

Danny, thank you for your response, and the opportunity to elucidate the points purposefully made succinct in my tract. Even such a cursory reply to as little as two of the points in this article is very rare.

First of all I want you to understand that I have no personal animosity or ill will to any Romanist. I have family members who are Roman Catholics. I love ALL Roman Catholics. And that love compels me to proclaim the Scriptures to you. On the other hand Romanism as an institution, I loathe with a pure and complete hatred.

Therefore I esteem all thy precepts concerning all things to be right; and I hate every false way. - Psalms 119:128

The Roman Catholic Church, a false way, is far and above the most wicked, godless and anti-Christ institution to have ever existed.

Danny, I do believe you were led to Romanism by a spirit, but it wasn't the Holy Spirit, for He will never violate or contradict His Word.

Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak: and he will shew you things to come. John 16:13

To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them. Isaiah 8:20

DB "there may be more truth in one sentence than in all of a 28 page article."

Interesting statement considering the article is simply a comparison of Scripture quotes and Catechism quotes, with very little commentary at all. What are you referring to as void of truth; the Scripture or the Catechism or both?

As for the commandments:

DB “The first commandment includes what you call the 2nd commandment. It is not passed over or given less emphasis so we can worship idols.”

If this is true, why is the admonition against images not in the Catechetical formula, which is the list that is taught, not the direct quote from Scripture? Honestly, this is an interesting omission considering the proliferation of images in Romanism.

“Essentials of the Faith: A Guide to the Catechism of the Catholic Church” in it’s review and explanation of the first commandment never even mentions images. (Chapter 44, pages 167-169) Nor does the Catechism itself when expounding upon this all important issue, except for one page which essentially says, “we’ve decided that our images are okay”.(2084-2141) (I will deal more with this shortly.) This is surely “passed over or given less emphasis” by any standard.

Even so I qualified my statement in the article with just that point as here quoted:

“While the Catholic bible retains verses 4 thru 6, the Traditional Catholic Catechetical Formula removes it from the list making the forbiddance of images a minor byword in the pages of Scripture which the Pope has the power to change anyway.”

The list is on page 551 of the small mass market version of the Catechism. Notice the absence of admonition against images in the quote of Deuteronomy. (pg 496 on the large version)

DB “I will give you one example of the incompleteness of your arguments. Regarding the 10 commandments, these no scriptural basis for the deviation.”

Really?

Is there a scriptural basis to divide covetousness in your 9 & 10?

Danny, Exodus 20:3-4 are two separate sentences which is the actual 1st and 2nd commandments. Verse 17 is one sentence, the actual 10th commandment.

Ditto Deuteronomy 5:7,8,21.

Although your New American Bible conveniently separates the final verse into 2 sentences, your Douay-Rheims does not. It is even displayed as one sentence in the Exodus quote in your catechism! Although I was able to find 5 other versions (out of nearly 40 that I checked) which separate the thought into 2 sentences as well, the Hebrew does not warrant this separation. (Hence the proper rendering in the Authorized Version)

Interestingly enough, Ex.20:3,4 and Deut 5:7,8, are never combined into one sentence.

My point? Commandments 1 and 2 are separate thoughts, commandment 10 is not, and there is no justification whatsoever to divide the command not to covet into categories.

I read Part III (I assume you meant Section 2) Chapter One, subsections III and IV, wherefrom you quoted: "No other gods before Me" and "you shall not make for yourself a graven image". I see you have a predilection for quoting headings without delving into the actual passage. I will here deal with images in IV.

Firstly, par 2130."Nevertheless, already in the Old Testament, God ordained or permitted the making of images that pointed symbolically toward salvation by the incarnate Word: so it was with the bronze serpent, the ark of the covenant, and the cherubim.⁶⁹"

1. I am particularly impressed with the subtle insertion of "or permitted" in the text here. The implications are obvious. The creation of these three mentioned items was exclusively ordered by God for specific

purposes. Where is the specific command of God to make little blue and white statues to put in your yard, et.al.?

2. The bronze serpent was destroyed by King Hezekiah because the children of Israel were venerating it. (You can read about this in 2 Kings 18)
3. The ark of the covenant has been missing since at least the time of the Babylonian captivity.
4. The cherubim have been destroyed as well.
5. There has been no subsequent command (or “permission”) by God to make any images of anything.

So who decided it was okay for the Roman Catholic Church to make for themselves graven images? It wasn't God.

“the seventh ecumenical council at Nicaea (AD 787) justified . . . the veneration of icons” (2131)

And so Romanists have decided:

“The Christian (read Catholic here, for no real Christian venerates images) veneration of images is not contrary to the first commandment which proscribes idols.”(2132) Really? And who decided this? Nicaea?

And so basically as I stated above, a little rhetoric to say, “we've decided that our images are okay”! How profoundly arrogant!

Nevertheless, I never stated that the Romanist admits he worships images. Notwithstanding, the abortionist can emphatically deny that he is a murderer yet his actions belie his claims.

Succinctly, there is no justification for categorizing covetousness, and ignoring the adverse implications of venerating images.

As for the Muslims.

DB "Regarding the Muslims, once again you fell short and did not read the rest of the text - or omitted to enhance your point "Outside the Church there is no salvation""

You say this as though the quote is part of the text I quoted in the article. The Muslim quote is par 841. Your quote is the heading for par 846 ff. This is a bit disingenuous on your part.

Nevertheless I reexamined both sections "The Church and non-Christians" beginning at 839 and the section "Outside the Church there is no salvation" (the heading of which you quoted as part of par 841) beginning at 846. Examining the content your defense does not hold up.

These passages underlie a certain allusion to a strange type of universalism. The Catholics with whom I have conversed, for the most part, use the teachings in this section to bolster their belief that those who "don't know any better" and who are "sincere worshipers" of other gods are covered under the umbrella of the mother church.

Hence Mother Teresa's blasphemy:

"There is only one God and He is God to all; therefore it is important that everyone is seen as equal before God. I've always said we should help a Hindu become a better Hindu, a Muslim become a better Muslim, a Catholic become a better Catholic. We believe our work should be our example to people. We have among us 475 souls - 30 families are Catholics and the rest are all Hindus, Muslims, Sikhs—all different religions. But they all come to our prayers."

"Mother" Teresa, and those who worked with her, never tried to convert to Christ the dying people for whom they cared. Instead, "Mother" Teresa declared: "If in coming face to face with God we accept Him in our lives, then we are converting. We become a better Hindu, a better Muslim, a better Catholic, a better whatever we are. ... What God is in your mind you

must accept" (from *Mother Teresa: Her People and Her Work*, by Desmond Doig, p. 156).

This is not only blasphemous but extreme hatred!

In context these catechism passages are under the heading "The Church is Catholic". Let us quote portions of the Catechism in this section building up to the section in question.

"III. THE CHURCH IS CATHOLIC

What does "catholic" mean?

830 The word "catholic" means "universal," in the sense of "according to the totality" or "in keeping with the whole."

831 "All men are called to belong to the new People of God..._he made human nature one in the beginning and has decreed that all his children who were scattered should be finally gathered together as one. . . ."

"Who belongs to the Catholic Church?

836 "All men are called to this catholic unity of the People of God. . . . And to it, in different ways, belong or are ordered: the Catholic faithful, others who believe in Christ, and finally all mankind, called by God's grace to salvation."³²⁰ "

This clearly states who "belongs to the Catholic Church" according to the Catechism.

- 1- The Catholic faithful
- 2- Others who believe in Christ
- 3- All mankind

From here, is it so difficult to discern the intent of par 841, that Muslims are ranked among those included in the plan of salvation? This is a supreme reproach to the Word of God.

None the less, the Catechism continues in its unique universalism.

“842 *The Church's bond with non-Christian religions* is in the first place the common origin and end of the human race:..._all share a common destiny, namely God.”

“843 The Catholic Church recognizes in other religions that search, among shadows and images, for the God who is unknown yet near since he gives life and breath and all things and wants all men to be saved. Thus, the Church considers all goodness and truth found in these religions as "a preparation for the Gospel and given by him who enlightens all men that they may at length have life."³³²

And it is in this context that your quote of "Outside the Church there is no salvation" is set.

This quote, apparently by Augustine, the catechism states “means that all salvation comes from Christ the Head through the Church which is his Body:” (846) and includes those who do not know Christ yet are sincere (847).

Also under the heading of this statement:

“847 This affirmation is not aimed at those who, through no fault of their own, do not know Christ and his Church: . . ._who nevertheless seek God with a sincere heart. . ._those too may achieve eternal salvation”

“In other words, God’s grace is guiding and saving those who live sincerely and conscientiously good lives, but who have, for whatever reason, honestly never seen the embrace of Christ or the church as a personal religious obligation.” (Dietzen, John J., Catholic Q&A, pg. 375)

And this section on the catholicity of the church is concluded in par 848 which states:

848 "Although in ways known to himself God can lead those who, through no fault of their own, are ignorant of the Gospel, to that faith without which it is impossible to please him, the Church still has the obligation and also the sacred right to evangelize all men."³³⁸

So in the whole scope of things, it is actually you who have fallen short or omitted to enhance your point.

The Catechism teaches just as it says, that:

"The plan of salvation also includes ... the Muslims;"(841)

One Catholic apologist has stated:

"Unity between our two faiths doesn't appear imminent. But God accomplishes remarkable things when he is ready to move." (Dietzen, John J., Catholic Q&A, pg. 385)

This is downright irresponsible. There is no unity between light and darkness. Never has been, never will be.

Seems the only ones reserved for ultimate damnation are those who purposefully reject the Roman Catholic Church.

And finally, what Biblical basis do your popes have for kissing a pagan "holy" book, and praying with all manner of devil worshipers?

I believe it is your arguments that are incomplete and inaccurate. I know a bit more about Romanism than you have given me credit for.

The copyright on the article is only to protect content. By all means print out in entirety and disseminate as many as you wish.

Praying for your deliverance,
& In His service

Jeffrey

