Norman L. Geisler was the cofounder and President of Southern Evangelical Seminary, a longtime member and President of the Evangelical Theological Society, founder and President of the Evangelical Philosophical Society, and has been a very influential leader in evangelical circles. He has written around 70 books and numerous periodicals over many years as an evangelical. Geisler has zealously defended his view of "orthodoxy" against the heretics, cultists, and skeptics so that he was known as "Stormin' Norman." What we wish to know about Stormin' Norman is whether he really has been a consistent evangelical or if he has actually succeeded in being a major player in destroying evangelical Protestantism.

My Contact and Study of Norman Geisler.

Immediately after my conversion to Christ in 1991 I became very involved in evangelism and counter-cult ministry in the city of Toronto (which is one of the most multicultural cities in the world and contains every cult you can imagine). I soon got involved with, and helped form, a counter-cult ministry made up of persons who were formerly members of the Christian Research Institute (founded by Walter Martin). Apologia: Home Mission for New Religions, hosted North America's largest counter-cult library in the back of a used bookstore. The ministry was lead by Dave Aspinal who was a former Jehovah's Witness Elder in Toronto. We used to reach out to JW's, Mormons, debate Muslims in the University of Toronto, and even examine strange groups like the Toronto Airport Christian Fellowship which was formerly called the Toronto Vineyard.

During those early years several of us went down to southern PA for a major counter-cult convention where hundreds of ex-Jehovah's Witnesses were to gather and give testimony and listen to speakers like Norman Geisler. This was my first meeting with Geisler as well as with other major counter-cult ministries. In those days we studied Geisler's apologetics books because he was a top authority on the subject and we were engaged in the same work he was doing. We did not however find his work to be
very accurate all the time. For example, some of our friends looked up his references to his work on
the resurrection in reference to JWs and found numerous misquotations and errors. This was the first
edition of that book which now has been corrected. Further, in his work When Critics Ask, Geisler
many times gives a list of possible answers to bible difficulties in a way that appears desperate to give
some answer. The argumentation becomes shallow in many cases and makes one wonder why he
bothered to use such reasoning. Poor reasoning tends to discredit positions held. Nevertheless much
of what Geisler wrote was good and worthy of study so I continued to buy his books and tapes to
learn what I could from this popular evangelical leader. Geisler is a philosophical Realist, as I have
always been, and so I had great interest in tracking the developments of a contemporary Realist. I
publish works by famous evangelical Realists like Charles G. Finney and Asa Mahan from 140 years
ago. I even gave several of these republications to Geisler in person a year ago, and he did not know
who Asa Mahan was.

During those early years I ended up attending Rexdale Christian Missionary Alliance Church in
Toronto because the preacher was Sunder Krishnan who was a Christian apologist and brother-in-law
to Ravi Zacharias the famous Christian apologist of RZIM.org (who is a friend of the family having
been a fellow student with my aunt and uncle, a convert of Billy Graham, and had gone to my parent's
church in Toronto). Ravi was also a student of Geisler and shares his philosophy in most respects.
Thus in the 1990's I attended all these men's lectures and listened to all their tapes. After three years
of deep involvement I was even asked by the exiting youth pastor to take over the young adult
meetings. However, the view of Christianity as held by these men was not something I shared, in
relation to fellowship and spirituality. I addressed my concerns to Sunder about corruption in the
church and gave examples of how people were promoting skepticism in the classes and how various
obvious sins were left unaddressed by the leadership. But he did not take me seriously, and after
getting a similar response from the President of the denomination, I decided to leave altogether. The
church and denomination went in the way of all the major denominations and catered to the social
desires of the people. They tickle the ears with enough truth to keep them religious and active while
making everything politically correct and entertaining.

Realizing at that time that this influence had been ruinous to my soul I fully repented of the
methodology used often in the counter-cult ministry world. Some of my friends were more interested
in winning debates with persons intellectually so that they cared little of winning them spiritually to
the truth. This attitude had rubbed off on me. Thus soon after I repented I developed the new name
for my ministry: Alethea In Heart, or Truth In Heart. http://truthinheart.com/Intro.html The idea came
from the following lecture notes by Finney in the opening chapters where he talks about not allowing
truth to just be acknowledged in the head, but to also be received into the heart and life. I now publish
this book online and have it in print:
http://truthinheart.com/EarlyOberlinCD/CD/Finney/Theology/flt.htm

What I learned was that Geisler and company had only selectively promoted Realism in philosophy
and theology. There were fundamental contradictions in his system that were unexplainable to me at
the time. We have often read his Logic book and recommended it to others. But we have had to tell
people that he does not always keep to the rules in his theological works. It is safe to say that I have
been a student of Geisler. I have two entire courses of lectures of the History of Philosophy as well as
his Prolegomena Theology Course which I have deeply studied along with numerous other books and
tapes of his over the years. I believe I could write volumes about this subject, but can only afford to
bring out some points about one of Geisler's serious contradiction in relation to philosophical and
theological realism.

During the tragic time of September 11th 2001 my wife and I were blessed by some clients to
vacation in their Northern Michigan cottage for a week. We soon realized that they had been long
neighbors of Dr. Geisler and we spent an entire evening at another neighbor's home/cottage who was
a missionary and friend of Geisler's discussing him and related things. This was not mentioned as a
negative point but just to show that there has been a lot of events that have brought Geisler to my
attention over the last 17 years. Also before that time I had two students who I had also begun to
teach theology and philosophy to. I did mention the works of Geisler as a contemporary Realist but
always cautioned them about the lack of consistency and related perceived errors. I brought Geisler
up as a contemporary issues subject and less as a source for learning. I told them that at one point I
had desired to attend Southern Evangelical Seminary but not any more. My teaching of these two
men was short-lived and one of them later decided to attend SES against recommendation over the
last two years (2006-2008). This friend said he did not agree with the school's statement of faith. He
was eager to attend and asked the President and others if he had to sign the school's statement to go
there. After some discussion about it they all agreed that even though he disagreed with the statement
in several points that he could still sign it anyway and not have to worry about it. This of course did
not sit well with me and made me wonder about what was happening down at SES. I warned my
friend that he will always go down as having signed this contrary to his own beliefs. He would never
be able to say he disagreed with them on those points.

In November 2006 my friend invited me to their National Apologetics Convention at SES. Many of
the top evangelical apologists were there to speak, so I decided to go down with a friend and another
student to visit and observe what was happening after all these years. Everything seemed to be the
same as it was in earlier years. The same authors were pushing all their latest books and the same
topics were being focused on. While time forbids me to go into the details of that meeting I will say
that I was again disappointed with what I observed.

One of the more noticeable occurrences of the first night was when Josh McDowell started his speech
and got off the stage and proceeded to insult people who he asked (with cameras pointing in their
faces) to give answers to his questions about their faith in the Bible. He then returned to the stage and
made some utterance that probably only about eight people of the 3000 in attendance, which included
most of the student body, could give a defense of their faith in the bible. Just what he was trying to
prove eluded everyone.

Another amazing thing I found was one of the missionaries who had a booth in the hallway was very
enthusiastically promoting Benny Hinn as a great man of God. What is amazing about this is that the
theological camp that these apologists represent has often exposed heretics like Hinn. To be fair, I had
walked over to the crowd of students around him and listened to him as the students got all excited
with his ministry. Then I saw his CDs of Hinn and asked him what he thought of the man. It was at
that point that he praised him as a man of God, etc. The students did not have the discernment to ask
the man some basic questions about his ministry but were caught up with all the hype.

One of the lectures I also attended in a small room was by Geisler on Fundamentalism. I really
wanted to hear him at so late an hour in his life to see where he was at. So I was the first to get there
and sat in the front row. My friend and I got a chance to talk with him, and I gave him a pile of my
Asa Mahan books on philosophy [http://truthinheart.com/Asa_Mahan.html](http://truthinheart.com/Asa_Mahan.html) and explained to Geisler
how Mahan was one of the greatest Christian Realist in history. He was thankful for the books and we
later talked about it after the lecture. After I shared about my publishing ministry he then asked me if
I would consider publishing some of his works. His lecture was what I expected. He gave the usual
summary of what the fundamentals of the faith were, most of which were fundamental, and some of
which were not. He also left out some fundamentals. However, the important thing was that he
stressed that Christians should unite in fundamentals and have grace where matters were not
fundamental. And there was no place for fellowship when there was no agreement fundamentally. This is the fundamentalist's argument. Seems fair enough depending on how you define what is fundamental. This will be the focus of this article on Geisler in relation to Roman Catholicism.

I did get a chance to also visit the SES church where Geisler was the preacher as well as have some lengthy conversations with students and faculty. I wanted to see what was going on there and also give away books to students and faculty and the library as I have done across the country. One student I spoke with for a long time was Mike Jackson, who was and is Geisler's right-hand man, and who was a major contributor to one or more of Geisler's recent 4 volume Systematic Theology. We talked about many things and he shared about his new ministry of developing and promoting Geisler's works domestically and internationally. http://www.internationallegacy.org/ As I shared about my ministry he became very interested in my publishing services. I do agree with a lot of the things that Dr. Geisler has taught, and even talked to both of them on the phone a few months back because they desired for me to publish booklets and books. But I could not bring myself to open the door to publishing that which may contradict what is so fundamentally important. I would also have to contradict the very purpose of my ministry name which, as I wrote above, was chosen in rejection to the dead orthodoxy of this camp. I write this in all honesty that the prospect of becoming a publisher for a big name like Geisler, and even potentially publishing for a Seminary, was very tempting. But I could never go through with that.

Over the last few months I weighed out the matter and decided to go back over the old books and refresh myself about all my past studies pertaining to Geisler and company. One subject I almost completely forgot about was covered in Geisler's book *Roman Catholics and Evangelicals: Agreements and Differences*, 1995, Baker. I never got around to reading that book even though I had picked it up several times over the years to make an effort. But after I discovered that presidential candidate Ron Paul had let me down after praising Pope John Paul II as a great man of God and one of the greatest religious leaders in modern times, even though he promoted fundamentally opposite things to what Ron Paul had appeared to stand for http://rpmgt.org/RonPaul.htm, I decided to revisit Geisler's book on the subject. What was interesting about this was that I was fully aware of Geisler appreciating Catholics like his mentor Thomas Aquinas, but I was not really expecting him to embrace Roman Catholics as brethren, so I never really looked into that subject in my studies of him. It is almost like blinders were preventing me from paying attention to the pro-Catholic position he really held to. In the same way I was like so many evangelicals who just sort of thought of the Papacy and Roman system as dying out and modernizing and not anything to really worry about or focus on. But when I revisited the subject I found that that is not the case at all, and in fact I have been fooled by a clever trick. And now when I pick up Geisler's book I find quotes like the following that really trouble me:

"Catholics and evangelicals share a common core of beliefs about salvation. ... For both groups salvation is by grace and is not prompted by human works. It comes as a gift of God to undeserving humanity" (pp. 81, 103, 104).

"Since evangelicals and Roman Catholics have so much in common doctrinally and morally ... we believe that there are, nonetheless, many areas of common spiritual heritage and practical social and
moral cooperation possible. ... In this final section we wish to end on a positive note, firmly believing that a cooperative effort between Roman Catholics and evangelicals could be the greatest social force for good in America. ... Our common doctrinal and moral beliefs are too large and the need in America for a united voice on them is too great for us to dwell on our differences to the neglect of crucial cooperation needed to fight the forces of evil in our society and our world. ... Even the most reactionary of Protestant fundamentalists has more in common with Cardinal John O'Connor and John Paul II than with Joan Campbell and John Spong" (pp. 357, 358).

"Perhaps evangelicals felt a bit guilty when they realized they were 'Johnnie-come-latelies,' given the fact that Roman Catholics had been alert to the moral dimensions of the problem while their evangelicals neighbors were spiritually asleep" (p. 360).

These kinds of quotes were alarming to me and woke me up in a real hurry. Yet they were just what I needed to read to put the final pieces of the puzzle together. Now all the contradictory statements I had read in the past in the numerous publications make sense. Now I understand why Geisler never was a consistent Realist in theology and fellowship as he was more of in philosophy. Just looking at the back cover of the book and doing a little research on the names of those who recommended the book, should say a lot. Just look at all the Jesuits and connections with Jesuits and their agendas, and remember that Geisler got his Ph.D. from Jesuit Loyola University. While this may not bother some people there is much more to consider. Needless to say, I now realize the agendas evangelical leaders like Billy Graham, Chuck Colson, and Geisler have had over the years, and why things turned out the way they did. It was very clever and it worked.

I am not inclined to be one to stir up trouble but I was compelled to speak up for the truth at such a time as this. People like Geisler are often heard quoting Jude 3, which reads: "Beloved, when I gave all diligence to write to you of the common salvation, it was needful for me to write to you and exhort you that you should earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered to the saints." This is the hour to do this, and I will continue with the next verse: "For
there are certain men crept in unawares, who were before of
old ordained to this condemnation, ungodly men, turning the
grace of our God into lasciviousness, and denying the only
Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ." Allow me, after my
very long historical account, to introduce this subject and
turn over the main points of concern. I will ask the question,
what was the purpose of the Reformation and what does it
mean to be a Protestant? Allow me to make a few more
preliminary point before we focus on a main article on
Geisler's website that calls us to "grant the Pope the respect
he deserves, love him as a brother in Christ".

**Southern Evangelical Seminary not only promotes Jesuit
Theology and Agendas but also has some Professors that
come from Jesuit schools.**

The first example has already been mentioned, that the
founder, former President, and biggest influence in the
school is Norman Geisler, who got his Ph.D. from Jesuit
Loyola University. Another example is the other philosophy
professor Jason L. Reed who is *Associate Professor of
Philosophy*. He went to the following schools:

B.A. Iowa State University
M.A.A. Southern Evangelical Seminary
M.A. St. Louis University-- a Jesuit school.
Ph.D. Candidate St. Louis University-- a Jesuit school.

Another big personality coming from SES, and still
influencing it, is Lee Strobel who was given an honorary
SES degree. Lee was the main speaker at the National
Apologetics Conference in 2006 when I visited. Lee is a big
name in apologetics, selling millions of copies of his books,
and getting a lot of recognition. The following gives a
review of one of his books. Just one quote that is relevant to
the subject at hand:

"This is actually the reason that Strobel is able to bring in a
Roman Catholic theologian (Peter Kreeft) and not have no
issue with his thoughts on issues. Strobel really doesn't
differentiate between the Catholics and Protestants but just
merely continues to call them both 'Christians.'"

One final example is Frank Beckwith. He was the President
of the Evangelical Theological Society (ETS) and resigned
to go back to Roman Catholicism. Has this sort of thing not
happened many times before? They pretend to be
evangelicals, are raised up to high places and then later show
their true colors after they do their damage. But notice what
the present SES President has to say in the Introduction
about such people and their defending the faith. He asks why do people come so far to such a school? He says for "training under some of the top apologists and Bible teachers in the country to evangelize the world and to defend the historic Christian Faith." Yet are not at least some of these men pushing for the Roman faith? And one finally rejoins it unambiguously. Where is Christian apologetics at SES???

What happened to defending the faith against the greatest enemy? As I have written elsewhere, the best way to beat the opposition is to create it and control it.

http://www.reformedcatholicism.com/?p=1127

Frank Beckwith's return to full communion with the Roman Catholic Church.


A Word from the President

Dr. Alex McFarland

"Why have hundreds of students come to Southern Evangelical Seminary from all over the United States and many other countries? Because they can get something here that they cannot get anywhere else, namely, training under some of the top apologists and Bible teachers in the country to evangelize the world and to defend the historic Christian Faith (Matt. 28:18-20; 1 Peter 3:15).

"In only a few years SES has trained students from across the country and around the world. What is more, doctors, lawyers, dentists, engineers, scientists, teachers, and other lay persons come to Charlotte to learn how to contend for the Faith (Jude 3).

"Why do so many come from so far? Because our dedicated Board, staff, and faculty provide an educational experience not found elsewhere. The SES faculty have combined to produce some 150 books, many of which are standard textbooks throughout the Christian world. In addition, they have produced hundreds of articles. And they are surrounded and supported by a Board and staff members who share the same goals and who care for students who can help achieve this vision. Indeed, top theologians and apologists from around the country fly to Charlotte to help train a future generation. These include Drs. Ravi Zacharias, Frank Beckwith, Gary Habermas, H. Wayne House, Ron Rhodes, Win Corduan,
Is this some unfortunate event or is it part of a larger agenda? This is a top theologian and apologist who came from Roman Catholicism and after he was given such a high chair, and looked up to as such a great example---indeed that people come from all over the country to be taught by---then he returns back home to Rome. What does this say about these institutions, Societies, and people? Let us look in detail at two last statements that Geisler is promoting as main articles on his website, to focus in a little more on what is taking place.

**NeoProtestant Geisler Inconsistently Shuns Heresy and the ETS while embracing Rome.**

Geisler contradicts himself in leaving the Evangelical Theological Society for its allowing of members to violate the present or original doctrinal statements, while he embraces Roman Catholics and believes that "all Christians should grant the Pope the respect he deserves, love him as a brother in Christ". This is not only a contradiction, it is fundamental, and way out of proportion. Just what do these heretics believe that makes Geisler so opposed to them that he is willing to part company with them and yet still embrace the Pope as deserving of respect and love as a brother in Christ??? Geisler has continually opposed what he has called NeoTheism, but it seems that he has become guilty of NeoProtestantism if we are wanting to call names here. If a new form of Theism gets the stigmatization of NeoTheism then a heretical form of new Protestantism should get the same treatment.

Having long followed the theological and philosophical debate about the foreknowledge of God I have found Geisler's books very interesting and useful. As someone who has long embraced classical Moral Government Theology I have put forth much effort to counter recent theological developments where a certain mysterious camp have hijacked the phrase and made it one of their greatest missions in life to merge this phrase with the idea that God has limited foreknowledge. I have engaged in numerous discussions and many years ago asked Geisler if I could use quotes from his book on the subject to combat this error. He did not give permission but I continued to debate this subject. Geisler goes out of his way to brand this Open View theory as a heresy and NeoTheism. The following statement http://www.normangeisler.net/etsresign.htm of his appearing on his website http://www.normangeisler.net/articles.htm gives such
Why I Resigned from The Evangelical Theological Society

Norman L. Geisler

November 20, 2003

Today, I tendered my resignation from ETS. It was a painful decision for many reasons. First, I have been attending the Society for forty-four years. In addition, I served as a past president, and I was founder and first president of a daughter organization, the Evangelical Philosophical Society (EPS). What is more, I love the organization and that for which it once firmly stood—the total factual inerrancy of the written Word of God.

Many things occasioned my decision to leave ETS, all of which came to a climax at the annual conference of ETS in Atlanta. Since many will wonder why I resigned, I would like to make it clear to all.

1. ETS Has Lost Its Doctrinal Integrity

2. ETS Has Adopted a Revisionist Interpretation of Its Own Doctrine.

3. ETS is Now Operating Contrary to Its Own Historic Precedent

4. ETS is Logically Inconsistent with Its Own Doctrinal Basis

5. ETS Acted Inconsistently with Its Long-Standing Journal Policy

6. ETS Has Acted Contrary to Previously Approved Presidential Decisions

7. ETS Refused to Consider Pinnock’s Major Work on the Topic

Paragraphs under each heading have been removed. See the following link http://www.normangeisler.net/etsresign.htm for the entire statement. I am not entirely conversant with this exact controversy within ETS but it appears that Geisler is correct in his arguments. So my point is why does he fall into the same error that he accuses the ETS of in his embrace of Roman Catholicism? By claiming to be an evangelical and a
Bible-believing Christian and Protestant, while embracing the Pope as a brother in Christ to be respected, it contradicts all seven of these points far more than the ETS did in reference to divine foreknowledge statements. Take for example the full title of the Pope. I really hesitate to quote this because it is so blasphemous: "His Holiness Pope Benedict XVI, Bishop of Rome, Vicar of Jesus Christ, Successor of the Prince of the Apostles, Supreme Pontiff of the Universal Church, Primate of Italy, Archbishop and Metropolitan of the Roman province, Sovereign of the State of the Vatican City, Servant of the Servants of God."

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pope_Benedict_XVI

He is also called many other like names like "the most holy father." These titles mostly belong to Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit. These claims are as contradictory to scripture as can be imagined. These statements flatly contradict Geisler's statement of faith in the fundamentals section pertaining to Jesus Christ, the Holy Spirit, and God the Father. The Protestant Reformers have long exposed all the blasphemous practices in relation to the Papacy and the Mass and we could quote volumes showing these points. Here is just one example about the Mass from Keith Green's Catholic Chronicles II:

As the Second Vatican Council commenced in 1963, Pope John XXIII declared, "I do accept entirely all that has been decided and declared at the Council of Trent."

What did the Council of Trent decide and declare? Some of the first sections are as follows:

CANON I - "If anyone shall deny that the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and therefore entire Christ, are truly, really, and substantially contained in the sacrament of the most Holy Eucharist; and shall say that He is only in it as a sign, or in a figure - let him be accursed!"

CANON II - "If anyone shall say that the substance of the bread and wine remains in the sacrament of the most Holy Eucharist, together with the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ - let him be accursed!"

CANON VI - "If anyone shall say that Christ, the only begotten Son of God, is not to be adored in the holy sacrament of the Eucharist, even with the open worship of Latria, and therefore not to be venerated with any peculiar festal celebrity, not to be solemnly carried about in processions according to the praiseworthy and universal rites and customs of the Holy Church, and that He is not
to be publicly set before the people to be adored, and that
His adorers are idolators, - let him be accursed!"

The Worship Of The Host

"Thou shall not make unto thee any graven image
(4)...Thou shall not bow down thyself to them, nor serve
them" The Second Commandment (Ex.20:4-5)

"God is spirit, and those who worship Him must worship
in spirit and truth." (John 4:23)

In Canon VI, a rite of worship called "Latria" was spoken
of. This is not just an "ancient custom," it is thoroughly
practiced today in many Masses. After the bread has been
supposedly "changed" into the Christ by the priest, it is
placed in a holder called a monstrance. And before this
monstrance the Catholic must bow and worship (this act
is called genuflecting) the little wafer as God! Sometimes
they have processions where they solemnly march, as the
congregation bows and offers praise and worship - to this
piece of bread!

Somehow Geisler ignores all the heresies of the Roman Catholic Church and his own statements of
faith to embrace the Pope as a brother in Christ that every Christian should respect in his office.
Geisler has shown by these statements on his own website that he really rejects Biblical Christianity
for a compromise with a blasphemous contradictory system of oppression and superstition. Geisler
has been guilty of the following:

1. Giesler Has Lost his Doctrinal Integrity
2. Giesler Has Adopted a Revisionist Interpretation of his Own Doctrine.
3. Giesler is Now Operating Contrary to his Own Historic Precedent
4. Giesler is Logically Inconsistent with his Own Doctrinal Basis
5. Giesler Acted Inconsistently with his Long-Standing Journal Policy
6. Giesler Has Acted Contrary to Previously Approved Presidential Decisions
7. Giesler Refused to Consider Papacy Actions on the Topic

So how is it that people like Geisler have been able to destroy the Evangelical church and make it
actually become the relativistic religion it now is? It is because while these men have upheld sound
philosophy and have fought so many battles for a select number of fundamentals, the people have
therefore praised them as heroes of the faith and have never bothered to notice what they have
ignored, or how they have contradicted themselves in other matters. There has been a sleight of hand
and somehow this has lead to not only a general compromise with Evangelicals and Catholics but also
a serious loss of doctrinal integrity, doctrinal identity, and doctrinal and personal consistency. The
masses are illogical (moving toward ancient feudalism), and if they are theologically or
philosophically trained, they are fighting a selective battle and ignoring a major historical foe. We need to get back to the Reformation in this point, and it is fitting to quote Martin Luther here:

If I profess with the loudest voice and clearest exposition every portion of the truth of God except precisely that little point which the world and the devil are at that moment attacking, I am not confessing Christ, however boldly I may be professing Christ. Where the battle rages, there the loyalty of the soldier is proved, and to be steady on all the battlefield besides is mere flight and disgrace if he flinches at that point.

These men fight many battles to deceive us into thinking they are of the faith. We agree with many of their positions. They use the truth, and a lot of it, so that we are unsuspecting of the lies they promote. Asa Mahan wrote the following in his *Intellectual Philosophy*:

"Naked error is powerless to deceive, and borrows all of its effectiveness from mere fragments of the truth with which it is associated."

The truth promoted and defended has won our trust so that we were unsuspecting of both the lack of focus on fundaments "which the world and the devil were at that moment attacking," and the unsupported lies that were presented illogically.

The last statement to review is also found on Geisler's website:

http://www.normangeisler.net/The%20Only%20Church_9%203.pdf

Is the Roman Catholic Church the Only Church of Christ?

by Michael A. Field

September 2007

The following information about Mike and his church is added:

United Faith Assembly Of God

http://www.unitedfaith.org/

Michael A. Field
8617 Providence Rd.
Charlotte, NC
28277-9854
704-541-8850
mike.field@UnitedFaith.Org
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10. WE BELIEVE...The Church has a Mission to seek and save all who are lost in sin. We believe 'the Church' is the Body of Christ and consists of the people who, throughout time, have accepted God's offer OF redemption (regardless of religious denomination) through the sacrificial death OF His son Jesus Christ.

http://www.unitedfaith.org/?pageid=1039

Values Statement:
In our quest to fulfill our vision, we covenant to operate within the following values:
The title of this essay is misleading to start with. The real question is whether the Roman Church is a church at all. Mike assumes it is but all his points show otherwise. He takes the softball approach to every point and whitewashes the whole controversy.

Mike begins with the following paragraph:

The Vatican's recently published response to questions about its doctrine on the Church puzzled many Christians. The document, dated June 29, 2007 (released July 10, 2007), said nothing new, yet it reminded the world that Churches not in communion with Rome are considered defective in the eyes of the Roman Catholic Church (RCC). Parts of a previous declaration, *Dominus Iesus* (2000), were restated; namely, that Orthodox Churches are defective for not recognizing the primacy of the Pope, and that Protestant "ecclesial communities … cannot be called 'Churches' in the proper sense." The reason given for the latter assertion was that "these Communities do not enjoy apostolic succession in the sacrament of Orders, and are, therefore, deprived of a constitutive element [the Eucharist] of the Church." These clear statements of the RCC are an invitation for non-Catholics to speak the truth in love.

In other words, those who came to accept the contradiction of the Papacy under John Paul II, that all Christians were brethren, have stumbled with the turn back to consistency with previous tradition. The first question Mike asks and appears to expound biblically is:

**What Does the Bible Teach about the Church?**

In other words, the body (two or more people) together with the head (Jesus) is the Church. In light of the above testimonies, the RCC's sectarian view of the term, "Church," appears to be inconsistent with God's Word and early Church belief and practice. One can conclude that Protestant Churches are part of God's household, and thus deserve to be called Churches in both a biblical and historical sense.

The RCC is sectarian and therefore sinful. But it is beyond sectarian. It engaged in a physical war for hundreds of years against all those who did not give it lip service. This Inquisition was resumed, just as this latest Vatican flip-flop, and continued to support and assist in massive holocausts during WWII. The Church rules and doctrines that make the RCC sectarian are as clear as those that justified the Inquisition hundreds of years ago and during WWII, and have never been retracted. See the following movie for some references: [http://arcticbeacon.com/movies/catholic_inquisition_torture.html](http://arcticbeacon.com/movies/catholic_inquisition_torture.html)

The fact that anyone could overlook this shows a great ignorance of history and Protestant differences with Romanism. Mike is only looking at one side of the subject and thus softens the whole controversy to be merely the Protestants exclusion from communion! Why not stress the fact that official church doctrine states that such outsiders are accursed? Further, that such justifies all manner of abuse and extermination. This is historical fact. For centuries these presently unretracted RCC laws and doctrines were carried out. Then after some apparent pausing where the world supposed it had become more civil, the same unretracted laws and doctrines were reapplied in Concordats with Hitler and other tyrants and holocausts resumed. The fact is that the Vatican did not have the power, after the Reformation had fully developed, to apply its doctrines fully. But when much of Europe had become fascist under its influence then it readily resumed this practice. In our day we see the same doctrine existing, the same prejudice and blasphemy guiding the whole system, and the same inability to carry out its former practices as in the times after the Reformation when Protestants had
temporarily won the battle. Yet we have seen the same trends over the last 60 years, like before the 1930's, with such Evangelical leaders like Billy Graham, Nixon accomplice Chuck Colson, and the great teachers and apologists like Jesuit-trained Norman Geisler, who have gradually merged Protestants with Rome. Once again Europe is united, and prospective leader of Europe Tony Blair has just now fully joined the RCC and may be made a deacon. Notice how Pope John Paul II may have claimed to have opposed the Iraq war, but now chief proponents of that war are welcomed into the fold after they have done their deeds. “Tony Blair suggested his decision to go to war in Iraq would ultimately be judged by God.” I guess the Pope accepted that decision.

We must look at this historically and admit the truth of the matter. The atrocities committed by the Roman Church over the centuries were not mere sectarian mistakes or accidents. The way Popes John Paul II and Benedict XVI and others have shared their regrets about such violent persecutions towards men of science and people of contrary faiths has only added to the evils of the past. For such comments have been made in a way as to suggest that it was just a few individuals that were mistaken and that such mistakes were isolated and not birthed out of essential Roman doctrine. It is said that 75 popes in succession practiced this doctrine of torture and violent persecution and acted consistently with it to kill some 50 million persons over hundreds of years. How can this be brushed aside as some unfortunate blurb when it stemmed from the philosophical system and idolatrous structure that still exists today? People like Mike and Geisler need to tell us exactly what happened in RCC history through the ages and not brush these gruesome facts aside. The fact is that the RCC had developed from the top down a whole organized crime structure of deception that was and still is firmly intertwined in their rules and doctrines. In other words this was not the abuse of a good thing but the necessary outflow of a tyrannical system bent on destroying the freedom and intelligence of people just so much as it had opportunity to do it. These popes and leaders were not merely mistaken, they were criminals of the worst sort. The whole system was as evil as can be imagined. Anyone trying to ignore or downplay such atrocities becomes guilty of the same kinds of deceptions to foster a blasphemous and idolatrous system.

Next, Mike asks the question:

**What is Required for a Valid Eucharist?**

"This is My body which is given for you; do this in remembrance of Me." Lk 22:19

According to the RCC, only a priest or bishop ordained in apostolic succession is qualified to administer the Eucharist.... The RCC also asserts that a valid Eucharist requires a literal interpretation of Jesus' words, "This is My body ... this is My blood" (Mt 26:26,28) and "unless you eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his blood, you have no life in yourselves," (Jn 6:53, cf. Catechism of the Catholic Church [CCC] 1384-1400). Why single out these two sayings from the many other figurative sayings in the New Testament? Jesus didn't change into a vine when He said, "I am the vine;" yet the RCC insists that the bread changed into His flesh when He said, "This is My body," at the Last Supper. The RCC also claims that the communion bread, under the invocation of its priests, is changed into the physical body of Christ, in spite of its unchanged physical properties (the doctrine of transubstantiation).

The final point made under this head is where he begins to show his delusion. After showing a fundamental difference between Evangelicals and Catholics in the Eucharist, where he shows that the Catholics believe the substances become deity, he then makes this incredible statement:

The refusal of the RCC and other Churches to admit certain people to communion because of their Church affiliation has deeply hurt some of Christ's disciples. Making the Eucharist a point of division is a sad commentary on the Church today.
The fact is that the RCC wishes people to only partake in this ritual in unity according to their views of the matter. Do they not have the right to believe what they want and create their own rules of worship? Further, why would any evangelical wish to participate in such a ritual when those partaking and administering are engaging in superstitious idolatry? This immediate shift from logical consistency and biblical faithfulness to such an absurd statement ought to show the reader that the author is either deluded or trying to soften the fundamental differences between the two differing religions in order to merge them into one "united faith."

Jumping to the last point Mike continues:

**What is the Role of the Pope in the Church?**

"You are Peter and upon this rock [petra, in Greek] I will build My church." Mt 16:18

The RCC interprets everything about the Church through the lens of the above verse. The Vatican's recent statement reiterated that the RCC is the "only Church" of Christ: "This Church, constituted and organised in this world as a society, subsists in the Catholic Church, governed by the successor of Peter and the Bishops in communion with him" (cf. DI, 16; CCC 816). Since not all Christians agree with this definition, it is reasonable to enquire further about what the Scriptures teach and about how the early Church understood the role of Peter's successors.

Mike again focuses his arguments upon truthful points of differences but fails to cover the more serious claims. Most of the article is about what Evangelicals believe on certain points so the reader is very much in agreement and feels a sense of victory as they read this essay. And since the whole focus is a very softened look at these issues the reader is more prepared to accept the illogical conclusion at the end. When Mike does bring up the more serious errors in the following quote he again softens the blasphemous claim by calling people who believe in it as "brothers and sisters."

Because Jesus declared Himself to be the door of the sheep-fold (cf. Jn 10:9), Christians should recognize the error in statements such as, "Into this fold of Jesus Christ no man may enter unless he be led by the Sovereign Pontiff, and only if they be united to him can men be saved" (Pope John XXIII, Nov. 4, 1958). Indeed, non-Catholic Christians should help their Roman Catholic brothers and sisters understand that the Pope does not take Christ's place as the door, neither does Peter "continue to govern" through the Pope. Unless the RCC can provide convincing arguments from both Scripture and Church history to the contrary, it is time for the Vatican to abandon its claims to the Pope's universal primacy. A serious student of both Scripture and history cannot ignore the many inconsistencies surrounding the papacy.

Let us also not forget the very clear scripture 1 Timothy 2:5, that says there is one Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus. There is no sincere misunderstanding of such a claim that places oneself as the High Priest and Savior of all. Further, it is naive to suppose that such views are held in ignorance of the scriptures and their obvious meaning. Mike's stated expectation "for the Vatican to abandon its claims to the Pope's universal primacy" are misleading the readers into supposing that it is merely their mistake and not about political ambition and blasphemy. He will not call it blasphemy but rather "inconsistencies". I beg to know what is blasphemy and idolatry if this is not it? Mike has made the Word of God null and void to neglect to call this what it is and rather soften it down to mere misunderstandings of brethren!

Mike continues the special treatment of the Papacy and gives us his main objective in the following quote:

Christ alone is "head over all things to the Church" and His Word of Truth, together with His Spirit of Truth, guides the Church "into all the truth" (cf. Eph 1:22; Jn 17:17; 16:13). Churches that cling to the true head of the Church need not fret over claims that they are "defective" for not submitting to the Pope. Protestants and Orthodox
are both vindicated by Scripture and history in retaining their respective Church rights vis-à-vis Rome. The Pope may govern the institution he heads, but he has no rightful claim to supreme authority over Christ's whole Church. Nevertheless, all Christians should grant the Pope the respect he deserves, love him as a brother in Christ, and insofar as possible be at peace with him and with those who are in his care.

After all this blasphemy all Mike can do is deal with the insecurities of Evangelicals and say they need not fret over being called defective for not submitting to the Pope and not being able to take their idolatrous Mass! Next he says the Pope may govern if he wills, but he has no authority over us. This may be a leading statement for the next incredible statement. Notice that he appears to be arguing that people are really honestly under his care as if he is really a Pope-bishop under God. After showing that the whole system is not biblical and is in error and contradiction, Mike insists that "all Christians should grant the Pope the respect he deserves". What respect does he deserve?? Mike just showed he took upon himself many titles that belong only to Christ. He just admitted that the office and person must continually blaspheme God and Mike expects us as a result of that to give him respect!! Mike is thus taking the side of the blasphemer and idolater and urging all to join him in this. Further, he calls for us to love the Popes as brothers in Christ. What reason do we have to suppose anyone is a brother in Christ? Shall I quote what the bible says about this? How is one to know who is not a brother in Christ? Certainly by their fruit you shall recognize them. And of all fruit, blasphemy and idolatry is most telling. Mike is thus a disguised promoter of idolatry who flatters us with sound reasoning only to slip in the lies in the conclusions that actually absolutely contradict the premises. Mike and Geisler have shown their agendas. The rest of the essay is just a whitewash of the controversy and reveals the same things shown above.

Conclusion

In conclusion, Norman Geisler has disguised his agenda with a sophisticated methodology where he became the hero of the fundamentalist after fighting many battles for fundamentalist doctrine, as well as the hero of the evangelicals after waging wars on most of the cults but the Roman Catholic Church, while at the same time ignoring and softening the critical points of differences between Evangelicals and Catholics, and after he established the highest respect, chairs of influence and experience he then significantly helped with the merger of Catholics with professed Evangelicals. There can be no way to look at this as accidental. Here is one of the greatest philosophers of our times called upon as an expert witness in one of the most famous cases in the century, a man who marvelously expounded upon Realism, and consistently applied such principles to clearly present the truth on so many fronts that either gained him respect or where no threat to Rome existed. Yet throughout so many long years we find this pattern of contradiction where all roads lead to merge Evangelicals with Catholics. This was no mistake or leap in logic. It was brilliant, and few will ever suspect it, because the people have been as a frog slowly coming to the boiling point in a pot over 40 years. Few care to learn logic, and fewer care to gather all the facts pertaining to any matter of investigation. So few will bother to take this seriously.

See also:

**Halfway out of Rome into full Gospel Liberty.** Progress from Luther's Partial Coming out of Rome to a Full Return to Biblical Consistency and the Real Principles of the Reformation.