
Subject: Re: The Passion of the Christ

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Mon, 01 Aug 2005 23:11:44 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I'm not sure you're aware of your own self-validation throughout your flawed argument. You've gone out and crapped out more of that Aristotilian logic that simply doesn't work here.

And I would very much like to clarify to you: I was baptized Anglican-- but I very much not Anglican in practice. I find your organized worship to be a hinderance and the sheeplike following to be a plague. Your Church, established on the name of God and in the acts of good has done some very evil things and continues to blaspheme God. What's worse, you do it in total ignorance of it. The protestants had the right idea by cleaning up the Catholic bastardization of the Bible but in their own right have messed up a fair bit. The confederation of altered faiths you could potentially categorize protestantism is, is in itself another blasphemy. As such, I want to make clear to you that your conception and blind tracking of such a flawed organization, be it catholic or protestant is a problem and you are quite wrong to categorize me into either of these.

amid_tha_rubble wrote on Mon, 01 August 2005 15:18

Listen, you keep claiming that 'i'm wrong' but you never offer any proof. My point does exist: There is no contradiction in catechism.

Actually, as I've already stated and you conveniently ignored: The Catechism already works fine... if you accept that which is in it as an extension of the Bible. The problem is though-- it's not. Much of what is in the Catechism, the blantly obvious rules which come from the Bible are accurate. Except for when it comes down to dealing with falsehoods such as the Papacy, the divinity or "specialness" of Mary, just about everything in the Vatican, it's dead wrong. THOSE are contradictions. They have no Biblical criterium or reinforcement. THERE IS NO TIGER CLAW. YOU'RE MAKING SHIT UP.

Now, since you're obviously getting worked up and have already stated you won't be replying again, I'll ask you to find some proof that actually reinforces the divinity of Mary, and the authority and justification of Papacy and the Cardinals. You know, from the Bible? Because you have yet to do it, and have already responded when you said you wouldn't. I'm calling your bluff and I have a feeling you'll cave like the crusades did.

Quote:Only God can forgive sins? Then why the passage "He whose sins you forgive will be forgiven; he whose sins you retain shall be retained".

You're not thinking again. Stop that.

There is a very clear and distinct difference between the forgiveness of sins between men and the forgiveness of sins between men and God.

Matthew 6:15 But if you do not forgive men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses.

Wait a second here, but doesn't the Catholic doctrine say that men can forgive men? You're self-proclaimed, and you said that yourself. But uhh...

Wait a second! Mark 2:7 "Why doth this man thus speak blasphemies? who can forgive sins but God only?"

Read the rest of Mark 2, it's a fair and fully valid context. Jesus completely reinforces this quotation Himself.

The fact of the matter is, men can forgive the transgressions of men. But that's as far as it goes. Since when was I allowed to harness the power of God and abolish a sin? Do you even know what a sin is? Sins are ALWAYS between man and God. Never between man and man. Man transgresses between other men, but the act of disobedience against the Word is always between man and God. So when did Judge Judy get the divine power to absolve such a transgression? I'm sorry, but your faith fails here.

Oh, and take a look at this chief:
Catechism falsehoods

Quote:As for your requirement that everything christian be founded in the bible, what about 'Now Jesus did many more things than are written down here but if written out, I suppose the whole world could not hold them'.

What are you trying to say here? That because the entire life and times of Jesus weren't documented in a book that somehow a bunch of old farts in red dresses can fill in the blanks 2000 years later, call it ice cream and condemn all those who disagree? Don't you find it slightly odd that God *wouldn't* pick and choose what to inspire into the writers of the Bible? It seems to me that God would have put in exactly what He wanted to and what was necessary. Obviously you disagree.

Quote:For someone who claims to base things from the bible, you sure do ignore the hierarchies existant in Paul's letters, and in the Acts of the Apostles and in all the other letters to the Churches. Had you read them carefully you can see that church leaders and hierarchies are already taking shape in the time of the Apostles; that is to say, The apostles are forming the Roman Catholic Christian Church!! Jesus Gave the apostles the authority to become 'fishers of men'. So they did, and following that they did so by growing Jesus' Church on earth. They had the Holy Spirit to guide them, as Jesus says, 'I will send the Helper'. So, if on Authority from Jesus, and in Union with the Holy Spirit, the Apostles started the Catholic Christian Church, it would seem that the Church does indeed have complete apostolic authority; other man made churches simply do not. The bible clearly shows that the hierarchical church is taking shape in Peter, Paul and the rest of the apostles' time.

There is a very key and very distinguished difference between the authority in the Acts and Letters and the authority and hierarchy of the Catholic establishment.

Do you realize what the Catholic hierarchy entails? It says that a man, a MAN elected through democratic means ALONE (sometimes days, or weeks, or YEARS of voting) becomes a proclaimed mediator and High Priest between man and God. Aside from the fact that Jesus Christ is already the High Priest as defined in Hebrews (Read me!111111) and was and is to be considered the FINAL High Priest, your pontiff has erroneously called himself this name himself!

How? Where is his Biblical authority to do this? Was Peter a High Priest? The democratic process leading to this falsehood is even more ridiculous. They claim the pontiff is elected through the will of God and always is someone chosen by God and was predestined to such a position. And when the vote fails for days, months, even years on occasion, the excuse is "well, I guess they weren't aware of the will of God yet." Every time I hear that explanation it makes me chuckle, because it's the foundation of faith for so many people that have no idea how it even came about.

In fact, the only mention of a real hierarchy or any means of administrative authority in the Church is established in 1 Timothy.

It's actually a humorous thing to talk about, because the very existence of your Priests is a farce. There is no mention of the necessity of Priests after the death of Christ. God intentionally did this; Jesus was the High Priest, sinless, and absolved us from bondage with Satan. Priests became redundant and unnecessary. Here's a little history lesson for you.

Before Christ, all mankind was in bondage. They were without a complete mediator between man and God and required the services of priests in order to perform the rituals that would otherwise COULD not be done. It was basically the old Jewish law. The old covenant. When Jesus came, as you know He took the sins of all mankind and upon his death created the eternal mediation between man and God. This nullified the usefulness of Priests. For them to do what they did after the death of Christ might as well be considered a blasphemy. It would be like saying to God: "Well, that's nice your kid died for us, but you know, I think I'm just gonna keep doing what I did before". It seems to me that would be an insult to God for priests to do what they did before Christ... AFTER Christ. As such, the very existence and arrogance of your pontiff has very dangerous and blameworthy roots. You might as well rename Catholicism to Hebrewism because you're not doing anything better. They ignore God and claim it His will. Bravo.

Quote: Say it with me, one more time: "The bible is the Canon of the Roman Catholic Church. It is not a stand alone document. It supplements Church teaching, it does not supplant it

The Word of God IS a standalone document. Why would God leave out important details? I'd like to point out, however, that those who you claim to have been imbued with the Holy Spirit to guide the Catholic church have this nasty habit of doing things which have no Biblical endorsement and are very much to be considered sinful. Remember indulgences? The pompous Popes? The crusades? THESE are the people you think God chose to run a Church? These are the "infallible" men to whom claim to know the thoughts and will of God?

Quote: I am sure that you will say the RC Church isn't the original Christian Church; to that I will simply say that surely no Protestant Church is, so that kinda narrows it down, don't it?

The only true Church is the one created by Jesus Christ. And it is definitely not the same as the Catholic one.

Quote: I recall you saying that there was only one line in the bible that proves authority of the church 'I tell you you are petros...on this rock I will found my church' etc. Notwithstanding the fact that I've already proved that the bible is the Canon of the RC church and therefore not the be-all-end-all of God's Word, I'll humour you. You said 'it was only one line' - I'll humourously

question you, how many lines does it take for God's Word to be true? One? Three? Five? Are we counting to determine importance? How many lines of Scripture that reveal Jesus' complete glory to the Israelites are jsut that - ONE LINE!

You left out the misinterpretation of it which is the basis for you entire organization. You're right though, God only needs one line to get a point accross. It's certainly not HIS fault that the self-proclaimed leaders of the Church miscontrued it to suit their own needs. I'm not sure how versed you are on Church history, but I think you should know that the early Church was not all good and happy. It was a greedy foundation where men in power got into power playing on people's faith. It's where the Church has been led to this day, and it's quite obviously still racking in foolish sheep.

Quote:Part of your problem is that (here's the shocker) you lack faith in Christ; Faith that His apostles, led By The Holy Spirit (God Himself!) and directed by Jesus (Ditto) grew His Church into what it is today;

There is a Church today. It's not the Catholic denomination. The Church exists in every person who accepts Jesus as their savior. It doesn't rely on silly, pointless and redundant sacraments that give man the power of God. It certainly doesn't create a barrier between man and God through one man who could pull off a role in Star Wars. Most importantly, it doesn't play on people's fear of God's wrath to pass its often distorted agenda.

I suggest you sit down and think about just how the Kingdom of God and the Church are related. Do you even know what the Church is?

Quote:Seriously, how on earth could you think that God would tell the apostles 'Grow my Church' and then dodder off for two thousand years? Do you think Jesus would give authority to His apostles (in His name) and then just go AFK?

It comes down to Faith.

He did, and it does. The Church is growing. It isn't growing nearly as fast as the Catholic or Muslim faiths-- and that's a shame.

Quote:I figured you would take my apathy for responding to yet another anti-catholic hack (now i am ad hominem, but so are you) as being 'defeated' in my argument. You can think what you like. I have spent FAR too long online arguing the Chruch's authority to apostates such as yourself and, as I have said, I am simply no longer willing to do it. Period. End of story. And I realy wish you'd stop baiting me by continuing this pointless tit-for-tat BS because you will not take my eye off of Truth, nor will I lead you from your mistaken blindness. If you choose to respond to this forum, fine. But i'm taking off my e-mail alerts for this topic and i'm not coming back. It is a waste of my time.

You said this before, and you came back. I suspect you'll falter. It suits the denomination.

Quote:Perhaps what is most amusing about your vitriolic anti-catholic attitude is that your church hasn't once come up; not once have I asked what denomination, if any, you belonged to. Not once

have I made any attempt to attack your denomination, your beliefs about Christ, or your devotion to your faith. Not once have i questioned your dogma. Never. But you don't seem to have any problem launching a good-ol'-catholic bashing. If you aren't catholic, why should you care? Why'd you bring it up? Why so judgemental? Despite the truth that protestant churches are clearly in apostasy from God's One True Mother Church, I haven't made it an issue. Because I don't care. Because that's between you and God. I will never understand the protestant drive to slander the roman Catholic Church's teachings, other than the fact that moral-relativist-nihlists can't stand to see someone take a stand on anything.

I don't belong to any denomination. I was baptized against my will when I was too young to think in the Anglican denomination and that is where it stopped.

I find it interesting how you assume I'm attacking your faith because it is different than mine. I'm not against Catholics: many of my good friends, even my "good" friends are Catholic. I'm against ignorance. You preach ignorance and call it capital T truth. Do the math. I would do the same thing to you, or anyone else if you were speaking on matters you clearly knew nothing about, be the war in Iraq, the morality or logistics of controversial topics, anything. You and your faith are not special, sorry.

Quote:Anyways, that's it, i'm done, no more arguing, reminders are off, see you later. Enough rambling. Bye. Have a good life.

Talk to you tomorrow.