

## Roman Catholicism

*"The (Catholic) Church says that the Earth is flat, but I know that it is round. For I have seen the shadow on the moon and I have more faith in the Shadow than in the Church."* Ferdinand Magellan\*

### Bottom line differences between the two that cannot be reconciled:

- Where Evangelical Christianity is a relationship based on the Word of God, Catholicism appears to be the word of God delivered through a mediator, based on tradition.
- Although the Catholics say they believe in the Trinity which is commendable, in their actions they try to install Mary as the Co-mediatrix and pray to her as if she is another equal. Evangelicals are strict trinitarians who keep Mary out. We believe she is blessed but not Holy and does not hold sovereign powers.
- In Catholicism the plan of salvation is by works (sacraments (especially the Eucharist) and church membership). Evangelical Christianity is solely by grace.

**"The Roman Catholic Church"** (he katholike (meaning universal) ekklesia(meaning church)) is found for the first time in the letter of St. Ignatius to the Smyrnaeans, written about the year 110. It was about this time that the disciples of Marcion<sup>1</sup>, and other prominent gnostics such as Valentinus began to make numerous heretical attacks against the church with their writings. In fact these "Who's Who" of heretics were not considered anybody at all unless they could author their own "Gospel" book. Hence the flood of The Gospel of Thomas, The Gospel of Philip, and 50 other false gospels as found in the Nag Hammadi codices in 1945. Theoretically, these are the same heresies that later attached to Judaism and produced the Kabbalah<sup>2</sup>. These theological barnacles are the underpinnings that the book The Da Vinci Code and Freemasonry rely on today to produce the same "secret knowledge" heresies. For this reason the Roman Catholic Church evolved ....out of the overkill in the battle against that Gnosticism. The idea was that only the Church and its Bishops had the correct scriptures, and so true Christians were only to attend *these* particular churches. In this one respect, heresies can be looked upon favorably as they forced the church to quickly solidify its canons and creeds. But as the Roman Catholic Church attained authority, some bishops such as Victor I began to go against the flow of Christianity. (Victor tried to force the celebration of Easter on a Roman holiday rather than Passover Sunday). Instead of exhortation, the church modus operandi evolved to command and demand from the faithful. Irenaeus<sup>3</sup>, and Tertullian, who at first agreed with the bishopric power, noticed this abuse of power and finally jumped ship, declaring such church authority was wrong, wrong, wrong...and the truth did not come from individuals like Bishops at Rome (Popes were called Bishops until the 6th century). It turned out that the one "Catholicism" was not really universal as it split between an Eastern "Byzantine, or Turkish" division, and a Western one in Rome. Both are still with us today, Most notably the split was over the term "Mother of God" when the Roman Church began to heretically describe Mary. Nevertheless, the Roman Catholic Church is the church most often spoken about when

---

\*(note: only the Roman Catholic Church taught that the earth was flat, every scientist since Aristotle knew it was round, Erastosthenes even calculated the circumference circa 240bc)

- 1 Papias reports Marcion was kicked out of St. John's school because he was caught interpolating and injecting texts that he was supposed to be copying verbatim. P52 footnote [The New Testament Documents](#), F.F. Bruce Marcion hated Jews and dismissed the Old Testament and many NT books that favored them. He decided that the God of the OT and the one of the NT were 2 separate gods and was thus a dualist. The first known gnostic was Simon Magus of Acts 8, others include Menander, Cerinthus, Basilides
- 2 "A History of the Jews" by Paul Johnson; Kabbalist views are anathema to orthodox Jews and one would be defrocked for teaching this today. As the early church fathers stood against gnosticism in the first two centuries, so did Moses Maimonides stand against this for the Jews in the 12<sup>th</sup> century.
- 3 In their zeal, Tertullian (who complained that there were "too many Bishops") and Irenaeus jumped from the heretical frying pan into the fire and joined the "Montanist" heresy which had two women who channeled or claimed to be possessed by the Holy Spirit.

the term Catholic is used. It is about 1 billion strong today and accounts for about half of those who are loosely called Christian. It agrees with evangelical Christianity and the Bible in a few places and yet opposes the Bible in others. There is a lot of negative history during the so called dark ages with the Roman Catholic Church that will be touched upon later but for evangelicals, the most august moment was the reformation.

**The Reformation:** Historically, in the 1340's John Wycliffe could be called the reformation egg that was to incubate for two centuries. He was so hated by the Roman Catholic Church they exhumed his bones and burned them 30 years after his death. But it was Martin Luther in 1517 who gave birth to the split with the Roman Catholic Church that hatched what came to be called the Protestant Reformation. It would have been better called "Protestant Reformations" because they were plural. People were only too happy to follow Luther, given the Papal sins, doctrinal heresies, and the excessive church demands on the "little folk" for funds and sweat in order to complete St Peter's Basilica. Among many other things, Luther said that the church was wrong to follow papal traditions and that doctrine should only be based on scripture for orthodoxy and faith for salvation. Keep in mind that this was not a bunch of evangelicals beating at Rome's door from the outside, as the Catholics like to portray. These were Catholic Priests who worked from inside the church and after seeing the heretical teachings rebelled en masse. Some didn't escape with their lives; John Huss, Girolamo Savonarola, and the Lollards, for example. Others escaped to other countries and preached. Zwingli to Zurich, Calvin to Geneva, and John Knox to Scotland. Not that any of these men were beyond reproach. Luther came to hate Jews and consented to burn their synagogues. All have sinned and like sheep, have gone astray. That's why we should follow what is the true, and pay attention to the truth of doctrine, and never go after who we think hold the truth, as only Christ can embody. However, it is exactly the difference between individual sailors who commit treason and an Admiral who commands the whole fleet, sometimes unbeknownst to the sailors, to do so. Nevertheless, the Catholic answer to the Protestant reformation was the Council of Trent's (circa 1560 A D) weak attempt to reform the still arrogant church sins by installing the apocrypha, forbidding nepotism and the like; and then Michelangelo, who highly paid by church funds, condemned the departed illiterate infidels and forbade them to see such artwork as the "Last Judgment". Neither worked.

**To its credit** the Roman Catholic Church has virtuously defended the trinity doctrine consistently throughout the ages against all onslaught. Other good Catholic teachings include a stress on forgiveness, doing well to others, generosity, opposing homosexuality and Freemasonry, eugenics, abortion, and euthanasia, many of which destroy divinely created life. Their chameleon stand, and intermingling with certain occult and pagan practices such as voodoo, horoscopes, Halloween, The "Day of the Dead" in Mexico, saturnalia with Christmas, and Easter egg hunts have been a mixed bag. Evangelical participation in the same is not much better. Good works is the current catholic focus...and is something that many religions display... but which is not a part of salvation according to the Bible, nor is it the primary heart of what God wants from us. These things are only what the evangelicals call "witness", or the displayed laurels of Christianity that draw people to Christ. Especially in these last two centuries Catholics can certainly be commended for its missions and good works through nuns and Mother Theresa types. **On the other hand**, historically, Roman Catholicism has certainly been a church that has claimed more relationship to God than it has lived up to. See the crusades for example, where neither Catholic nor Muslim were acting as "people of the Book"....as well as: "selling" the office of Pope through the centuries, and fly-by-night pairing with various infamous governments, including the acceptance of Hitler's extermination of the Jews and Rafael Trujillo's brutality in the Dominican Republic. The Catholic church was negligent and all too willing to hand over Tootsies to their deaths under Hootoo machetes in the 1994 Rwanda uprising as well.<sup>4</sup> It also has a general church history that has sanctioned atrocities against any anti church rebels. The Roman Catholic Church

---

4 Collapse, by Jared Diamond

stopped translators of the Bible by execution. The Roman Catholic Church has murdered many peoples ( as in various and Inca and Aztec Indians, Latin Americans, and the Caribbean), for refusing to convert. Sometimes, with the inquisition for example, it opposed to the point of death scientists and philosophers, and people of other faiths. Some such as Galileo and Copernicus barely escaped with their lives. Others, like the Lutheran Johannes Kepler, in like fields and times, could prosper and explore things scientifically just because of his protestant faith<sup>5</sup>. To be fair, Pope John Paul II formally apologized for these things in the late 1990's. I'm glad he did, but again, what does that say about the Church's infallibility? But to continue to be fair, no other religious group has murdered so many people prior to the 20th century....evidently infallibly, and under the trumped-up direction of God than has the Catholics. Killing more fellow Christians and people who were trying to find their way, such as the Albigenses and as many as 70,000 Huguenots (This name maybe from a french perjorative meaning "Huss monkeys") in just a few days<sup>6</sup>, than even the Muslims. I have heard the numbers of inquisitional deaths upwards of 341,000, nevertheless, one count of Roman Catholic murders of *Jewish* "Conversos"<sup>7</sup> alone during the Inquisition came to 20, 297. At present, Roman Catholic penalties are limited mostly to excommunication, but the past *process* of inquisition still remains today as it was then, in that it is secret, the investigations are only done by Roman Catholics, and no defense by outsiders are allowed. This confuses unbelievers who view all of the Christian faiths as responsible for these actions. For example, these stories of Roman Catholic killings are the straw man arguments that atheist author Sam Harris levels against true Christianity in his book "End of Faith". (A "straw man" is an argument easily pushed over from false premises: when one points to a motorcycle, for example, and calls it a terrible car). Evangelicals were not there and not responsible. Yet, Catholicism is not Biblical Christianity. And the atrocities it has committed brings to mind the contrast where Jesus said, **"Satan is a thief and a murderer....but I am come that you might have life, and that you have it more abundantly"** and in John 16:2, **"...people will kill you thinking they are doing God a favor"**. It is true that certain individual evangelicals like John Calvin have been responsible for murder (Severus) as well as some groups where 21 were killed in the Salem witch trials. After the English reign of the Roman Catholic Mary Bloody Mary who probably killed about 300, Anglican Elizabeth actually killed more that Mary did. However, Elizabeth was content to let the Catholics live peaceably until Pope Pius V issued a papal bull in 1570, called Regnans in Excelsis, declaring "Elizabeth, the pretended Queen of England and the servant of crime" to be a heretic and thus setting all of her Roman Catholic subjects to overthrow her. She considered this treason and saw to the common duty of protecting the throne. Another difference is that those protestant murders were done without the approval of any Biblical standard and outside the imprimatur of God. The Catholic promise of salvation to fight the crusades, the inquisition, papal adulteries, simony, and other atrocities mentioned above were done *with* the approval of the highest Roman Catholic authority. Nevertheless, many Catholics are wonderful people and I love them dearly....but they are dearly wrong to follow this group.

---

5 "How Christianity Changed the World" Alvin J Schmit, 2004, Although the logic side of Aristotle's teachings were fine, his pantheistic and only "deduction" ( where only internal thinking could produce knowledge at the exclusion of "induction" or external experimentation and learning) principles were kept by the Roman Catholic Church through the 16<sup>th</sup> century and beyond. Yet Wm Ockam, Francis Bacon and others brought into play "empiricism" or external perception through the senses and experimentation, to which the protestants accepted both methods of reasoning.

6 Cf "St. Bartholomews Massacre" from any source 24 Aug, -3 Oct., 1572

7 "**A History of the Jews**" Paul Johnson, from the 15<sup>th</sup> century ff. "Conversos" were Jews who converted to Christianity, mostly to avoid persecution, and then were murdered when they were thought to be false. Anti Semitism peaked here when rumors of a Christian boy who was murdered, said to be by Jews, with repeated puncture wounds in hands and feet mocking the crucifixion. Jews Drinking Christian Blood. Causing the plague by poisoning wells (however,they died, too!)

**Demonizing:** Although some philosophers and curmudgeons like Bertrand Russell and Francois Marie Arouet were labeled as atheistic<sup>8</sup>, many were not. They just were a-catholic. Against Catholicism. They were falsely labeled atheists by the Roman Catholic Church, because they hated the Roman Church for its massacres and theological misgivings. The Spanish-American pragmatist George Santayana said this about the Roman Catholic Church, "*She is like the unfaithful lover, and although I know she lies, I still believe her*". He considered himself an "Aesthetic Catholic" and spent the last few years of his life in a convent being attended to by nuns. Arouet said "**This agglomeration which was called and which still calls itself the Holy Roman Empire was neither holy, nor Roman, nor an empire.**" At the end of his life he asked the Church for absolution which they would not give unless he signed a document saying he agreed with all of their doctrine. He would not. Instead he called his secretary in and had him write his statement, "*I adore God. I love my friends and do not hate my enemies, and I despise all superstition.*" Most Christians would, could, and should say the same thing, wouldn't you agree? However, to show you how his name has always been associated as a high atheist because he despised Catholicism.... You might know him by the pen name he took for himself... Voltaire. Ben Franklyn initiated Voltaire into Freemasonry, proving he was no atheist because you must take an oath that you trust God before you can become a Freemason. So the "enlightenment" was, in truth, against the Roman Catholic Church...not God. Yet most of the so called atheistic enlightenment philosophers such as Descartes, Kant, Locke, etc., never made any substantial criticism against God but rather tried, sometimes in vain, to include Him into their own philosophical postulates. Hume might be the exception to that.

#### **Sexual Misconduct of Priests:**

Nor has any other church found and willfully covered up the sexual perversion of its Priests...which was directly under the oversight of Pope John Paul II. Consider that beginning in 1973, in one California parish alone, it is thought that "Father" Oliver O'Grady<sup>9</sup> molested nearly 100 children for 30 years before he was exposed.....and not by the Roman Catholic Church who knew about it....but was finally uncovered only by the molested victims themselves. One of O'Grady's rapes was on a 9 month old baby. Another was repeatedly on a 5 year old girl. Others on young boys. One was an affair with a mother that opened the door for the sexual abuse of her son. What was done about it? Church officials quietly moved O'Grady to another parish 50 miles away, with no warnings to other children or the parishioners... twice! Even against subpoenas, the church buried records and lied just to keep the reputation of Cardinal Mahoney, O'Grady's overseer, who knew all about it, unstained, so as not to hinder Mahoney's advancement in the church! Evidently, to the Roman Catholic Church, Mahoney's reputation was more important than all of the molested children. Unbeknownst to the priests, their concealment game was up when O'Grady wrote a letter of confession. After the exposure of O'Grady in 1993 where he served 7 years in jail, other cases began to surface. Boston uncovered abuse under the watch of Cardinal Law. Under public pressure Law resigned Boston ....only to resurface again working at the Vatican! Cases began turning up all over the United States. One lawyer who is helping the victims says on average, he receives a report of a new case every day. One wonders how many cases have gone unreported out of shame? In South America hundreds of cases surfaced and people all over the world began taking to the streets with protest signs. It is estimated that in the last 50 years there have been thousands of cases in the United States and tens of thousands across the the world of sexual abuse by Priests inside the Roman Catholic Church! How many others down through the centuries? In

---

<sup>8</sup> This same thing occurred to Baruch Spinoza and the Jewish faith. He was called an atheist and excommunicated but actually he was a pantheist, believing that God was in nature.

<sup>9</sup> It should be noted that O'Grady was himself molested by visiting "Priests" when he was a young boy....and by his brother who also repeatedly molested his sister. This again shows how molestation starts a pattern that is passed on and on until it is stopped. O'Grady disassociated himself with some of his acts and had trouble describing some of the events.

the Bible there is no statement strictly against priests being married. In **1 Tim 4:1-3**, there are warnings against those who *require* Celibacy for anybody, including Priests,

**“The Spirit clearly says that in later times some will abandon the faith and follow deceiving spirits and things taught by demons. Such teachings come through hypocritical liars, whose consciences have been seared as with a hot iron. They forbid people to marry and order them to abstain from certain foods, which God created to be received with thanksgiving by those who believe and who know the truth.”**

..... and the book of **Titus** and

**1 Timothy 3:1-7 “Here is a trustworthy saying: If anyone sets his heart on being an overseer, (Same Greek word as Bishop as in the King James version) he desires a noble task. Now the overseer must be above reproach, the husband of but one wife, temperate, self-controlled, respectable, hospitable, able to teach, not given to drunkenness, not violent but gentle, not quarrelsome, not a lover of money. He must manage his own family well and see that his children obey him with proper respect. (If anyone does not know how to manage his own family, how can he take care of God's church?) He must not be a recent convert, or he may become conceited and fall under the same judgment as the devil. He must also have a good reputation with outsiders, so that he will not fall into disgrace and into the devil's trap.**

These verses describes all Bishops and Deacons with the ability to have wives, be humble and manage their children and not desire to be rich. Where can you find celibacy in these verses? In fact it seems to say that family management is a good sign for a Bishop, later known as “Pope”. If one reads detailed and honest descriptions of the Popes, you will find that these verses are certainly not historically descriptive of Roman Catholic Popes<sup>10</sup>! Just when the Roman Catholic Church had the chance to become reformed and renewed under the best pope of the last century, Pope John, he died right in the middle of the transformation process of Vatican 2 in the 1960's. He would have stopped the celibacy and birth control. The next Pope who took the reigns in the middle of Vatican 2 stopped the renewal and returned the masses to the hard lines of restoration back to the medieval Catholicism.

Up until the fourth century<sup>11</sup>, Popes ( called Bishops at that time) married and had children. One problem with that was that all inheritance went to the oldest son. Consequently, disguised as purity, celibacy was installed in the fourth century in order to keep the rich papal estate passing *back* to the church, not the children. Sexual abuse has been documented since then...and with few exceptions,<sup>12</sup> still nothing is done. Cardinal Ratzinger, who is the Pope Benedict today (2009), was directly responsible for the Vatican office that dealt with sexual abuse within the church. He knew all about the molestations yet he, too, covered it up. The United States charged Him with “conspiracy to cover up” the evidence of such abuse, but President George W. Bush quietly gave him immunity in 2005. Before Ratzinger in the last century, after 40 years, a document stored in secret archives of the Vatican, was uncovered that was written in 1962 by Cardinal Alfredo Ottaviani stating any “ sexual assault committed by a priest” or “attempted by him with youths of either sex or with brute animals”. Bishops are instructed to pursue these cases “in the most secretive way....restrained by perpetual silence.....and everyone (including the victim)....is to observe the strictest secret ....under penalty of excommunication.”<sup>13</sup>

As of 2006, Oliver O'Grady was living free in Ireland, and when a camera crew shooting a

10 The famous little red pamphlet “ Trail of Blood” or “**Halley's Bible Handbook**” H.H. Halley, 1965, pp 765 ff quickly summarize Papal immorality throughout history

11 Council of Elvira (306 A.D.) Canon 33: was probably the first prohibition that became a fad that further constricted these doctrines at other councils throughout the 4<sup>th</sup> century, it read; “ Bishops, presbyters, deacons, and others with a position in the ministry are to abstain completely from sexual intercourse with their wives and from the procreation of children. If anyone disobeys, he shall be removed from the clerical office”

12 One father Tom Doyle courageously championed the victims rights in this case and deserves honorable mention. He was promotionally passed over and chastised by the church. Still today he is a victims advocate.

13 (CBS 8/6/2007) quoted by editor Mike Gendron in “Proclaiming the Gospel” Jan-Mar 2008 Vol 17 No.1

documentary caught up with him, neither the children or the community he was living in, nor the local parish, or even his landlords were aware of his pedophile past.<sup>14</sup>

Therefore, even though Roman Catholicism is a peaceful religion today, I submit that it could not be the church of our Savior on these charges alone. Furthermore, Roman Catholicism cannot possibly be that Christianity described in the Bible. Historically wavering in its doctrine and practice, it favors and gives precedent, in fact proudly proclaims, its own tradition, which Jesus condemned at many places:

**Mark 7:5-13 So the Pharisees and teachers of the law asked Jesus, "Why don't your disciples live according to the tradition of the elders .....He replied, "Isaiah was right when he prophesied about you hypocrites; as it is written:**

**" 'These people honor me with their lips,  
but their hearts are far from me.**

**They worship me in vain; their teachings are but rules taught by men.' You have let go of the commands of God and are holding on to the traditions of men." And he said to them: "You have a fine way of setting aside the commands of God in order to observe your own traditions!.....**

**Thus you nullify the word of God by your tradition that you have handed down. And you do many things like that."**

.... over what is stated in the very Bible. For example: The Roman Catholic Church desperately claims it started from the Bible as a direct successor from Peter ...it is wrong. Although there is some evidence of Peters bones having even been in Rome, (but not much), it is obvious from the Bible that Peter was meant to be an apostle to the Jews and not the Gentiles. Peter probably died in Rome but did not spend his ministry there. Furthermore the verse Roman Catholics cite for Jesus giving Peter the inheritance of authority is very skimpy to say the least. In fact, if you aren't Catholic you would say it is nil. Jesus just didn't do it. In the passage of **Matthew 16**, Jesus says to Peter; "**Who do you say that I am**"? ...and Peter responds by saying "**You are the Christ, the Son of the living God**". To which Jesus says "**Cephas (Peter), you are a rock, and upon this rock I will build my kingdom**". That's it. That's what the whole thing the Roman Catholic Church takes the keys from. This one and only pseudo link to Papism is so important to the Roman Catholics that the phrase is engraved in 6ft letters over St. Peters Basilica. Yet evangelicals say that it was Peters correct *statement* of recognition that Jesus was declaring "**You are the Christ, the Son of the living God**" was the rock hat Jesus promised to build His church on. Again, the declaration is the rock Jesus built his church on not the person. The Catholics say the "rock" he would build his church on was Peter himself. However, when you look at the language in the Greek, Jesus was just doing a word play using feminine and masculine forms of "rock". Jesus normally spoke in Aramaic poetry. Yet he may have in this instance have spoken in Greek for the effect. If not, Matthew nevertheless knew the inflections and translated it with the gender forms present. In today's vernacular it would be like saying "Peter (the original word meaning rock), you are called Rocky, but upon this rockette I will build my kingdom". You can decide for yourself but I think Jesus was building his church on Peter's statement....wherein all members of the true Church recognizes Christ as the Son of the living God. It is quite fitting also, to mention that St Peters Basilica, the largest physical work of Roman Catholicism, was not dedicated to Jesus but was finished with the inscription "Dedicated to the glory of Peter and completed by Pope Sixtus"

*When Pope John Paul died, Fox News interviewed a mourning Catholic man in the street in front of Saint Peter's Basilica, the man said " Pope Paul did more for the world than Jesus Christ did".*

---

<sup>14</sup> Excellent, must see 2006 academy award nominated documentary film "Deliver us From Evil" by Lionsgate, where all of the above is documented with on camera interviews of victims, O'Grady, Mahoney, and many others involved.

**The office of Pope, called the "infallible" Catholic mediator**<sup>15</sup> between God and man (cf 1 Tim 2:5 which forbids mediators), was not even called Pope until the fifth century. He was one of many bishops, not necessarily in succession. "Bishop" comes from the word "episcopal" from which "epi" means "over", and "scopal" means "watch". So the Bishop is to "watch over", not "rule over". Protestant clergy who want to lord it over the sheep should take note of this also<sup>16</sup>. The Roman Catholics claim to have direct apostolic succession from Peter yet their proof is dubious. The first "list" of Bishops came from a second century letter to Ignatius that was found to be a forgery. In fact the first *proof* of any Bishop after Linus is Anicetus at 155-166AD. The first Bishop of Rome to use the term "Papa" or Pope was Siricius 384-399 AD. And the first Bishop to *demand* the title was Leo the first 440-461AD. The so called Vicar of Christ. Before this time they called themselves the "Vicar of Peter". Throughout the years the Popes began to call themselves infallible...in other words, he spoke for God on earth. This became the official church doctrine at Vatican 1 in 1870. Effectively calling Popes prophets...like Isaiah for example. Under some conditions in Roman Catholicism even the Magisterium, or other Bishops, can also teach infallibly. Yet sometimes when Popes say fallible things in direct opposition to the Bible, Catholics tend to make excuses for his infallibility that makes it hard to pin down at all.... "He is not infallible unless he is sitting down" (ex cathedra)....and then when that didn't seem to cover his errors... "he is not infallible unless he has his staff in hand"....and then...."he is not infallible unless he specifically states it". For example Nicholas 1 said ex cathedra that catholic women must have their head covered in church ....yet many don't do this today. Just recently Pope Benedict said the Muslims were corrupt. Then he apologized for it. Which statement was infallible? In fact, some so called infallible Popes contradicted other so called infallible Popes. In the case of Pope Liberius (352AD), definitely in their "apostolic succession" I might add, taught that Jesus was not God.. ...(for which he has not yet been canonized)....then Honorius came along and taught that Jesus was not man. Today, Roman Catholics rightly teach that Jesus was both God and man. But which Pope in succession was infallible? Even Peter himself was fallible:

**Galatians 2:11 "But when Peter came to Antioch, I opposed him in public, because he was clearly wrong".**

Once, the Roman Catholic Church had a "Great Schism" where they had the one Vicar of Christ evidently schizophrenically living in two places, one in Rome and one in Avignon, France. Then they fired them both! Fired by the Council of Constance (1414-18) which burned John Hus at the stake, and took away the power of three infallible, all powerful Popes and replaced them with Martin V. Which of these were the infallible head of the church and direct successor of Peter that they fired? However, in the Bible you find no such office of Pope ever mentioned. In fact you find no office mentioned. In fact, you find verses that condemn other such mediators.

**1 Timothy 2:5, "There is one mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus".**

You also have entire chapters in the Bible devoted to telling Christians that they are their own high priests and can pray and confess directly to the throne of God. Yet if I came along and told you that God made me the highest of all earthly priests, and that he gave me special permission to disagree with the Bible and teach myths, and by the way, don't bother reading it to see for yourself or I will have you killed....you would probably like to have me committed....at least you probably wouldn't believe me. Nonetheless, over the years, this, as well as many other charismatic leaders of false religions, is exactly what the office of the Pope has accomplished. If failed infallibility doesn't sway you, then isn't it at least a little disturbing how the Popes exercised control over governments and life and death over individuals? When the huge Egyptian obelisk (think of the Washington Monument) needed to be

<sup>15</sup> Papal "infallibility" was always in effect throughout history but specifically stated at Vatican 1. Catholics deny that he is a mediator, but if he speaks for God and interprets scripture and God, then if not he.... who else could be called a mediator? The Mormons like to deny Joseph Smith is a mediator as well. Seems that all religions who have mediators are supernaturally blinded from seeing them as such.

<sup>16</sup> For more, read "**Pagan Christianity**" by Frank Viola and George Barna

moved in Rome, the Pope gave the the order that if anyone said a word while it was being moved he would be executed<sup>17</sup>. Did Peter exercise such life and death powers? Furthermore, if your are one that favors cities as gospel relics, you should note that during the early years of Christianity the Rome office has usurped power from at least four other church cities including Jerusalem, Antioch, Smyrna, and Alexandria. All of which were of equal and higher importance in ancient times. Yet the Catholic faith erroneously places the city of Rome, it seems to me, in preeminence to the true Gospel city of Jerusalem where our Lord died.

**Roman Catholic Salvation** is: although stated that it is by grace by the masses....effectually, in practice, it is ...be a good person, get forgiveness for the small stuff through confession and work out a payment for that sin (penance and sacraments), and then, like many cults, you have to go in under the umbrella of their church. With true Christianity, you are responsible to go in alone with Christ. Here is one of their authoritative quotes from the

***Second Vatican Council: Dogmatic Constitution Lumen gentium, 14, "They could not be saved who, knowing that the Roman Catholic Church was founded as necessary by God through Christ, would refuse either to enter it, or to remain in it" .***

While everyday Catholics help the world accuse protestants of being bigoted and exclusive, the truth is that official Roman Catholics quietly but firmly stand by this statement today. Yet didn't Jesus say He was the Way? In Roman Catholicism, Jesus opens your salvation account with some money, and through penance, confirmation, rosary prayers, sacraments, required good deeds, alms, and the help of Mary, your account is bolstered. But the amount in your account as well as the cost of salvation is unknown. When do you know you have enough? In contrast, true Biblical salvation that the evangelicals believe is as if you don't have any money yourself, you ask Jesus to help you, and God transfers the exact amount into your bank account that Jesus' deposited....and your entire salvation is eternally prepaid in full. Realizing this grace, evangelicals are appreciative to the point of doing good works. We are saved by grace and not works

**John 6:28-29 Then they asked him, "What must we do to do the works God requires?" Jesus answered, "The work of God is this: to believe in the one he has sent."**

Notice where Jesus is asked about "works" plural and responds with "work" singular...and that singular "work" is "to believe" on Jesus.

**Ephesians 2:8-9 For it is by grace you have been saved, through faith—and this not from yourselves, it is the gift of God— not by works, so that no one can boast.**

**NOT BY WORKS !** That means you can't do anything or quit doing anything to be saved....only believe!

**The Sacraments:** There are normally two celebrated in Protestantism (The Bible only cites Baptism and the Lords Supper) versus seven for Catholics. Protestants view the Sacraments, no matter how many you choose, as being reminders of divine truths, whereas Roman Catholics view them as being life changing aids that in real time help accomplish their salvation. At the Council of Trent in 1545- 63, Catholics declared that anyone who denies any of them, or the Apocrypha, or changes the number of them is to be declared "anathema" (condemned) by the Roman Catholic Church! All of these sacraments contain longer explanations that can be investigated throughout the scope of history, but for this abridgment, here are the basics:

- **Baptism**, for Roman Catholics provides the rebirth that cleans away all sin to that point and thus begins the salvation process. Usually done with Babies today, it was not always so. At one time the Baptism was postponed to the end of ones life in order to clean all previous sins. That

---

<sup>17</sup> The book "**Basilica: The Splendor and the Scandal: Building St Peter's**" by R.A.Scotti 2007, when the all knowing Pope obviously did not know how to rectify the problem of the huge slipping ropes on the winch wheels that were moving the obelisk, one man broke the order and hollered to "put water on them"! He wasn't executed only because it worked.

is the reason the emperor Constantine was baptized at his deathbed...not because he had little faith as those who like to discredit him claim. For Protestants it is the first command after salvation that is to be a one act picture drama of the death, cleansing, and resurrection of Jesus ...made for the public to show that one is being initiated into the club. Much as the wedding ring is for the marriage. The ring is not the marriage and you can be married without it....but if it is not there, you can bet there might be questions later from the spouse! The thief on the cross was not baptized and yet promised to be with Jesus that very day in paradise.

- **Confirmation**, supposedly bestows the Holy Spirit and increases the grace in some special sense. Bonds Catholics to the church.
- **Penance**, Many times after confession to a Priest he will tell you to say so many "Hail Mary's", or give alms, or some other payment that removes the penalty of sins committed after baptism and confirmation. You work it off... so to speak. For Protestants the Bible says that you can't work it off. If you could work off your sins, why would you need Jesus....and when do you know you did enough? It also states that only the Godhead can forgive sins.
- **Holy Eucharist (AKA Transubstantiation)** in the Mass. This is the doctrine that John Wycliffe stood against that seeded the reformation. In a nut shell transubstantiation is the belief that when you drink the wine, that it is not just a representation of Jesus' shed blood but that it actually is molecularly turned into his blood at the blessing by the priest. Likewise, the bread is not just a representation of his body but is actually his body when eaten. Not only do most Roman Catholics not know that the church actually teaches transubstantiation<sup>18</sup>, but they don't know what the word means until you tell them. When you investigate Roman Catholic doctrine closely, you find Catholics teach that Christ is actually re sacrificed again at this point, but the Bible teaches that there was one sacrifice for all time and that the sacrificial work of Christ is finished. Besides, if Christ is in heaven as the scriptures say, and sitting down at the right hand of the Father, then how can we be eating His body here on earth? When I meet a Roman Catholic priest on the street and he throws up a hand....I cannot help but think 'cannibalism'. Jokes aside, heresies have always had serious side effects. At one point in history, rumors of Jews spearing the "Bread" body of Christ with a needle caused many of the Jews to be put to death by the Roman Catholic Church. Furthermore, Roman Catholic verification of transubstantiation is one reason that early Caesars used to unnecessarily put them to death ....claiming they were admitted cannibals and blood drinkers. With Protestants, it is done just as the Bible instructs, "**This do in remembrance of me**" (Luke 22:19, 1 Corinthians 11:24-25 notice that Paul said Jesus instructed this while he was still alive ....and so it could not have been his actual body that He was talking about.....Also we have Hebrews 1:3 and 10:12 showing how Jesus is in Heaven and not on earth and to be eaten!)
- **Marriage**, the blessing is given only from the church with the understanding that the matrimony remain in Catholic hands. That's why many Catholics require a church wedding....or a remarriage within the church.
- **Anointing the sick (AKA "extreme unction")**, bestows grace on the dying, aged, or sick, and helps in the forgiveness of their sins and possibly the physical healing.
- **Holy Orders**, confers special powers for the Priest's "for all eternity".

---

<sup>18</sup> As shown on the DVD "**Catholicism: Crisis of Faith**", where Roman Catholics are interviewed in the streets, most Catholics do not know details about this and other Catholic doctrines that sound strange to them when they hear the details, (e.g. Immaculate conception, Assumption of Mary). They sometimes do not believe it when you tell them. Nevertheless, we cannot refute what each person believes about his faith, but it is what that faith teaches in it's books and creeds that IS the doctrine. After all, that is what will be taught in the schools and to the next generations.

**"There is Something About Mary!"** was just a third rate movie. But with the Catholics, there truly is something about Mary that is not above board. Many things are not known or told to the congregations about Mary that is different than what they believe. Things that Rome cannot justify, it veils with inattention. For example, most Catholics believe the Doctrine of the **"Immaculate Conception"** was about the innocent, sinless birth of Jesus. In fact, it is about the immaculate sinless birth and life of Mary herself! This is not true and is clearly refuted by scripture that says "All have sinned and come short of the Glory of God". According to the church this includes the fact that she could not have had sex and procreated any other children but was a perpetual virgin! Again scripture says (above and elsewhere)that all have sinned , and that Jesus had other brothers and sisters:

**Mt 13:55-56 "Isn't this the carpenter's son? Isn't his mother's name Mary, and aren't his brothers James, Joseph, Simon and Judas? Aren't all his sisters with us? Where then did this man get all these things?", this is also repeated at Mark 6:3, .... and at Acts 1:14 They all joined together constantly in prayer, along with the women and Mary the mother of Jesus, and with his brothers.**

The famous Jewish historian Flavius Josephus writes about James' execution: **".... and brought before them the brother of Jesus, whose name was James."**<sup>19</sup> I have heard some Catholic apologists claim that the greek word for brother meant cousin. That is absolutely not true. A completely different word is used for cousin.. In a similar myth, the Catholic Doctrine of **"The assumption of Mary"** is simply unexplainable by the average Catholic. They don't know that the official church doctrine teaches that Mary was sinless all of her life and thus could not die, but God simply took her up from the earth. They get this from a single apocryphal letter written about 350 years after the event supposedly happened! To quote their own Catholic Encyclopedia website [www.newadvent.org](http://www.newadvent.org); "The belief in the corporeal assumption of Mary is founded on the *fictitious* treatise De Obitu S. Dominae, bearing the name of St. John, which belongs however to the fourth or fifth century." There were no eye witnesses and they don't even know in which city the assumption supposedly took place....Ephesus or Jerusalem! Yet Pope Benedict maintains that to deny this, *based on an apocryphal treatise*, is blasphemous!<sup>20</sup> **They claim they do not worship Mary...** yet they pray to her with words that would work just fine if applied to Jesus or God the Father. According to scripture, Mary, other than great among women, is nowhere commanded to be worshiped...in fact she is mentioned only once (**Acts 1:14**) ....in passing, after the gospels. She is also prayed to sometimes for salvation yet Mary herself said she needed a savior at **Luke 1:46-47 And Mary said: "My soul glorifies the Lord and my spirit rejoices in God my Savior.** Was she lying? How can she need a savior and yet *be* a savior?If she were the Holy Mother of God you would think there would be much more mention from the epistles. In fact, in **Matthew 12:46-50 While Jesus was still talking to the crowd, his mother and brothers stood outside, wanting to speak to him. Someone told him, "Your mother and brothers are standing outside, wanting to speak to you." He replied to him, "Who is my mother, and who are my brothers?" Pointing to his disciples, he said, "Here are my mother and my brothers. For whoever does the will of my Father in heaven is my brother and sister and mother."**and elsewhere **Luke 11:27-28 As Jesus was saying these things, a woman in the crowd called out, "Blessed is the mother who gave you birth and nursed you. He replied, "Blessed rather are those who hear the word of God and obey it."** it is clear that Jesus wanted no special treatment for his Mother and family but gave his disciples and others obedient of God equal status. "Full of grace" is a title that is given to Jesus and because Mary was called that, Catholics like to say that she should be venerated as Jesus. But what do they do with Stephen (**Acts 6:8**) and others who were also called "full of grace"? Logically, if Mary is not omnipresent nor omniscient then how can she actually hear the prayers of the saints all praying at the same time?

19 "Antiquities of the Jews", by Flavius Josephus, Chapter 9, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph

20 Catholic Encyclopedia <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/02006b.htm> "the fact of the assumption"

**Worshipping graven images.** One of the Ten Commandments no doubt! Thou Shalt have no Graven Images Before Me! Yet what do you find Catholics doing? They buy Jesus' face on a pizza selling on ebay! They are fascinated with, and constantly seeking to worship images and occult sightings. They do this claiming that the image is not worshipped but it only brings to mind the God that is. Nevertheless, this is exactly what is condemned. In the Old Testament, the pagan tribes that surrounded the Jews did not worship the “idol carved with hands” but only used those carvings to remind them of Baal and the other gods they worshipped.<sup>21</sup> To obfuscate this commandment the Catholics change the reading of the Ten Commandments so that instead of "Thou shalt not worship graven images", they omit it, and then, to keep the 10 count, they divide up the "thou shalt not covet" commandment into two!!!

**Acceptance of the Apochrypha;** The Apochrypha is a collection of 11 books (sometimes arranged as less) that the Catholics accept that have some truth and history and yet contain historical, chronological, and geographical errors as well as obvious heresies and absurd legends. They were not even accepted with the Catholics until the council of Trent in 1546. Although they were included in the Septuagint, Jesus and the Apostles knew about them and yet never quoted from them. The Jews did not accept them, and the early church fathers such as Jerome, Origen, Athanasius, and Cyril of Jerusalem spoke against them. When they were written there was not even a Jewish prophet on earth! They could not be the word of God. The reason the Catholics accepted them was because the Protestants had rejected them at the reformation. In a childish move to counteract the reformation, the Catholics just wanted to do the opposite of what the protestants were doing, and dogmatized it at the council of Trent. That, and Michelangelo's Sistine chapel<sup>22</sup> were part of the Catholic knee jerk answer to Luther. You just weren't gonna print it and you weren't gonna get in to see it if'n you weren't Catholic.

**Other Errors:** When the church wants to mark a document as inerrant they use one of two seals; the Nihil Obstat or the Imprimatur. The Catholic Encyclopedia is so marked yet contained the following errors; salvation is by works, Muslims worship the biblical God, the book of Daniel was written 165BC , Mormons believe in the trinity, the Roman Catholic Church is the only true church, and papal infallibility is true. All of the above is false<sup>23</sup>. Catholicism mixes unashamedly with Voodoo in the Caribbean as well. In Haiti I have seen photos of pope John Paul shaking hands with the big voodoo houngan of Haiti, and we found from first hand experience that in the Haitian city of Ouanaminthe, the local Roman Catholic Church received kickback from their own preferred list of voodoo priests for any who inquired.

**Purgatory** is not found anywhere in the Bible but is simply a church fabrication of a netherworld where people go to be punished enough for their sins so they can eventually get to heaven<sup>24</sup>. In times past, alms could be given to the church to help their loved one avoid the tormenting while conveniently filling the church coffers and building the cathedrals. If you weren't forgiven enough in this life then purgatory “place of purging” is available to finish off your payments. Now you know one reason why those beautiful Roman Catholic Churches could be built so extravagantly. In many cases they were built while the people starved.

**Confessions** (to Priests) and last rites (final Unction) where the priest absolves you of any final sins (hint: only God can forgive sins)

**Selling of Indulgences and selling of offices :** This “office” selling became so big in the church that it earned the name “Simony” after the condemned practice with Simon in **Acts 8:9ff** . Neither are done

21 “**A History of The Jews**”, Phillip Johnson

22 The book “**Basilica: The Splendor and the Scandal: Building St Peter's**” by R.A.Scotti 2007

23 John Ankerberg: **The Facts on Catholicism**

24 As the idea of the old testament sheol , paradise, great chasms, evolves into Gehenna, and hell, there is some confusion on this subject for the average Christian from any faith, it is true. Much like multiplication tables evolve into calculus as more light is given. The subject is too broad to be discussed here but I refer you to the definitive textbook on the subject by Dr. Robert Morey, **Death and the Afterlife** nevertheless, the purgatory doctrine as the Catholics teach it is not to be found in the Bible.

today (that we know of), but were biggies in the past. When my daughters and I visited Saint Marks Cathedral in Venice, they were amazed at how rich, beautiful, and lavish was the artwork that adorned it. Many other Roman Catholic cathedrals such as Notre Dame and Saint Peters Basilica, as well. One in every big European city it seems. But when I told them how the Popes got the money for the sumptuous, gorgeous, and affluent buildings, their admiration faded. The Popes used two methods;

1. Sometimes they sold false artifacts about the savior. Sometimes they sold admission to see the artifacts. In the 16th century Martin Luther preached the Roman Catholic Church had "sold enough crucifixion nails to shoe every horse in Rome". And "eighteen of the twelve Apostles are buried in Spain".
2. As mentioned above in "purgatory", they sold papers that would release a deceased loved one from their immediate pain of hell for a time (their amount of relief was based upon the amount paid). These two false concepts angered Luther causing him to birth the Protestant reformation where he restated from the Bible "the Just shall live by faith"... not indulgence money or Catholic works.

I have to say that some protestant pastors are venturing down this same road today when they knowingly preach "tithing" out of context in order to fill the church coffers. Of course, Pastors have the scriptural right to ask for offerings, alms, almsdeeds, and freewill donations.....but not the *Jewish* tenth tithe from the favorite out of context verse at **Malachi 3:8 "Will a man rob God? Yet you rob me. "But you ask, 'How do we rob you?' "In tithes and offerings.** This was a tax on the Jews to support their annual party! ....cf Deuteronomy 14. Nowhere are tithes levied against Christians in the New Testament. I have heard well meaning Christians say that you should pay this tenth before you pay your bills! Violating their contracts would make Christians look real good to the outside world don't you think? And those same pastors might even say that the poor, and even widows should pay. The alms were *for* the poor, not taken from them. All churches ought to be careful how they spend this money. There is nothing wrong with a big comfortable church. There *is* something wrong with a big lavish church not doing it's missions.

**Worthy of Mention** is the term "worthy of belief", which the church has applied to various dubious sightings and miracles, (aka "signs and wonders" where God has warned us against believing everything we see (**Deuteronomy 13:1-3, Matthew 24:24**). Things that through the years defy proof in either direction. Fakes and forgeries abound. One notable example of many is the story of Padre Pio (1887-1968), famous for his stigmata (having nail scars or signs appear in his hands). First he was accused and chastised for various perversions, then canonized as a saint, then his reputation again questioned for his teachings, then found to have used carbolic acid to produce the redness in his so called stigmatic hands. He claimed the Devil physically attacked him in the form of young girls dancing naked....."Several times, they have even torn my shirt off so they could attack my exposed flesh".<sup>25</sup> To which I say ....yeah right.....that is exactly the kind of the babbling methane that keeps the howling atheist flames in conflagration! Worthy of mention is Christ crucified and salvation by that grace alone.....not whether some so called miracle is accepted by men who are not omniscient.

**To qualify for Sainthood, the body of the Saint** in times past had to be proven incorruptible and found free of decay before they could be canonized, but this is not done today. Why not? And which is correct? Because some of the bodies were found to have been *embalmed* in secret, and thus cheating the confirmation of God! One more quick thing about the Saints: the Catholics pray to them. Anybody, including Mary, with the ability to hear all prayers from millions of praying Christians would have to be omnipresent and or omniscient which philosophically also makes them gods. Mary is not.

---

<sup>25</sup> The Other Christ: Padre Pio and the 19<sup>th</sup> Century Italy by Sergio Luzzatto, *Wikipedia* in the Italian language translated, Proclaiming the Gospel Pamphlet, Mike Gendron, Jan-Mar 2008 Vol. 17 no. 1 page 7

Against all internal Biblical teaching and examples **the Roman Catholic Church has Impeded and discouraged Bible reading throughout history** (No wonder!), at the Fifth Lateran Council of 1514, the fourth decree said you had to have the Church s' permission to even print books.

Of late Roman Catholicism has become more civilized and moral yet it still wavers in its teachings... For example, one Catholic council (1<sup>st</sup> Vatican 1870) says you have to be subject to the Roman Pontiff (Pope) to get to heaven and yet Pope John Paul said you didn't even have to be Catholic to get to heaven....so which one is right? This 1st Vatican edict created another mini-split. Those who did not agree that the Pope was infallible split off to become "The Old Roman Catholic Church" which is also still with us today. There have been other divisions of Catholic belief within the church ....some are reportedly strict Catholics in the traditional sense....some are Bible reading evangelical types except for rituals....some attend the church because their families did. One Evangelical girl in the Dominican Republic said you could tell who were the Catholics there because they "**let the wind read their Bible for them as it lays open on their coffee table to the book of Psalms**". Many others, I'm ashamed to say, as in other religions including my own, don't know what they believe, or, as in the case of transubstantiation and the immaculate conception, what the church even teaches. They attend out of tradition. As always, Jesus well said when he lashed another false group for the same attitude, "**by your tradition you have made the Word of God of non effect**".

Furthermore, like the Jim Baker "name it and claim it" theology, it should be mentioned that the falsehoods of Roman Catholic teachings are always used as the "strawman" argument that the media attacks in order to ridicule all of Christianity. For example, the Roman Catholics traditionally walk the Via De la Rosa where Christ is supposed to have carried his cross. The trouble is that archeology has proven the Via De La Rosa is not located where they claim. So the average Joe thinks to himself..."what else about Christianity is not true"? Same thing with the Turin Shroud that was proven fraud. Jesus simply did not want our focus to be on any relic. He wanted all of our focus on Him in a personal relationship.

Attached to salvation is the Biblical requirement of repentance. Repentance just means to change your mind about former things and therefore be "born again". Some of us had to change our minds against drug use. Some of us against drunkenness. Some of us against fornication. Some of us against unbelief. Some of us are called to stand against our own family philosophy. Some of us have to leave false religions and turn only to Christ of the Bible. I hope this paper for whoever reads it will not offend.... because I have many people close to me that I love dearly who are Catholics. (My own wife's family is from Latin America.... where you can't help but be Catholic). But I hope this paper pricks the conscious of the sheep who have gone astray and motivates them to investigate further.

We always speak of Roman Catholicism as a world religion but apologist author Dave Hunt asks the question that I cannot answer..."why don't we call Roman Catholicism a cult"<sup>926</sup>?

***I am not yet finished with this article and will address the following in a later update:***

*Notes to finish for followup: check out Cyprian, address the apochrypha with specific examples, explain the orders: dominican, franciscan, opus dei, jesuit, carmelite marianites, etc. elaborate on the pseudo isidora papers. Also show the charts where Mary is worshipped compared to Jesus by Catholic theology, and where the ordinary Catholic actually in practice, makes her co mediatrix of the Trinity, Queen of heaven, Mother of God. Etc. list more specific fallibilities of popes by name. **Saints, Beads (rosaries), occult Sightings, Statues, and?***

*From Wikipedia and supported by other official catholic readings, et al:*

Pseudo-Isidore is the pseudonym given to the scholar or group of scholars responsible for the Pseudo-Isidorean (False) Decretals, the most extensive and influential set of forgeries found in medieval Canon law. The works were probably produced c 842 in Metz.[1] The author, a French cleric calling himself Isidore Mercator, created false documents purportedly by early church popes, demonstrating that supremacy of the papacy dated back to the church's oldest traditions.[1] The author's motive was to protect Frankish bishops from both archbishops and kings, by asserting the importance of the Pope.[1] The work aimed first of all at establishing the bishops' right of appeal to the pope from their metropolitans.[1]

In some manuscripts, the decretals include the Donation of Constantine, in which Constantine grants Pope Sylvester I secular authority over all Western Europe.[1] Thanks to this forgery in the collection, the decretals became one of the most persuasive forgeries in the history of the West to bolster papal infallibility as ancient.

The decretals have been universally recognized as forgeries, thanks to the work of Lorenzo Valla in 1440

*False Used to support and claim papal authority for centuries! 2<sup>nd</sup> Question: Why did not the multiple Vicars of Christ see through these forgeries if they have led the church infallibly ?*

*Pope Stephen 896 exhuming Pope Formusus putting his dead body on trial (He probably didn't say much in his defense) even cutting his fingers off that he blessed with.... etc*