

**General Topics :: Are all Catholics going to hell?****Are all Catholics going to hell? - posted by phebebird (), on: 2005/1/1 3:08**

Okay guys, I've just got to bring something up that has been bugging me. I often tend to get a drift on SI that many seem to think that Catholicism is a cult on the same level as Jehovah's Witness and Mormonism. While I am not a Catholic and never have been, I readily regard them as being part of the Christian church, though a group that I don't necessarily agree with on every biblical point. Catholicism has many forms and varies widely depending upon where you are, but as far as I can tell they do agree with us Protestants on salvation by grace, no matter how easily it tends to get mixed up with some of their other lesser beliefs.

I've known so many spirit-filled, evangelical Christians that are also strong Catholics! It grieves me when I see so much Protestant literature (pamphlets, etc, not necessarily on this site), etc, claiming terrible things about the Catholic church that are unfounded. I have met so many Protestants that really think that all true Catholics are really going to hell!

I currently live in a mostly Catholic town and many people "get saved out of Catholicism". Basically they mean that they get saved out of being a nominal Christian, being religious. That is because Catholicism happens to be the most widely accepted church around here. I also lived in the Bible belt for a few years and there are many people in the Protestant church that are headed straight for hell as well! There are many, many people there that you will meet that have been "saved out of nominal Protestantism".

Just want to know you guys' thoughts. I'm hoping that we're not all anti-Catholic here, are we?

Phebe

Re: Are all Catholics going to hell? - posted by KeithLaMothe, on: 2005/1/1 3:27

Simple answer: I don't think all of them are going to hell.

I agree that there are plenty "saved out of nominal protestantism" as well as plenty "saved out of Roman Catholicism." Nonetheless, I am decidedly "protestant" rather than merely "non-Catholic." Largely I "protest" against (brief list): their use of church tradition as "on par" with Scripture, their view of the Pope as the Vicar of Christ (and, indeed, at least one of them claimed to be "God on Earth"), their rejection of what's generally called "Justification by Faith", their ceremonial "re-sacrifice" of Christ at every Mass, and particularly their idolization of Mary.

But I'm not generally going to get up extra early Sunday morning to nail 95 more Theses to the local Roman Catholic church door. I'm also generally pleasant towards Catholic acquaintances (I don't really have any good friends amongst them), and don't express to them doubts about their salvation (I would if I had good reason, but I'd do that for Baptists, Presbyterians, Lutherans, etc. as well). If they need help, I'll gladly help them just as I would anyone. Besides, most of the ones I actually run into don't have the slightest clue about many or any of the things that bother me about the RC Church's teachings.

I rather like some of what G.K. Chesterson has said, and I'm very fond indeed of Tolkien's works on Middle Earth. Both were Catholic.

But I don't think I'll ever be quite comfortable around them in the same way as my protestant friends; the differences are too unsettling.

edit - one quote I meant to bring up but forgot, from Douglas Wilson (staunchly Reformed) : "Justification by Faith in Christ, not Justification by Faith in Justification by Faith"

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/1/1 6:11

Hi phebebird

Quote:
-----I've known so many spirit-filled, evangelical Christians that are also strong Catholics! It grieves me when I see so much Protestant literature (pamphlets, etc, not necessarily on this site), etc, claiming terrible things about the Catholic church that are unfounded. I have met so many Protestants that really think that all true Catholics are really going to hell!

For me the issue lies in a single 's'. Are we talking about Catholic or Catholics? Catholic has to do with religious system which I think is anti-Christian. Catholics are people who pay allegiance to that system. Catholic or Catholicism is based on a different ultimate authority. Conservative Evangelicalism hold the Scriptures to be the final authority in matters of faith and behaviour. Catholicism holds the 'Church' to be the final authority. It claims to be the 'author' of the Bible and therefore its only legitimate interpreter.

Historically the Catholic church was against the translations of the scriptures into the vernacular because it undermined their hold on 'what God had said'. This has now been modified but the Catholic church still holds the only authoritative interpretation of them.

Catholicism, theologically, is a closed system. You cannot be a Catholic without accepting Catholic dogma, and as salvation is historically only possible inside Peter's Barque (his boat, the Catholic church), so there is no salvation outside Catholicism. Its necessary dogma include

1. the immaculate conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary. This teaches that Mary herself was without sin. Unless you believe this you cannot be a bona fide Catholic, and hence there is no salvation.
2. The Bodily Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary. This teaches that Mary did not die (because she had no sin) and had her own private rapture. you believe this you cannot be a bona fide Catholic, and hence there is no salvation.
3. Transubstantiation. The physical elements of the wine and the bread are transmuted into actual blood and flesh (the accidents of appearance excepted) of Christ. Catholics physically eat Christ's flesh and drink his blood. you believe this you cannot be a bona fide Catholic, and hence there is no salvation. Anyone not regularly communicating is self-excluding themselves from salvation.
4. Baptismal regeneration. An unbaptised baby can never go to heaven. Instead it goes limbus infantum. Neither heaven nor hell. Limbus infantum is next door to Limbus Patrum where Abraham and all other unbaptised saints spend their eternity. Baptismal regeneration water is 'ex opere operata' which means water baptism actually effects the regeneration at that moment.
5. Priestly mediation. Sin in Catholicism is dealt with by a wide variety of rituals. Auricular confession to a priest is followed by absolution in which the priest, and he alone, absolves the sinner. The priest also administers Extreme Unction (the last rites) in which the dying person is anointed with oil and his sins absolved.
6. Purgatory. Dead Catholics do not go to heaven but to purgatory when they pay the price for their sins. The Saints created works of supererogation. That is, they were not only good enough for their own salvation but their surplus holiness has gone into the Papal treasury. Time in purgatory can be reduced by the use of Peter's keys whereby the holiness of a Saint can be transferred to reduce the sinner's purgatorial sentence.

So, including the Mass, sin is resolved by water, flour, wine, oil and fire. As distinct from the scripture which says 'without the shedding of blood'. Catholicism does not believe in the merits of Christ's death, it believes in the mediated merits of Christ's death available only through the Catholic church.

I could go on... You will say but I know many Catholics who don't believe these things and who are true believers. I don't doubt it, so do I. The problem is that it is impossible to be a 'good Catholic' and a 'good Bible believing Christian' at the same time; they are mutually exclusive. There are many good Christians who are Catholics, but they are not 'good Catholics'

As Keith says 'most of the ones I actually run into don't have the slightest clue about many or any of the things that bother me about the RC church's teaching'. That is to say, they are not 'good Catholics'.

True orthodox Catholicism is anti-scriptural, and anti-Christian. But many Catholics have a genuine knowledge of the Lord and His salvation although their 'church', in the council of Trent, has said that it is impossible to know this.

General Topics :: Are all Catholics going to hell?

Re: - posted by Lawevangelis (), on: 2005/1/1 11:05

Phebe,

I don't believe that all Catholics are going to Hell. Only the ones who believe the teaching of the Catholic church on justification.

The Catholic Church teaches in all of its foundational documents from the Council of Trent right up until Vatican II that salvation is by dead works. I have not met a Catholic yet who has not thought that they were going to Heaven because of their good works (attending Mass, confirmation, confession, etc.).

Are they a cult? To answer that you have to define what a cult is and does. A cult teaches doctrine that is un-orthodox. If the Catholic church does not do that, I don't know what group does. Their teaching on salvation runs exactly counter to the Bible's teaching.

If that thinking is anti-Catholic, I guess I could also be accused of being anti-Protestant. Most of the mainline denominations have abandoned their Biblical moorings and have become cults as well.

Salvation is a narrow road and there are few, very few, who find it. Modern evangelical thinking tends to be so inclusive regarding the doctrine of salvation it has almost lost its meaning. Anyone who names the name of Jesus is considered a believer these days, even though He Himself said that many will come to Him in that day of judgment and say, Lord, Lord, did we not do all these incredible things in Your Name? And He will say, "Depart from Me, I never knew you."

Re: - posted by phebebird (), on: 2005/1/2 1:45

Thanks for all of your replies. They were enlightening. Ron, I did not know all of that stuff. I'm glad that there is less of an anti-Catholic bend on SI than I had feared. I think you are right that those Catholics that are really Christians are not very good Catholics. Catholics very often do not know everything their own church teaches (as is also often true in Protestant churches as well). Certainly the spirit-filled Catholics I've met are considered quite an anomaly by other Catholics. Anyway...

I hope I did not come across as too vehement. Anti-Catholicism is one of my very pet peeves, I realize. I guess it comes from seeing books claiming ridiculous things about the Pope being the anti-Christ and Catholicism being witchcraft, etc. I've also met a lot of very hoity-toity Protestants who really believe that stuff. It's amazing... Anyway, thanks guys. Glad to be among much more level-headed folks...

Re: - posted by crsschk (), on: 2005/1/2 2:41

Hi Phebe,

Had a rather long reply earlier but decided against it, the replies here more than suffice.

Was raised as a Catholic and it is true, practically everything I have learned about what the 'official' church teaches was totally foreign to me until recent years.

It's still an area that I hope to do more study on. Some of the doctrine is like reading legalese and can be very confusing.

Guess I should throw in this one bit though:

Ron's comments about;... *hence there is no salvation*

Hasn't this been also modified now? Am under the impression that we 'protestants' are now 'accepted';

Quote:
-----The Council is explicit when it declares that other Christians "justified by baptism in faith, are incorporated into Christ, and therefore they are rightly endowed with the name of Christian and justly recognized by the children of the Catholic Church as brothers in the Lord"

General Topics :: Are all Catholics going to hell?

(http://www.vatican.va/jubilee_2000/magazine/documents/ju_mag_01031997_p-26_en.html) http://www.vatican.va/jubilee_2000/magazine/documents/ju_mag_01031997_p-26_en.html

Re: - posted by KeithLaMothe, on: 2005/1/2 3:49

Bro. Mike: I think the anathema pronounced by the Council of Trent on all non-Catholics (and specifically anyone who dared believe Justification by Faith) was explicitly or implicitly rescinded at Vatican II.

Sis. Phebe:

Quote:
-----I guess it comes from seeing books claiming ridiculous things about the Pope being the anti-Christ and Catholicism being witchcraft

Well, I hope I don't appear hoity-toity, but those accusations are not entirely ungrounded. The Westminster Confession of Faith (a very widely used Confession among Reformed, especially Presbyterian, circles) originally called the Pope *the* anti-Christ, and I agree that during that time he had a pretty good shot at it (I could explain, if desired). Since then, it appears considerably less likely, and generally churches subscribing to the WCF have amended it at that point to no longer call the Pope *the* anti-Christ, though they probably still agree that he is *an* anti-Christ.

As for witchcraft: the Roman Catholic church is extremely good at taking local religions and "Catholicizing" them to various degrees. You probably won't find too much occultism in the RC Church in the United States, but elsewhere it may be a different story. For example, the wife of one of my friends was raised Catholic in Brazil, and one time she had some kind of disease (I think that was the issue) and the people at the Catholic church put her in a vegetable bath and sacrificed a chicken. It was the sort of town where, if a woman wanted a little help having a child, she could go to the pagan place and ask the fertility goddess, or she could go to the Catholics who had a *saint* for that kind of thing.

All that said, it's still quite possible to be anti-Catholic in an arrogant or otherwise wrong-spirited way. On the other hand, we should investigate accusations (against any group) before passing judgment; as the level-headed can believe false things, and the hoity-toity can occasionally be factually correct (though that doesn't make their other behaviors right).

Re: - posted by phebebird (), on: 2005/1/2 4:09

I suppose so. I know that Catholicism has long had a history of being mixed up with local witchcraft in certain parts of the world. Perhaps they are more susceptible to this because of their one-time history of discouraging their followers to read God's Word for themselves. The rest of us are, of course, not immune to getting mixed up with this sort of thing. I'll never forget a church of a mainline denomination that I knew of when I was in Sierra Leone that was all mixed up in the ever-present local witchcraft.

Re: - posted by adonaisarmy, on: 2005/1/2 4:55

PLEASE READ ALL

Hi phebebird,

I just want to thank philologos, for your description on catholic doctrine. I just want to say quickly, that doctrine is very important to ones faith. It is your beliefs, what you stand on, what you will die for. It is what brings unity, and true peace. It will separate the chaff and the wheat persay. It separates the false from the truth.

Now one can say that doctrine is not as important as unity or peace, but i say no, for true unity and peace can not be sought without the truth being the mediator and governor of that unity and peace, or will not truth be compromised, and a false truth, unity and peace set in.

Many have fallen for giving in to this compromise. It is not love. True love for God is to stand on the truth, His word whether it offends or not.

phebebird you said:

"I could go on... You will say but I know many Catholics who don't believe these things and who are true believers. I don't doubt it, so do I. The problem is that it is impossible to be a 'good Catholic' and a 'good Bible believing Christian' at the same time; they are mutually exclusive. There are many good Christians who are Catholics, but they are not 'good Catholics'.

ics"

I agree with you, if your a christian of the bible you cannot be a true catholic of the catholic doctrine.

But I say, does not the word of God say none are good, none are righteous. We are all equally, condemned to hell. We have all sinned and fallen short of the glory of God. Ephesians 2:8 "For by grace that ye are saved through faith, and that not of yourselves and that not of yourselves it is the gift of God, not of works lest any man should boast."

If one teaches the man has any work in his salvation, then one is not admitting the truth that he is doomed, destined to hell, sinned and fallen short of the glory of God, But one is deceived believing he has inherently has some righteousness aiding and earning worthy of his salvation. Because he believes this lie, he is not receiving the gift of God the remission of his sins but is trusting in himself, keeping him in his sins. Therefore he would not be receiving the christ of the bible but another. John 9 :41 For christ said that your sins remain if you say you see, saying that you have no sin.

It is not just another gospel, that is preached and taught by them. But there is great Idol worship, worship of dead saints, priest, the cross, and bread and wine, doing such things are an abomination to Yahweh. Also catholics teach those who are to be ministers are not to marry, are we not all ministers? 1 Tim 4:1 "Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils;
2 Speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their conscience seared with a hot iron;
3 FORBIDING TO MARRY, and commanding to abstain from meats, which God hath created to be received with thanks giving of them which believe and know the truth." This also alludes to the only ones to live holy are the priests. They call a man their father, did not Jesus say call only your father in heaven father. Did not Jesus say their is only one mediator between man and God that man is Christ Jesus, Yet the priest, pope and every other saint almost is put as a mediator to God?

Did not Christ say do not pray like the heathens do, do not pray repetitious prays, but he said your father knows what you need before you even pray. Yet Catholics are taught to pray this way.

We must treat things as they are, sin as sin, false as false, we must stand for the truth unwaivingly. We must warn, rebuke, and exhort in love.

Paul did he not warn about taking names of other people. I believe we should keep away from calling ourselves after me n, im of Paul or Appollos or Im of Luther, or you get the point.

But if you call yourself something do you not repressent what it is you call yourself. So If you call yourself a catholic, you represent all that catholicism is do you not?

Many say doctrine is not important anymore, many say unity and peace is more important than doctrine, I say without doctrine stood upon and revered there cannot be true unity and peace but only a superficial peace and unity. Lets see what the bible says: These are all scriptures talking about Jesus Christ's Doctrine:

Mt 7:28, Mt 16:12,Mt 22:33,Mr 1:22,Mr 1:27,Mr 4:2 ,Mr 11:18,Mr 12:38,Lu 4:32,Joh 7:16,Joh 7:17 ,Joh 18:19 , REV 2:14 ,15,24.

Ac 2:42 "And they continued stedfastly in the apostles' DOCTRINE and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers."

Ac 13:12,Ac 17:19 , Ro 6:17 "But God be thanked, that ye were the servants of sin, but ye have obeyed from the heart that form of DOCTRINE which was DELIVERED you."

1Ti 1:3 "As I besought thee to abide still at Ephesus, when I went into Macedonia, that thou mightest charge some that they teach NO OTHER DOCTRINE,"

1Ti 1:10 "For whoremongers, for them that defile themselves with mankind, for menstealers, for liars, for perjured persons, and if there be any other thing that is contrary to SOUND DOCTRINE;"

1Ti 4:16 "TAKE HEED unto thyself, AND UNTO THE DOCTRINE; continue in them: for in doing this thou shalt both SAVE THYSELF, AND THEM THAT HEAR THEE."

1 Tim 6:3 " 3 IF ANY MAN TEACH OTHERWISE, and consent not to wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the DOCTRINE which is according to godliness;

4 He is proud, knowing nothing, but doting about questions and strifes of words, whereof cometh envy, strife, railings, evil surmisings,"

General Topics :: Are all Catholics going to hell?

2Jo 1:9 "Whosoever transgresseth, and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God. He that abideth in the DOCTRINE of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son",

2Jo 1:10 "If there come any unto you, and BRING NOT THIS DOCTRINE, RECIEVE HIM NOT into your house, neither bid him God speed:"

Scripture shows the great importance of doctrine, abiding in it, heeding it, teach it and no other, do not associate with those of different doctrine, continue and hold fast to it.

Galatians 1:7 " 7 Which is not another ; but there be some that trouble you , and would pervert the gospel of Christ.
8 But though we , or an angel from heaven , preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you , let him be accursed .
9 As we said before , so say I now again , If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received , let him be accursed."

Catholic is a name of a sect, or group of people that have a set of particular beliefs. Yes there may be many who profess to be a Catholic, but do not adhere to the catholic beliefs and doctrines, that may be a born again christian, but such a person only could be if he or she did not believe in catholic doctrine. For the catholic doctrine is contrary to that of the doctrine of christ. I love all people, but we must expose things for what they are, we can not compromise with sin. We cannot treat it lightly, we must expose it for what it is.

I recommend to book John Foxes book of martyrs, this book will reveal catholicism, at its roots, and will show who were true followers of christ during that time.

Study the Catholic church, all its roots, I have some good references to Books i will email any who would like that email me, adonaisarmy@netscape.net
Much of Catholicism is rooted in Paganism, and great compromise.

I just watched a meeting that the pope had i think it was year 2002? not sure anyway, he met with almost every other religious belief leader, except evangelical christian, and they all meet to have so called "peace" "unity" Believing That all the gods, all go up to one God!

Im sure great persecution is coming.
Beware, As the words of our Lord said, you will be hated by all for MY NAMES SAKE!
There is only one way, and that is through Jesus Christ the Son of God the Father.

I was raised in the catholic faith, went to catholic school, was an altar boy, it is very deceptive, seems so innocent.

Do you know the Catholic, church attempted to change the day of the sabbath? to the 7th day of the week to the 1st. Why, because the first day of the week was named Sun-day, Constantine, worship the sun. Do you know that Constantine, threatened to kill all those who would adhere to the sabbath and Gods holy days! He had quite a bit of antisemitism, and idol worship. This is the roots of Catholicism, Gods Sabbath day can never be changed, nor his feast and festivals. Yet many have been taught nothing of them, or told they are null and void, or are only for the jews, or done away with. And we have adapted a pagan calendar, and pagan celebrations, and attempted to put them with our God Yahweh. Christmas, Easter, the names of our months and days, are all pagan in origin and present. Our Lord has given us as a warning to us, all the history and instruction of our fore fathers(old testament) to heed, and instruct us.

The Lord is waking up His church, His bride, who is to be Set apart, white, and pure. A priesthood, willing to forsake all for Him, and stand for him no matter what. He is purging the threshing floor. Seek the Truth.

General Topics :: Are all Catholics going to hell?

Re: Are all Catholics going to hell? - posted by Baldy1957MAP (), on: 2005/1/2 6:10

Dear Phebebird-

I was born and raised a catholic, but left the church many years ago, due to questions I had regarding saints and statues , etc., among many other things. (I had no formal training regarding being "saved" at that time, but felt very strongly that at least those things were against what I had read to that point in the Bible at Vacation Bible School that a Protestant friend had been kind enough to invite me to. That's the best of my recollection regarding the beginnings of my reservations about the church.)

I finally was saved 5 years ago, and since then have done much reading in the Word, as well as having read lots on catholic doctrine, which I won't go into for its' already having been discussed here. I will say here that I fear for the salvation of my mom and siblings, none of which know the Lord and are all convinced that I'm in a cult!! Although I was not a "good" catholic, I still suffer from much of the teachings which are deeply ingrained i.e.: salvation by works, etc. I feel very strongly, as do others who've posted, that although we have to speak the Truth in love, we DO have to speak the Truth. I personally feel in my heart that it is impossible to be "saved" and remain in the catholic church. I feel that it's a contradiction, as Christ told us that we can't serve two Masters. I don't believe that it's possible to change it from within, but should strive to bring our catholic family and friends to know Christ from without.

Regarding the pope or catholic church as the antichrist, you may find it interesting to read "The Two Babylons" by Alexander Hysop(?). Although you may regard that reading as a "rant", (which you seem hesitant to embrace and which I admire for your desire to be non-judgemental), I found it to be very enlightening to say the least. We have to balance our sincere desire to save others with good judgement in how to witness effectively. I can tell you from experience that my zeal (and anti-catholic sentiment) when I was saved was readily apparent to my loved ones, because I didn't temper it with a mild demeanor. I've since come to realize that that's exactly why they see me as they do. Although they admit that they don't feel I'm unbalanced, they will not be shown as of yet what I refer to as being "saved." (This burdens me because I feel that time is getting VERY short.)

Continue to love them, but try as the Spirit moves you to show them the love of Christ and how only He can save them. We all agree that not everyone in any denomination will be saved. We have to show Jesus in our walk, not just in our talk. But we can't afford to water down the Word, either, because we're doing a disservice to the lost if we do.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/1/2 9:10

Mike and Keith

Thanks for the update on the Catholic anemthemas. I've not studied Catholicism for many years now, and what I wrote were off facts lurking in the corners of my mind!

Do you know how they cope with the concept of the Church. Do they still mean by that title the Roman Catholic institution? What do they do with Augustine's concepts that there is no salvation without baptism and that baptism secures entrance into the Church? What will they have done with Papal Bulls against Lutheransim?

BTW I think the reformers generally distinguished between the Pope as the current holder of that position and the Pope as the continuing head of a system. In that sense they branded the Papacy as anti-Christ, rather than a particular holder of the office.

Re: - posted by crsschk (), on: 2005/1/2 11:16

adonaisarmy:

Quote:
-----But if you call yourself something do you not represent what it is you call yourself. So if you call yourself a catholic, you represent all that catholicism is do you not?

Depends, if you know what the establishment holds to as opposed to what is being feed to the congregation.

Have very little recall of what was learned in those years of going to church Sunday after Sunday. Catechism classes. By that I mean by means of doctrine. But I did learn from just general exposure good morals at home, discipline, how much my mom hated lying and stealing and the sting of a spanking, outmoded concepts in our day.

I learned much more from my fathers conduct than the words he uttered and more so later as I grew up and reflect back. Patience. My dad sacrificed much for us, worked hard all his life and never asked for anything in return. We held to much of the Church traditions of lent and advent prior to Christmas, which was always very special in our home (previously

General Topics :: Are all Catholics going to hell?

mentioned in another thread).

Something that has stayed with me even in recent times was how my Dad never forced us to go along with some of the other 'special days' for lack of a better word. Can't recall what they were for, but mid week services and the odd days my father always attended alone. That left an impression on me, not for whatever they were about, but that he felt they were important enough to him while not begrudgingly or forcing us to attend. Looking back I wish I had gone with him for no other reason than he's my Dad.

Only point these things out because for many and sadly what is followed and what is adhered to is not always known. It's rather easy to get caught up in things whether it be Word of Faith teaching or the absurdity of say transubstantiation unaware.

And usually it's the voices against that can bring a shocking revelation as it was in my case.

As was mentioned prior, it often does depend on how you go about it.

So, yes indeed I believe doctrine is of utmost importance and in no way would defend anything that contradicts God's word. But I also think that the finger needs to be pointed in the right direction. The 'teachers', 'priests', 'prophets', whatever title they like to go by, those who are leading the sheep astray and usually they are the ones that get most of our venom around here, for what they teach.

To reiterate something alongside these earlier comments. After living a prodigal lifestyle for many years and tired of running from the Hound of Heaven... When God by His grace arrested my attention and I cried out in repentance in the disgusting pit I had made of my life... When I was relating back to my mom how all the incredible leadings brought me back to the Lord, certain people over the years who had witnessed to me, Christians that convicted me even without words, all the strange and various ways the Lord used to draw me to Himself... The one thing that to this day still humbles me to no end was my mom's response;

"You know, don't forget, you have a mother who has been praying for you."

She could care less if I came back to the "Catholic" church, just that I came back to God.

Re: - posted by Agent001 (), on: 2005/1/4 11:00

Roman Catholicism is difficult to evaluate because:

1. Its official position on many doctrines were substantially re-worked at Vatican II Council. In many ways, its traditional doctrinal formulations had been *moderated*.
2. Many members of the Roman Catholic Church do not adhere to its professed teachings. There are the traditional ones who reject Vatican II. There are charismatic Catholics and evangelical Catholics. There are also those apart from professing to be Catholic, knows nothing about God and faith; they are mere church-goers.

I am not so much concerned about the **label**. What matters is whether a person has a personal relationship with Christ.

On another note, I observe that in Canada, some of the Roman Catholic Churches simply use the abbreviated sign **RC**, e.g. St. Jerome RC Church. I wonder if there is some theological justification or ecumenical motivation behind this.

Re: Are all Catholics going to hell? - posted by couch (), on: 2005/1/4 12:44

Just a side note for this discussion...

An excellent sermon on Catholicism is:

We Must Tell Catholics the Truth by Mike Gendron

It is the most precise, easy-to understand but thoroughly informational and practical explanation of how the Bible differs from Catholic doctrine.

Although I wouldn't agree with Mike on all points of doctrine, he has a true heart for the Lord and, being a former catholic priest, has an incredible heart and mind to reach Catholics with the true gospel of Christ.

<http://www.myfaith.com/Proclaiming-T-G-M-AUDIOS.htm>

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/1/4 13:21

Hi Sam

Does the Roman Catholic church still hold to the Athanasian Creed? with its opening lines...

WHOEVER wishes to be saved must, above all, keep the Catholic faith.

For unless a person keeps this faith whole and entire, he will undoubtedly be lost forever.

And its closing clauses...

This is the catholic faith. Everyone must believe it, firmly and steadfastly; otherwise He cannot be saved. Amen.

It is a glorious statement of the mystery of the Godhead, but does the Catholic church still claim that we must believe every clause in order to be saved?

BTW this page of creeds is a fascinating read!

Re: - posted by KeithLaMothe, on: 2005/1/4 17:17

Re: the Athanasian Creed; the word "catholic" simply meant "universal" (as in the Apostle's Creed) before it meant "Roman Catholic", and I suspect that RCs who want to be inclusive interpret it the first way and RCs who want to be exclusive interpret it the second.

Or was the word "Catholic" already set in its meaning by that time? 4th century, right?

There's a pamphlet called "Scriptural Truth for Roman Catholics" (http://la.znet.com/~bart/s_truths.htm) that, among other things, lists of some of the developments of RC doctrine, I thought some of you might find it interesting, and perhaps some would know whether it is accurate:

1. 2nd c. Presbyters first called priests by Lucian
2. 3rd c. Sacerdotal mass instituted by Cyprian
3. A.D. 300 Prayers for the dead
4. A.D. 300 Making the sign of the cross
5. A.D. 320 Wax candles
6. A.D. 375 Veneration of angels, dead saints, and images
7. A.D. 394 Mass became a daily ritual
8. A.D. 431 Beginning of exaltation of Mary, term "Mother of God" first applied to her by Council of Ephesus

9. A.D. 500 Priests began to wear special clothing
10. A.D. 526 Extreme Unction (Rite of Healing)
11. A.D. 593 The doctrine of Purgatory by Gregory I
12. A.D. 600 Latin used in worship
13. A.D. 600 Prayers offered to Mary, dead saints and angels
14. A.D. 610 First man to be proclaimed Pope (Boniface III)
15. A.D. 709 Kissing the Pope's feet
16. A.D. 750 Temporal power of Popes, conferred by Pepin, King of the Franks
17. A.D. 786 Veneration of cross, images, relics authorized
18. A.D. 850 holy water, mixed with pinch of salt, chrism, and blessed by a priest
19. A.D. 890 Veneration of St. Joseph
20. A.D. 927 College of Cardinals begun
21. A.D. 965 Baptism of bells instituted by Pope John XIII
22. A.D. 995 Canonization of dead saints by Pope John XV
23. A.D. 998 Fasting on Fridays and Lent

General Topics :: Are all Catholics going to hell?

24. 11th c. The Mass developed gradually as a sacrifice, attendance made obligatory
25. A.D. 1079 Celibacy of priests declared
26. A.D. 1090 Rosary adopted (pagan) by Peter the Hermit
27. A.D. 1184 The Inquisition instituted by Council of Verona
28. A.D. 1190 Sale of indulgences
29. 12th c. Seven Sacraments, defined by Peter Lombard
30. A.D. 1215 Transubstantiation, defined by Innocent III
31. A.D. 1215 Auricular confession (Rite of reconciliation) of sins to a priest instead of God, instituted by Innocent III

32. A.D. 1220 Adoration of the wafer (called the Host), decreed by Pope Honorius III
33. A.D. 1251 Scapular invented by Simon Stock of England
34. A.D. 1414 The cup forbidden to the laity at communion by Council of Constance
35. A.D. 1439 Purgatory proclaimed as a dogma by the Council of Florence in
36. A.D. 1545 Tradition declared of equal authority with the Bible by the Council of Trent
37. A.D. 1546 Apocryphal books are added to the Bible by the Council of Trent
38. A.D. 1560 Creed of Pope Pius IV imposed as the official creed in place of the original Apostolic Creed

39. A.D. 1854 Immaculate Conception of Mary (not virgin birth) proclaimed by Pope Pius IX

40. A.D. 1864 Syllabus of Errors proclaimed by Pope Pius IX and ratified by the Vatican Council; condemned freedom of religion, conscience, speech, press and scientific discoveries which are disapproved by the Roman Church; asserted the Pope's temporal authority over all civil rulers
41. A.D. 1870 Infallibility of the Pope in matters of faith and morals proclaimed by the Vatican Council
42. A.D. 1950 Assumption of Mary proclaimed by Pius XII
43. A.D. 1965 Mary proclaimed the "Mother of the Church" by Pope Paul VI

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/1/5 3:37

Hi Keith

Quote:
-----Re: the Athanasian Creed; the word "catholic" simply meant "universal" (as in the Apostle's Creed) before it meant "Roman Catholic", and I suspect that RCs who want to be inclusive interpret it the first way and RCs who want to be exclusive interpret it the second.

I'm not sure that this is true. If you read the article I hyperlinked in the last post you will see that the Athanasian Creed may be several hundred years younger than it is claimed, and was apparently unknown in the Eastern Church for some centuries.

Re: - posted by KeithLaMothe, on: 2005/1/5 4:56

I had not checked the link, but I just did. Interesting that it's in doubt whether Athanasius was even alive when it was written.

Any ideas on the history of the term "catholic" during the possible eras in which the creed could have been written?

If it did definitely mean "Roman Catholic", I suppose the damnatory clauses could be interpreted as condemning only those who deny anything affirmed in that particular creed.

As for the content of the creed, I was a bit surprised at some of the wording, considering that some Reformed churches subscribe to it. The words, if spoken today, would be considered more than a little sketchy on "Justification by Faith" (I'm thinking the second to last passage in the creed), but I do see how it fits just fine with that and that the author(s) simply had other doctrinal concerns to worry about at the time.

General Topics :: Are all Catholics going to hell?

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/1/5 5:21

'catholic' is a legitimate adjective and still used in the kind of sentence that says 'his taste in music is catholic'. It simple means 'universal' hence the name of the leading RC newspaper.

Evangelical anglicans were very conscious that they were part of the 'universal' or 'catholic' church, although occasionally their proofs were peculiar; apostolic succession, by the unbroken chain of laying on of hands from Peter through to the present day, is part of this.

Modern catholic ecumenic comments often refer to 'justification by faith in baptism'!! My reading of the last Vatican councils indicate that as they hold to baptismal regeneration this is really the entry point of Christians into the 'catholic church'. Consequently all who have received trinitarian baptism are part of the 'catholic church'.

Quote:
-----Keith writes: If it did definately mean "Roman Catholic", I suppose the damnatory clauses could be interpreted as condemning only those who deny anything affirmed in that particular creed.

The phrase 'catholic church' is definitely in earlier creeds (the Apostles' *(I believe in the Holy Spirit, the holy catholic church,)* and Nicene (*We believe in one holy catholic and apostolic Church.*), but the Roman Catholic church has taken the high ground of saying the 'Roman' Catholic church is the true inheritor of the 'catholic' church and has taken over that role and title. (a little like Judah taking over the promises to Israel) Even in their conciliatory ecumenical mode they refer to the 'other churches' as separated. They always start from the assumption that reunification means 'coming home to Rome'.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/1/5 5:49

I don't know if anyone has mentioned Evangelicals & Catholics Together: This group are seeking to mend the bridges, if they can be mended. But even in their attempts they acknowledge fundamental problems in understanding.

Among points of difference in doctrine, worship, practice, and piety that are frequently thought to divide us are these:

The church as an integral part of the Gospel or the church as a communal consequence of the Gospel.

The church as visible communion or invisible fellowship of true believers.

The sole authority of Scripture (sola scriptura) or Scripture as authoritatively interpreted in the church.

The "soul freedom" of the individual Christian or the Magisterium (teaching authority) of the community.

The church as local congregation or universal communion.

Ministry ordered in apostolic succession or the priesthood of all believers.

Sacraments and ordinances as symbols of grace or means of grace.

The Lord's Supper as eucharistic sacrifice or memorial meal.

Remembrance of Mary and the saints or devotion to Mary and the saints.

Baptism as sacrament of regeneration or testimony to regeneration.

This account of differences is by no means complete. Nor is the disparity between positions always so sharp as to warrant the "or" in the above formulations. Moreover, among those recognized as Evangelical Protestants there are significant differences between, for example, Baptists, Pentecostals, and Calvinists on these questions.

Many are acutely uncomfortable at this move which includes Chuck Colson, Bill Bright, and Jim Packer.

Re: Evangelicals & Catholics Together - posted by eagleswings (), on: 2005/1/5 6:51

“Many are acutely uncomfortable at this move ...”

To say the least :-)

See:

The Alignment of New Evangelicals with Apostasy

by Richard M. Bennett at: http://bereanbeacon.org/articles/alignment_evang_apostasy.htm

The Invincible Gospel, and the modern evangelical lie

by: Richard M. Bennett at: http://bereanbeacon.org/articles/invincible_gospel.htm

"THE GIFT OF SALVATION": (ECT 11) - The Lie Documented
by Richard Bennett at: http://bereanbeacon.org/articles/gift_of_salvation.htm

Re: - posted by KeithLaMothe, on: 2005/1/5 7:17

Quote:

-----They always start from the assumption that reunification means 'coming home to Rome'.

So long as they start there, they need not even ask.

Re: E&C Together; I'm certainly uncomfortable about the idea, as the Catholics being dealt with (presumably) *are* versed in and generally in agreement with the teachings of their church.

The pressures toward unity are great, and Rome has undergone an almost unbelievable transformation from a mail-fisted tyrant for whom "tolerance" perhaps meant merely torturing heretics instead of burning them to the center of an immense ecumenical and inter-faith movement that could well result in something resembling the fulfilment of those prophecies interpreted as foretelling a worldwide false "official" religion.

I think there's always been a tendency in Evangelicalism, perhaps due to the very fact that they are (usually) self-consciously *not* "fundamentalists", towards a phenomenon describable by the term "Evanjellyfish"; the point being that we (for I do, for now, call myself an Evangelical) can be swayed fairly easily by irenic, inviting, rational, and persistent dialogue. And some have been and are being swayed into things that have no business in the camp.

I believe I recognize the complexities of the issue, and how some on the "other side" are in Christ as well, but it is very difficult for me to see how we could regard the Church of Rome (as an institution) as anything other than one of our most bitter enemies.

Re: - posted by crsschk (), on: 2005/1/5 10:23

Keith, Ron,

Great discussion here.

Had listened to one of the messages Eagleswings listed here awhile back. It may seem unduly harsh if my recollection is correct, but largely think his fears are not unfounded, (Sorry, believe it was the Bennet message).

Think you are right Keith. What little I have read of all this seems to be loaded down with jargon and the path on it's way to compromise. Wouldn't expect any ground shaking renunciations from either side, likely it will be like most error, subtle, complex, much reading between the lines...muddy.

Quote:

-----the point being that we (for I do, for now, call myself an Evangelical) can be swayed fairly easily by irenic, inviting, rational, and persistent dialogue. And some have been and are being swayed into things that have no business in the camp.

Seems that the whole thing in reality is built upon the wrong premise, even though it goes unsaid, that under the guise of 'unity' the battle is more concerned with winning 'converts' to the other side of particular thinking. Not with lets scrap ever

General Topics :: Are all Catholics going to hell?

anything and start from scratch, 'what saith the Lord?'

Seems to me the only possible way this would ever work would be to come like children, with much humility and submission, more prayer than dialogue, much willingness to let go of presumptions, 'traditions' (they are not all wrong) would have to be set aside ...

Just mere speculation and opinion, but as I pondered this I am hopeful that just maybe all the rhetoric, all the denominational warring factions as a whole, not just these two parties is really working for the greater good in this sense;

That as I have often begun to see it here, the next generation is rightly fed up with denominational camps and constructs in that labels are for others to apply not necessarily to align yourself with... "*And the disciples were called Christians first in Antioch.*" I know even that is in dispute itself and wouldn't want to take this too far, nor am I talking about starting the same opposite error of constructing something 'new'. But as it seems here, we are blessed to be able to take and glean much truth from all these predecessors and to my way of thinking it leads in the opposite direction, back, further and further to the core issues of the faith. Back to where it left off, after the last jot and tittle was written, up to that point...

Train of thought is derailing here. Think that the opposite danger is in the humanistic utopianism ideal of one 'religion' which seems to be gathering more and more steam and that this whole topic here and as bro. Keith alluded to:

Quote:
-----that could well result in something resembling the fulfilment of those prophecies interpreted as foretelling a worldwide false "official" religion.

That a time is coming when the divisions may become so narrowed that either you are a follower and willing to lay down your life servant of Jesus Christ or you have swallowed the world's lie and their 'church'.

Re: - posted by KeithLaMothe, on: 2005/1/5 16:52

Quote:
-----That a time is coming when the divisions may become so narrowed that either you are a follower and willing to lay down your life servant of Jesus Christ or you have swallowed the world's lie and their 'church'.

That would be consistent with the trend among secularists and liberals to be extremely intolerant of diversity. Many of their complaints boil down to a problem with the recognition of difference: treating men and women as being different is a serious no-no, regarding homosexuality as much different (specifically, inferior in various ways) from heterosexuality is slowly being made a jailable crime, and then there's the idea that God (should He actually exist) must be pleased with all of us exactly equally, and that obviously the religions aren't really all that different, and anyone who thinks they are must be some kind of dangerous sectarian. In a way, it is becoming forbidden and illegal to say (or even think) that one person is different from another; even in the eyes of God. For the number of agnostics/atheists among them, they've got a remarkably good grasp on Unitarianism.

edit: and I agree that the Bennett articles are a bit over-harsh, though I don't disagree with his alarm at the situation. Still, treating J.I. Packer in that way is bordering on the reprehensible.

Re: - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2005/1/7 16:45

I was raised catholic and baptized as such and received communion. Through it all however I felt an emptiness, kinda like just going through the motions mindlessly from the sit-stand-kneel-sit of the mass to the prayers I memorized and said. I have some idea now why this was so. After prayers asking God questions and being shown revelations I see that the Catholic Church is based on a myriad of lies and blasphemies which have ensnared many people. It is somehow difficult to comprehend or reconcile in the flesh but in the spirit it is crystal clear. The enemy's main weapon is deception. Any good deception is one which is not very far from the truth or put such that it seems like another explanation of the truth. Hebrews says that the bible is sharper than any 2-edged sword which divides joints and marrow, sould from spirit and even judges the thoughts and desires of men. The bible separates into those who are truly after God by revealing truth to us, or those who are after futhering themselves (who are delivered into their own delusions) Clearly this has happened. For those who truly seek God they shall find Him and He shall give them grace sufficient for them to endure what is to come. But WOE unto those who spread lies and teach blasphemies as truth for God's judgement shall surely fall on them.

General Topics :: Are all Catholics going to hell?

Re: - posted by Jbat001, on: 2005/4/5 16:06

Just a curious enquiry from a Catholic reader browsing your site. How would you (for example) interpret this:

James 2:20-22

"20 But wilt thou know, O vain man, that faith without works is dead? 21 Was not Abraham our father justified by works, when he had offered Isaac his son upon the altar? 22 Seest thou how faith wrought with his works, and by works was faith made perfect?"

Faith is the light that burns inside us, but without that light showing to the world, it is effectively dead. This makes perfect sense from a Christian AND a secular humanistic viewpoint. I don't believe that works will buy me into heaven, but I know (from scripture) that without the fruits of my faith showing, it is as if it were not even there, as the passage illustrates.

Re: - posted by PreachParsly (), on: 2005/4/5 17:10

Quote:

-----Faith is the light that burns inside us, but without that light showing to the world, it is effectively dead. This makes perfect sense from a Christian AND a secular humanistic viewpoint. I don't believe that works will buy me into heaven, but I know (from scripture) that without the fruits of my faith showing, it is as if it were not even there, as the passage illustrates.

I agree. I've put in bold what I think the key is. Faith always produces action. If there is no action there is no faith. If I were to say "do 10 push-ups and I will give you \$1000" you (I would for sure.. and give it to missions ;-)) would do the push-ups, if you thought I was serious. Or in other words if you had FAITH in what I was saying was true you would have an action. But if you didn't have faith in what I was saying you would just laugh and go on. Faith produces action. What we have to ask ourselves is do we take His Word serious? If we do there will be works. (that analogy is a spin off of one I heard from Ray Comfort)

Hey, Welcome to Sermon Index. Listening to the recommended sermons on the first page will definitely motivate you to take God's Word serious.

Re: Works vs Obedience, on: 2005/4/5 22:48

Dear Jbat001

There is a clear indication that James was not referring to Works as in his salvation, this is not the object of his argument, because God is not the author of confusion, He wouldn't inspire one writer to say, "For you are saved by grace through faith and it is not of yourself lest any man should boast" and then say to another writer, "Faith without works is dead". This is a clear indication that God is not referring to works with salvation.

Many have stumbled over this passage in James, and yet it is very simple to understand, that James is saying that "Faith without obedience is dead". You can have all the faith you have it won't do you nothing unless you use it.

As Paul said that "Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels and have not charity I become like tinkling brass".

It is a foolish thing to just take one scripture and plant our feet there without incorporating the whole.

With this faith that we have, coupled with the holy Spirit which has given us power, love and a sound mind. We take this faith and combine it with love and you have obedience. So that if you see a man hungering, you will have compassion on him and feed him, otherwise if you had no compassion your faith will only feed yourself and you will hoard everything that you have accumulated by the faith that you have, thus your faith is in vain.

This is why the Word of Faith or the prosperity gospel is so sickening, it's because it's selfish and has selfish motives.

I hope this helps you understand what Saint James was trying to convey.

Karl ;-)

General Topics :: Are all Catholics going to hell?

Re: - posted by jsb515, on: 2005/4/6 8:42

Quote:

don't express to them doubts about their salvation (I would if I had good reason, but I'd do that for Baptists, Presbyterians, Lutherans, etc. as well).

want to explain this a little more...

Re: - posted by deltadom (), on: 2005/4/6 9:15

Not bornagain ones

Re:, on: 2005/4/6 10:02

Being a baptist doesnt get you into heaven. Being a Catholic doesnt send you to hell.

Having said that... if a person is trusting in the Catholic Church for their salvation, then they are not saved. To be a true Catholic, you must believe and submit to the teachings of the Catholic Church, which teaches that you are saved thru the Catholic Church.

This is unscriptural.

Can a Catholic be saved? Certainly. They have a bible, albeit a corrupt one, but I can take the Jerusalem Bible and lead someone to the Lord with it. Once they come to a saving knowledge of Jesus Christ... they are saved. However, at that point, God will begin to call them out of the Catholic Church and be holy unto Him. I do not believe a Catholic can be truly saved and remain in the RCC. We can not be unequally yoked together with darkness... and that would be exactly what that is. You can not submit to the teachings of the Bible, and submit to the teachings of the RCC at the same time. A simple examination of the Counsel of Trent, and Vatican II will bear that out to anyone who wants to take the time. No man can serve two masters.

If a Catholic says they are not trusting in the RCC for their salvation, then they do not understand the teachings of the RCC and are at odds the RCC.

And dont think for a minute that a saved Catholic can stay in their parish with the intended goal of "making a difference". We're not called to do that when it comes to issues of doctrine and religion. We are called to mark and avoid false teachers. Emphasis on **avoid**. We are commanded to do that for our own spiritual safety. Just like we are not called to jo in a JW church or a Mormon church in order to have a positive influence on them. We are to stay away from false religions. Seduction will happen if we disregard scripture on this point. It's ok to be selfish when it comes to our own spirituality.

Krispy

Re: - posted by Jbat001, on: 2005/4/6 14:48

Agreed - mostly.

Quote:

KrispyKrittr wrote:

Having said that... if a person is trusting in the Catholic Church for their salvation, then they are not saved. To be a true Catholic, you must believe and submit to the teachings of the Catholic Church, which teaches that you are saved thru the Catholic Church.

The key thing is to understand the meaning of the word Catholic - 'universal'. The Catholic Church does not teach that if you're not a baptised card-carrying RC that you cannot enter heaven. It teaches that if you are not a member of the 'church invisible' (catholic/universal) you will not enter heaven, and this is fair enough. It prevents proud man from ruling any

General Topics :: Are all Catholics going to hell?

particular group or person out. Personally, if Adolf Hitler welcomed me in to heaven, it would say much more about the mercy of God than the sins of Hitler.

And this is the key. Ultimately, God sees and knows all, and will judge us by our hearts, not the badges we wear. It is acceptance of the wonderful marvel of Jesus death and resurrection that we are saved, but God can still save whoever he likes with absolute discretion, because he is right by default. Like Job, you can't argue with God over what you think is right or wrong, you just have to accept His judgement, which I am happy to do.

I personally believe in the direct authority of the Petrine succession, but I have not one whit less love and respect for my brothers who question this, and I am made richer by their questioning my faith.....

Thankyou all, for your kind welcome too!

Re:, on: 2005/4/6 17:06

Quote:
-----The key thing is to understand the meaning of the word Catholic - 'universal'. The Catholic Church does not teach that if you're not a baptised card-carrying RC that you cannot enter heaven. It teaches that if you are not a member of the 'church invisible' (catholic/universal) you will not enter heaven, and this is fair enough. It prevents proud man from ruling any particular group or person out. Personally, if Adolf Hitler welcomed me in to heaven, it would say much more about the mercy of God than the sins of Hitler.

And this is the key. Ultimately, God sees and knows all, and will judge us by our hearts, not the badges we wear. It is acceptance of the wonderful marvel of Jesus death and resurrection that we are saved, but God can still save whoever he likes with absolute discretion, because he is right by default. Like Job, you can't argue with God over what you think is right or wrong, you just have to accept His judgement, which I am happy to do.

I personally believe in the direct authority of the Petrine succession, but I have not one whit less love and respect for my brothers who question this, and I am made richer by their questioning my faith.....

Thankyou all, for your kind welcome too!

By the way... welcome to the site... prepare to be challenged! (But dont take it personally!)

What I've quoted from your post doesnt seem to jive with the anathemas of the Counsel of Trent. Care to address that?

Krispy

Re: Are all Catholics going to hell? - posted by CJaKfOrEsT (), on: 2005/4/6 18:47

There are probably as many prodestants who are going to hell as catholics. If not more.

Re: - posted by Jbat001, on: 2005/4/10 12:31

Which anathemas are you referring to?

Re:, on: 2005/4/11 8:12

Quote:
-----Which anathemas are you referring to?

These...

FOURTH SESSION: DECREE CONCERNING THE CANONICAL SCRIPTURES: "If anyone does not accept as sacred and canonical the aforesaid books in their entirety and with all their parts , as they have been accustomed to be read in the Catholic Church and as they are contained in the old Latin Vulgate Edition, and knowingly and deliberately rejects the aforesaid traditions, LET HIM BE ANATHEMA."

General Topics :: Are all Catholics going to hell?

SIXTH SESSION, CANONS CONCERNING JUSTIFICATION: "If anyone says that justifying faith is nothing else than confidence in divine mercy, which remits sins for Christ's sake, or that it is this confidence alone that justifies us, LET HIM BE ANATHEMA" (Canons Concerning Justification, Canon 12).

SIXTH SESSION, CANONS CONCERNING JUSTIFICATION: "If anyone says that the justice received is not preserved and also not increased before God through good works, but that those works are merely the fruits and signs of justification obtained, but not the cause of its increase, LET HIM BE ANATHEMA" (Canons Concerning Justification, Canon 24).

SIXTH SESSION, CANONS CONCERNING JUSTIFICATION: "If anyone says that the Catholic doctrine of justification as set forth by the holy council in the present decree, derogates in some respect from the glory of God or the merits of our Lord Jesus Christ, and does not rather illustrate the truth of our faith and no less the glory of God and of Christ Jesus, LET HIM BE ANATHEMA" (Canons Concerning Justification, Canon 33).

SEVENTH SESSION, CANONS ON BAPTISM: "If anyone says that in the Roman Church, which is the mother and mistress of all churches, there is not the true doctrine concerning the sacrament of baptism, LET HIM BE ANATHEMA" (Canons on Baptism, Canon 3).

SEVENTH SESSION, CANONS ON BAPTISM: "If anyone says that baptism is optional, that is, not necessary for salvation, LET HIM BE ANATHEMA" (Canons on Baptism, Canon 5).

SEVENTH SESSION, CANONS ON BAPTISM: "If anyone says that children, because they have not the act of believing, are not after having received baptism to be numbered among the faithful, and that for this reason are to be rebaptized when they have reached the years of discretion; or that it is better that the baptism of such be omitted than that, while not believing by their own act, they should be baptized in the faith of the Church alone, LET HIM BE ANATHEMA" (Canons on Baptism, Canon 13).

SEVENTH SESSION, CANONS ON CONFIRMATION: "If anyone says that the confirmation of those baptized is an empty ceremony and not a true and proper sacrament; or that of old it was nothing more than a sort of instruction, whereby those approaching adolescence gave an account of their faith to the Church, LET HIM BE ANATHEMA" (Canons on Confirmation, Canon 1).

THIRTEENTH SESSION, CANONS ON THE MOST HOLY SACRAMENT OF THE EUCHARIST: "If anyone denies that in the sacrament of the most Holy Eucharist are contained truly, really and substantially the body and blood together with the soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and consequently the whole Christ, but says that He is in it only as in a sign, or figure or force, LET HIM BE ANATHEMA" (Canons on the Most Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist, Canon 1).

THIRTEENTH SESSION, CANONS ON THE MOST HOLY SACRAMENT OF THE EUCHARIST: "If anyone says that Christ received in the Eucharist is received spiritually only and not also sacramentally and really, LET HIM BE ANATHEMA" (Canons on the Most Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist, Canon 8).

FOURTEENTH SESSION, CANONS CONCERNING THE MOST HOLY SACRAMENT OF PENANCE: "If anyone says that in the Catholic Church penance is not truly and properly a sacrament instituted by Christ the Lord for reconciling the faithful of God as often as they fall into sin after baptism, LET HIM BE ANATHEMA" (Canons Concerning the Most Holy Sacrament of Penance, Canon 1).

FOURTEENTH SESSION, CANONS CONCERNING THE MOST HOLY SACRAMENT OF PENANCE: "If anyone denies that sacramental confession was instituted by divine law or is necessary to salvation; or says that the manner of confessing secretly to a priest alone, which the Catholic Church has always observed from the beginning and still observes, is at variance with the institution and command of Christ and is a human contrivance, LET HIM BE ANATHEMA" (Canons Concerning the Most Holy Sacrament of Penance, Canon 7).

FOURTEENTH SESSION, CANONS CONCERNING THE MOST HOLY SACRAMENT OF PENANCE: "If anyone says that the confession of all sins as it is observed in the Church is impossible and is a human tradition to be abolished by pious people; or that each and all of the faithful of Christ or either sex are not bound thereto once a year in accordance with the constitution of the great Lateran Council, and that for this reason the faithful of Christ are to be persuaded not to confess during Lent, LET HIM BE ANATHEMA" (Canons Concerning the Most Holy Sacrament of Penance, Canon 8).

FOURTEENTH SESSION, CANONS CONCERNING THE MOST HOLY SACRAMENT OF PENANCE: "If anyone says t

General Topics :: Are all Catholics going to hell?

hat God always pardons the whole penalty together with the guilt and that the satisfaction of penitents is nothing else than the faith by which they perceive that Christ has satisfied for them, LET HIM BE ANATHEMA" (Canons Concerning the Most Holy Sacrament of Penance, Canon 8).

TWENTY-SECOND SESSION, CANONS ON THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS: "If anyone says that in the mass a true and real sacrifice is not offered to God; or that to be offered is nothing else than that Christ is given to us to eat, LET HIM BE ANATHEMA" (Canons on the Sacrifice of the Mass, Canon 1).

TWENTY-SECOND SESSION, CANONS ON THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS: "If anyone says that by those words, Do this for a commemoration of me, Christ did not institute the Apostles priests; or did not ordain that they and other priests should offer His own body and blood, LET HIM BE ANATHEMA" (Canons on the Sacrifice of the Mass, Canon 2).

TWENTY-SECOND SESSION, CANONS ON THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS: "If anyone says that the sacrifice of the mass is one only of praise and thanksgiving; or that it is a mere commemoration of the sacrifice consummated on the cross but not a propitiatory one; or that it profits him only who receives, and ought not to be offered for the living and the dead, for sins, punishments, satisfactions, and other necessities, LET HIM BE ANATHEMA" (Canons on the Sacrifice of the Mass, Canon 3).

TWENTY-SECOND SESSION, CANONS ON THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS: "If anyone says that it is a deception to celebrate masses in honor of the saints and in order to obtain their intercession with God, as the Church intends, LET HIM BE ANATHEMA" (Canons on the Sacrifice of the Mass, Canon 5).

TWENTY-THIRD SESSION, CANONS ON THE SACRAMENT OF ORDER: "If anyone says that there is not in the New Testament a visible and external priesthood, or that there is no power of consecrating and offering the true body and blood of the Lord and of forgiving and retaining sins, but only the office and bare ministry of preaching the Gospel; or that those who do not preach are not priests at all, LET HIM BE ANATHEMA" (Canons on the Sacrifice of the Mass, Canon 1).

TWENTY-THIRD SESSION, CANONS ON THE SACRAMENT OF ORDER: "If anyone says that the bishops who are chosen by the authority of the Roman pontiff are not true and legitimate bishops, but merely human deception, LET HIM BE ANATHEMA" (Canons on the Sacrifice of the Mass, Canon 8).

TWENTY-FIFTH SESSION, DECREE ON PURGATORY: "Since the Catholic Church, instructed by the Holy Ghost, has, following the sacred writings and the ancient tradition of the Fathers, taught in sacred councils and very recently in this ecumenical council that there is a purgatory, and that the souls there detained are aided by the suffrages of the faithful and chiefly by the acceptable sacrifice of the altar, the holy council commands the bishops that they strive diligently to the end that the sound doctrine of purgatory, transmitted by the Fathers and sacred councils, be believed and maintained by the faithful of Christ, and be everywhere taught and preached."

TWENTY-FIFTH SESSION, ON THE INVOCATION, VENERATION, AND RELICS OF SAINTS, AND ON SACRED IMAGES: "The holy council commands all bishops and others who hold the office of teaching and have charge of the cura animarum, that in accordance with the usage of the Catholic and Apostolic Church, received from the primitive times of the Christian religion, and with the unanimous teaching of the holy Fathers and the decrees of sacred councils, they above all instruct the faithful diligently in matters relating to intercession and invocation of the saints, the veneration of relics, and the legitimate use of images, teaching them that the saints who reign together with Christ offer up their prayers to God for men, that it is good and beneficial suppliantly to invoke them and to have recourse to their prayers, assistance and support in order to obtain favors from God through His Son, Jesus Christ our Lord, who alone is our redeemer and savior; and that they think impiously who deny that the saints who enjoy eternal happiness in heaven are to be invoked, or who assert that they do not pray for men, or that our invocation of them to pray for each of us individually is idolatry, or that it is opposed to the word of God and inconsistent with the honor of the one mediator of God and men, Jesus Christ, or that it is foolish to pray vocally or mentally to those who reign in heaven."

Krispy

General Topics :: Are all Catholics going to hell?

Re., on: 2005/4/11 13:07

Our family went to a Catholic Church this weekend for an Eagle Scout ceremony. Our friend's son earned Eagle, and they are Catholic, so they held the ceremony at their church. While there I picked up a bunch of their Catholic literature (that was free in the lobby). The only thing I've read so far is a thing about Mary... and I found it interesting that in the pamphlet it mentioned that **MARY** has crushed the serpents head.

Where is that in the Bible?

It's not there... not to mention, I cant seem to find any of the other statements about Mary in the Bible that the RCC believes... except that she was a virgin **when Jesus was born**. (She *did* have other children.)

Krispy