

1950

# The Menace of Roman Catholicism

Earl West

Follow this and additional works at: [http://digitalcommons.acu.edu/crs\\_books](http://digitalcommons.acu.edu/crs_books)

 Part of the [Catholic Studies Commons](#), [Christian Denominations and Sects Commons](#), and the [Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

West, Earl, "The Menace of Roman Catholicism" (1950). *Stone-Campbell Books*. 385.  
[http://digitalcommons.acu.edu/crs\\_books/385](http://digitalcommons.acu.edu/crs_books/385)

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by the Stone-Campbell Resources at Digital Commons @ ACU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Stone-Campbell Books by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ ACU. For more information, please contact [dc@acu.edu](mailto:dc@acu.edu).

**T H E**  
**M E N A C E**  
**O F**  
**ROMAN CATHOLICISM**

**BY**  
**EARL WEST**



## **DEDICATION**

“Now these were of a nobler character than those of Thessalonica and they received the word with great eagerness, studying the scriptures every day to see whether these things were so.” (Acts 17: 11, 12) (Douay Version)

To all Roman Catholics who have the courage to think for themselves and who are noble enough to study the scriptures every day to see whether these things are so, this little booklet is dedicated in the hope that it will help lead many to the way of Truth.

—The Author

# **The Menace of Roman Catholicism**

The Trojan horse has been rolled into America! Her army threatens disaster to every principle of American democracy. Every point of religious truth revealed in the word of God is threatened. She does not pose as an open enemy; but through subtle propaganda persuades the ignorant that her case is God's cause, and that her battles are democracy's battles. Thus, she seeks to win America. In doing so, the Roman Catholic Church is the darkest menace ever to face this nation.

## **Part I**

### **The Threat to Democracy**

#### **A. Aims and Intentions**

Dr. Goebbels is dead, but his propaganda machine is not. Every trick known to Goebbels is being utilized to its full effectiveness by Catholic propagandists. Doctrinally, Roman Catholicism is directly opposed to everything for which America stands. We note with interest Pope Leo XIII's statement to the archbishops and bishops of North America:

"It is necessary to destroy the error of those who might believe, perhaps, that the situation of the Church in America is a desirable one, and also the error of those who might believe that in imitation of that sort of thing the separation of church and state is legal and even convenient."

Thus, Roman Catholicism is not satisfied with the condition here in America. Why, then, hasn't she done something about it?

Leo XIII set the policy to be pursued by a statement issued in 1888:

“Although no account of the extraordinary political condition today it usually happens that the Church in certain modern countries acquiesces in certain modern liberties, not because she prefers them in themselves, but because she judges it expedient that they should be permitted; she would in happier times resume her own liberty.”

The Catholic Church in America is pushing cautiously, watching carefully not to arouse any antagonism to herself. Her intention is to use every means available to gain sympathy for her cause, and plant her stronghold here on American soil. It was not an accident that four of her new Cardinals came from the United States. It fits in with Romanist plans to strengthen her weakened positions on this side of the Atlantic.

Six months before Pearl Harbor the Jesuit magazine, **America**, published on May 17, 1941, a Roman Catholic tyrade against democracy:

“How we Catholics have loathed and despised this Lucifer civilization, this rationalist creation of those little men who refuse to bend the knee or bow the head in submission to a higher authority . . . Today, American Catholics are being asked to shed their blood for that particular kind of secularist civilization which they have been heroically repudiating for four centuries. This civilization is now called democracy, and the suggestion is made that we send the Yanks to Europe again to defend it . . . All the Yanks in America will not save it from disinte-

gration. Unless a miracle occurs, it is doomed — finally and irrevocably doomed.”

Catholics now must concede that a “miracle” did happen, and that the Yanks in America did save it from disintegration. Painfully realizing this fact, Roman Catholic propaganda has been forced into a spiritual sommersault, and is now seeking to prove that she is pro-democratic and that her cause is the only cause of American democracy.

## B. Catholicism and Fascism

Roman Catholics intend to leave the impression that they are responsible for democracy and really favor it. So, for example, one reads in the **Catholic World**, June, 1942, an article entitled, “Medieval Origin of Democracy” by John Vincent Connorton. Connorton says: “The simple truth is that democracy came really from the Middle Ages, the age of Faith, where Catholic philosophy was predominant, and where Catholic Churchmen and laymen fought for the principles of political and economic democracy.” (p. 293) To such an article, we answer “nonsense.” There has never been a country predominately Catholic where democracy ever flourished much less originated. Witness in our day the situation in Argentina where ninety-eight per cent of the population is Catholic. In February, 1946, the nation had a fine chance to overthrow Juan Domingo Peron’s influence and his pro-Catholic, pro-Fascist element and put in a more democratic government if it wanted it, but Peron was elected. Last December 3, 1945, **Time** magazine reported that Santiago Luis Cardinal Copello, Catholic primate of Argentina, sent a pastoral letter to Argentina Catholics, warning them not to vote for a candidate who would stand for

(1) the doctrine of separation of Church and State and (2) take religious (Catholic) instructions out of the public schools. This was, in effect, warning Argentina Catholics that they had better vote for Peron and his pro-Fascist element. This is Roman Catholicism at work. Is it any wonder, then, that informed people will not take Catholic propaganda on this point?

**The nature of Catholicism and Fascism the same.** Nazism and Fascism are to politics what Roman Catholicism is to religion. They are all totalitarianism, demanding absolute submission from the masses to the authority of a dictator. Hitler, in his **Mein Kampf** shows clearly that he patterned his political views after the Roman Catholic Church. He borrowed the uncompromising dogmatism of Catholicism for Nazism. He borrowed Catholic methods of suppressing Truth to keep his people in error. Hitler made it a death penalty to read a newspaper not authorized by the Nazis or listen to a foreign broadcast on the radio. His system thrived on ignorance. This, he got from the Catholics who made it illegal for a Catholic believer to attend a Protestant worship or read the Protestant Bible. Catholics know they will lose ground when their followers read for themselves the pure word of God. Catholicism like Nazism thrives on ignorance of the masses. Too, Hitler borrowed his idea of the Concentration Camps from the Inquisition used in the Middle Ages. Nazism was Catholicism applied to politics. Catholicism, by its very nature, will no more mix with democracy than will Nazism.

Further facts bear out this truth. In 1933, shortly after Hitler came to power, Pope Pius XI made a concordant with Franz Von Papen, German ambassador to the Vatican, through Cardinal Pacelli, the

present Pope Pius XII. Von Papen then said of Nazism, "This is the order which is also approved by the pope . . . the new regime which is anti-liberal and anti-democratic must enjoy our complete and unrestricted confidence." On March 14, 1946, Hermann Goering, Number One Nazi War Criminal, was testifying before the War Criminals Tribunal at Nuernberg. The United Press reported: "Goering defended the Nazi program of blind obedience to the fuehrer with the contention: 'The Catholic Church is still relying on the leadership principle . . .'" Goering saw that the nature of Nazism was the same as Catholicism: **both are totalitarian.**

Catholic Count Kalergi-Coudenove in his book, **Crusade for Pan-Europe** admits the same: "Catholicism," he says, "is the Fascist form of Christianity. The Catholic hierarchy rests fully and securely on the leadership principle with an infallible pope in supreme command for a life-time." (p. 173) Just how much confidence the Catholics have in the judgment of the masses can be seen by a speech delivered by Lainez, the general of the Jesuits, before the Council of Trent. He compared the masses to sheep saying, "Sheep are animals destitute of reason, and in consequence they can have no part in the government of the church."

**Catholic denials.** Roman Catholics issue violent denials of Fascist leanings today. But to one who sees the real side of the picture not presented by Romanist propaganda, it is clear that in sympathy Catholicism backs the Fascists. **The Indianapolis News**, March 14, 1946, reports that a Fascist underground movement with 9,000 members is known to be organized in Rome. Its financial support comes from Spain with valuable aid coming from the

clergy. Carlo Scorza, fugitive former secretary of Mussolini's Fascist party, is the leader.

Allied authorities have not been able to capture Scorza as yet and bring him to trial, because, the article informs us, Scorza is hiding in a Dominican convent in Rome. Just how much then is Catholicism not backing Fascism?

Soon after the Japanese captured the Philippines, Michael J. Doherty, the Archbishop of Manila, issued a pastoral letter, calling upon all Philipponoes to cease anti-Japanese activities. As an interesting side-light to this, **The Indianapolis News**, March 13, 1946, reports that a Catholic bishop of Manila was arrested and tried for treason for giving valuable aid to the Japanese.

**What Catholics think of democracy.** Americans who are interested in knowing what the Roman Catholics think of the United States political set-up should read **Catholic Principles of Politics** by John A. Ryan and Francis J. Boland published by MacMillan Company, New York, 1943. This book informs us that the state should have a care for religion. (p. 313) Furthermore, "The state has an obligation to declare and recognize religion." Again, "Error has not the same rights as Truth." (p. 318) This book informs us that the Roman Catholic Church is the sole teacher of virtue and guardian of morals, and that everything contrary to her must be put down. (p. 298) This book says that Roman Catholicism approves of no liberty that runs contrary to her authority. (p. 301) It goes on to say that if the United States would become predominantly Catholic, her constitution would be changed to insure the "political proscription" of all non-Catholic sects. (p. 320) This is what is in store for you,

Americans, if Catholicism can win its present battle.

For more information concerning the Catholic attitude toward democracy one might read Francis Stuart Campbell's book entitled, **The Menace of the Herd**, published in 1943. This book from a Roman Catholic is an attack on the theory and practice of democracy. He attacks the intentions of the founders of this country. He insists that true democracy must be what they meant for it to be, and yet if the nation is to be dynamic, it must keep pace with current conditions and present needs of the people. He insists that the recommendations of 18th century statesmen can be no final word for today. He also points out that the Roman Catholic Church has never felt particularly at ease with democracy.

The man on the street, we are told, is ignorant. He says only three thousand voters are capable of competent criticism of the New Deal. He asserts that in actual practice democracy leads to a negation of religious liberty. Is this a sample of Catholic love for democracy?

### **C. Methods of Catholic Propaganda**

**The Press.** The American newspaper has become the chief organ for propagating Catholic teaching. Dispatches come regularly from the Vatican and find their way into the newspapers of the land. These dispatches are characteristically laden with the Catholic views of the news.

Moreover, Roman Catholics are known to set up pressure groups in various areas to curb any opposition that may arise to her cause. One notable example of this came up in San Francisco sometime ago.

**The San Francisco News** carried an article about a Roman Catholic priest who, with a woman companion, was arrested one night for drunken driving. He pleaded guilty in Madera, California, and was fined \$250. Archbishop John J. Mitty tried twice to get the **News** to kill the story, but it refused. Afterwards, Mitty organized a Roman Catholic boycott against the paper for being "bigoted" and "antagonistic."

Catholics find the press a convenient means of spreading doctrinal teaching through paid advertising. This method started in the **St. Louis Post-Dispatch**, June 18, 1944, and has since spread to other American cities and newspapers. Each ad cost the Catholics \$150. During the first six months of such advertising in St. Louis alone, 170 non-Catholics were enrolled in special Catholic instruction courses. Requests for pamphlets by readers of these articles came from 3,500 non-Catholics.

Such articles contained the usual Catholic doctrines. They ran along three lines: (1) Conception of the Bible (2) Origin and Uniqueness of the Catholic Church (3) Forgiveness of Sins. Typical ads were: "But First Century Christians Never Saw the Bible" or "Bible Not to Be Authoritative" or again, "The World's Best Seller—A Book of Disunity." Readers of these ads were urged to write for free literature. Literature sent out included the following topics: "The Catholic Church and the Bible." Also, "The Catholic Church Is the Church of Christ." And also, "The True Church Quizzes a Street Preacher."

**Books and Libraries.** **The Catholic World**, February, 1941, called the attention of all Catholics to the fact that they must not neglect the opportunities afforded them by the libraries and magazine racks of

spreading their religion. It was pointed out that thousands who would never read a book will read a magazine article, so Catholics were urged to put their magazines and tracts in racks in public places for them to be read. They were also encouraged to establish "Catholic Book Shelves" where Catholic classics in fiction and literature could be placed free of charge for the general reading public. This is another method employed by Catholics for propagandizing America.

**The Movies.** Another source of Catholic propaganda is the moving picture. Thousands of Americans attend the movies every week, and this provides the Catholics with a powerful means of propaganda. Outstanding movies have Catholic settings, showing Catholic courage against aggression in time of war. Members of the Motion Picture Executives of Hollywood paid a visit less than six months ago to the Vatican. The pope reminded them of the "special responsibility" they had to produce the kind of pictures he desires.

To summarize, it is the Catholic design to win America. They have a clear-cut pattern they are pursuing which is that of spreading favorable propaganda while arousing the least amount of opposition possible. They are using every means available to them in declaring their propaganda. That they are succeeding to no small extent is very clear.

## Part II

### Religious Errors of the Catholic Church

#### A. Identity of the True Church

**Unity.** All Catholic authorities agree that one of the marks of the true Church is its unity. They make much of the fact that as soon as the Protestant revolt from Rome occurred, Protestantism began to divide and subdivide. This is only a partial truth. Lutheranism, Zwinglianism, and Calvinism did not represent two splits in Protestantism, but three splits from Rome. Actually, it is an indictment against Catholicism, not Protestantism, that so many people found so many reasons for revolt against Romanism.

But is the Roman Catholic Church united? Catholics have always insisted so. Hitler just here borrowed a favorite bit of Catholic propaganda and made it apply to Nazism. Hitler criticized democracy for its division, its disunity, and its inefficiency. Proudly, he pointed to Nazism for its unity and efficiency. This is precisely what the Roman Catholic Church has always done. How shall we answer their arguments? Let these proud "defenders" and "originators" of democracy, the Roman Catholics themselves, tell us how they defended democracy when Hitler used their propaganda against it, and we shall tell them how we defend it when it comes via the Catholic propaganda machine.

Actually what unity the Roman Catholic Church has is merely superficial. An hour with the **Catholic Encyclopedia** will convince anyone that division of opinion has always been characteristic of the Catholic hierarchy. Catholic propagandists find their arguments meeting them coming

back. Out of one side of their mouths they insist that the Church is united. Then, when the Fascist leanings of the Church are pointed out, these same propagandists reply that this does not represent all of the church but just a part of it. And still there is no division!

**Sanctity.** Catholics insist that Holiness is a mark of the true church. But, while saying so, they will admit, as does Cardinal Gibbons, that many within her ranks do not and have not lived holy lives. But, every church has individuals within it whose lives are not complimentary to the cause they have espoused. Just what exclusive claim the Catholics have to be the true church through this mark is hard to see since it no more characterizes them than others.

**Catholicity.** This suggests the idea of the world-wide nature of the church. Every believer in the Bible will agree that the church of Christ is not to be limited to a nation, race or strata of society. But that the Catholics have no peculiar claim on this is again very evident.

**Apostolicity.** This is the fourth and last mark which all Catholic authorities agree identifies the true church. Charles Coppens defines this term for us thus: "This term designates the fact that her governing and teaching body today and throughout all ages is nothing else than the continuation of the Apostolic body to which Christ gave His mission . . ." (**Systematic Study of the Catholic Religion**, p. 81). We unhesitatingly deny that there is any comparison of the Roman Catholic Church today with the Church of the New Testament. Instead, the Roman Church is the apostate church foretold by the apostles, and the "Mother of Harlots," pictured in John's

apocalypse. We shall have further occasion to point this out from the Bible.

The Catholics have set up these marks of identity for the true church. Granting, for the sake of argument, they are right, we deny emphatically the Catholic Church possesses them. If **Unity** is a mark of the True Church, then Catholicism has no claim, for she is certainly divided. If **Holiness** is a mark, Catholics still have no claim. Her moral and ethical standards are lower than in any other body of people. What church sanctions gambling as the Catholics? In what Protestant Church can one go and find bar-rooms serving beer and whiskey in the basement? Holiness? ? ? ? "Corruption" is a truer term. If the Catholics claim **Catholicity** as a mark, they have it no more than others. If they insist that the Catholic Church is found in all countries whereas this cannot be said of any other church, we ask, "Then, what of the church of the New Testament?" "Was the church at Jerusalem a true church?" (Acts 2) Yet, it had not been extended throughout all the world up to that time. If Catholics reply that her doctrine was to permit this, then we ask, "Does not every other church teach and believe the same?" As to **Apostolicity**, we deny that the Catholic Church is any more than an apostate Church.

## **B. False Assumptions of Catholicism**

Once the Romanists are granted certain false assumptions, from there on Roman Catholicism is a logical system. This is what is so misleading to thousands of Bible novices. Romanism is built upon three major pillars—all false assumptions nowhere found in the Bible. First, the primacy of Peter. Second, the theory of Apo-

stolic Succession. Third, the Infallibility of the Church.

**The Primacy of Peter.** The idea that Peter was the first pope was not thought of in the first century. It is a human assumption nowhere taught in the Bible. Catholics assume this theory from Matt. 16:18. "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." (Note: All scripture quotations are taken from a translation of the Latin Vulgate, being itself a revision of the Challoner-Rheims Version, edited by Catholic Scholars.) For the Romanist this is the magna charta of the papacy. The "rock" here, they contend, was Peter. The Bible student is referred to Matt. 16:13-18. It is very clear that the "rock" does not refer to Peter, but to the confession that Peter had just made, viz. that Jesus was the Christ the Son of the living God. In every scripture in the New Testament Christ Himself is recognized as the rock, or foundation or cornerstone of the church. Never did anybody recognize Peter as such. (Acts 4:11, 12; 1 Cor. 3:11; Eph. 2:18-20)

All that is mentioned about Peter in the Bible is against the idea that he is a pope. At the council in Jerusalem Peter had no authoritative position above any other apostle. (Acts 15) Peter did not undertake to forgive sins, (Acts 8:22) and even refused to be adored. (Acts 10:25) To imagine Peter allowing someone to bow down and kiss his toe would be a complete absurdity. None of Peter's writings display any consciousness that he was a pope. He spoke of Christ as the cornerstone and Christians, without distinction, as "living stones." (1 Pet. 2:5) Himself, he referred to as a "fellow-presbyter." (1 Pet. 5:1)

Catholics insist that Peter went to Rome in the year 44 A.D. to take his seat as pope. It is definitely known that Peter was in Antioch in 55 A.D. where he was withstood by Paul. (Gal. 2:11) Paul wrote the book of Romans from Corinth about 57 A.D. In chapters 15 and 16 Paul extends salutations to many brethren in that city, but not a word is sent to Peter. If Peter were there as a pope, this would be a strange action from Paul. Paul, furthermore, expresses his desire to come to Rome that he might impart some spiritual gift unto them. (Rom. 1:11) But, if Peter were there, why did Paul need to go to give them a spiritual gift?

Catholic friends, we implore you not to be led astray by such false assumptions. The papacy is not found in the Bible. Peter was never a pope. The whole idea is repugnant to the spirit of Christianity. Listen to Jesus: "But Jesus called them (The Twelve) to Him, and said, 'You know that the rulers of the Gentiles lord it over them, and their great men exercise authority over them. Not so is it among you. On the contrary, whoever wishes to become great among you shall be your servant; and whoever wishes to be first among you shall be your slave.'" (Matt. 20:25-27) Does this convey the idea of a prince among the apostles, a vicar of Christ, a lord over the people of God? Certainly not!! It condemns the very idea.

Again, in Matt. 23:9 Jesus said: "And call no one on earth your father; for one is your Father, who is in heaven." The word, father, here is the same word as "pope." Jesus says in effect, "Call no man pope upon earth." Every Roman Catholic goes against the teachings of Christ here. We insist: **THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH IS NOT THE CHURCH OF CHRIST BUT AN APOSTATE CHURCH.**

**The theory of Apostolic Succession.** The Roman Church claims an unbroken line of clerics since the days of the apostles. These clerics, bishops and priests, have inherited through the apostles special grace and have had committed to them the deposit of faith of which they are perpetual guardians. This theory was substantially upheld by the Council of Trent.

Let it be noted that Apostolic Succession is just a theory: it is nowhere taught in the Bible. The apostles were a distinct body, one of whose qualifications was that they had to be witnesses of the resurrection of Christ. (Acts 1:21; 1 Cor. 9:1-5) No apostle ever had any successor from the point of view of having someone to take his office with all of its powers with it.

**The Infallibility of the Church.** Cardinal Gibbons bases the doctrine that the Roman Catholic Church is infallible upon Matt. 16:18. "Thou art Peter and upon this rock, I will build my church and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." He reasons that if the church had ever erred, the "gates of hell" would have prevailed against it, and therefore, it would have died. Since it lives today, the gates of hell have not prevailed against it; so, he concludes, it is infallible.

Catholic error on this point is apparent. "Hell" is rendered more correctly by the revised version as "hades," the "unseen." Hades comprehends the entire realm of the unseen world. What Jesus was saying was that he was about to build His church upon the great cardinal truth that he was the son of God. "Though I must die," Jesus was saying, "and my soul go to the realm of the unseen, yet even that will not deter me from building my church." The idea of the infallibility of the church

drawn from this passage is a total absurdity.

The Roman Catholic Church has often erred. This fact is undeniable to the student of history. In the early 17th century the church denounced the Copernician theory as false and heretical. In 1633 Galileo, the advocate of the system, was threatened with torture by the Inquisition if he did not recant it. The Index of 1704 contained the prohibition forbidding "all works that teach the mobility of the earth or the immobility of the sun." The Catholic Church in the Middle Ages upheld the idea of the Inquisition and said that the burning of heretics was legal in the eyes of God. Did the Roman Catholic Church err in its opinion about burning heretics? If not, why do Roman Catholics condemn Hitler for torture chambers in his Concentration Camps?

By way of summary, we observe that the Roman Catholic Church is built upon these false assumptions—none of which are taught in the Bible. We repeat: **THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH IS NOT THE CHURCH OF CHRIST BUT AN APOSTATE CHURCH.**

### **Part III**

#### **The Origin of Roman Catholicism**

Admittedly, Roman Catholicism is a force with which to reckon. From where did it come? Is it the church founded by Jesus Christ as their propagandists claim? Can they trace their origin back to the New Testament? It is vitally important that we understand the answers to these questions.

**Origin through evolution.** No certain date can be given for the establishment of the Roman Catholic Church. The reason is that it did not begin at any one certain date, for it came through a period of evolution, a period of apostatizing from the original church.

We believe in the church of the New Testament. We do not believe in the Roman Catholic Church, for it represents a "falling away," a degeneracy in the apostolic church. The word of God pictures such a falling away. Listen to the apostle Paul: "Let no one deceive you in any way, for the day of the Lord will not come unless the apostasy comes first, and the man of sin is revealed, the son of perdition, who opposes and is exalted above all that is called God, or that is worshipped, so that he sits in the temple of God and gives himself out as if he were God." (2 Thess. 2:3, 4) Where can one find a better picture of Roman Catholicism than this one painted by Paul? A falling away was to come **within the church**. One man should assume divine prerogatives, so that as God, he would sit in the temple of God, showing himself to be God. We remember that the pope is frequently addressed officially, as "Our Lord God, the pope." What a true picture Paul gave of the pope! All of this apostatizing should come about after the original church should become corrupt. **THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH IS NOT THE TRUE CHURCH.**

Paul again pictures the latter end of things. "Now the Spirit expressly says that in after times some will depart from the faith, giving heed to deceitful spirits and doctrines of devils, speaking lies hypocritically, and having their conscience branded. They will forbid marriage, and will enjoin abstinence from foods, which

God has created to be partaken of with thanksgiving by the faithful and by those who know the truth." (1 Tim. 4:1-3) Where again, could one find a better picture of Roman Catholicism? Who is it that forbids to marry? The Roman Catholics. Who commands men to abstain from "foods"? Roman Catholics. In clear, unmistakable language, the inspired apostle Paul points to the Roman church as the apostate church.

Human corruption and desire for authority originated the theory of the papacy. Then, after it originated in this manner, the papacy demanded absolute obedience on the threat of eternal condemnation. Canon Dollinger said: "The Catholic believer will say, 'I believe in the infallible pope, because the pope has said that he is infallible.'" What logic!! What informed man could be a Catholic believer??

Thomas Hobbes was right when he said: "If a man consider the origin of this great ecclesiastical dominion, he will easily perceive that the papacy is no other than the ghost of the deceased Roman empire, sitting crowned upon the grave thereof. For so the papacy began on the ruins of that heathen power."

**ROMAN CATHOLICISM PRESENTS A FORMIDABLE BARRIER TO EVERY RELIGIOUS PRINCIPLE OF TRUTH AND TO EVERY DEMOCRATIC PRINCIPLE OF LIFE. NEVER IN THE HISTORY OF THE WORLD HAVE SO MANY BEEN DUPED BY SO FEW.**

We plead with you, our Roman Catholic friends, to investigate the Bible and see for yourselves the falsehood being pressed upon you by the Roman Catholic hierarchy.

See for yourself that Roman Catholicism was never known in apostolic times; the church itself is not once found named in the New Testament. Then, seeing that for yourself, we beg you to lay aside the shackles of Roman Catholicism, become a Christian, recognize no other Head but Christ, no other Church but the church of Christ about which you read in the New Testament.

— The End —

ORDER ADDITIONAL COPIES FROM  
**RELIGIOUS BOOK SERVICE**

722 N. Payton Road  
Indianapolis 19, Indiana

**PRICES**

<b>Single Copy</b> .....	<b>\$ 0.10</b>
<b>12 Copies</b> .....	<b>1.00</b>
<b>100 Copies</b> .....	<b>6.50</b>
<b>500 Copies</b> .....	<b>30.00</b>
<b>1000 Copies</b> .....	<b>55.00</b>

Ten Reasons Why You  
Should Be a Member of the  
**CHURCH OF CHRIST**

1. You may read about it in the Bible.—Rom. 16:16.

2. It has no creed but Christ, binds no names on its members, but Christ's.—Acts 11:26, 1 Peter 4:16.

3. It speaks where the Bible speaks, is silent where the Bible is silent.—I Pet. 4:11.

4. It exalts Christ as the **only** head of the church.—Colossians 1:18.

5. Its acts of worship are patterned after the New Testament.—John 4:24.

6. It teaches that scriptural unity can be attained on all disputed doctrinal questions.—1 Corinthians 1:10.

7. The Church of Christ pleads for unity of all believers in Christ.—John 17:20, 21.

8. It is not a denomination, nor group of denominations, but the body of Christ.—Colossians 1:18. Its founder is Christ himself.—Matthew 16:18.

9. Its aim—to save souls by preaching the gospel, teach godly living, and help all those in need.—1 Cor. 15:1-4.

10. Its future—eternal glory with Christ.—1 Thessalonians 4:17.

—Selected.



This tract was presented by: