

# Let us meet the pagans half way so as to win them for the church

Matthew Cserhati

## Introduction

Three of us went out to the Walk for Life rally in Lincoln, Nebraska at 10 AM on January 25, 2014. We were prepared with a couple of signs and hundreds of Gospel tracts to hand out to passers-by. My own sign read: "Pro-life doesn't necessarily mean eternal life. Jesus says: 'I am the way, the truth, and the life. No man cometh to the Father but by me.' (John 14:6)" Soon hundreds of people flooded R street in front of the student union of the University of Nebraska, Lincoln, the large majority of which were Roman Catholics. Priests, nuns, common believers, some even holding up images of Mary or crucifixes. People even came from all around the world, like South America. We even saw a man from Poland waving a small Polish flag. We got the impression that this basically political rally was turning into a religious procession. This was an interesting mix of the Roman Catholic religion and politics. As a side note I might add that some might view this as hypocrisy, since some Jesuit authors upheld abortion, and that the reason Socialism is spreading in Mexico is because Mexicans know about the pits filled with the bones of babies underneath nunneries... We kept busy for the next two hours passing out tracts and debating Catholic who came up to us while we were holding our signs. This writing is a summary of these debates, and serves to answer many main points of the Roman Catholic religion.

## The question of authority

Whenever Protestants debate Roman Catholics, the debate many times tends to concentrate on the question of authority. Protestants will always argue directly from the Word of God, the Bible. However clever their argument may be, Roman Catholics will many times just shut a deaf ear, saying that they turn to the church for the truth, thereby completely circumventing any counter argument. The quote which serves as the title of this writing is attributed to pope Gregory I of the 6<sup>th</sup> century. It illuminates the attitude of the church towards proselytizing, but explains also the way the Roman church approaches the Bible. What the quote by pope Gregory I means is that during the early centuries of the Catholic (universal) church, after it had become the state religion, missionaries were set forth to convert the pagan nations surrounding Christendom, such as the German tribes. Unfortunately they used a very bad principle in winning converts from these pagan nations: the Catholic church watered down its doctrines so as to "match" the beliefs of these pagan tribes. It was a sort of early ecumenism: much headway can be made with people of an opposing viewpoint if instead of stressing your differences, you point out what is common between the two debating partners. It is as pure and simple as that; it only stems from human nature. This way the pagans would feel that since there was a common bond between them and these people presenting a new faith, they could thus be drawn into the church.

Will you win the world or will the world win you?

Sadly, this principle flies in the face of Scripture and is the root of one of the biggest apostasies in human history. Romans 12:2 says “Do not be conformed to this world, but be transformed by the renewal of your mind, that by testing you may discern what is the will of God, what is good and acceptable and perfect”. What happened in roughly the first millennium A.D. was that in meeting many pagan tribes “half way”, the Catholic church itself became pagan, by introducing many, many pagan practices. Even the 1994 catechism of the Catholic church admits that confession was a practice which arose in the 7<sup>th</sup> century. We all know how very different Peter, the poor fisherman was from the pomp of the Roman church today. The Roman church has so much money today that it cannot even put a figure on it, and instead of helping the poor, the Roman church is operating a space satellite system for its large, Catholic media empire as well as paying billions and billions of dollars to sexual harassment victims... This goes to show that the papacy itself underwent a gradual evolution, adding more and more power, grade by grade over the years, not even shying away from brute force, claiming the whole earth as its dominion, whereas Jesus said that His kingdom is not of this world. Then you have the dogma of transubstantiation, which was formulated between the 9<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> centuries. Then, in the 16<sup>th</sup> century we had the addition of the apocrypha to the Bible, then the dogma of papal infallibility in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, and the dogma of the ascension of Mary in the 1950's. These facts clearly show that over the millennia a Roman Catholic tradition was formulated, which became very distinct from the Bible, simply because pagan and unbiblical doctrines were brought in from without the Church. This spiritual prostitution has gotten to the point today that the present Jesuit pope, pope Francis claims that even atheists, who know nothing about God, and deny His existence can be saved. Thus the Roman Catholic church completely apostasized with the true Catholic church, the hallmark of which is to constantly reform, to humbly admit if one is in error, and seeks God's word in the Bible and conform to it. Nowadays about 99% of all Roman Catholics believe in the theory of evolution, to win the world for their church, even though the official catechism of the Roman Catholic church upholds literal Biblical creation, the fall into sin, Adam and Eve, and the Flood. This goes to show how very little Roman Catholics value the teaching of their own church. Why should we follow them, then?

#### Rome's false authority

This leads us to our next point: since Rome fully disagrees with Sola Scriptura, and adheres to the authority of its tradition and its priesthood, on being at least on par with the Scriptures, this makes Rome inherently incapable of Biblical exegesis. In other words, Rome does not interpret the Biblical text. Rome follows the principle of concordance, that is, making the two different sources of the Scripture and its tradition agree with each other. By force, if necessary, but often times overriding Scripture with its tradition. Rome interprets Scripture in light of its tradition, thereby putting its tradition above Scripture. In such a way, Rome tears Bible verses out of context so as to reinforce its own traditions, something which Roman Catholic always accuse Protestants of doing. In other words, Rome does not let the text of the Scripture stand alone and interpret itself, but has to have its priesthood stand above it and interpret itself. Thus the Roman Catholic priesthood is elevating itself above God and dictating to the Scripture. No wonder when Roman Catholic counter the Scripture verses of Protestants with verses which might seemingly oppose each other. For example we might reprove Catholics not to carry around crucifixes and rosaries and statues and images, because of the Second Commandment: “You shall not make for yourself a carved image, or any likeness of anything that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth. You shall not bow down to them or serve them.” Roman Catholic then tear Scripture out of context referring to the figure of the snake which was nailed to the cross, or the

figures of the ark of the covenant. Roman Catholics suffice with a Biblical contradiction so as to preserve their theology, thereby introducing error, against which Peter the apostle warned us of. Protestants delve deeper into the text so as to be able to resolve the seeming contradiction, led by the Holy Spirit. The real meaning of the Second Commandment is not to use figures or images as objects of worship. A crucifix is an image, like a photo of my loved ones, argue the Roman Catholics. Yet at the same time, what man knows how Jesus looked like? Since Jesus is one with the father, how can we represent Jesus, who has both a human and a divine nature at once? Some archaeologists claim that the popular image of Jesus with long hair was taken from the pagan Babylonian culture (to illustrate my point), where one of the gods, called Dumuzi, or Tammuz was depicted as having long, flowing hair. The New Testament, however, declares that it is improper for a man to have long hair, making himself look like a woman.

Does being old make you right?

The Roman Catholic church maintains its primacy due to its antiquity, as though if simply being around longer means that you are always right in whatever you say just because you are older. While individual Protestant churches institutionally may have arose later in time, it is important to note that their spirituality and faith is continuous from the first century onwards, and indeed the Reformation's goal was to take the church back to its true roots. Interestingly enough, the word for church in the Bible is the Greek word *ἐκκλησία*, from which the Spanish *iglesia* and the French *église* are derived. This word occurs all across the Old Testament. This is the body of Christ, the Catholic church, which is described in 1 Corinthians 12. The Old Testament church is also mentioned in Acts 7:38 as the church which wandered in the wilderness, and received the law at Mount Sinai. This is the body of all believers, which dates back to Adam and Eve in the garden of Eden who received the protoevangelium, that is, the promise that the seed of man shall overcome sin. Thus, the Protestant churches because of their spiritual inheritance are connected to the Old Testament church, the whole church being older than the offshoot Roman Catholic church which is but 1400 years, as the church historian Dowling argues.

Plurality in the Protestant churches and the Roman Catholic church

The Roman Catholic church decries Protestant plurality while ignoring the plurality evident within its own fold. One can but mention the Old Catholics, the Sedevacantists, the Eastern rite, the charismatics, and the liberals, or the numerous cafeteria Catholics who all pick and choose whatever teachings suits them best, and who are all tolerated within the church just to swell the church's numbers and as an extra source of income. Pope Francis himself acknowledged that one can be a good Catholic, regardless of whether you are conservative or liberal. As mentioned previously, even atheists can be saved according to the pope. Why does difference in doctrine then matter to Catholics for unity? Protestants are at least honest when they form different churches.

Clearly, the Roman Catholic church is but one church out of many, one voice amongst other voices, one opinion which must be weighed amongst others. Roman Catholics must seriously ask themselves the question, as to why their church is the right one. How do they know that their church leaders aren't misleading them, or teaching them things which are just not true? This is essential, because they might be sidetracked and locked into a church which is taking them to damnation. Roman Catholics

will assert that it is their church that Jesus founded in Matthew 16:16-18. But then again, the question begs itself: how do they know that their church interprets Matthew 16:16-18 correctly in asserting that Jesus was talking about the church in Rome (albeit when he was in Israel)? Roman Catholics will again assert that this is because their church is the one true church. Which again begs the question, how do we know that? Because it is the Roman Catholic church that was founded in Matthew 16:16-18. Again, we can ask how do they know that their interpretation of this Bible passage is correct? And then we can run in circles ad infinitum... And even if Jesus did refer to Peter, then this means that the church would have died out with the death of Peter. Jesus Christ clearly did not refer to the Roman Catholic church, as the popes who are Peter's successors are not mentioned in Matthew 16:16-18, only Peter. Jesus did not say, "Peter, I build my church on you.", He said I build my church upon this rock, the rock elsewhere in the Bible denoting Jesus Christ. Even if Roman Catholics insist that we listen to the early church theologians, we will read that many of them thought that the rock of Matthew 16:16-18 refers either to Jesus Christ, or the faith of Peter, which must be the building block of the church, an essential characteristic of every believer.

Who gave us the Bible, the church or God?

The Roman Catholic church claims it gave the world the Bible. This is simply not true. God is the ultimate author of the Bible. The Bible, the Holy Writings are a corpus of the information and knowledge God gave to mankind through the Scripture writers, who He chose and inspired. No inspiration, no Bible, no church. The church can only passively acknowledge what makes up the Holy Scriptures, which themselves declare that "thus says the Lord". The church has no authority to define what is Scripture, and what is not. Man's word cannot override and supersede God's Word. This is sheer blasphemy, but which sadly a consistent element of the Roman Catholic church's mentality, it being basically an unregenerate secular organization with spiritual overtones. Unregenerate because as the title of this writing shows, the Roman Catholic wishes to win the world, but in the process loses its soul (Matthew 16:26).