

ROMANISM

In the Light of Scripture

by

J. Dwight Pentecost

Copyright © 1962

CHAPTER SEVEN

WHAT IF THE VATICAN CONTROLS THE WHITE HOUSE?

A PERFECT SOCIETY existed in the Garden of Eden. All things were in subjection to God the Creator, and there was perfect amity between Creator and creature. Because there was no rebellion and no lawlessness there was no need for government to hold man in subjection to preserve right and order. With the advent of sin into this creation, through the willful disobedience on the part of Adam and Eve, man had to be subjected to the control of government so that law and order, right and justice should prevail on the face of the earth. Man, by his sin, became a lawless creature, and it became necessary to institute law to curb his lawlessness.

Early in Genesis, we find that God instituted human government to be His arm, His minister, to preserve law and order. Because man was not only a lawless rebel, but was also separated from God by his sin, it was necessary for God to institute some means of approach by which man might come to God. God instituted the principle of blood sacrifice as the means through which man could come into the presence of God.

These two offices, the office of king and the office of priest, were vested in two different individuals. Apart from Melchizedek, no individual ever held the dual role of king and priest at the same time.

In dealing with the nation Israel, God made it very clear that the office of king and the office of priest were to be two separate spheres. God instituted, if you please, the principle of the separation of church and state. In the nation Israel, the king must come from the tribe of Judah and, as early as Genesis 49:10, God decreed that the Messiah, the Lord Jesus Christ, should arise from the tribe of Judah. The priest could only arise from the tribe of Levi and must be a descendant of Aaron in that tribe. So God put a gulf between the office of priest and the office of king. Both were ministers of God, but with their own separate spheres of authority.

The Roman Church, from the time of its earliest history, has been unshakably opposed to the concept of separation of church and state. Since, as we have seen in an earlier study, the Pope is not only head in the religious sphere but is also head in the political sphere, it is the necessary teaching of Rome that church and state must never be separated and that church and state must be subjected to the authority of the one whom they call the Vicar of Christ, the Vice-Regent of Christ, or the Pope.

If the Vatican were to control the White House, certainly one of the first results would be the union of church and state. To be sure, that purpose of Rome would be slowly and yet cleverly developed so that we would scarcely be conscious of what would be happening. Should Rome overnight seek to overthrow all of those liberties which we enjoy under our Constitution, there would either be revolution or there would be repudiation of another Romanist official at the earliest possible election. But a program would be inaugurated to put this nation under the authority and the control of Rome. The rule of this land would no longer be our Constitution and our legal system, as inaugurated by our Congress, but rather it would be the law of Rome. One of the first goals of any Romanist in control would be the abolition of this separation of church and state.

The United States today controls the problems arising from the dual role assigned by God to church and state by the separation of these two ministries in the two categories. The United States recognizes that authority in the political realm and authority in the religious realm are both God-ordained, but serve different purposes. The United States recognizes that we cannot relegate the authority of the state to the church, or the authority of the church to the state. Rome insists on uniting the two functions under one head and suppresses any individual or any power that would question her right to rule in both of these offices. The difference between the two systems is the difference between separation of church and state and the suppression of all things to the authority of church and state.

Such a doctrine as the separation of church and state is entirely repulsive to the Roman hierarchy which says that it is impossible for any Roman candidate to hold such views. In January, 1960, eight hundred Catholic clergymen were summoned to meet in an official meeting of the Diocese of Rome, the first meeting of the Diocese of Rome in nearly five hundred years. The following rules were adopted for Catholic laymen by the Diocese of Rome:

“The Catholic layman is subject to excommunication if he joins, or votes for, political parties or persons that promote heretical principles or doctrines. He can be excommunicated if he has any part in enacting laws harmful to the church. He is forbidden to read publications inspired by Protestantism, atheism, or materialism. He is barred from taking part in services, sermons, or discussions of non-Catholic groups.”

Thus, according to this statement of the Diocese of Rome, which was designed to guide Catholic laymen in that land but which established Vatican principles that apply to any Catholic layman who is subject to Rome anywhere in the world, it is affirmed that a Catholic layman has no right to hold or espouse any doctrine contrary to that which is promulgated by Rome herself.

This is the basis of the directives that the bishops have recently issued in Puerto Rico which are causing such consternation in our own country among the Catholic bishops. Many Romanist bishops in this country have repudiated the right of the bishops in Puerto Rico to give directives to their constituents as to how they should vote. But the American bishops were repudiated by the Vatican, for the Vatican backed up the bishops in Puerto Rico and said they had not only the right but the duty and responsibility to direct the conscience of all the voters in that country.

Should a Catholic president be inaugurated who follows the directives of Rome, it would ultimately mean the end of democracy. I quote from *Brownson's Review*,

“Democracy is a mischievous dream wherever the Catholic Church does not predominate to inspire the people with reverence and to teach and accustom them to obedience to authority.”

That which we hold so highly in our nation, the concept of democracy, the people ruling or speaking, is utterly repudiated by Rome as “a mischievous dream.”

Rome is the most authoritarian system that this world has ever seen. She has no equal in absolute authoritarianism in the world today and, naturally, must be opposed to any non-authoritarian system. Democracy is a principle, according to the Roman system, which must be abolished so that the authoritarianism of Rome may be in control.

The extent of this authoritarianism, I believe, is well illustrated by an event that took place recently in Dijon, France. Khrushchev of Russia was to pay a state visit to France. Canon Felix Kir, the mayor of Dijon, who is also the priest in that city, was to give Khrushchev an official welcome when he came. When it was publicized that he, as priest and mayor, would welcome Khrushchev, he was forbidden by his bishop to do so. But he defied the bishop and said he would receive Khrushchev officially. The matter was referred to the Vatican and the Vatican backed up the decree of the bishop, forbidding this priest to receive Khrushchev. He still insisted that he would receive the visitor from Russia when he came.

The morning that Khrushchev was due to land in Dijon, the bishop led a retinue of policemen who kidnapped the priest-mayor and hustled him away from the city into another part of France until several days after Khrushchev left. The Roman Church, in order to enforce the directives of the bishop and the Vatican, did not hesitate to stoop to the use of the police force to detain and to remove this eighty-four-year-old canon, Felix Kir, from his sphere of authority.

The authoritarianism of Rome will tolerate no deviation from her directives whatsoever.

Not only would a Catholic president be opposed to the separation of church and state and try to bring about the consolidation of church and state so as to remove democracy from our country, if the Vatican were in control of the White House all freedom of conscience would be removed.

In our nation today we recognize the right of an individual to exercise his own conscience, one of the freedoms guaranteed by our Constitution. The freedom of conscience has never been allowed to an individual under the Roman Catholic system. Pius XI, in the papal bull *Ineffabilis Deus*, issued December 8, 1854, said,

“Wherefore, if any should presume to think in their hearts otherwise than as it has been defined by us, which God avert, let them know and understand . . . that by their own act they subject themselves to the penalties established by law, if, what they think in their hearts, they should dare to signify by word or writing or any other external means.”

For a Romanist to oppose any directive that has been enacted by the Roman system is to invite excommunication, the penalty affixed for such disobedience.

Pius XII, in 1950, in his decree, *Humani Generis*, said,

“But if the Supreme Pontiffs in their acts, after due consideration, express an opinion on a hitherto controversial matter, it is clear to all that this matter, according to the mind and will of the same Pontiffs, cannot any longer be considered a question of free discussion.”

An editorial appeared on May 17, 1960 in *L'Osservatore Romano*, a Jesuit publication, which is the official mouthpiece of the Vatican in matters touching the Roman world, which replied to a candidate for the presidency of the United States who had said that, regardless of the dictates of Rome, he would abide by the Constitution of the United States and determine policies in the light of his own conscience. I quote parts of it:

“The Church, constituted with its hierarchy by Jesus Christ as a perfect society, has full powers of real jurisdiction over all the faithful and thus has the right and the duty to guide, direct, and correct them on the plane of ideas and of action in conformity with the dictates of the Gospel . . .

“A Catholic can never depart from the teachings and directives of the Church. In every sector of his activity, his conduct, both private and public, must be motivated by the laws, orientation and instructions of the hierarchy. It is highly deplorable . . . that some persons, though professing to be Catholics, not only dare to conduct their political and social activities in a way which is at variance with the teachings of the Church, but also take upon themselves the right to submit its norms and precepts to their own judgment, interpretation and evaluation with obvious superficiality and temerity.”

What this editorial in *L'Osservatore Romano* says is that no political candidate who is a Romanist, nor an individual who is a Romanist, has any right to any private opinion of conscience. He has only the right to submit to the conscience of the Church for the conscience of the Church has become his conscience.

On January 14, 1960, Reuben E. Alley, the editor of *The Religious Herald*, wrote,

“Unlike Protestants, the Catholic believes the Church has authority over the political state and that this super-national authority resides in a religio-political institution that is ruled over by a man who is infallible.

“A faithful Catholic in the United States must give first allegiance to a foreign ruler as the supreme head of the Church from which he receives salvation. Since this is so, it is futile to plague a Catholic candidate with questions about what he would do on specific issues if elected to office. Like Protestant candidates, he would act in the light of conscience, which for the faithful Catholic, is determined for him by the Roman hierarchy. It is likewise futile to assume that Catholics in the United States are different.

“The Pope is the supreme and final authority.”

The editorial gives lie to the contention that any Romanist has the right to determine any issue in the light of the Constitution, in the light of the Word of God, in the light of the independent exercise of his conscience; he only has the right to decide in the light of the teachings of the Roman hierarchy.

There is a principle which would permit any Catholic official to take an oath to support the constitution and then to fail to support his oath. *Moral Guidance*, by Edwin F. Healy, published by Loyola Press with the Imprimatur of Samuel Archbishop Stritch of Chicago, was written to be a textbook in ethics and morals for use in Catholic universities and seminaries. In that book is presented the principle of mental reservation.

“For a sufficient reason we may permit others to deceive themselves by taking the wrong meaning out of what is said, and this remains true though the listener, because of his ignorance, does not know that there is another meaning to the word that is employed.”

By that principle, if a Romanist deceives you because you thought he meant one thing, when he, in his own mind, meant another thing, the fault is not his and the sin is not his; the fault is yours because you have deceived yourself.

Continuing the quotation,

“By way of illustration, if asked by a customs official, ‘Anything to declare?’ I may answer, ‘No,’ even though I may have several thousand dollars’ worth of taxable articles. My answer means, ‘I have no dutiable goods that I wish to reveal for taxation. It may be that I actually have such goods on my person. I need not expose them to your view. It is your duty to discover them.’ In acting thus, however, one must beware of scandal.”

Continuing the quote,

“If a suspicious husband asks his wife whether or not she has committed adultery, she may licitly answer, ‘No,’ even though she has actually sinned thus many times. Her answer really means: ‘No, I have committed no crime of adultery that I want to reveal.’ The question is rightly aimed only at knowledge that is not secret, and so the wife may reply accordingly.”

This author, who holds a leading position as a Romanist moral theologian, presents the principle of mental reservation, whereby one may make a statement which causes you to interpret his statement one way when he intends it to be interpreted exactly the opposite way.

One of my first introductions to the working of this principle took place back in the early years of World War II when I was pastor in a small town in northwestern Pennsylvania. We were required to go to the ration board and get a book of sugar rationing stamps.

My wife carefully totaled up all of the sugar that we had in our house. We went to the ration board and when they asked for a declaration of how much sugar we had, we informed them. We watched as they tore out several pages of those coupons from that ration book.

Following us was a Romanist priest from our community. He stepped up and was asked the same question, “How much sugar do you have?” He answered with a smile, “Only what’s on the dining room table.”

So they handed him his book without removing any stamps. When he left the ration board, he began to chuckle and informed us that he had taken over two hundred pounds of sugar which was in his possession and had stacked it up on the dining room table before he went to declare it so that he could say, “Only what is on the dining room table.”

Such is the outworking of this principle of mental reservation. Any Romanist, by the use of the principle of reservation, may cause another individual to be deceived without being accused of perjury or without being accused of being a liar.

By this quotation from *Moral Guidance*, we can see three things:

First of all, *a Catholic need not hold to an oath, if by holding to that oath he would commit an act contrary to Roman Canon law.*

Therefore, if a Romanist took an oath to defend the Constitution of the United States and in the course of his duties he found that the teaching of the Constitution was contrary to the teaching of Rome, he would be under no obligation to his oath to defend that which was required in the Constitution.

In the second place, *when a Catholic leader says that he would obey his conscience, what he actually means is that he would obey the rule of the hierarchy.*

And a Catholic president can glibly stand up and say, “I will take an oath to support the Constitution according to my conscience.” When understood in the light of the law of mental reservation of Romanist moral theology, what he means is, “I take an oath to support the Constitution insofar as it conforms to Romanist law.”

Third, we observe *that a Catholic can lie, on the basis of this mental reservation.*

Therefore, while many may be satisfied that a Romanist contender for office would faithfully uphold the Constitution of the United States, in the light of Romanist theology we see how meaningless such an affirmation really is. Further, if the Vatican controls the White House, not only will the liberty of conscience be abrogated, but freedom of worship would be removed from this nation.

Gregory XVI, in an encyclical issued on August 15, 1832, termed religious toleration,

“The most fruitful cause of evils with which the Church is at present afflicted . . . From this noxious fountain of indifferentism flows that absurd and erroneous opinion, or rather that form of madness, which declares that liberty of conscience should be asserted and maintained for everyone.

“For this most pestilential error, that full and immoderate liberty of opinion, paves the way which, to the injury of sacred and civil government, is now spread far and wide, and which some, with the utmost impudence, have extolled as beneficial to religion.”

And that which is guaranteed to us by our Constitution, the freedom of worship, is called *a noxious fountain, an absurd and erroneous opinion, a form of madness.*

Pius IX, the first of the infallible Popes, in his *Syllabus of 1864*, condemned eighty errors of his day. Let me quote several of the errors which he specifically condemned. The error that “every man is free to embrace and profess the religion which he believes to be true according to the light of reason” and, the error that “the Church ought to be separated from the State and the State from the Church.”

Leo XIII in his encyclical of June 20, 1888 said: “In the extraordinary conditions of these times, the Church usually acquiesces in certain modern liberties, not because she prefers them in themselves, but because she judges it expedient to permit them.”

Many Romanists affirm that they firmly believe in the principle of freedom of worship. But we ask, “What do you mean by freedom of worship?”

The *Catholic Dictionary* defines it thus: “Freedom of worship is the inalienable right of all men to worship God according to the teaching of the Catholic Church.” No wonder they can affirm that they believe in freedom of worship!

Civilita Cattolica in April, 1948, said,

“The Roman Catholic Church, convinced through its divine prerogatives of being the only true church, must demand the right of freedom for herself alone . . . In some countries Catholics will be obliged to ask full freedom for all, resigned at being forced to cohabit where they alone should rightfully be allowed to live. As to other religions, the Church . . . will require by legitimate means, that they shall not be allowed to propagate false doctrine. Consequently, in a state where the majority of people are Catholic, the Church will require that legal existence be denied to error, and that if religious minorities actually exist, they shall have only a de facto existence without opportunity to spread their beliefs . . . The Church cannot blush for her own want of tolerance, as she asserts it in principle and applies it in practice.”

In this quotation we are denied the right of freedom of worship, the right of freedom of speech, the right of freedom of press to propagate one’s own faith or belief, and the right of freedom of assembly.

But further, certainly one of the first goals, should the Vatican move into the White House, would be to control the judicial system. By placing a few key men in strategic places, it would be possible for Rome to control the legislative system of the United States. John Dennis Davis in his book entitled *The Moral Obligation of Catholic Civil Judges* has set down the principles of moral guidance for Romanist judges in the United States.

Davis deals with the question of what a Catholic judge would do with a Catholic layman who has refused to pay his taxes for the public schools. He describes such a tax as

“A penalty for exercising the Catholic divine constitutional right of being interested in the spiritual development of the child.”

Now he says,

“If a particular Catholic appears in court on a charge of refusing to pay such a tax, the Catholic judge should do what he can to show the law’s injustice and avoid its application.”

In the instructions given to Catholic judges, the judge is told that when any law of the United States is in contradiction to Catholic law, the Catholic judge must do what he can to avoid upholding the Constitution of the United States. Thus a Roman judge must support Roman edict and Roman law and not the Constitution of the United States.

Brownson’s Review says,

“If the Pope directed the Roman Catholics of this country to overthrow the Constitution, sell the nationality of the country . . . they would be bound to obey.”

Some of us remember when a former president of the United States sought to impose his will on the people of the United States by packing the Supreme Court. At that time the movement was defeated because all could see how easy it would be for one man to assume dictatorial power by controlling the nine who sat on the Supreme Court bench. It would be an easy matter for a Romanist president to appoint a Romanist bench, who would then subject all legislation and all judication to the dictates of the Roman system, rather than to the requirements of the Constitution and duly enacted law. It would not be necessary for a Catholic president to control the Army, and the Navy, and the Air Force to accomplish his purpose in the United States. It could be done by controlling the judicial branch of the government.

Further, if the Vatican controlled the White House, a Catholic president would certainly move in to control the State Department. By placing a few key men in a strategic position free intercourse between the United States and the Vatican would be assured. For Protestants and Evangelicals one of the most serious considerations would be that it would stifle missionary endeavor and activity. By simply refusing to grant passports for Protestant missionaries to leave this country as emissaries of the Gospel of Christ, the whole missionary endeavor of the United States could be cut off by one office in Washington.

I have had friends, graduates of schools where I have taught, who have sought month after month to get a passport to go as missionaries into countries that were dominated by Romanists. The passports simply were not forthcoming.

One friend of mine went to Washington to investigate and to see why his passport was being withheld.

In talking with one of the secretaries in the passport division the secretary inadvertently said, "The reason you don't get your passport to go as a missionary is that you belong to the wrong church. We have granted passports to dozens of Roman priests to go to that country."

It would be a simple matter to terminate completely the Protestant missionary endeavor if a Romanist president controlled the passport division of the State Department. Evangelicals should give this serious consideration.

It is well known that Rome seeks to control all school education and, if the Vatican controlled the White House, certainly there would be a movement to end all public education.

John XXIII, the present incumbent on the papal throne, said in December, 1959,

"The rights of the Roman Catholic Church in the teaching of youth come before the rights of the state."

Rome, for a long time, has sought to capture the public school system, and it has held that public school education is a devilish institution. We are familiar with the inroads into education being made by the school bus laws and the school lunch laws, which are only tests as to whether the Romanists can infiltrate the public education system of this nation. If the Vatican controlled the White House so the Romanists were able to accomplish their purpose, all schools would be church schools and would be supported by the state.

The purpose of the Roman Church is to let public education deteriorate to force all to look to the church for the education of their children.

Rome would soon move in, should the Vatican occupy the White House, to control the legislative assembly. Leo XIII, in his encyclical said,

"They must penetrate, wherever possible, in the administration of civil affairs . . . All Catholics should do all in their power to cause the Constitution of States and legislation to be modeled on the principles of the true (Catholic) Church."

No legislator would be exempt from the pressures of the Romanist lobby to force the enactment of legislation favorable to Rome and furthering Romanism.

May I suggest, finally, should the Vatican move into the White House, we would see the inauguration of persecution such as has never been witnessed in this land.

I would direct you to the history of present day Spain, or of Italy, or of Colombia, nations where Romanism is in absolute authority, which have constitutions guaranteeing freedom of worship, but where freedom of worship means the freedom to worship according to the Roman Catholic system. There are nations where Protestants pay with their lives because they hold to the truth that men may come to God through Jesus Christ, without the mediatorship of a priest, or the intercession of Mary, or the administration of sacraments by Rome.

This basic concept goes back to the Fourth Lateran Council of 1215 which said,

“Secular authorities, whatever office they may hold, shall be admonished and induced, and, if necessary, compelled by ecclesiastical censure . . . to take an oath that they will strive in good faith and to the best of their ability, to exterminate in the territories subject to their jurisdiction, all heretics pointed out by the Church.”

This means that there is a Romanist directive to any Catholic president of the United States to the effect that he is compelled to wipe out all heretics who live under his jurisdiction.

The *Catholic Encyclopedia* says,

“Heretics may not only be excommunicated, but also put to death.”

You would do well to ask the question, “What do they mean when they say that Rome directs the Catholic president to exterminate all heretics?” Father Harvey of St. Peter’s Catholic Church of Brunswick, New Jersey, replying to the question, “Are Protestants heretics?” says,

“Certainly the Church does consider Protestants heretics. . . . I do not doubt, if they were strong enough, that the Catholic people would hinder, even by death, if necessary, the spread of heretical errors among the people, and I say rightly so.”

Rome contends that the state has the right to execute a man for treason. Any refusal to bow to the authority of Rome is treason. Therefore, any Protestant who refuses to bow to Rome may rightly be killed. Although this is a directive that was issued in 1215 it is still the governing principle for any civil leader. He is under oath to exterminate any heretic pointed out by the church.

Any Catholic president, then, would be compelled, by the direction of Rome, to use the sword against any who refuse to acknowledge the primacy of Peter and the superiority of the Roman Church.

The United States could not exist under Roman law and Roman control, and continue to be the United States that it is today.

The issue that faces us is the issue of our basic freedom;

- Whether we shall have separation of church and state,
- Whether we shall have freedom of worship,
- Whether we shall have freedom of conscience,
- Whether we shall have judges who will judge according to the Constitution of the United States and the law of our land duly enacted;
- Whether we shall have freedom recognized by the State Department to go to the ends of the earth and propagate the Gospel;
- Whether we shall have schools that are free from Roman domination;

And whether we shall be free from the threat of death because we believe that Jesus Christ is the Way, the Truth, and the Life.

But may I close by pointing out to you that, for you personally, there is one issue that is greater than the issue of what will happen if the Vatican controls the White House.

That is the issue of your own personal relationship to Jesus Christ.

You recognize from your own conscience that you are under the guilt and the bondage of sin; your own conscience convicts you that you are unworthy to stand in the presence of a holy and righteous God. You need a Saviour. You need one to introduce you to the Father.

The Lord Jesus Christ came to take upon Himself the penalty of your sin.

When He died on Calvary's cross, He paid the debt that you owed to God, that you could not pay yourself. And Jesus Christ offers to you a salvation; a salvation by faith in Him; a salvation that bestows upon you the forgiveness of sin and gives to you the gift of eternal life; declares you to be acceptable to God; a salvation by faith in the Lord Jesus Christ.

The greatest issue you face is not an issue in time; it is the issue of eternity.

What will you do with Jesus?
Neutral you cannot be.
Some day your heart will be asking,
What will He do with me?

~ end of book ~

<http://www.baptistbiblebelievers.com/>
