

No Person Will Remain a non-Catholic Who Believes What the Bible Teaches

{1} Do you agree that everyone who has a correct understanding of the Holy Bible believes it is the inspired word of Almighty God?

{2} Do you agree that Almighty God would not be God if He could tell a lie, or teach what is not true?

{3} Do you agree that it is better to have an infallible teacher who therefore must absolutely teach the truth; than a fallible teacher who could teach error?

{4} Do you agree that infallibility is surely one of the powers of heaven – “*All power is given to Me in heaven*” (Matthew 28:18)

{5} Do you agree that no one can reasonably doubt that infallibility was bestowed on earth?

St. Paul wrote: “*And he gave some apostles, and some prophets, and other some evangelists, and other some pastors and doctors, for the edifying of the body of Christ: Until we all meet into the unity of faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the age of the fulness of Christ.*” (Ephesians 4:11, 13)

{6} Do you agree that we could not become perfect, if the Church were liable to teach us untruth, and if we were bound to believe it?

{7} Do you agree that St. Paul could not call the Christians of Ephesus “*fellow citizens with the saints*” (Ephesians 2:19) if they were liable to be led into error by the Church?

{8} Do you agree that the prophet Zacharias, speaking of the Church, could not truthfully call it the “*City of Truth*,” if it is not infallible, and therefore unable to teach us error? (Zacharias 8:3)

{9} Do you agree that our Lord could not truthfully state that the gates of hell shall not prevail against His Church, if it could be conquered by error? “*And I say to thee: That thou art Peter; and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.*” (Matthew 16:18)

{10} Do you agree that if the Church could teach the world a lie, if it could teach us error, the devil would laugh: for then he would have gotten God’s instrument of salvation to do his work of damnation?

{11} Do you agree that the Church Jesus Christ founded is infallible because the Spirit of truth is with it; and Jesus promised the presence of the Holy Ghost? “*And I will ask the Father, and he shall give you another Paraclete, that he may abide with you for ever. The spirit of truth, whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, nor knoweth him: but you shall know him; because he shall abide with you, and shall be in you.*” (John 14:16, 17)

{12} Do you agree that those who are actuated by the Spirit of truth cannot teach lies?

“*But the Paraclete, the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he will teach you ALL things, and bring ALL things to your mind, whatsoever I shall have said to you.*” (John 14:26)

“*But when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will teach you ALL truth. For he shall not speak of himself; but what things soever he shall hear, he shall speak; and the things that are to come, he shall shew you.*” (John 16:13)

{13} Do you agree that there is no quibbling here, there is no room for falsehood?

{14} Do you agree that the WHOLE TRUTH is to be taught for the salvation of the world?

{15} Do you agree that there is no guarantee that the whole truth will be taught with 100% certainty without an infallible teacher?

{16} Do you agree that the Catholic Church is infallible because Jesus Christ is with His Church and working in it?

{17} Do you agree that Jesus sent His Apostles on the most difficult mission that any body of men could undertake?

{18} Do you agree that Jesus sent the Apostles to make the world one fold – in other words, that all mankind should believe *one and the same* thing?

{19} Do you agree that Jesus sent the Apostles to teach the world what to believe and how to behave?

Jesus promised His presence. “*Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world.*”

{20} Do you agree that the words *I am with you all days* when spoken by Jesus Christ, constitute a pledge of success, from now until the end of the world, because they promise divine cooperation?

{21} Do you agree that success in teaching ALL TRUTH with no error mixed in with what is taught, is what we imply when we claim for the Catholic Church infallibility?

{22} Do you agree that infallibility simply means that God is with His Church, and She teaches with His authority and cannot lie or make mistakes in what She teaches concerning matters of faith and morals to the Universal Church?

If God is with the Church He founded, who is against it?

“He that is not with me, is against me: and he that gathereth not with me, scattereth.” (Matthew 12:30)

“He that is not with me, is against me; and he that gathereth not with me, scattereth.” (Luke 11:23)

{23} Do you agree that unfortunately for them, millions of people are against the Catholic Church that Jesus Christ founded?

The prerogative of Infallibility in the New Law ought to be inferred from the fact that even in the Old Law there existed an infallible tribunal for settling disputes. In the Book of Deuteronomy we read: *“If thou perceive that there be among you a hard and doubtful matter in judgment ... and thou see that the words of the judges within thy gates do vary: arise, and go up. ... And thou shalt come to the priests of the Levitical race, ... and thou shalt ask of them, and they shall shew thee the truth of the judgment. And thou shalt to whatsoever they shall say that preside in that place, ... thou shalt follow their sentence: neither shalt thou decline to the right hand nor to the left hand. But he that will be proud, and refuse to obey the commandment of the priest who ministereth at that time to the Lord thy God, and the decree of the judge, that man shall die, and thou shalt take away the evil from Israel.”* (Deuteronomy 17:8, et seq.)

{24} Do you agree that God cannot command acceptance of a false decision?

{25} Do you agree that the very attributes of God protest against the acceptance of a false decision?

{26} Do you agree that therefore, we know the judgment, even in the Old Testament, must have been infallibly just and true?

{26} Do you agree that St. Paul tells us that the Old Law was but a figure of the New? *“All these things happen to them in figure.”* (1 Cor. 10:11)

{28} Do you agree that if there was an infallible authority in the Old Law to settle difficult matters, for greater reason there must be one in the New Law?

{29} Do you agree that Christ’s Church is not less perfect than the Mosaic dispensation?

{30} Do you agree that Jesus testified to the authority and truthfulness of the teaching body of the Old Law? *“The Scribes and Pharisees have set on the chair of Moses. All things, therefore, whatsoever they shall say to you, observe and do: but according to their works do ye not.”* (Matthew 23:2, 3)

{31} Do you agree that even the high priest who condemned our Lord prophesied rightly, because as St. John says, he was *“the high priest of that year.”* (John 11:51)

If, then, even in the Old Law, *‘the lips of the priest kept knowledge, and the people sought the law at his mouth,’* (Mal. 2:7) how much more shall the message of Christ be delivered with infallibility?

{32} Do you agree that the Apostles claimed the prerogative of Infallibility? *“We have the mind of Christ.”* (1 Corinthians 2:16) *“We have received... The Spirit that is of God: that we may know the things that are given us from God. Which things also we speak, not in the learned words of human wisdom; but in the doctrine of the Spirit.”* (1 Corinthians 2:12, 13) *“For our exhortation was NOT of ERROR.”* (1 Thessalonians 2:3) *“For we are not as many adulterating the word of God, but with sincerity, but as from God, before God, and in Christ we speak.”* (2 Corinthians 2:17) *“We are of God. He that knowest God, heareth us.”* (1 John 4:6) Again St. Paul says: *“Therefore he that despiseth these things, despiseth not man but God: who also hath given his holy Spirit in us.”* (1 Thessalonians 4:8) *“When you had received of us the word of the hearing of God, you received it not as the word of man, but (as it is indeed) the word of God.”* (1 Thessalonians 2:13) *“He that heareth you, heareth me.”* (Luke 10:16) *“If he will not hear the church, let him be to thee as the heathen and publican.”* (Matthew 18:17)

Are we to be lost because we refuse to hear a lie? By no means!

{33} Do you agree that therefore, all logical people will believe the infallible teachings of the Catholic Church without doubt, and hence “*we be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine*”? (Ephesians 4:14)

{34} Do you agree that every person who believes the truth can say, “I am no surer that Christ is not a liar, than I am that the Catholic Church is the infallible teacher of mankind: for it is through the ministry of the Catholic Church that I even know Christ”? (St. Augustine)

We know the truth, and we have peace in the truth. Sometimes it seems to me our security in the truth is excessive to a fault. We not only rest in the truth, but we sleep in the truth, instead of arousing ourselves to let others know our good fortune.

{35} Do you agree that besides the One, Holy, Catholic, Apostolic Church, there is no other that claims Infallibility?

{36} Do you agree that if there is a church that is infallible, it must necessarily lay claim to that title?

{37} Do you agree that every church that disclaims the title of infallibility is proof thereby that it does not possess the thing?

{38} Do you agree that; for in proclaiming its own fallibility, it either tells the truth or it falls into error?

{39} Do you agree that if it tells the truth when it says it is fallible, that it is not infallible; and if it falls into error, it is not infallible?

{40} Do you agree that the church that denies its own Infallibility cannot be the teacher of ALL TRUTH?

{41} Do you agree that any church that denies it is infallible proclaims that it is liable to teach you error – and is therefore not a trustworthy guide of your soul?

{42} Do you agree that the Church is infallible in believing as well as in teaching? “*Though we, or an angel from heaven, preach a gospel to you besides that which we have preached to you, let him be anathema.*” (Galatians 1:8) “*If anyone preach to you a gospel besides that which you have received, let him be anathema.*” (Galatians 1:9)

{43} Do you agree that as far as passive Infallibility is concerned; the faithful receive the truth because the Church teaches the truth? Hence Our Lord says, “*The sheep follow him, because they know his voice. But a stranger they follow not, but fly from him, because they know not the voice of strangers.*” (John 10:4, 5)

Considering active Infallibility, the Church is infallible in Her DAILY teaching throughout the world.

{44} Do you agree that it follows reasonably that an infallible teacher cannot make a mistake in her DAILY teachings?

{45} Do you agree that the Catholic Church would not be infallible if She could teach error in ANYTHING She proposes for the belief of Her children in matters of faith or morals (either when She makes a solemn definition concerning dogmas, or in Her ordinary magisterium teachings)?

{46} Do you agree that most every Protestant church teaches at least something that is true?

{47} Do you agree that just because Protestant preachers teach something(s) that are true does not make them infallible?

{48} Do you agree that to be infallible the Church cannot make an error in anything she teaches on matters of faith and morals – either in her extraordinary teaching or in her daily, ordinary teaching throughout the years?

{49} Do you agree that General Councils are infallible?

{50} Do you agree that by a General Counsel we mean not merely a lot of bishops assembled, but the Bishops with the chief Bishop, the Pope?

Some will then try to teach that Vatican Council II, held in Rome in the early 1960s, was a General Council – by the definition just presented.

{51} Do you agree that those things that are taught always and everywhere are infallible truths?

{52} Do you agree that Vatican Council II taught the opposite of “Those things that are taught always and everywhere”?

{53} Do you agree that an Infallible Church could never in the future teach the opposite of what that Church taught infallibly in the past?

{54} Do you agree that those who will pray and study can learn with certitude that many of the teachings of Vatican Council II are contrary to the dogmas the infallible Catholic Church taught before Vatican Council II?

Always remember this important truth: “Those things that are taught always and everywhere are infallible. Therefore neither a General Council, nor any true successor of St. Peter on his own without a General Council, can contradict or teach the opposite of any doctrine the Catholic Church taught in the past!”

Although the essential truth has just been explained, the complete understanding of what happened in the 1960s and thereafter regarding the Catholic Church; requires much prayer and study to understand the truth and the consequences of what has happened! We can come back to that study later (NOTE: please read the information found at <https://jmjsite.com/cr.pdf> for a later study and a more complete understanding about Vatican II, the Novus Ordo sect, and the Traditionalists Movement sects), but first let us continue understanding the truth about Infallibility. Because, understanding the Catholic teaching on Infallibility will provide the knowledge we need to know concerning the errors and heresies of this new religion that is now often referred to as the Novus Ordo Conciliar church.

{55} Do you agree that both the Infallibility of General Councils and the Infallibility of the whole teaching body are consequent on the Infallibility of the head, with which the Bishops and teachers are united?

{56} Do you agree that hence, the Papal Infallibility is the real Infallibility of the Church? “*Let no man seduce you, ... Walking in the things which he hath not seen, in pain puffed up by the sense of his flesh, and not holding the head, from which the whole body, by joint and bands, ... groweth unto the increase of God.*” (Colossians 2: 18, 19)

Now what is Papal Infallibility? In the Acts of the Vatican Council (1870), fourth Session, Constitution 1, concerning the Church of Christ, Chapter IV., We read: “The Roman Pontiff, when he speaks *ex cathedra*, that is, when he performs the office of pastor and teacher of all Christians, and by his supreme Apostolic authority defines a doctrine as of faith or morals to be held by the universal Church, possesses, through the divine assistance promised to him in Blessed Peter, that Infallibility with which the Divine Redeemer wished His Church to be endowed in defining doctrine, whether of faith or morals.”

The limitations of Infallibility fall under four heads. First, the person in whom Infallibility resides; second, the persons to whom infallible teaching is directed; third, the subject-matter of Infallibility; and, fourth, the form of infallible utterances.

First, the Pope is infallible when he speaks in his official capacity to the **whole** Church, whether directly or indirectly. Second, a decision, to be infallible, must be intended for all the faithful, whether addressed to all or to a particular person. Third, the subject-matter of Infallibility must be a doctrine of *faith* or *morals*. All the revealed truths come under this head. Likewise all theories of government or of *science that have to do with faith or morals*, and finally all dogmatic facts that are necessarily connected with revealed truths, belong to the domain of Infallibility. Fourth, the intention of the Pope and the form of expression tell us whether the Pope speaks *ex cathedra* or not.

{57} Do you agree that we prove the Infallibility of the Pope if we prove the Infallibility of Peter?

{58} Do you agree that we need not waste much time showing that the Pope is the successor of Peter?

{59} Do you agree that the world cannot get rid of that truth?

{60} Do you agree that Papal succession is a glaring fact, that no man who knows history can gainsay?

{61} Do you agree that if, then, Christ made Peter the head of the Apostles, and gave him the prerogative of Infallibility, so that in his [office of the primacy] *official* capacity he was to be the unerring teacher of the whole church, it follows that all true successors of St. Peter are also infallible?

{62} Do you agree that the first time Jesus met Peter, He marked him out in a special manner for the office of Pope?

Peter’s brother Andrew met our Lord first. And: “*He findeth first his brother Simon, and saith to him: We have found the Messias, which is, being interpreted, the Christ. And he brought him to Jesus. And Jesus looking upon him, said: Thou art Simon the son of Jona: thou shalt be called Cephas, which is interpreted Peter.*” (John 1:41, 42) *Cephas* is the Syro-Chaldaic for “Peter” or “rock.”

{63} Do you agree that Jesus gave Peter a new name, a name which signified his office as the foundation of the Church?

God never gave a new name without a purpose. He changed the name of Abram to that of Abraham. Jacob was changed to that of Israel. Our Lord's own name, Jesus, was meant to show forth the Savior. God says, "*To him that over cometh, ... I will give... a new name.*" (Apocalypse 2:17)

{64} Do you agree that Christ meant something of great importance when he bestowed the name "Cephas" on Simon; the very first time He met him?

{65} Do you agree that later on in our Lord's life Jesus conferred on Peter both the Primacy and the Infallibility? (Matthew 16:13 – 19)

"And Jesus came into the quarters of Caesarea Philippi; and he asked his disciples, saying: Whom do men say that the Son of man is? But they said: Some John the Baptist, and other some Elias, and others Jeremias, or one of the prophets. Jesus saith to them: But whom do you say that I am? Simon Peter answered, and said: Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God." Our Lord praises Simon for that profession of faith. *"And Jesus answering, said to him: Blessed art thou Simon Bar-Jona,"* – There were two Simons in the Apostolic College (*Bar-Jona* means son of John) – *"because flesh and blood hath not revealed it to thee, but my Father who is in heaven. And I say to thee; That thou art Peter."* Here Christ alludes to the name given years before. Jesus brings it up again. *"Thou art Peter; and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven. And whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven."* In English the full force of our Lord's words do not come out. The identity of "Peter" and "rock" is not obvious but in the language which our Lord used there is only ONE word for both Peter and rock – "Thou art *Cephas*; and upon this *cephas* I will build my church." The English does not express this identity.

{66} Do you agree that no logical, reasoning person can deny that Christ made Peter the Rock and foundation of His Church?

{67} Do you agree that Jesus Christ founded His Church to last after the death of St. Peter and the other Apostles?

{68} Do you agree that if St. Peter is the Rock and foundation of the Church, that St. Peter and his lawful successors cannot be swept away by err and lies?

What is to be the fate of the Church if its foundation can be destroyed?

{69} Do you agree that if Peter and his lawful successors are not infallible, that the Church is not infallible?

{70} Do you agree that if the Church is not infallible, the gates of hell can prevail against it?

{71} Do you agree that if the gates of hell can prevail against the Church, the words of Jesus Christ are false?

{72} Do you agree that if the words of Jesus Christ are false, then He is not God?

{73} Do you agree that if Christ's words are false, Christianity is a sham?

{74} Do you agree that if God is a liar, then the Bible has no truthful meaning which one can use to come to the knowledge of the truth?

Do you see where we are landing? Anyhow, Peter is the Rock and foundation of Christ's Church, according to Christ's words.

{75} Do you agree that therefore every logical person will recognize as the true Church, the very Church of which Peter is the Rock and foundation?

{76} Do you agree that Peter is the Rock and foundation of one and *only* the one Infallible Church founded by Jesus Christ?

{77} Do you agree that to recognize the Church of which Peter is the Rock and foundation is to be a Catholic?

{78} Do you agree that in the passage already quoted, we see that our Lord commits to Peter the keys of the kingdom of heaven?

{79} Do you agree that everywhere the keys signify power and authority?

Jesus Christ says of Himself in the Apocalypse: "*I... have the keys of death and of hell.*" (Apocalypse 1:18)

“*And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven.*” (Matthew 16:19)

Here we have a new image drawn from the relation of the Lord to His household and servants. What was the obvious and natural meaning of the second part of the passage? In the first part Our Lord has spoken of Himself as an Architect, and had compared His Church to a house. Now Jesus speaks as a King, and His Church He compares to a kingdom, and He declares that the King will give to Peter the keys of this kingdom. The obvious and natural meaning of all this was that Peter was to be the King’s Viceroy or vicar over His kingdom, for even in domestic life the tradition of the key of a house meant the house was in the possession of the holder of the key. For example: at the coronation of a Sovereign, the presentation of the keys of the City to him by the Chief Magistrate meant that the Sovereign was to be regarded as having the supremacy over the City. And so our Lord, who has supreme authority over the Church, by promising to commit the keys of it to Peter, signified His intention of investing him with Supremacy under Him of His Church upon earth.

{80} Do you agree that Keys are, according to all usage, sacred and profane, a symbol of power, administrative, judicial, and legislative?

{81} Do you agree that Peter has authority over the kingdom of heaven? But how could this be true if Peter were not an infallible guide to those who would enter heaven?

{82} Do you agree that St. Paul tells us some of the mortal sins people commit that will forbid St. Peter from letting them into the kingdom of God?

“*Know you not that the unjust shall not possess the kingdom of God? Do not err: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor the effeminate, nor liars with mankind, nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor railers, nor extortioners, shall possess the kingdom of God.*” (1 Corinthians 6:9, 10)

{83} Do you agree that it is VERY important to *always* remember that the unjust shall not possess the kingdom of God?

{84} Do you agree that they are unjust who claim that Jesus Christ had anything to do with founding any other church besides that one and only one of which St. Peter was given Its keys because he is Its Rock – that is to say, the Catholic Church?

{85} Do you agree that Jesus Christ judges just judgments?

“*And I heard another, from the altar, saying: Yea, O Lord God Almighty, true and just are thy judgments.”* (Apocalypse 16:7)

“*O the depth of the riches of the wisdom and of the knowledge of God! How incomprehensible are his judgments, and how unsearchable his ways!”* (Romans 11:13)

“*And they perverted their own mind and turned away their eyes that they might not look unto heaven, nor remember just judgments.”* (Daniel 13:9)

{86} Do you agree that Jesus Christ will judge us on whether or not we hear the Church He founded on St. Peter?

{87} Do you agree that Jesus Christ cannot be a JUST Judge and tell me under pain of damnation to hear the Church He founded; if millions of others could be saved while they reject His Church to follow a man-made church?

“*Tell the church. And if he will not hear the church, let him be to thee as the heathen and publican.*” (Matthew 18:17)

{88} Do you agree that no one should have the least hope of entering the kingdom of Heaven if they do not, before their death, enter the Church of which St. Peter has the keys?

“*And he shall reign in the house of Jacob for ever. And of His kingdom there shall be no end.*” (Luke 1:32, 33)

“*Lord, remember me when thou shalt come into Thy kingdom.*” (Luke 23:42)

“*Then shall the king say to them that shall be on his right hand: Come, ye blessed of my Father, possess you the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world.*” (Matthew 25:34)

“*Not every one that saith to me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven: but he that doth the will of my Father who is in heaven, he shall enter into the kingdom of heaven.*” (Matthew 7:21)

{89} Do you agree that it is the will of God the Father that everyone be a member that Church founded by Jesus Christ and of which St. Peter has the keys – and not some church founded by some man centuries later?

{90} Do you agree that all those who do not belong to the same Church to which St. Peter belonged on Pentecost Sunday; will not be with St. Peter for eternity?

{91} Do you agree that St. Peter belonged to one and only one Church from Pentecost Sunday until his death?

{92} Do you agree that any and every church founded later than 50 days (Pentecost Sunday) after the Resurrection of Jesus Christ cannot possibly be the same Church to which St. Peter belonged?

{93} Do you agree that the one and only Church in the entire history of the world that has St. Peter and his lawful successors as Its visible head is the One, Holy, Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman Church?

“And whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose upon earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven.” (Matthew 16:19)

{94} Do you agree that the power here promised to Peter is unlimited (*whatsoever*)?

{95} Do you agree that it is a power over the Universal Church (My Church), – the Kingdom of Jesus Christ on Earth?

{96} Do you agree that throughout the New Testament Peter is given the place of prominence?

Peter’s name leads in every list of the apostles. (Matthew 10:2; Mark 3:16; Luke 6:14; Acts 1:13) St. Matthew simply calls Peter “the first,” that is, the captain, the leader, the chief of all. *“The first Simon who is called Peter.”* 1. Not first in mere numerical order; for then we should have the corresponding ordinals, *second, third, etc....* 2. Not first by *calling*; for it appears from John 1:40 – 42, that Andrew was call before Peter (and brought him to Christ). 3. Nor first in *age*, a meaning that is unexampled, and there is strong reason to believe that Peter was younger than Andrew; but first in dignity and authority. The explanatory cause, “who is called Peter,” is the reason why Simon was styled *first*, that is, because he was made and called *Peter* the *Rock (Petra)* of the Church (John 1:42; Matthew 16:18). *“First, says he, Peter and Andrew. From this is derived the name of Primacy. For if he were first (primus), his place was first, is ranked first, and this quality of his was Primacy.”* “It is the answer to this,” continues St. Francis de Sales whom I am quoting, “that if the evangelist here named Peter the first, it was because he was the most advanced in age among the Apostles.... But what is the worth of such a reason as this, I should like to know? To say that Peter was the oldest in the society is *to seek and hazard an excuse for obstinacy*; and the Scripture distinctly tells us that he was not the earliest Apostle when it testifies that St. Andrew led him to our Lord. The reasons are seen quite clearly in the Scripture, *but because you are resolved to maintain the contrary*, you go thinking about with your imagination on every side. Why say that Peter was the oldest, sense it is a pure fantasy, which has no foundation in the Scripture, and is contrary to the ancients? Why not say, rather, that he was the one on whom Christ founded His Church, to whom He had given the keys of the kingdom of heaven, who was the confirmer of the brethren? – *For all this is in the Scripture.* What you want to maintain you do maintain; whether it has a base in Scripture or not makes no difference” and to Protestants and all of those who do not believe the Word of God.

Peter was the first to address the Jews after the descent of the Holy Ghost. Peter was the first to make converts from the Gentiles. *“And when there had been much disputing, Peter, rising up, said to them: Men, brethren, you know, that in former days God made choice among us, that by my mouth the Gentiles should hear the word of the gospel, and believe.”* (Acts 15:7) When a successor was to follow Judas, it was Peter that spoke, and only Peter, to appoint that new member. (See Acts 1: 15 – 22) In the First Council of Jerusalem, Peter’s was the principal speech. There was, of course, *“much disputing,”* but when Peter spoke all *“held their peace.”*

Let us notice. James was Bishop of Jerusalem. He was a cousin of our Lord, a very near and dear disciple. James was cast into prison, and was finally put to death. But was there any extraordinary commotion made about him among the Churches? We have no evidence that there was. Peter, also, was put into prison, but mark the difference! *“Prayer was made without ceasing by the church and to God for him,”* (Acts 12:5) until an angel from God delivered him.

It is worthy to note, also, how the Scriptures, in speaking of Peter, distinguish him above the rest. While the others are often mentioned in a body, Peter is expressly mentioned by name to mark the difference in rank between him and the others. Thus: “*Simon, and they that were with him.*” (Mark 1:36) “*Peter, and they that were with him.*” (Mark 1:36) “*Peter, and they that were with him.*” (Luke 9:32) “*Peter standing up with the eleven.*” (Acts 2:14) “*Peter, and the rest of the apostles.*” (Acts 2:37) “*Peter and the apostles answering, said.*” (Acts 5:29) The translators of the King James Bible have corrupted this last text, inserting *other* before the word “apostles.” They must have felt that the text was conclusive of Peter’s pre-eminence, that Peter was something more than a mere Apostle.

{97} Do you agree that the form of expression we have here is not applied to any other of the Apostles; that it is clearly an expression that denotes the superiority of Saint Peter?

{98} Do you agree that, as you know well, to name one person and put the others altogether with him, is to make him the *most important* and the others his *inferiors*?

Again, when only some of the Apostles are mentioned with Peter, he invariably gets the most honored, – the *first* place. Thus, when three witness the raising of the daughter of Jairus to life, the order is, “*Peter, and James, and John*” (Mark 5:37; Luke 8:51); and when the same three are privileged to witness the Transfiguration, the record reads: “*Jesus taketh unto him Peter, and James, and John.*” So again in the history of the Agony in the Garden, Peter is one of the witnesses of that tragic event and is named first: “*And he taking with him Peter, and James, and John.*”

Again, a constant practice with the sacred writers, in narrating anything which concerns all the Apostles, is to represent Peter as speaking and acting for all. Thus when our Lord puts to all of the Apostles the question: “*But whom do you say that I am?*” It is Peter who answers: “*And Simon Peter answered and said.*” Jesus speaks to all of how difficult it is for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of heaven; and again Peter alone speaks: “*Then Peter said: Behold, we have left all things, and have followed thee, what therefore shall we have?*” And again, “*Then Jesus said to the twelve: Will you also go away?*” All save Peter are silent. “*And Simon Peter answered him: Lord, to whom shall we go?*”

The next incident is a remarkable one: “*And when they were come to Capharnaum, they that received the didrachmas, came to Peter and said to him: Doth not your master pay the didrachmas? He said: Yes. And when he was come into the house, Jesus prevented him, saying: What is thy opinion, Simon? The kings of the earth, of whom do they receive tribute or custom? of their own children, or of strangers? And he said: Of strangers. Jesus said to him: Then the children are free. But that we may not scandalize them, go to the sea, and cast in a hook: and that fish which shall first come up, take: and when thou hast opened its mouth, thou shalt find a stater: take that, and give it to them for me and thee.*”

Please observe that: (1) the tax gatherers address themselves to *Peter* rather than to any of the other Apostles. Why? (2) Our Lord singles out Peter and asks him *alone* for his opinion; and (3) He orders Peter to pay the didrachmas not for Himself and all the others, but for Himself and for *Peter*: “*give it to them for me and thee.*”

{99} Do you agree that it is clear that our Lord associates Peter with Himself on this occasion?

{100} Do you agree that even the strangers who collected the taxes recognized that Peter was the *leader* of the Apostles? “*As Peter seemed to be the first of the disciples, they go to him.*” Says St. John Chrysostom on the text. Accept Peter to be the Chief, – the Leader, and the action of our Lord and of the tax gatherers is most natural, – just what would be expected.

After the Resurrection Jesus shows special concern to have the fact of the Resurrection made known especially to St. Peter through St. Mary Magdalene. “*But go, tell his disciples and Peter that he goeth before you into Galilee; there you shall see him, as he told you.*” (Mark 16:7)

The frequent recurrence of St. Peter’s name in the pages of the sacred Scriptures cannot fail to impress the thoughtful reader. In the *entire* New Testament, John, who is mentioned oftener than the rest, occurs only 38 times; but in the Gospels *alone* Peter is mentioned 23 times by Matthew, 18 by Mark, 20 by Luke, and 30 by John.

After the Ascension, St. Peter, without debate, without election, without a formal organization of the Apostolic College, openly takes the lead, and unmistakably acts the Pope in the newborn Church. Of this the Acts of the Apostles supply abundant evidence.

This history may be divided into two parts; the first part, embracing the first 12 chapters, gives the labors of the Apostles in common: the second part, beginning with Chapter XIII, and continuing to the end, is little more than the history of St. Paul, and of the churches founded by him.

Now taking the first part and examining it, what do we find? In these 12 chapters of general history, St. Peter's name is mentioned more than *twice* as many times as *all* the others *put together*! His name occurs 53 times, while the names of *all the others* occur only 23 times. St. John's name, the next most frequent, occurs only 12 times, and that of St. James, the Bishop of Jerusalem, the birthplace of the Church, only *twice*.

{101} Do you agree that in a history which professes to record the acts of *all* the Apostles, this fact, surely, is not without meaning?

St. Peter certainly gets the place of honor whenever he is mentioned with all or any of the others. St. Peter is expressly mentioned while the others are mentioned only in a body; St. Peter is represented as a mouthpiece of the others; St. Peter's discourses, his miracles, the number of his converts, his various acts, are carefully noted, while little is said of the others. Hence, as the Gospels may be called the history of Christ, so these 12 chapters of the Acts may be called the history of St. Peter. The position of Peter in the Acts is similar to that of Christ in the Gospels.

{102} Do you agree that what Christ was to the Apostolic body while on earth, that St. Peter was after His Ascension?

{103} Do you agree that it was St. Peter who exercised the authority given to him by Jesus Christ to take the initiative in the election of a successor to Judas in the Apostolic College?

{104} Do you agree that it was St. Peter alone who defended the Apostolic body against the charge of intemperance? "*But Peter standing up with the eleven, lifted up his voice, and spoke to them: Ye men of Judea, and all you that dwell in Jerusalem, be this known to you, and with your ears receive my words: for these are not drunk, as you suppose, seeing it is but the third hour of the day.*" (Acts 2:14 – 15)

St. Francis de Sales sums up the spiritual evidence for the Primacy thus: "Whoever will read the Scriptures attentively will see this Primacy of St. Peter *everywhere*. If the Church is compared to a building, as it is, *its rock and its secondary foundation is St. Peter* (Matthew 16). If you say it is like a family, it is only our Lord who pays tribute as head of the household, *and after him St. Peter, as his lieutenant* (Ib. 17). If to a ship, *St. Peter is its captain*, and in it our Lord teaches (Luke 5). If to a fishery, *St. Peter is the first* in it; the true disciples of our Lord fish only with *him* (Ib. & John 21). If to draw nets (Matthew 13), it is *Peter* who cast them into the sea, *St. Peter* who draws them; the other disciples are his coadjutors. It is *St. Peter* who brings them to land and presents the fish to our Lord (Luke 5 & John 21). Do you say it is like an embassy? – *St. Peter* is the *first* ambassador (Matthew 10). Do you say it is a brotherhood? – *St. Peter* is the *first*, the *governor* and *confirmer* of the rest (Luke 22). Would you rather have it a kingdom? – *St. Peter* receives its *keys* (Matthew 16). Will you consider it a flock or fold of sheep and lambs? – *St. Peter* is its *pastor* and *shepherd-general* (John 21). *Say now in conscience how could our Lord testify his intention more distinctly*. Perversity cannot find use for its eyes amid such light.... But let us continue. When our Lord ascends into heaven, all the holy Apostolic body goes to *St. Peter*, as to the *common father* of the family (Acts 1). *St. Peter* rises up among them and speaks the *first*, and it teaches the interpretation of weighty prophecy (Ib.) *He* has the *first* care of the restoration and increase of the Apostolic College (Ib.) It is *he* who *first* proposes to make an Apostle, which is no act of light authority.... The Apostles have no sooner received the Holy Ghost than *St. Peter*, as *chief* of the Evangelical Embassy, being with his eleven companions, begins to publish, *according to his office*, the holy tidings of salvation to the Jews in Jerusalem. *He* is the *first* catechist of the Church, the preacher of penance; the others are with him and are all asked questions, but *St. Peter alone* answers for all (Acts 2). If a hand is to be put into the treasury of miracles confided to the Church, though St. John is present and is asked, *St. Peter alone* puts in his hand (Ib. 5).... *St. Peter* is the *first* who recognizes and refutes heresy in Simon Magus (Ib. 8).... *St. Peter* is the *first* who raises the dead, and he prays for the devout Tabitha (Ib. 9). When it is time to

put the sickle into the harvest of paganism, it is *St. Peter* to whom the revelation is made, as the *head* of all the laborers, and the *steward* of the farmstead (Ib. 10). The good Italian centurion, Cornelius, is ready to receive the grace of the Gospel; he is sent to *St. Peter*, that the Gentiles may by *his* hands be blessed and consecrated; *he* is the *first* in commanding the pagans to be baptized (Acts 10). When a General Counsel is sitting, *St. Peter* as *President* therein opens the gate to judgment and definition; and *his* sentence is followed by the rest (Ib. 15)... *St. Paul* declares that he went to Jerusalem expressly to see *St. Peter* and stayed with him 15 days (Galatians 1). He saw *St. James* there, but to see him was not what he went for, – *only to see St. Peter*. What does this signify? Why did he not go as much to see the great and most celebrated Apostle, *St. James*, as to see *St. Peter*? Because we look at people in their head and face, and *St. Peter* was the *head* of all the Apostles. When *St. Peter* and *St. James* were in prison the Evangelist testifies that *prayer was made without ceasing by the Church to God for Peter* as for the *general head and common ruler* (Acts 12). If all this put together does not make you acknowledge *St. Peter* to be the head of the Church and of the Apostles, I confess that Apostles are not Apostles, pastors are not pastors, and doctors not doctors, *for in what other and more express words could be made known the authority of an Apostle and pastor over the people than those which the Holy Ghost has placed in the Scriptures to show that Peter was above Apostles, pastors, and the whole Church.*” (*The Catholic controversy* pages 269 – 272)

{ 105 } Do you agree that whatever the Apostles received, *St. Peter*, as one of the body, shared, for “*nothing passed unto anyone else without his participation in it*”?

{ 106 } Do you agree that whatever the others received they received in a body, of which *St. Peter* was a member, and therefore in union with Peter; whereas, what *St. Peter* received he received singly, – *alone*?

It is true that whatever power *St. Peter* possessed, the whole body of the Apostles possessed, inasmuch as it included Peter, just as it is true to say that the whole Episcopate of the Catholic Church possesses all the powers and prerogatives of the Pope because it includes the Pope. But, as in the latter case, it does not follow that every member of the Episcopal body has the same authority as the Pope; so neither does it follow in the former case that everyone in the Apostolic body had the same authority as *St. Peter*.

{ 107 } Do you agree that it is *not* true to say that *St. Peter* received nothing that was not afterwards given to all?

{ 108 } Do you agree that *St. Peter alone* received a new name, and that, as we have seen, so significant?

{ 109 } Do you agree that *St. Peter alone* was made the *petra ecclesiae*, – the Rock of the Church?

{ 110 } Do you agree that *St. Peter alone* received the keys, the symbol of supreme authority?

{ 111 } Do you agree that *St. Peter alone* received the office of confirming his brethren?

{ 112 } Do you agree that *St. Peter alone* received the commission to feed the lambs and sheep, – to shepherd the whole flock?

There was just one promise made to *St. Peter* that was afterwards made to all, *St. Peter* included; that was the promise of binding and loosing. But in reference to this I ask, is there nothing meant by first bestowing this power on *St. Peter* *singly*? (God’s words are “*not idle and inoperative.*” - *St. Jerome*.)

It was, then, clearly the design of Jesus Christ to put *first* in one *alone*, what afterwards He meant to put in several; but the sequence does not reverse the beginning, nor does the first lose his place. That first word, “And whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose upon earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven,” said to *one alone*, has already arranged under his power each one of those to whom shall be said, “Whatsoever thou shalt loose”; for the promises of Jesus Christ, as well as His gifts, are without repentance; and what is once given definitely and universally, is irrevocable. Besides, power given to several carries its *restrictions* in its *division*, whilst power given to *one alone*, and overall, and without exception, carries with it *plenitude*; and, not having to be divided with any other, it has no bounds save those which its terms convey.

Origin, a Father of the third century, and of the Greek Church says: “What before was granted to Peter, seems to have been granted to all, – but as something *peculiarly excellent* was to be granted to Peter, it was given *singly* to him. ‘I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven.’ This was done before the words ‘whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth’ were uttered. And truly, if the words of the Gospel be considered, we

shall there find that the last words were common to Peter and the others, but that the former, spoken to Peter, *imparted a great distinction and superiority.*”

Here we come at last, to a grant which was afterwards extended to the other Apostles also. But that God chose to make it to St. Peter first *means something*. To St. Peter *singly* was given in promise what was subsequently so bestowed upon the rest *collectively and with him*. *It is one thing to exercise authority in the house, and a very different thing to hold the keys thereof.*

{113} Do you agree that the Apostles were not made the foundation of the Church; for it is not said that it was built on the Apostles, but on the foundation of the Apostles, (Ephesians 2:20) *i.e.*, on the doctrine they preached?

This is clear from the fact that it is said to be built also on the foundation of “the prophets” (Ephesians 2:20) who were the foundation of the Church only by their doctrine. A comparison with Chapter IV., 11-14, makes it plain that there is question of doctrine. So in the Apocalypse (21:14), the twelve are called foundations of the heavenly Jerusalem, because they were the first to convert the world by their preaching, and thus, as it were, lay the foundations of Christianity. But St. Peter is not merely made the *foundation*; he was made the *rock* of the Church, – the support even of the foundation, for the universal Church (*My Church*), and therefore the Apostles themselves, was built on him. The two metaphors differ very materially. The metaphor of the *Rock* points to the support of the entire building; it involves the idea of firmness, strength, and stability, and implies that the *rock* will communicate these qualities to the superstructure based upon it. This is plain from what follows: “*and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.*” And especially from Matthew 7:24, 25, where our Lord Himself explains the import of the metaphor. On the other hand, the metaphor of the foundation necessarily implies no more than the beginning of anything, and thus aptly typifies the relation of the Apostles to the Church, who were its beginning and the first preachers of its Gospel. As *Apostle*, then, St. Peter with the rest was the foundation of the Church; but as *Primate* he was, moreover, the *Rock* whose office was to sustain the foundation or corner-stones of the superstructure as well as the others.

It is true that the Apostles, like St. Peter, has universal jurisdiction; but in them it was *extraordinary* and *subordinate*, while in St. Peter it was *ordinary* and *supreme*. They received it in *union* with him, to be exercised in subordination to *his* authority. (Cf. St. Francis de Sales: *The Catholic Controversy*, pp. 248 – 249.)

St. Peter’s prerogative was no other than that of being the first to open the gates of the Church and receive into it the first converts – Jews and Gentiles. The Church, for this reason, may be said to take its rise and spring from him, and in this sense he was the *rock* of the Church.

“Say not, think not,” says Bossuet, “that this ministry of Peter terminates with him; that which is to serve for support to an eternal Church can never have an end. Peter will live in his successors, Peter will always speak in his chair. That is what the Fathers say. That is what 630 bishops at the Council of Chalcedon (A. D. 451) confirm.”

“And in truth,” says St. Francis de Sales, “all the reasons for which our Lord put a head to this body (the Church) do not so much require that it should be there in the beginning when the Apostles who governed the Church were holy, humble, charitable lovers of unity and concord, as in the progress and continuation thereof, when charity having now grown cold, each one loves himself, no one will obey the word of another, nor submit to discipline.”

“I ask you,” he continues, “if the Apostles whose understanding the Holy Spirit enlightened so immediately, who were so steadfast and so strong, needed a confirmer and pastor as the form and visible maintenance of their union, and the union of the Church, how much more now has the Church need of one, when there are so many infirmities and weaknesses in the members of the Church? And if the wills of the Apostles, so closely united in charity, had need of an exterior bond in the authority of a head, how much more afterwards when charity has grown so cold is there need of a visible authority and ruler? And if, as St. Jerome says, in the time of the Apostles ‘one is chosen from amongst all, in order that a head being established, occasion of schism may be taken away,’ how much more now, for the same reason, must there be a chief in the Church? The fold of our Lord is to last till the consummation of the world, and visible unity: the unity then of eternal government must remain in it, and nobody has authority to change the form of administration save our Lord who established it.”

But someone who has been reading his Bible will exclaim: “Did not St. Paul withstand Peter to his face?” “*But when Cephas was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed.*” (Galatians 2:11) I would advise such a one to read that passage again, and read it carefully. Instead of arguing against the preeminence of Peter, it argues for it. Peter was at fault, and Paul withstood him. The incident gets its importance only by reason of Peter’s preeminence. Besides, elsewhere St. Paul acknowledges Peter’s superiority. He went up and tarried with Peter 15 days. (Galatians 1:18) St. Paul consulted St. Peter on his teachings, as he said, “*Lest perhaps I should run, or had run in vain.*” (Galatians 2:2)

And again, St. Paul who was so disposed with respect to all, knew *how great a prerogative St. Peter ought to enjoy*, and revered him most of all men, and was disposed towards him as he deserved. *And this is a proof.* The whole earth was looking to St. Paul; there rested on his spirit the solicitude for the Churches of all the world. A thousand matters engaged him every day; he was besieged with appointments, commands, corrections, councils, expectations, teachings, and the administration of endless business; *yet giving up all these, he went to Jerusalem.* And there was no other occasion for his journey save to see St. Peter, as he himself says: “*I went up to Jerusalem to see Peter.*” Thus he honored him and placed him before all men. St. Jerome says: “Paul came to see Peter.... *To pay honor to the Primate of the Apostles.*”

I might also call your attention the fact that there are eight verses in the sacred Scriptures where we find the word *Cephas*. It is found only once in the Gospels; “*And he brought him to Jesus. And Jesus looking upon him, said: Thou art Simon the son of Jona: thou shalt be called Cephas, which is interpreted Peter.*” (John 1:42). The other *seven times* the word *Cephas* is found are *only* in the epistles of St. Paul! Surely, this must have some great significance! St. Paul refers to St. Peter as *Cephas* (the **ROCK** on which Jesus Christ built His Church) in seven verses of his epistles; while St. Paul only uses the name *Peter* three times in all of his epistles! (Although the word *Peter* is found in 151 verses of the Bible!)

{114} Do you agree that sacred Scripture teaches that Jesus Christ taught the people out of Peter’s ship?

{115} Do you agree that out of the ark of Noe there was no salvation from the flood waters; so likewise, out of the Barque of which St. Peter is the head, there is no salvation?

{116} Do you agree that on the night of His last supper Jesus prayed especially for Peter, that his faith should not fail, and that he should be the means of confirming his brethren?

Our Lord said: “*Simon, Simon, behold, Satan hath desired to have you*” (meaning all the Apostles), “*that he may sift you as wheat.*” The Devil wanted the whole Church. “*But I have prayed for thee*” – for Peter alone – “*that thy faith fail not.*” (Luke 22:31, 32)

{117} Do you agree that Peter’s faith cannot fail because Christ’s prayer is an efficacious prayer?

At the tomb of Lazarus Jesus said: “*Father, I give thee thanks that thou hast heard me. And I knew that thou hearest me always; but because of the people who stand about have I said it, that they may believe that thou hast sent me.*” (John 11:41, 42)

{118} Do you agree that this means that the faith and teachings of the true successors of St. Peter in both their *ordinary* and/or *extraordinary* teachings CANNOT error and promulgate false doctrine concerning Faith or Morals to the Universal Church?

We have something still further, for our Lord continues: “*And thou being once converted, confirm thy brethren.*”

{119} Do you agree that the brethren cannot confirm Peter, but Peter confirms them?

{120} Do you agree that the Bishops do not make the Pope sure, but the Pope makes the Bishops and the faithful sure?

{121} Do you agree that Peter could not confirm his brethren in the faith if he could err in the faith?

The promises and preparations for the Primacy and the Infallibility, which were begun with the bestowal of a characteristic title, were all fulfilled before our Lord’s Ascension. A short time before our Lord left this earth, He said to Peter: “*Simon, son of John, lovest thou me more than these?*” Peter believed that he loved his Master, but since his denial of Him he had learned not to presume. At that time he said, “*Although all shall be scandalized in thee, I will never be scandalized.*” But, humbled by his fall, he does not say that he loves the Lord more than the rest, but he answers simply, “*Yea, Lord, thou knowest that I love thee.*” Then our Lord said

to him: “*Feed my lambs.*” Again our Lord asked him the same question, and He received the same answer, and said again: “*Feed my lambs.*” A third time our Lord put the question to Peter, “*Simon, son of John, loveth thou me?*” Peter was trouble, but his heart was right and true, and he replied: “*Lord, thou knowest all things: thou knowest that I love thee.*” Then said Christ to him: “*Feed my sheep.*” (John 21:15 – 17) What is it that constitutes a flock?

{122} Do you agree that it is both lambs and sheep?

{123} Do you agree that the flock of Jesus Christ consists of pastors and people?

{124} Do you agree that Peter is empowered to feed the whole flock?

{125} Do you agree that we shall know if we are truly of the flock of Christ if we get our spiritual food from Peter?

But some will say, a mere man cannot be infallible.

{126} Do you agree that the Pope is but the organ of the Holy Ghost?

{127} Do you agree that God could have made Peter infallible if he wanted to do so?

{128} Do you agree that the evangelists, in writing the books of the New Testament, were infallible?

If you say God cannot make a poor, weak, sinful man an infallible teacher of His truth; then how do you know that any part of the Bible or anything else is the truth?

{129} Do you agree that sacred Scripture informs us that Jesus Christ only wrote one time, and that in the sand – and therefore whatever Jesus wrote was not preserved?

{130} Do you agree that there are written, recorded books of the Bible that are infallible?

If the Pope is not infallible, how do the evangelicals say that every regenerate soul is infallible? –

“And every saint has to himself alone
The secret of the philosophic stone.”

{131} Do you agree that no Protestant preacher is infallible?

{132} Do you agree that if no Protestant is infallible, it is verging on total and absolute insanity to accept them as infallible teachers and guides to whom anyone should entrust the direction and guidance of their immortal soul?

{133} Do you agree that there is no logical reason to accept what they teach to be the truth – since they themselves claim to be *fallible* teachers – i.e. who can teach, have taught, and will teach what is *not* true?

{134} Do you agree that according to the evangelicals, every man is infallible in interpreting the Bible, but when the Pope tries his hand at it he is invariably wrong?

{135} Do you agree that all the hammering of heresy and infidelity has never struck one spark of falsehood from the rock of Peter?

St. Augustine says: “This is the rock over which the proud gates of hell prevail not.”

“O gracious God! How well does Thou provide
For erring judgments an unerring guide!
Thy throne is darkness in the abyss of light,
A blaze of glory that forbids the sight.
Oh, teach me to believe Thee thus concealed,
And search no further than Thyself revealed;
But her alone for my director take,
Whom Thou hast promised never to forsake.”

{136} Do you agree that many non-Catholics think that infallibility means omniscience and/or omnipotence and/or that the pope in claiming infallibility arrogates to himself a divine nature?

{137} Do you agree that others mistakenly think that for the pope to speak infallibly implies a quasi-hypostatic union with the Holy Ghost with each successive pope?

{138} Do you agree that others mistakenly think that for the pope to speak infallibly means that the Pope of Rome has the power of creating right and wrong; that not only truth and falsehood, but morality and immorality depend on his setting his seal to a bit of parchment?

{139} Do you agree that others mistakenly think that infallibility means the pope can accomplish all things by miracle, if need be?

{140} Do you agree that others mistakenly think that for the pope to speak infallibly means that the Pope can do no wrong, can commit no sin, – that he is impeccable?

{141} Do you agree that with such views of papal infallibility quite common among non-Catholics, that we hear the Dogma denounced as preposterous, irrational, revolting to common sense, blasphemous, antagonistic to the liberty and welfare of the state, incompatible with the duties of the citizens, etcetera?

{142} Do you agree that as in so many other cases of Catholic doctrine, it is not the doctrine that is at fault, but the views of those who condemn it?

{143} Did you know that the word infallibility means freedom or exemption from the liability to err?

{144} Do you agree that infallibility does not mean merely freedom from actual error – that would be simply inerrancy – it means more, freedom from the possibility of erring, – freedom from the very *liability* to err?

{145} Do you agree that infallibility is not impeccability?

{146} Do you agree that the Catholic dogma of Infallibility means that the Pope, by virtue of a special supernatural assistance of the Holy Spirit of Truth promised to him, in and through St. Peter, is exempt from all liability to err when, in the discharge of his Apostolic *Office* of Supreme Teacher of the Universal Church, he defines or declares, in matters of or appertaining to Christian faith or morals, what is to be believed and held, or what is to be rejected and condemned by the faithful throughout the world?

{147} Do you agree that in the definition stated in the above question; that this definition substantially embodies the whole Catholic teaching on the subject of Infallibility?

{148} Do you agree that Infallibility has its origin in the express promises of Christ to His Church, and to its visible Head, the Pope?

{149} Do you agree that the sole efficient cause of Infallibility is a presence and assistance of the Holy Spirit of Truth pledged through the following words?

“And I will ask the Father, and he shall give you another Paraclete, that he may abide with you for ever †. The spirit of truth, whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, nor knoweth him: but you shall know him; because he shall abide with you, and shall be in you.” (John 14: 16, 17)

† “For ever”: {150} Hence, do you agree that it is evident that this Spirit of Truth was not only promised to the persons of the apostles, but also to their successors through all generations?

“But the Paraclete, the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he will teach you all things † , and bring all things to your mind, whatsoever I shall have said to you.” (John 14:26)

† “Teach you all things”: {151} Do you agree that: Here the Holy Ghost is promised to the apostles and their successors, particularly, in order to teach them all truth, and to preserve them from error?

“But when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will teach you all truth †. For he shall not speak of himself; but what things soever he shall hear, he shall speak; and the things that are to come, he shall shew you.”

† “will teach you all truth” {152} Do you agree that , the Spirit of truth was given in order to preserve the Church Jesus Christ founded from teaching error at ANY time; simply because He was given to teach all truth?

{153} Do you agree that Infallibility is not a natural, but a supernatural endowment, – that it belongs to the order of grace rather than of nature?

{154} Do you agree that infallibility does not consist in the learning or wisdom of man, but in the power of God? St. Paul tells us in his first letter to the Corinthians: *“And my speech and my preaching was not in the persuasive words of human wisdom, but in shewing of the Spirit and power; That your faith might not stand on the wisdom of men, but on the power of God.”* *“Which things also we speak, not in the learned words of human wisdom; but in the doctrine of the Spirit, comparing spiritual things with spiritual. But the sensual man † perceiveth not these things that are of the Spirit of God; for it is foolishness to him, and he cannot understand, because it is spiritually examined. But the spiritual man judgeth all things; and he himself is judged of no man.”*

† “the sensual man” The sensual man is either he who is taken up with sensual pleasures, with carnal and worldly affections; or he who measureth divine mysteries by natural reason, sense, and human wisdom only. Now such a man has little or no notion of the things of God. Whereas the spiritual man is he who, in the

mysteries of religion, takes not human sense for his guide: but submits his judgment to the decisions of the Church, which he is commanded to hear and obey. For Christ hath promised to remain to the end of the world with His Church, and to direct her in all things by the Spirit of truth.

{155} Do you agree that the Pope is infallible, not because he is prudent or wise, not because he is aided by the learning and prudence and wisdom of the entire Church, but simply and solely because he is supernaturally assisted by the Holy Spirit of Truth, according to divine promise?

{156} Do you agree that the learning or the ignorance, the wisdom or the unwisdom, the virtues or the vices of the Pope in no way affect his Infallibility?

{157} Do you agree that Infallibility is altogether independent of the one and the other?

{158} Do you agree that though infallible, the Pope is not inspired; far from it?

{159} Do you agree that no Pope has ever attributed to himself inspiration, but divine assistance only?

{160} Do you agree that never have Catholics taught that the gift of infallibility is given by God to the Church after the manner of inspiration?

{161} Do you agree that the inspiration of the Pope or of the Church in the sense in which the Apostles were inspired, is contrary to the received teaching of all Catholics?

{162} Do you agree that the assistance of Infallibility is not a direct communication from the Holy Ghost, in other words, an inspiration; but by it the Pope is preserved from error in declaring and defining the truths of Revelation?

{163} Do you agree that Infallibility is not a quality inherent in any person, but an assistance attached to an **office**; and its operation?

{164} Do you agree that Infallibility is not the discovery of new truths, but the guardianship of old ones?

{165} Do you agree that infallibility is simply an assistance of the Spirit of Truth, by which Christianity was revealed, whereby the head of the Church is enabled to guard the original deposit of Revelation, and faithfully declare it to all ages?

{166} Do you agree that infallibility is simply an external guardianship, keeping the Pope and the Church from error?

{167} Do you agree that in the case of inspiration the Holy Ghost informs the mind, excites and moves the will, and directs and guards the tongue and pen of the teacher?

{168} Do you agree that in the case of infallibility the Holy Ghost does not act at all, except by his ordinary grace, on the will and mind?

{169} Do you agree that when infallibility is involved the Holy Ghost merely guards the tongue and pen of the teacher, so as to secure him against the possibility of error, when officially witnessing, proposing, defining, and defending the Christian Revelation?

{170} Do you agree that infallibility does not imply the gift of miracles; neither does it mean that the Pope is protected from error by “a miracle”?

He is protected from error by divine assistance, which is a supernatural entity, but not miraculous, – the result not of an extraordinary, but of an ordinary Providence.

Now, seeing what Infallibility really means, what an utter perversion of the truth to call it “divinity,” or “omnipotence,” or “omniscience,” or to say that the Pope, by reason of it, arrogates to himself “a divine nature” or claims to be “the Incarnate Visible Word of God,” or that, in the belief of Catholics, it implies or demands “a quasi-hypostatic union of the Holy Ghost with each successive pope.”

{171} Do you agree that all such notions as listed above are simply blasphemous?

The purpose of Infallibility is the guarantee for all time the safekeeping and preaching, in its unity, purity, and integrity, “*the faith once delivered to the saints*” (Jude 1:3); to enable the Church in all ages to fulfill effectively the great mission entrusted to her by her Divine Founder of “*Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you*” (Matthew 28:20); because the Spirit of Truth is come to “*teach you all truth*” (John 16:13); “*Until we all meet into the unity of faith,*” (Ephesians 4:13) and “*That henceforth we be no more children tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine by the wickedness of men, by*

cunning craftiness, by which they lie in wait to deceive.” (Ephesians 4:14); “*Ever learning, and never attaining to the knowledge of the truth.*” (2 Timothy 3:7); “*and behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world.*” (Matthew 28:20).

{172} Do you agree that in one word, the purpose of Infallibility was to make the Church that Jesus Christ founded “*the house of God, which is the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth,*” (1 Timothy 3:15) and thereby assure all men that they can, with the utmost confidence, entrust to her direction the great interest of their souls?

{173} Do you agree that therefore, *the pillar and ground of the truth* is the *house of God* and *the Church of the living God*? To say that in another way: “The pillar and ground of the truth is the **Church**” (and not the bible) – **as very clearly taught by the Holy Ghost?**

{174} Do you agree that therefore, the TRUTH is found in the Infallible Church founded by Jesus Christ, true God and true Man; and not in a fallible church founded by a mere man?

{175} Do you agree that infallibility does not enable the Pope to make new revelations, or to create new doctrines to be believed by Catholics?

{176} Do you agree that in Catholic teaching there is no power on earth authorized to add to, or to take from, or to alter in one jot or tittle the *Deposit* or Revelation completed in the Apostles?

{177} Do you agree that no doctrine not contained, formally or virtually, in that sacred *Deposit*, can ever be made a dogma of Catholic faith?

{178} Do you agree that the office of the Church, is to declare what was contained in the original Revelation, and infallibility is the result of a divine assistance, whereby what was divinely revealed in the beginning is divinely preserved to the end?”

{179} Do you agree that a doctrine once proposed or defined by the infallible authority of the Pope or of the Church remains forever absolutely unalterable?

{180} Do you agree that the Pope cannot by virtue of his Infallibility reverse what has always been held?

{181} Do you agree that a definition once made, remains unchanged and unchangeable for all times?

{182} Do you agree that infallibility is not a personal, but an *official* prerogative; it is attached not to the person, but to the *office* of the Pope?

{183} Do you agree that infallibility has to do, not with what the Pope himself thinks or believes; but with what he teaches for the belief of the Church?

{184} Do you agree that the conditions, then, essential to an infallible judgment are: (1) on the part of the Pope, that he should speak as Supreme Teacher of the Church; (2) on the part of the subject-matter, that it should appertain to the domain of faith or morals; (3) on the part of the form, that the judgment should be pronounced with the clearly manifested intention of commanding the absolute intellectual assent; and, (4) on the part of the subject, that it should be binding on the entire Church?

Why Do Catholics Believe In The Dogma Of Infallibility? I will state some of the reasons why I, a Catholic, believe in infallibility.

- I. Because I believe in the importance and necessity of my souls salvation; and both call for the guidance and security of Infallibility
- II. Because I believe in the Goodness of God and in His Love for man; and this belief justly leads me to expect from Him the concession of Infallibility.
- III. Because I believe that God made a supernatural Revelation of His will for the benefit of man to the end of time; and from this fact I conclude that the Wisdom of God must have provided a living Infallible Witness, Guardian, and Interpreter to authenticate, protect, and teach in all ages this Revelation in its purity and integrity.
- IV. Because I believe, moreover, that God imposed this Revelation on the belief and practice of man as a law of faith and conduct; and from the existence of this divine obligation I conclude that God, in His Justice, must have appointed an Infallible Witness to its contents, and an Infallible Interpreter of its meaning.

- V. Because I believe that God made divine faith in the teaching of this Revelation a condition of my salvation; and such faith in its plenitude is impossible without the aid of Infallibility.
- VI. Because assuming a divine faith in the contents of Revelation to be necessary, nothing short of the certainty and security of Infallibility can satisfy legitimate demands of my reason and conscience.
- VII. Because a living Infallible Authority is at once the source of the greatest blessings, and a safeguard against the greatest evils.
- VIII. Because only a living Infallible Authority can satisfactorily settle the Christian controversy, and be equal to the many and grave difficulties connected with it. Only a living Infallible Authority can adjust and harmonize the respective claims of Reason and Revelation, Science and Faith, Liberty and Authority, Nature and Grace; in one word, of the Natural and Supernatural.
- IX. Because the doctrine is a teaching of Revelation, and is and ever has been the belief of the great majority of Christians.
- X. Because the history of the dogmatic teaching of the Church for 1800 years points to Infallibility in *fact*.
- XI. Because without Infallibility, logically speaking, I would have no valid reasons, – no sufficient grounds for the profession of the only consistent and tenable position to believe God must always teach the Truth.
- XII. Because it is unjust on the part of God to oblige men to hear a fallible church.

{ 185 } Do you agree that every person possesses a soul of inestimable value, a soul purchased by the Blood of Jesus Christ?

{ 186 } Do you agree that as with every other human being; the salvation of my soul is to me the *one thing necessary*? (Luke 10:42)

{ 187 } Do you agree that the loss of one's soul means a loss of all that constitutes true happiness; and that to lose it once is to lose it, beyond all hope or possibility of recovery, for all eternity?

{ 188 } Do you agree that everyone who belongs to a fallible church founded by a mere man; has a fallible guide, and therefore subject to be taught err?

{ 189 } Do you agree that without an infallible Guide, one cannot know with complete certitude that they are in the way of salvation?

{ 190 } Do you agree that without an infallible Guide, no one can know beyond all prudent doubt or danger of deception, the conditions of salvation?

{ 191 } Do you agree that without an infallible Guide, I cannot have absolute certainty as to what God wishes me to believe and to do to attain my destiny?

{ 192 } Do you agree that without an infallible Guide it is impossible to have absolute certainty and security concerning one's salvation?

{ 193 } Do you agree that no security can be too great where eternity is at stake?

{ 194 } Therefore, is it extremely obvious to you that when the salvation of the soul is concerned; nothing could be more desirable, or better adapted, or indeed more necessary, to the needs and welfare of my soul than a Guide to whose direction I could, with entire confidence, entrust its everlasting interests, and to which I could turn for a satisfactory answer to all questions affecting them?

{ 195 } Do you agree that such a Guide, to be equal to the necessities of the case – to be able to guarantee the certainty, the intellectual security, which interest so great demand, and remove all fear of conscience and anxiety of heart – ought to be beyond the reach of error or deception, – in other words, ought to be Infallible?

{ 196 } Do you agree that therefore, the surpassing value of the soul and the vital importance of securing its salvation suggest and demand the aid of Infallibility?

{ 197 } Do you agree that what the wants and interests of my soul suggest and call for, my belief in the infinite Goodness and Love of God justifies me looking for as granted?

{198} Do you agree that my belief in the riches of the Goodness and Love of God, and in the immense blessings which through them He has bestowed on man, and not find in such belief ample reason for concluding that the blessing of Infallibility is among the number?

{199} Do you realize that God gave up to the torments of Calvary His own divine and only begotten Son for our souls' redemption and salvation, – the God, “*Who will have all men to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth,*” (1 Timothy 2:4)?

{200} Do you agree that it is impossible for Divine Love to leave us, without a living unerring, infallible Guide to the truth, to group our way amidst the darkness of more than 1000 conflicting creeds, and liable at any moment to be ensnared by error and its apostles?

Remember what the Holy Ghost told us through the pen of St. Paul, “*He that spared not even his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how hath he not also, with him, given us all things?*”

{201} Do you agree that if God gave us *all things* necessary for salvation, then God necessarily gave us an Infallible Guide?

{202} Do you agree that without a living Infallible Witness, Revelation cannot be certainly identified? How is man to distinguish with certainty what is Revelation and what is not Revelation?

To my mind, it is clear that if God made a supernatural Revelation of His will, and intended the same for the benefit of man to the end of time, He must have provided a living Infallible Witness to its authenticity and genuineness, a living Infallible Guardian of its purity and integrity, and a living Infallible Interpreter of its contents and meaning.

{203} Do you agree that without a living Infallible Witnesses, the Revelation cannot be certainly, positively, and unquestionably identified?

{204} Do you agree that mankind cannot distinguish with certainty, assurance, and conviction what is Revelation and what is not Revelation – true from false – genuine from spurious Revelation without an Infallible Witness?

{205} Do you agree that regarding religion, without an Infallible Witness we have no adequate means of ascertaining the truth in the many cases of doubt and controversy of great importance?

In other words, if there is no living Infallible Witness to this Revelation and to its contents, what sufficient guarantee have I that what is proposed for my assent is, beyond all reasonable doubt or prudent fear of error, the identical Message delivered by God nearly 2000 years ago?

{206} Do you agree that without a living Infallible Guardian, Revelation cannot be properly safeguarded?

{207} Do you agree that Revelation is a body or system of truths expressed in human language?

{208} Do you agree that there is no way of knowing with 100% certitude that this sacred deposit will be protected from the assaults and encroachment of error without an Infallible Guardian?

Expressed as it is in changeable, corruptible, perishable language, how secure is this Revelation against innovation, perversion, corruption and decay without an Infallible Guardian?

{209} Do you agree that without an Infallible Guardian no one could know for certain that this Revelation is kept and transmitted in whole and unsullied from one generation to another amidst the falsifying influences of men and time?

{210} Do you agree that the Bible cannot do this; because in no sense, can it be called an adequate Guardian, a sufficient guarantee for its purity and integrity?

{211} Do you agree that the Bible itself, no less than Revelation, needs a living Infallible Witness, Guardian, and Interpreter?

{212} Do you agree that if the Bible was this Infallible Witness, Guardian, and Interpreter; that every person who reads the Bible would have the same understanding and interpretation of everything it says?

{213} Do you agree that without a living Infallible Interpreter of Revelation, that I cannot be certain that I understand right what the Bible is teaching?

{214} Do you agree that admittedly, the many religious sects throughout the world provide a number of different interpretations of Revelation and what the Bible teaches?

{215} Do you agree that as a matter of fact many and, not infrequently, the most opposite meanings have been given to some of its most important parts?

How in such cases determine with certainty its true meaning, – the meaning intended by its Divine Author, if there is no living Infallible Interpreter of it?

{246} Do you agree that if its true meaning cannot be certainly ascertained, that such a Revelation would have no practical value to man?

What would be the wisdom or the object of making Divine Revelation without an Infallible Interpreter?

Assuming, then, that God made a supernatural Revelation of the body of truths for man's benefit for all time, the Wisdom of God, I repeat, must have provided it with a living Infallible Witness to identify and authenticate it, a living Infallible Guardian to protect it intact and defend it against the assaults of error, and a living Infallible Interpreter to determine and declare unerringly its genuine meaning.

Deny the truths stated in the above paragraph and what follows? Why, the absurd conclusion, that an infinitely wise God sent from heaven no less a person than His own Son to make for man's guidance a Revelation of His will, and that at the same time He made no adequate provisions for its proper identification, preservation, or usefulness in after ages; that God delivered a most important Message, and appointed no one to bear witness to it before future generations, – no way to safeguard it against the encroachments of heresy, – no one to define its contents or to declare its meaning, or to decide the many great controversies that were sure to arise in the course of time concerning it; that He left His sacred truth to be the sport of the theories, fantasies, follies, disputes, contentions, and contradictions of men, not caring whether they received it or not, or in what sense they received it, whether true or false, or whether they received it in different or even contradictory senses; in a word, that God is perfectly indifferent both as to the custody of the Revelation itself and as to the success of its mission.

{217} Do you agree that this view of the case is not acceptable to either reason or to common sense?

{218} Do you agree that we have an absolute proof of the need for a living Infallible Witness, Guardian, and Interpreter of Revelation before our eyes today in the many sects in the world with their religious dissensions, divisions, and contradictions among them who say they accept the supernatural Revelation, and at the same time reject infallibility?

{219} Do you agree that one of two things is perfectly certain; either God made no Revelation at all, or He provided it with a living Infallible Witness, Guardian, and Interpreter?

{220} Do you agree that to make a Revelation, and not make such provision for its preservation and propagation would be as absurd as to make a law and leave it without a judge to declare and apply it?

{221} Do you agree that God did not leave it optional with man to accept or reject His Revelation?

{222} Do you agree that God made it obligatory to accept His Revelation, His belief, and practice; He ordained it to be His rule of faith and conduct, and that under the penalty of eternal damnation?

Our Divine Lord's words are explicit and emphatic: "*And he said to them: Go ye into the whole world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved: but he that believeth not shall be condemned.*" (Mark 16:15, 16)

Now, I ask, would or could a God of infinite Justice make faith in Revelation obligatory on man under so extreme a penalty, without furnishing him with the means of knowing beyond all danger of error what the specific, precise, and exact truths of this Revelation were, and what their genuine meaning was?

If you answer the last question in the affirmative, then I say you impugn, dispute, and attack the Justice of God, and at once write yourself down a blasphemer; and if you answer in the negative, then, I contend, you have no alternative but to profess yourself at once a believer in Infallibility.

For, seeing that God does not vouchsafe to speak to us Himself, what other means, besides an Infallible Witness and Teacher, are there of determining with certainty what Revelation teaches on each point of necessary faith?

{223} Do you agree that there are none?

{224} Do you agree that therefore, we must conclude that if God made faith in a body of supernaturally revealed truths a condition of our salvation, He, most certainly, has appointed and commissioned someone to

tell us with unerring authority what these truths are, and the precise sense in which He wishes us to receive them?

{225} Do you agree that otherwise we are forced to believe that God laid upon us a most grievous obligation, and at the same time did not furnish us with the necessary means of fulfilling it?

I insist on the necessity of Infallibility merely in the present order of Divine Providence. Almighty God, of course, could speak directly and immediately to man; but here we are dealing with an order of things in which He does not speak personally to us, but in which He spoke to a special body of men in one generation the law for all future generations.

God demands of man faith in the teaching of Revelation. (Matthew 24:35; Mark 13:31) Faith, considered as an act of reason, is defined to be an act by which we firmly and without condition or reserve believe a truth of Revelation.

{226} Do you agree that the assent of faith must be undoubting, unconditional, and absolute; and the truth to which this consent is given must be one supernaturally revealed by God?

{227} Do you agree that in order, then, that an act of faith be a reasonable act, it is plain that the mind that makes it should know for certain that the doctrine proposed for its belief is really a truth of Revelation?

{228} Do you agree that an act of faith presupposes and demands certainty not only as to the fact that God has spoken, but also that the truth or doctrine in question is part of what He said?

{229} Do you agree that probability, even the highest, will not do; (Luke 10:16; Matthew 10:15, 16) absolute certainty is required; for faith and doubt are absolutely, totally, and altogether incompatible, and certainty alone can remove all doubt?

“He that heareth you, heareth me; and he that despiseth you, despiseth me; and he that despiseth me, despiseth him that sent me.” (Luke 10:16)

“Amen I say to you, it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom and Gomorrha in the day of judgment, than for that city. Behold I send you as sheep in the midst of wolves. Be ye therefore wise as serpents and simple as doves.” (Matthew 10:15, 16)

Believers in *“The Bible and the Bible only”* would do well to reflect on these texts (Luke 10:16; Matthew 10:15, 16), and to ask themselves whether they can point to any as clear, forceful, convincing, persuasive, and as cogent in support of their theory. The texts quoted above clearly show that our Divine Lord was deeply interested in the Catholic Church and in its pastors. He gave an express commission to the pastors of the Church to preach His Gospel to all nations. Did He anywhere give this commission to the Bible? Did Jesus appoint the Bible to be the organ of His Revelation, and the means of propagating its teaching? To the pastors of His Church He said, he that hears *you* hears *me*. Did Jesus anywhere say anything like this of the Bible? Did Jesus constitute the Bible His mouthpiece? Jesus said expressly that he who did not *“hear the Church”* should be regarded as a heathen and a Publican (Matthew 18:17). Did Jesus anywhere say that he who did not *hear the Bible* should be regarded in the same light?

Without the testimony of an Infallible Witness to the fact, how is it possible for any man to have such certainty in the case of each and every one of the truths to which the divine command to believe extends?

{230} Do you agree that without the authority of an Infallible Interpreter of those truths, no one can be sure that he understands aright their divine meaning?

{231} Do you agree that then, as no man can believe by divine faith doctrines of whose Revelation and genuine meaning he is not absolutely certain, it follows at once, that to have divine, saving faith, at least in its *plenitude*, I must have an Infallible Witness to the specific truths of faith, and an Infallible Interpreter of their true meaning?

{232} Do you agree with Cardinal Newman that nothing is clearer than this, that if faith in God’s word is required of us for salvation, the Catholic Church is the *only* medium by which we can exercise it?

{233} Do you agree that God willed that His Revelation should be believed everywhere and by all men in its integrity and unity?

{234} Do you agree that to make a Revelation, and leave man free to accept or reject it wholly or in part would be absurd?

What would be the denial or the refusal on man's part to believe a *single* point of Revelation mean? Clearly it would be one or other of four things. It would be to offend against (1) the Knowledge of God, by virtually accusing Him of error, or (2) against His Veracity, by virtually charging Him with deceit, or (3) against His Wisdom, by virtually accusing Him of having spoken without purpose, or (4) against His Authority, by refusing to submit to it.

{235} Do you agree that man cannot, therefore, deny or refuse to believe a single truth of revelation without sin?

{236} Do you agree that to deny or refuse to believe a single truth of Revelation would mean the loss of faith altogether, in as much as it would involve a denial of the very principle – the formal motive or reason – of faith?

{237} Do you agree that the sole motive or reason why we believe any truth by divine faith is the authority of God who revealed it; and that no other motive is sufficient for divine faith?

{238} Do you agree that all the truths of Revelation alike rest on the same Divine Authority?

{239} Do you agree that therefore, to reject any one of them would be to reject the Authority of Him who revealed it, – the very principle of faith?

{240} Do you agree with St. Augustine that, the man who believes what he likes of the Gospel and rejects what he likes, believes himself rather than God or the Gospel?

“And whosoever shall keep the whole law, but offend in one point, is become guilty of all.” (St. James 2:10)

Now, if the man who transgresses one precept of law is considered guilty of transgressing the whole law because it condemns the Law-Giver; the man who denies or refuses to believe a single truth of Revelation is guilty of denying all Revelation, because he contends the Divine Revealer.

{241} Do you agree that God willed His Revelation to be believed everywhere, and by all men, in its *unity*?

{242} Do you agree that God willed that all men should always and everywhere have *one and the same* faith?

The evidence of Scripture on this last point is abundant. St. John tells us that so much did our Divine Lord desire unity among His followers, teachers and taught, that the last prayer He uttered before His Sacred Passion was that they may be *one*. *“And the glory which thou hast given me, I have given to them; that they may be one, as we also are one.”* (John 17:22)

“Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that you all speak the same thing, and that there be no schisms among you; but that you be perfect in the same mind, and in the same judgment.” (1 Corinthians 1:10)

{243} Do you agree that unity is essential to truth, and, therefore, that faith, to be true, must be one?

{244} Do you agree that it is evident to reason and common sense that God cannot be the Author of many conflicting religions?

{245} Do you agree that truth cannot teach doctrines in any measure at variance with one another, or sanction different and contradictory creeds?

{246} Do you agree that it is not possible to attain and perpetrate this worldwide, all-embracing integrity and unity of faith without an Infallible Authority?

{247} Do you agree that it is not possible to get all men everywhere to agree in believing by divine faith the *same* creed, and in believing it in exactly the *same* sense, without an Infallible Teacher to determine unerringly both the articles of the Creed and their genuine meaning?

In case a difference of opinion should arise on any vital point, how then maintain the integrity and unity of faith without an Infallible Judge to declare the truth and put an end to controversy?

{248} Do you agree that the thing is impossible; and that to show it is impossible, the history of Protestant Christianity furnishes a conclusive proof?

{249} Do you agree that non-Catholic Christendom is split up into hundreds of sects, all differing in faith; some contradicting and some condemning and denouncing what others hold to be most sacred?

{250} Do you agree that with all those who reject infallibility: as time goes by, everyday witnesses a worst state of things, – sects continually subdividing, creeds ever changing, one point of Christian doctrine after another called in question, doubted, and denied?

Does not the state of all Protestant religions taken as a whole, represent and prove beyond doubt that unity and integrity of faith is an utter impossibility without the authority of Infallibility?

{251} Do you agree that to create and maintain unity or oneness of faith in its fullness demands an Authority which is able to produce universal and undoubting conviction of the absolutely unerring truth of its teaching?

{252} Do you agree that only an Authority endowed with the supernatural prerogative of Infallibility can do this?

Sacred Scripture tells us that *heresy* is one of the greatest of sins. But how condemn any man's belief or teaching as heresy except on the principle of an Infallible Teacher of divine truth? Heresy is dissent from the word, not of a human and fallible, but of a Divine and Infallible Teacher. What right, then, can any Teacher or body of Teachers, or Council or Church, that claims not Infallibility, have to condemn and denounce as heretical the creed or opinions of those who may differ with them, seeing that the one has the same authority for his belief and the same right to hold that it is the genuine teaching of Revelation as the other?

{253} Do you agree that the charge of heresy, or a trial for heresy by a Body that claims not unerring divine judgment of Infallibility, is an absurdity, – a solemn farce?

To provide effectively, then, against heresy and schism, against divisions and sects in the Christian body; to create and perpetrate everywhere, and in all minds, divine saving faith in its integrity and unity, there must necessarily be a Teacher whose authority is, beyond question, divine, and his judgment is, beyond suspicion, infallible. And the necessity of the case being so manifest, can we for a moment believe that our Divine Lord, who so fervently prayed for unity of faith among His followers, failed to provide the only adequate means of guaranteeing it?

Assuming a divine faith in the teaching of Revelation to be necessary to salvation, than I hold that nothing short of the certainty and security of Infallibility can satisfy the legitimate demands of Reason and Conscience.

{254} Do you agree that no one who believes the Bible to be the Word of God can for a moment doubt that divine faith is necessary to salvation?

{255} Do you agree that St. Paul lays down this necessity in the plainest terms?

*“But **without faith it is impossible to please God.** For he that cometh to God, must believe that he is, and is a rewarder to them that seek him.”* (Hebrews 11:6)

{256} Do you agree that Jesus Christ empathetically declares in words that cannot be mistaken that divine faith is necessary for salvation?

“He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved: but he that believeth not shall be condemned.” (Mark 16:16)

What, then, is faith, and what does it demand of reason? Fundamentally, faith is a belief in or an acceptance of information solely on the word or authority of the person who gives it. When the informant is man our faith in what he says is *human*; but when the informant is God, then our faith is *divine*.

{257} Do you agree that it is the very essence of faith that the assent of the intellect should be absolutely undoubting, unconditional, unhesitating, unreserved; otherwise there is and can be no supernatural, no divine faith?

{258} Do you agree that there may be opinion, or private judgment, or a tendency, or willingness to believe; but real faith there cannot be, for that absolutely excludes all doubt or distrust of any kind?

The reason of this is clear. The sole motive or reason of divine faith is the authority of God. When we make an act of divine faith in any doctrine, the mind assents to the doctrine, not because reason convinces us of its truth, nor because the senses and their experience supply us with evidence of its truth, not because, as it may happen, it is the unanimous teaching of the most learned among men; not because it is the teaching of any Church – no, but *simply* and *solely* because God revealed it.

{259} Do you agree that no other authority is sufficient for an act of divine faith?

{260} Do you agree that even in Catholic teaching the authority of the Church, though infallible, is not the formal motive of faith?

{261} Do you agree that God's authority excludes even the possibility of error in all that He reveals?

{262} Do you agree that God's Knowledge and Veracity being infinite, He can neither deceive nor be deceived?

{263} Do you agree that consequently there can be no room for doubt or distress, no justification for hesitation or reserve, or for ever revoking or wavering in an assent once given?

{264} Do you agree that Faith has its rights, and so has Reason; and the rights of the latter as well as of the former have to be respected and it's just demands fully satisfied?

Before I submit to this demand of faith and yield the assent it calls for, I have a right to exact and must have absolute certainty (1) on the truths of faith, – what they are; and (2) on their genuine meaning.

{265} Do you agree that I am not and cannot be bound to the obedience of faith before I am satisfied beyond all reasonable doubt or prudent fear of error on these two points?

{266} Do you agree that as nothing less than an Infallible Teacher of Revelation can give or guarantee such certainty, I therefore demand the security of such a Teacher before I give the assent of faith to any body of teaching?

{267} Do you agree that nothing can be more reasonable than to believe the word of God?

{268} Do you agree that Reason readily admits that the assent of faith ought to be perfectly undoubting, absolutely unreserved.

{269} Do you agree that what reason contends for as its strict right is that, before it is bound to give this assent to divine faith, it must be thoroughly satisfied that what is proposed for acceptance is, beyond doubt, the teaching of Revelation, the word, not of man, but of God, and that the meaning proposed is the true meaning intended by God?

So much security Reason certainly has a right to exact – so much, in fact, that it is the duty of Reason to exact – to safeguard itself against error or deception in a question of such vital importance.

{270} Do you agree with Cardinal Manning that until the reason is *certain* there can be no moral obligation to believe?

No man, therefore, no organization, no Church can justly claim, or have any right to ask for my obedience to its teaching unless it can completely satisfy me on these two heads; and if it is not infallible, how can it succeed in doing this? For if I know that it may be mistaken about the contents of Revelation, or about the genuine meaning of its contents, how can I be sure that it is not actually so; and, therefore, that it is not asking me to accept as the word of God the erroneous word of man?

To put this argument in a concrete form, let us suppose the following case: A Missionary from one of the Protestant bodies undertakes the work of converting an unbeliever. He begins by telling him about the Divine Founder of Christianity, who He was and about His Mission on earth, what its object was. He tells him of the Gospel He preached for the salvation of man, of its sublime teaching, of the hope it inspired, of the great reward it promised here and especially hereafter to all who would faithfully observe its precepts. He next passes on to the evidences of Christianity, and puts before the unbeliever the proofs of our Lords Divine Mission and of the fact of His having preached the Gospel of Christianity, and having made it the rule of faith and conduct for all men to the end of time. Having fully and forcibly stated the evidences, he turns at once to the work of convincing his hearer that the particular creed professed by his Church, (be it Lutheranism, Episcopalianism, Presbyterianism, Congregationalism, Methodism, Baptist, Seventh-day Adventist, Mormonism, etcetera,) is the true Christianity which Christ Himself preached. At the conclusion of his discourse on this head, can we not easily imagine that the intelligent unbeliever taking up the argument and continuing somewhat after this fashion? Friend, I have been charmed with your account of Christianity and its Founder; its doctrines are beautiful and consoling, and your arguments and proof of the fact that the Founder of Christianity was no other than the Son the Eternal One made man, and, therefore, that Christianity is a Divine Religion, the teaching of God Himself – these are strong and convincing. But when we have got as far as this your argument begins to lose force and fails to satisfy me. Let me tell you why. I have been to America and have lived there for some time. It is a professedly Christian country, believing in God and in the Gospel of Christ. Now what did I find in this Christian America of yours? I found that its Christians were divided into a hundred and more different bodies, forming as many distinct and different sects, each with its own place of worship. All different one from

the other, and different on points of admitted importance; some even on the very first principles of Christianity. No, my friend, I would like to be a Christian, but here I am confronted with more than one hundred different forms of it; and at once the question arises, which is the true one? All cannot be true; that is certain. It is equally certain that only one form can be true; for God is a God of truth, and truth is essentially one indivisible and immutable like God Himself – *Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, and today; and the same for ever.* (Hebrews 13:8) God cannot be the Author of contradictions. He could not teach one body one thing, and teach others the very opposite of that. He could not teach one Church for sacred saving truth what He teaches another church to be error, aye, worse, blasphemy and idolatry. I could far more easily and, in my opinion, more reasonably believe that there was no God at all than believe in a God of variations, deviations, and contradictions.

Now this Church tells me that Christ the Son of God was the Author of its creed; and that other tells me that the same Christ, God and man, was the Author of its creed, though the latter differs essentially from the former; nay more, perhaps denounces and anathematizes it. A third Church, differing from both, makes precisely the same claim for its creed; and so for dozens and scores of others, – all claim to have the divine and immutable teaching of Christ; and yet no two of them agree. Well, you speak to me in the name of one of these Churches, and you tell me that the particular Church, whose Missionary you are, claims my allegiance; and you would have me believe that I am bound to accept by divine faith its teaching as the pure and unadulterated word of God. Now, friend, how do you justify this claim, on the part of your Church, on my belief and conscience? You ask for the complete submission of my intellect, will, and conscience to your teaching as the Gospel of Christ. Are you able to guarantee me against error or deception if I yield to your demands, accept your decree, and say *credo*, I believe? Can you assure me, beyond all reasonable doubt or prudent fear of error, that yours is the only true form of Christianity, and that in embracing it, I, certainly and surely, believe what Christ commissioned His apostles to preach to “*every creature*,” and in reference to which, He said, “*he that believeth not shall be condemned*”? If you cannot give me this assurance, I cannot prudently, I cannot reasonably or conscientiously give to your Church and its creed the obedience for which you ask. Remember the all-important interests that are at stake. You tell me that my soul is of inestimable value; that its salvation is the one thing necessary, – the crown of all blessings; that it involves the consideration of eternity, and where there is question of salvation and eternity you say I cannot be too cautious or too secure. Moreover, you tell me that salvation under the Gospel depends on knowing, believing, and practicing what it teaches. Well, what if you should be wrong in your view of the Gospel? What if the teaching you put forward as God’s saving truth should turn out to be error? You are not infallible, your Church is not infallible, – *neither of you claim to be.* You are, therefore, liable to err; and how, I ask, can I be sure that you do not actually err in what you believe and would have me accept as the true teaching of Christianity? You have no more certainty, no more security for the truth of your position, than the hundred other Christian bodies around you which differ with and contradict you, and which in your opinion are wrong. They are 100 to 1 against you, and they are composed of believers as sincere, as learned, as good, and as pious as any in your body. They are, also, as dogmatic as you in asserting that their forms of Christianity are severally the true and pure Christianity of Christ. Perhaps one or other of these is right; if so, you must be wrong, so far at least as you differ. How, then, can you justly claim for your creed, and how could I reasonably yield to it, the obedience of faith? How could I as a reasonable man, and fully alive to the importance of my act, bow down before your teaching, and, accepting it as the supernaturally revealed word of God, make an act of divine faith in it? No, friend, I cannot do it. My Reason and Conscience both demand, in a matter of such surpassing interest to my soul, the security of an Authority that cannot deceive me, an Authority that can, beyond the possibility of a mistake, tell me what true Christianity is, solve my difficulties, and clear up my doubts on all religious questions.

{271} Do you agree that therefore, reason has a strict right to demand, and ought to have, the guarantee of Infallibility in matters of religion in order to be certain that nothing shall be proposed for its belief but the pure and unadulterated teaching of God, and that nothing shall be required of it in morals say what the law of God prescribes?

{272} Do you agree that without this, Reason would not have that certainty to which it has a right, nor would Conscience have the security which is essential to its peace and happiness?

{273} Do you agree that with Infallibility, Christianity is not something uncertain, indefinite, or vague; – and that without infallibility the opposite is true?

{274} Do you agree that with Infallibility, we know precisely and for certain what Christianity is, what it teaches, what it commands, and what it condemns; – and that without infallibility the opposite is true?

{275} Do you agree that with Infallibility, dogmas of Christianity are irreversible and unchangeable, and the same everywhere, at all times, and for all men; – and that without infallibility the opposite is true?

{276} Do you agree that with Infallibility, an unerring knowledge of the truths and means of salvation is within the reach of all, and is easily attained by the unlearned as well as the learned; – and that without infallibility the opposite is true?

{277} Do you agree that with Infallibility, there is no need of great or of labored study, or of length and examination; – and that without infallibility the opposite is true?

{278} Do you agree that with Infallibility, all the believer has to do is to listen to the Infallible Teacher, and he learns at once the truth as God revealed it; – and that without infallibility the opposite is true?

{279} Do you agree that with Infallibility, all the difficulties of the religious controversy disappear; – and that without infallibility the opposite is true?

{280} Do you agree that with Infallibility, you have the means of determining, beyond the possibility of mistake, the truths of faith, and of deciding unerringly all points of controversy, answering satisfactorily all objections, and dispelling effectively all doubts in reference thereto; – and that without infallibility the opposite is true?

{281} Do you agree that with Infallibility, you have a principal that triumphantly vindicates the truth of whatever it teaches, and completely justifies the most absolute faith in it; – and that without infallibility the opposite is true?

{282} Do you agree that with Infallibility, there is perfect unity of faith among believers; it unites men of all races, countries, and nationalities in one and the same faith; – and that without infallibility the opposite is true?

{283} Do you agree that with Infallibility, my faith is fixed and permanent; – and that without infallibility the opposite is true?

{284} Do you agree that with Infallibility, what my faith was yesterday, it is today, and will be tomorrow; – and that without infallibility the opposite is true?

{285} Do you agree that with Infallibility, the least variation, contradiction, or inconsistency is impossible; – and that without infallibility the opposite is true?

{286} Do you agree that with Infallibility, all is certainty, security, calm, and repose; you are completely protected from the strife and confusion of tongues; – and that without infallibility the opposite is true?

Now let us reflect on what happens *without* infallibility.

{287} Do you agree that without Infallibility, the specific truths Christianity embodies are, and what their genuine meaning is, cannot be determined with certainty?

{288} Do you agree that without Infallibility, to one mind Christianity will teach one set of doctrines; to another a different and perhaps a contradictory set?

{289} Do you agree that without Infallibility, a certain knowledge of the necessary truths of faith, and of the means of salvation, would be impossible, if not to all, at least to the great majority of men?

{290} Do you agree that without infallibility every point of doctrine and dogma must be launched, discussed, established, recognized, proven, verified, authenticated, and agreed upon by everyone involved?

{291} Do you agree that the points mentioned in the above question have never taken place, and will never take place, among all those who reject the Infallible Teacher?

{292} Do you agree that in the theory of Infallibility only one point has to be established, viz., the doctrine of Infallibility itself?

{293} Do you agree that once this question of infallibility is settled, it will satisfactorily settle all other questions?

For when I have once fully satisfied myself that there exists, by God's appointment, a living Infallible Teacher of the truth, then all I have to do is to interrogate this Divine Teacher on the point of doctrine, or on the subject of my doubt, difficulty, or ignorance, and without further trouble I have the truth beyond the possibility of error.

{294} Do you agree that without Infallibility, the Christian believer is like a man at sea without a pilot, rudder, or compass; he is the sport of the winds and waves of controversy, doubt, and uncertainty?

{295} Do you agree that without Infallibility, man can have no certainty about the truth of faith, for he has no principle of certainty to appeal to, no standard of truth to consult, no unerring guide to the contents and meaning of Revelation?

{296} Do you agree that without Infallibility, there can be no unity in matters of faith?

{297} Do you agree that without Infallibility, men will disagree as to what is, and what is not, of necessary faith?

{298} Do you agree that without Infallibility, there will be dissensions and contradictions, divisions, schisms, and sects – the perfect babel of tongues – until no man knows what to believe?

Cardinal Manning asks, "What, then, do we see in this land? Sects without number perpetually subdividing, each equally confident, all contradictory; and that dominant communion which claims to be authoritative in teaching, itself confounded by internal contradictions of its own. *How has this come to pass? It is because the Rule of Faith is lost, and the principle of certainty is destroyed.*" A Protestant has described the church of England as "*100 sects battling within one church.*"

{299} Do you agree that without Infallibility, there was no guarantee for permanency or stability in matters of faith, no security for a single dogma of Christianity?

{300} Do you agree that without Infallibility, what is of faith will be ever subject to change and changing; mutability and variation will mark its daily history?

{301} Do you agree that without Infallibility, what was believed yesterday is called into question and doubted today, and will be denied tomorrow?

{302} Do you agree that without Infallibility, dogma after dogma will meet the same fate until there will be left no fixed, invariable truths, no necessary articles of belief, no objective historical faith?

{303} Do you agree that without Infallibility, God might as well have never spoken?

{304} Do you agree that without Infallibility, no church or organization will have a right to undertake the mission of converting those without it; for being unable to assure them of the truth of its creed, it cannot rightly demand or ask of them the assent of faith?

{305} Do you agree that without Infallibility, the Christian believer is ever exposed to the misery of doubt and uncertainty?

Without Infallibility any moment the dreadful thought, "perhaps I may be wrong; perhaps what I hold to be the saving truth of Jesus Christ may after all be error," may come to disturb his peace, and torment his soul. He sees that others, who adopt the same Rule of Faith, entirely differ with him, and having the very same means of knowing the truth that he has, he cannot justly deny they might be right. He cannot, consequently, be quite sure that his is the only true and saving faith of Christ. Then the perplexing question arises, "If I am in error will God hold me excusable in the day of judgment?" And what anxiety reflection upon such a question must bring to the religious mind!

{306} Do you agree that without Infallibility, religion would be little more than "*a dismal hell of mere speculation?*"

{307} Do you agree that if all men must hear the Church, if all must submit to the Church as they would to Christ Himself; must not God necessarily provide that His Church teach nothing but truth?

If God did not so provide; if He should allow His Church to teach falsehood, then we would have this absurdity: you and I would, by Christ's words, be obliged to submit to the teaching of a Church which might, for all we know, be teaching falsehood!

{308} Do you agree that it would be a great injustice if we were obliged to believe all that is taught by the Church if we have no guarantee that the Church would always teach us truth?

{309} Do you agree that such injustice may not be ascribed to God?

{310} Do you agree that therefore, the very fact that God established a Church to which He obliges men to submit, proves that He will not allow that Church to teach falsehood?

Since there is a Church which He expects men to hear, He must necessarily guarantee with absolute certainty that His Church teach only truth when it speaks to men. I am a Catholic because Christ made it necessary for me to believe all He taught. But in order to believe what Jesus Christ taught it is necessary for me to know exactly and without probability of error just what Christ did actually teach. Of myself, alone and unaided, I am unable to arrive at this knowledge. Hence the necessity of some authoritative representative of Christ who, aided from on high, is competent to tell me without error what Christ taught. I must know infallibly what to believe; and the only Church that makes any claim at all to be infallible is the Catholic Church.

It is so absolutely significant to me that no other Church claims to teach infallibly, that if I were outside the Church, I would enter it for that reason alone. I would ask: "What did Christ mean when He said: '*behold, I am with you all days*'? Can Jesus Christ be with error? Can He abide with falsehood? If other churches believe Jesus is with them, why do they not claim infallibility, instead of holding up their hands in horror at the arrogance and pride of the Catholic Church claiming always to teach truth and nothing but the truth."

What a disastrous admission it is for any church not to claim infallibility!

{311} Do you agree that not to claim infallibility means not to claim to be the Church with which Jesus Christ abides all days, even to the consummation of the world?

{312} Do you agree that not to claim infallibility is to renounce all right to teach?

{313} Do you agree that when you assert that you belong to a church that is not infallible, you assert that you belong to a church, in which neither you nor your leaders profess to know whether what you teach and believe is true or false?

{314} Do you agree that it is the height of folly, imprudence, and madness to presume to teach in God's name, and at the same time have to assert: "I may be teaching you falsehood"?

Consider the beauty of knowing that what you believe is true, that whatever is taught is true. That is exactly what Jesus Christ promised should be the case, and that is exactly what we mean when we claim the Church founded by Jesus Christ to be infallible. Belief in the infallibility of the Church is simply belief in the truthfulness that Christ promised to remain with His Church all days, and to send to it the Spirit of Truth to teach it all truth and preserve it from error.

In conclusion I will remind everyone that this infallible Church founded by Jesus Christ has spoken at least three times infallibly that there is no salvation outside of the Catholic Church! Eternity is too long to be wrong and not die as a member of that Church founded by Jesus Christ, which is the Catholic Church – for It is the only Church that is infallible.

I now write to all those who do belong to the Catholic Church Jesus Christ founded. Thank God every day that you belong to this Church with this perfect unity of government and doctrine, its definiteness and certainty, it's absolutely uncompromising authority in teaching and commanding. We realize that this Church stands in direct contrast to Protestantism, with its vagueness's, contradictions, uncertainty, and inability to command or to demand, or to receive the unwavering assent of its adherents, its inability to teach with authority! The reason for that difference is that Christ is with us and renders our Church infallible. That is why we are Catholics and proud to be Catholics, while we thank God every day that we are Catholics, and why we pray in our charity that all those outside may eventually find their way into the true Church of God!

†††JMJ†††

Thank you for visiting <http://www.JMJsit.com> and please tell others about this website. I pray that you will live in such a way that the Good God will always constantly Bless you while He keeps you from all sin. May Jesus, Mary, and Saint Joseph obtain for you every grace you need.

P.S. The above information is only the beginning of an article explaining without a doubt that the holy Bible teaches that Jesus Christ founded only one Church; and that is the infallible Catholic Church. You can now find more details what sacred Scripture says about the four characteristic marks of the Catholic Church; namely, One (Unity), Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic by reading the article using this <https://jmjsite.com/cr.pdf> hyperlink.