvation — one life gone. You stay in purgatory for maybe centuries, burning sin out of you since the blood of Jesus Christ is impotent to take it away — two lives gone. When you finally achieve heaven, you get salvation, in a third life. Pagan religions have no deception more destructive of all truth and hope than that. That is why Roman Catholic populations are sodden with pessimism and why death is so terrible in their homes. "They sorrow as those who have no hope." Purgatory is not a hope. It is half a hell for half an eternity and the victims of the despair don't yet know the place does not exist.

ITS WRONG HEAD. Romanism is a two-headed religion — a monstrosity. Did you read about that two-headed turtle? Each head fought the other away from the food. Now "Time" tells of scientists grafting on a dog another head of a different canine breed. What snapping and snarling and biting ensued. So it would be to have a two-headed religion. Christ is the nominal head, the pope the real head of Romanism. "Not holding the Head," Col. 2:19, is Paul's indictment of an apostate faith, which obeys an earthly head rather than the Lord who bought us. "The head of every man is Christ," I Cor. 11:3.

ITS WRONG BAPTISM. There is not a single baptized person in the whole Roman Catholic sect, or in any other of the many Catholic sects, unless they have proselyted some timid soul who already had both salvation and baptism when he went into their midst. Depending on baptism as their only hope of regeneration, they then threw away baptism. Here is the amazing story of how baptism went astray and was destroyed, for its millions, by Romanism.

In the first century, and whenever and wherever churches of the New Testament faith and order have existed, there was no baptism but immersion,

and that a special type of immersion, of saved people, in obedience to Christ and his truth, for symbolic witness, leading on into a biblical life and fellowship of true churches. Then there crept in, through pagan philosophy in false or confused converts, the superstition that baptism is part of the saving process, washing away sin. Oh! But, if baptism washes away sin, then the more the better. So the change was made to trine immersion. The "Orthodox" (In what?) Greeks still follow that trine superstition and disobedience. To do too much or to do too little is disobedience.

Baptism remained such immersion for centuries. Vast baptisteries, with facilities for immersing crowds of catechumens, before crowds of Catholics, especially at Easter, because of the association of baptism with the resurrection, were built in all Southern Europe. They are still there, shown to tourists with the explanation that Europe was unanimous in immersion then. Eventually superstition adopted the extreme views of Jewish proselyte baptism — naked immersion. Baptism in the nude had little of the shame of our beaches, however, for the naked women were surrounded and herded into the waters by deaconesses. Only the "bishop" (not in any Bible sense of the term) saw all. Part of Lent is was — lent by the devil. If there is anything God seems to hate it is human nakedness on display, straight through the Bible. Yet Catholic art paints Jesus as stark naked when he is baptized by John. Can you beat it? Would YOU be baptized stark naked? Did Jesus have less shame than you? Yet look at Ronald Knox's Catholic Version of the New Testament, opposite p. 214 of the illustrated Chanticleer Edition and see for yourself. A fictitious Jesus, long curly hair, as has John, stands stark naked in water waist deep. John is in an acrobatic position on the side of a rock, and the only others present are two female-looking angels, heavily robed, waiting to cover up Jesus, clothes hanging on their arms. Good angels! The artist is Giovanni Baronzio, "active around 1344-45," and the original is in the National Gallery of Art, Washington (Kress Collection). Very naturally, Signor Baronzio painted the baptism he was accustomed to see in the great baptisteries of contemporary Romanism. Behold Rome's shameless medievalism, attributed ignorantly to the pure Son of God.

Let two great Presbyterian scholars, Benjamin Warfield, cited by H. E. Dosker, tell us, in the latter's history of "The Dutch Anabaptists," p. 177, the dull hue of this proselyte baptism, whose superstition crept into medieval Romanism. "A ring on the finger, a band confining the hair, or anything that in the least degree broke the continuity of contact with the water was held to invalidate the act." Yet some enemies of the truth would suppose that John got his baptism, not from heaven, as Jesus affirmed, but from that vile superstition of proselytism.

Down these Dark Ages every other superstition imaginable laid its hands on baptism. Affusion was early permitted, drenching the bed of the desperately ill with water, in place of baptizing them, but only in extreme cases. Then women began to dread the fate of their babies that died unbaptized, and infant baptism came in. For a while, the postponement of baptism till near death 'was all the rage'. Old murderous Constantine, on whose hands was the blood of wife, son, kin and friends untold, took a gloomy view of death. But since baptism washed away sin of all kinds, he nicely calculated his day of dying and, shortly before his demise, received his triple cleaning and eased out of life carefully, only to find, one minute after death, what folly and deception all sacramental superstition is. But once both this all-saturating superstition had held sway for a millenium, and to it had been added the notion that our Lord the pope can cancel the commands of God and substitute his own, it finally occurred to the unregenerate masses and their priests: "Why go to all this trouble? Just let the pope change the act of baptism as he changes everything else." And so the Council of Ravenna, to quote Dosker again, "in 1311, inverted the order and placed aspersion (no, affusion, W.C.T.) first and immersion second." Thus the Catholic Church, after corrupting and changing baptism to nude and triple shame, threw it clean away. There has not been a baptized Catholic in the world for centuries. You may be saved without baptism. As Truett said: "Baptism is never necessary for salvation, salvation is always necessary for baptism." All truly baptized people were saved before and without baptism, then obeyed the Savior in baptism. But this, too, is clear. No baptism, no church. That is Romanism's sad plight. What they most trust in they are destitute of.

ITS WRONG BISHOPS. Exactly so. Romanism has not a single bishop in all its range. Not one. A bishop is no boss of other ministers and their churches. As Dr. Mullins says, the bishopric is a local office. Every pastor is fully a bishop. No presbyter is less than a bishop: no bishop is more than a pastor, in the New Testament. Baptists have tens of thousands of biblical bishops: Rome has none. A Christianity without **true** bishops is not a **true** Christianity. Here is what the Word of God says about bishops: "A bishop then must be blameless, the husband of one wife . . ." (I Tim. 3:2). How many Catholic **bishops** did you ever see?

ITS WRONG WORSHIP. Here is the sentence of the Judge, even Jesus, "In vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men," Mark 7:7. Human traditions, converted into doctrine, annul worship. You have incapacitated your soul for acceptable worship, just to the extent you have banished the doctrines of God and, in their place, have put infant baptism, image worship, sacraments, celibacy and other tricks of priestcraft, ritualism, all "vain repetition" of Pater Nosters and Ave Marias and every other tradition of men. What men think

about this doesn't matter. God knows. He forbids. He annuls the worship. If heaven had a newspaper, it would have these headlines every Monday: "Another big show yesterday in So-and-So Church, repudiating the truth and will of God, substituting the traditions and superstitions of men. Value : zero."

This is universal Romanism, the same in Buenos Aires as in Boston, in New York and New Orleans as in Naples, in Paris or Philadelphia, in Rio de Janeiro or in Richmond and Roanoke, Virginia. **Roma semper eadem**, in Rome, Italy or in Rome, Ga. Just the same. That is why we do mission work among Roman Catholics in Home Missions and in Foreign Missions. They need the gospel of grace every where.

That was my personal letter No. 2, written from Brazil as I was bringing to a close my 41 years of mission work there, shortly before retiring in 1956. Baptists send missionaries to the Roman Catholic world, at home and abroad. Southern Baptists have missionaries in Argentina, the Bahama Islands, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Ecuador, Guatemala, Honduras, Italy, Macao, Mexico, Paraguay, Peru, the Philippines, Portugal, Spain, Uruguay, Venezuela, in the Panama Canal Zone and Porto Rico, and in special work in Switzerland and France. They work among Catholics also in our homeland and in pagan, Islamic, Buddhist and other lands. There are strong Portuguese Baptist churches in New England. I have visited them and preached in Portuguese in Boston, Providence and other centers of the half million Portuguese in the United States. And we have a Convention of 350 Mexican Baptist churches in Texas and a theological seminary and great Spanish Publishing House in El Paso, where I have also preached. Various Baptist groups have strong work among many Catholic groups of immigrants in this country, and all our Baptist churches preach the gospel to Catholics and have a vast lot of converted Catholics as members. "Time" (April 5, 1954) quotes Daniel Poling as saying in "**The Christian Herald**" that his investigations showed 4,144,366 known conversions of Catholics in the previous ten years. and the Baptist World Alliance has just closed a meeting in Rio in which Billy Graham preached to an audience of 200,000 souls, his greatest in all his career. "Time" (July 18, 1960) says that "an estimated 50% of the audience was Catholic" and some 20,000 answered Billy Graham's appeal for conversion. "Counselors later talked to 12,000, and Rio's 128 Baptist churches (in the Federal District of old, there being 241 Baptist churches in metropolitan Rio, W.C.T.) reported a steady influx of converts all week long," said "Time."

Let me disabuse your minds of the idea that Romanism is taking the United States. Nothing could be further from the truth. Our America of today was once almost totally under the domination of Rome. "In 1492, Columbus sailed the ocean blue," and in 1613 Ponce de Leon took possession of Florida for Spain and it was an intolerant Spanish colony till

1821. That includes 45 years of our national life. The vast land called "Louisiana" was bought from France in 1803. Spain, the most intolerant Catholic nation in history, at one time or the other dominated all the land from Florida to the Pacific and carried on missionary work through clerical orders, forbidding Protestant existence in its borders. Texas was under a law, the first third of last century, forbidding the organizing of any other kind of church than the Catholic in its borders. A Baptist church migrated there, already organized, to evade that provision. Not a Baptist existed from Miami to Los Angeles during the early decades of our national life. All was Catholic, as well as in many French settlements from Quebec to the Ohio, with their Indian converts. Today in Texas alone there are over two million Baptists, with as many more in their families, where no Baptist could exist till freedom came. Mobile and New Orleans were both Spanish centers of deadly intolerance once. Recently "Time" commented on the fact that the Catholics have become a minority in both cities. Early Baptists were whipped in Boston, thrown in jail for preaching the gospel in Virginia, persecuted in most of the rest of the new nation, which was subject to State Churches in the colonies little deviating from the Catholic model of intolerance. And in rivalry with these persecutors there was one definitely Catholic colony, named, of course, Mary Land. This nation has come up from original Catholic territory mainly, and a Catholic type of intolerance almost nation-wide over the original colonies. It has come into a freedom unparalleled in history, fruit of the Baptist doctrine of religious liberty in Rhode Island, Virginia, and the Carolinas. **Let's keep it free.**

Catholics publish, with great boasting, their number of converts from Protestants every year. Finally other denominations began to keep account of their increase by conversions from Catholicism and lo it is far more than the number of converts Rome boasts. Rome grows, too, by immigration. Half her strength comes from foreign groups. John A. Broadus said long ago that if immigration were stopped, Romanism would practically disappear in this land. It is our big foreign cities that now aim to put a Catholic president in the White House and then lower all barriers to immigration of their adherents from the lowest ranks of the pope's nominal followers in Europe, to make our cities even more foreign and alien. Presidents and priests testify frankly that of the Roman Catholic statistics in such lands only ten or twenty per cent are practicing Catholics. The rest go to church Easter, Christmas and for infant "baptisms," weddings and funerals. Is that a wholesome population to open the doors to, by the millions, tired of the very life they and their priests have created in Europe?

WHAT IS ROMANISM RELIGIOUSLY, MORALLY AND POLITICALLY? This addition is made to this original Letter No. 2 of my series, to discuss

the last item. Romanism is in national politics in this election. All the effort now is, and will be, to intimidate, browbeat and threaten the free voter who feels that Roman Catholicism in a candidate for that highest office in the gift of free men disqualifies him, in the individual voter's judgement. The method of this intimidation is, first to insist that there is no religious qualification for running for President, then to brand as "prejudiced," "intolerant" and "bigoted" any one who refuses to vote for a candidate because of his religious beliefs.

Now the Constitution provides that "no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office of public trust." Exactly. Devotees of any and all religions are as free as the wind to seek any office, from the Presidency down, from constable up. But does the candidate have religious freedom and the voter not? I have exactly the same religious freedom to vote against him that he has to seek votes for the coveted post. The issue is the free voter, not the free candidate. We have a free Catholic candidate. Now free voters will make their decisions.

Many men whom I hold free to run for the Presidency are men I, in my freedom, would not vote for. I would not vote for a blind man, or one stone deaf. I would not vote for an anarchist or a pacifist (how could he be the commander-in-chief of our armed forces?) or a Holy Roller fanatic or a Jehovah's Witness or a bigamist or a Mormon (and I could gladly dispense with one in the department of agriculture), or a witch doctor or a Spiritualist medium. **DO I HAVE TO VOTE** for some candidate just because he has the freedom to run? **My VOTE AGAINST HIM** is my freedom as a citizen, just as his running for office is his freedom, plus his own free vote.

But the Catholics, and their allies who are devotees of a false liberalism, are set to punish us for voting our convictions. They aim to intimidate us with the cry of "BIGOTS!". That is a subject on which any Catholic or admirer of Catholicism ought to be ashamed to speak. "Bigotry"? In most Catholic countries no man can be president or ruler who is not a member of the Catholic Church. Where they rule, we are not even eligible to be candidates. In Italy the forces of freedom won the War. But the old compact between Mussolini and the Papacy still is in force as to relations between Church and State, and a great fight has had to be waged to keep the police from closing permanently the doors of an evangelical church. "Bigotry"? In Colombia, says **The British Weekly** of June 16, 1960, "in the past twelve years one hundred and sixteen Protestants have been killed because of their religion, sixty six churches and chapels destroyed by fire or dynamite and over two hundred Protestant schools closed. At a conference of Protestant pastors held in May in Medellin a poll of pastors present showed sixty two of them had been imprisoned because of their faith, twenty six had been fired on at one time or the other, twenty eight came from churches destroyed or seriously

damaged by mob or police action and twenty three had members of their congregations martyred." "Bigotry"? The same article tells of Bible burnings, stonings and of the clergy's taking from their parents the control of three children, to educate them as Catholics, because the father had become a Protestant. "A Catholic government is bound to protect baptized children when their parents apostatize." "Bigotry"? The same journal, same date, reports that 80 churches of evangelicals have been closed and kept closed and 40 schools of our brethren closed for good and all. An eminent statesman, Governor Byrnes, who had been both Supreme Court Judge and Assistant-President of the United States, was proposed as candidate for the vice-presidency. In "The Christian Century" of August 1, 1960 Gladstone Williams is quoted as to a conversation he heard between the ailing President and the governor of Georgia. The President is quoted as saying that he had called in the head of the Catholic Church in the United States and put a question to him. His reply was that the Democratic ticket would lose 75% of the Catholic vote if Mr. Byrnes were given a place on it. "With a gesture of his hand toward an open window, Mr. Roosevelt remarked: 'And there went Jimmy, meaning out of the window, of course.'" That was the penalty for Byrnes having left Rome's Church and joined another.

"Bigotry"? I have been in two Catholic mobs myself, with fellow-Baptists. A number of the persecutors were later converted and baptized, even as was Paul long ago. "Bigotry"? **"Christianity Today,"** of March 20, 1960, tells of a Colombian priest, Rev. Angelino Isaza, who led a shouting mob against a home where Miss Aimee McQuilkin, missionary nurse, was conducting a service. "Father Isaza broke down the front door with his shoulder. Miss McQuilken blocked his entrance and asked him how a minister of Christ could behave in a manner so unlike Christ. The priest shouted at her to shut up, and pushed her back into the house. When she refused to let him enter, he slapped her in the face." She then turned the other cheek, and he went out.

I could write a book of documented data of a similar nature in current events. But a library of books is already written. Be intelligent. Read the books and encyclopedias on "the HOLY Inquisition," the most dastardly criminal persecution of saints in all the history of humanity. Read the story of the Anabaptists, burned at the stake for their faith by Rome and other State Churches that brought that spirit out of Romanism with them. The edict in many centers of hate was, **"Qui mergetur, mergatur" (He that immerses, let him be immersed — drowned!).** Hubmaier's noble wife, after encouraging him in the flames, was taken to the Danube and drowned. The Baptists of the World Alliance went to Vienna and strewed flowers on the waters where she sank, on the four hundredth anniversary of her martyrdom. Thou-

sands of our Anabaptist forefathers suffered such fates. If I were a Catholic, I think I would ashamedly let ten million years pass by before I ever opened my mouth on the subject of "bigotry"! I knew a Baptist pastor in Brazil, resident in a village and pastor of country churches. His child died and was buried in the public cemetery. The priest came and dug up that little body and threw it over the cemetery wall. The pastor came and picked up the body and brought it to a city near by, where I was later pastor, and buried it where the battle of public cemeteries had already been fought and won for freedom. If my bigotry went through this life and on beyond death, refusing to lie in the same soil with those who disagreed with me about religion, I think I would for sheer shame never show my face again to men who love freedom. And yet these are the people who, to gain THEIR ends, are going to scream "BIGOTS" at those of us who exercise our freedom and responsibility in voting to keep America free.

Now there is one kind of Catholic who makes a good President in Catholic lands. He is the "Anti-clerical Catholic". Forced to be a Catholic, to have any civil rights, he, nevertheless, loathes clerical intolerance and fights it at every turn. But have you seen any "anti-clerical" Catholics on our political horizon? No! They all have their pictures taken with the highest of the hierarchy. That is their privilege. Birds of a feather flock together.

"For there is one God, and one Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus," I Tim. 2:5. But Romanism can't count the myriads of mediators it has placed between the soul and God. But the one nearby is the priest. Before him every good Catholic must kneel and confess his sins and receive forgiveness, counsel and guidance. This priest is held to be a miracle-worker, more wonderful than God himself. God created the world. He creates God, "the body, blood AND DEITY" of God the Son, in the little wafer of the Mass, and he exercises the divine function of forgiving sins. Place a kneeling President of the United States before this ambitious imposter and slave of the Vatican, in some hour crucial for liberty, and what would the result be? Not by my vote will the liberties of the nation that I love better than life ever be subjected to that peril.

But suppose a "liberal" Catholic were elected President of our nation. His personal decisions would not be the only result. All over the land ambitious priests and covetous politicians would use the Catholic victory to intimidate all opposition to THEIR schemes, aggrandizement and to having their hands in the public treasury. And the same bigotry that intimidated the conscientious voter in the presidential election would intimidate every voice of freedom that resisted Rome's insatiable ambitions, from the town council to the Vatican's door itself. Watch and pray!

WILLIAM CAREY TAYLOR

W. C. T.