



The Burning Bush—Online article archive

The Bible or The Traditions of Rome

The following is the text of an e-mail message we received from a visitor to our website and the answer we sent to him. We thought both would be of interest to all our readers. A Further response and the editor's reply is included

Dear Sirs,

I live in a an area that is mostly Roman Catholic. However, when I leave my own geographic area I continually meet many people who are members of many Protestant denominations. Most of the Protestants I have met are sincere Christians who make outrageous statements about The Roman Catholic Faith.

At first, I considered what was being said and took it to heart. I began to study and research what they said. Are they telling the truth about the Catholic Church. After all if they believed in something so strongly maybe they were right.

I began to read some Protestant books about the Catholic Church. My first book was by Lorraine Boetner. He made some interesting statements. However, I did notice that he only had 10 footnotes to indicate the source of his information. For someone to write a book on an establishment as huge as the Catholic Church, I would assume that he would have more than just 10 references of which 8 were to Protestant writers. So then is what he stating his own opinion? Is it conjecture?

Well, I started to research many of the statements made by my Protestant neighbors and talked with many of them about my findings. One of my best friends is a Protestant Minister with whom I have had many conversations. He has also challenged me about some of the Catholic Churches beliefs.

Let me tell you about two of the Protestant statements I have found information on.

I have found that No where in the Bible could I find nor could my Protestant Minister friend find a statement that the Bible is the only truth and is the only source of the teachings of Jesus and the Apostles. Timothy refers to the church as the pillar of truth, not the Bible. Please read (Mathew 3:15), (2 Thessalonians 2:15 3:6), (1 Peter 1:25), (2 Peter 1:20 - 1:21), (Mathew 18:17) and (1 Timothy 3:15).

The second issue is the Protestant claim that Justification by faith alone. Well, I read many parts of Scripture that Protestants use to argue their case but Scripture states otherwise. What stands out the most is James 2:24 to the end of the chapter and 1 Corinthians 13:2.

I believe the Protestant position on these two tenants of faith are POLITICAL in nature. They certainly are not Biblical.

I have noticed that many Protestant Ministers who are educated in Protestant schools are being taught that Protestants are more Biblical than Catholics. What I have been uncovering is just the opposite. It appears that the Catholic Church is more Biblical.



The Burning Bush—Online article archive

I would have to say at this point in time the Catholic Church is being guided by the Holy Spirit. If you doubt this then why, at this point in time, are there over 2,500 Protestant denominations? Why? If I am not mistaken Jesus said that a house divided by itself will fall. At some point in time we would have no need of a church. Every household will be it's own church deciding for itself what is doctrinal and what is not. That sounds pretty scary doesn't it. So if you are under the assumption that the Holy Spirit is guiding you it may be very possible you are wrong. Numbers don't lie.

It would be more Christian to work together for the conversion of all of the world's people. It would be better to spread the word of Jesus to people and nations who are real pagans. Those people, who worship Buddha, Confucius, and other would be gods.

Wouldn't it be better to stop calling your brother names and work for Jesus than against Him. You know, most families disagree on issues, yet a loving family does not try to kill it's members. Disagreement is good, bigotry is not acceptable.

Here is a prayer said by a very famous Christian.

Lord, make me an instrument of Your peace.
Where there is hatred, let me sow love,
Where there is injury, pardon,
Where there is doubt, faith,
and where there is sadness, joy.
O Divine Master, grant that I may not so much seek to be consoled, as to console,
To be understood, as to understand;
To be loved, as to love;
For it is in giving that we receive,
It is in pardoning that we are pardoned,
And it is in dying that we are born to eternal life.

St. Francis of Assisi

I have one last thing to ask you and please do not take it as being offensive as I am not trying to be offensive It is just a question that makes a lot of sense.

Who started the Catholic Church? It has been in existence for about 2,000 unbroken years.

Who started the Presbyterian Church?

Who started the Lutheran Church?

Who started the Calvinist Church?

Who started the Anglican or Church of England?

It is obvious that these churches were started in or after the 16th Century. Do you think



The Burning Bush—Online article archive

that the Holy Spirit made a 16 century mistake. Do you think he purposely led Christians to hell for 16 centuries? Think about this with all your heart. Pray to receive the guidance to say the right things. You may be condemning the Holy Spirit, and I don't think that this is your intention. Jesus said that sins committed against the Holy Spirit are not forgiven. Now, the Bible doesn't say just what sin that is, but do you want to find out?

I will pray for you to love and not hate. For it is obvious you hate the Catholic Church.

I will pray for you to have compassion for those who are different. For you hate those whom you have no knowledge of.

I will pray for you to listen, the Holy Spirit works in many different ways. Do not close your ears to Him.

I will pray for you to read the Bible with an open mind. To look at what it really says. It is the Holy Spirit who interprets Scripture not college professors. College professors have inspired 2,500 Protestant denominations.

I will pray for you to be a REAL Christian.

I wish you and your family a very Merry and Holy Christmas and may God bless you and your family.

Dan Swartz.

The Editor's reply

Dear Dan,

Thank you for your letter to me regarding "The Burning Bush" site and the questions you have about Protestantism.

I would like to answer the two main points you raise in your letter.

You mention that you read a book by Loraine Boettner. You do not mention the name of the book. That is a pity. I have a number of his books. The one you most likely are referring to is the one entitled "Roman Catholicism." The only problem is that far from quoting from 8 Protestant writers and two Roman Catholic writers, Mr. Boettner lists some 100 authors referred to in his book and they are as diverse as the Jesuit Bellermine and John Calvin!

His work is a classic and is not so easily dismissed as you appear to think it is. No Roman Catholic scholar has, to my knowledge, attempted to respond to Mr. Boettner's book. Setting that aside, let me address the two main points you make.



The Burning Bush—Online article archive

You say, first of all: "I have found that nowhere in the Bible could I find nor could my Protestant Minister friend find a statement that the Bible is the only truth and is the only source of the teachings of Jesus and the Apostles."

You then give a series of references to support your view that the church rather than the Bible is the Christian's authority.

In answer to that assertion, I will simply let the Bible speak for itself. We will also see what holy men of God said about the Bible and the authority that they understood it to have.

In three places in the Bible, at the beginning, in the middle and at the end, God issued a warning about tampering with the words He had given. I will quote the three places.

Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish ought from it, that ye may keep the commandments of the LORD your God which I command you What thing soever I command you, observe to do it: thou shalt not add thereto, nor diminish from it , Deuteronomy 4:2, 12:32.

Add thou not unto his words, lest he reprove thee, and thou be found a liar, Proverbs 30:6.

And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book , Revelation 22:19.

The implication of those words is clear. Nothing contrary to that taught in the Bible is to be heeded by the believer. Clearly, it is to be seen as our final authority. Isaiah the prophet stated, *To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them* , Isaiah 8:20. There is the divine measuring stick by which that which is false is to be known. **To the law and the testimony** -- here is a definitive title of the Old Testament. In the story of the rich man and Lazarus, did not the Saviour define the Old Testament writings under a similar title? *Abraham saith unto him, They have Moses and the prophets; let them hear them* , Luke 16:29. Again, did not Christ teach the two disciples on the road to Emmaus (Luke 24:27) out of *Moses and all the prophets* ? The law or writings of Moses and all the other prophets comprised *all the scriptures* of the Old Testament.

I ask you, would there be such warnings against altering the Bible or accepting anything contrary to the Bible, if it were not the sole authority that God would have His people submit to? The Old Testament and it alone, was the authority of the Old Testament believer.

Likewise, the Old Testament scriptures, along with the inspired writings of the New Testament writers, became the authority of the people of God in the New Testament era.

It was to the Old Testament scriptures that the Bereans turned in order to verify whether the apostles were preaching an acceptable message. *These (the Jews of Berea) were more noble than those in Thessalonica, in that they received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the scriptures daily, whether those things were so* , Acts 17:11.

When Paul confirmed the gospel he had preached to the Corinthians he said: *Moreover, brethren, I declare unto you the gospel which I preached unto you, which also ye have re-*



The Burning Bush—Online article archive

*ceived, and wherein ye stand; by which also ye are saved, if ye keep in memory what I preached unto you, unless ye have believed in vain. For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures; and that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the scriptures , 1 Corinthians 15: 1-4. Note the criterion -- **the scriptures** .*

Again, would the Holy Spirit speak in such commendatory terms of the Bereans' practice of only believing that which was according to the Old Testament scriptures, if they were not indeed the sole authority of the people of God at that time? And would Paul have laid such an stress upon his message of the gospel being *according to the scriptures* if they were not the final arbiter of what is right doctrine?

Far from what you say being true, the very opposite is the truth. The Bible does clearly state that its pages and its pages alone are the final authority of the child of God.

If you don't believe this, the devil certainly does. You do not read of him stealing away traditions from men but you do read of him stealing away the Word of God, Matthew 13:19, Mark 4:14-15.

It is true that Paul (not Timothy as you seem to think) calls the church *the pillar and ground of the truth* , 1 Timothy 3:15. But these words plainly do not mean what you appear to think they mean, ie, that the *church is the pillar of truth, not the Bible* . That is not what the verse says. It says that the church is *the pillar and the ground of the truth* . The word *pillar* comes from a Greek word that means to *stiffen* . That is simple enough to understand as we all recognise the role of a pillar in a building. It is intended to uphold. The word *ground* , on the other hand means *a basis or support*. Far from the church of Christ **being the truth** it is the **upholder of truth as a pillar props up a building** .

You refer to other scripture references.

The relevance of Matthew 3:15 is lost on me so I will ignore it and come to your next reference.

Therefore, brethren, stand fast, and hold the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word, or our epistle , 2 Thessalonians 2:15. This upholds the authority of Holy Scripture rather than diminishing it as you seem to conclude it does. The traditions they were to observe were those which were born out of God's Word, those established from the word that he had preached in their midst or by his teaching in an epistle. It shows that the writings of the apostles were to be reckoned as authoritative in conjunction with the writings of the law and the prophets of the Old Testament.

Christ berated those traditions the Pharisees and Scribes observed for they were based upon the word of the *elders*. *Thus have ye made the commandment of God of none effect by your tradition*, Matthew 15:6. That is what Rome has done with her man-made traditions.

The tradition referred to in 2 Thessalonians 3:6 is likewise something that the Christians at Thessalonica had received from Paul. Here again, the Scripture-based teaching of the apostle was the only doctrine that they were to receive -- the Bible was their authority. Your reference to Matthew 18:17 is utterly without relevance to the subject of authority. I am fast coming to the conclusion that you have merely copied these references out of someone else's article and have not read them for yourself. Simple common sense would



The Burning Bush—Online article archive

tell anyone that the verse refers only to a stubborn Christian refusing to hear his fellow members of a congregation when they are reproving him for his conduct.

I can commend to your reading another verse you refer to, 1 Peter 1:25. It is clear you did not read it, since it declares the Bible to be the basis and authority of the gospel. *But the word of the Lord endureth for ever. And this is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you*, 1 Peter 1:25. Had you read this passage, you would have seen that Peter was saying that the **Word of God**, not **the traditions of their fathers**, was the sum and substance of the gospel, verse 18.

Again, 2 Peter 1:20-21, to which you refer, upholds the Protestant doctrine of *Sola Scriptura*, the Holy Scriptures alone as our authority. Your arguments show how dangerous it is for a Roman Catholic to attempt to prove the truth of his church's teaching and the errors of Protestantism. You end up wounding your self on the two-edged sword that you would try to employ against true believers.

But back to 2 Peter 1:20-21! What did Peter say? *Knowing this first, that no prophecy of the scripture is of any private interpretation. For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost*, 2 Peter 1:20-21. We say "Amen, Peter!" Protestantism does not believe that anyone may interpret God's Word according to their own fancy. Rather, Protestantism teaches that the interpretation of Holy Scripture must be *based upon the teaching of Scripture*. I must interpret God's Word by God's Word. *But God hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit: for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God. For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him? even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God. Now we have received, not the spirit of the world, but the spirit which is of God; that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God. Which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth; comparing spiritual things with spiritual*, 1 Corinthians 2:10-13. It is Romanism, not Protestantism, that has taken upon itself to supplant the authority of God's Word. It is you who are arguing against the authority of the Bible and I who am upholding its authority.

Regarding your second point, you say: "The second issue is the Protestant claim that Justification is by faith alone. Well, I read many parts of Scripture that Protestants use to argue their case, but Scripture states otherwise. What stands out the most is James 2:24 to the end of the chapter and 1 Corinthians 13:2."

Let us look first at James 2:24-26.

Ye see then how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only. Likewise also was not Rahab the harlot justified by works, when she had received the messengers, and had sent them out another way? For as the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is dead also. Do these words teach that there are two ways by which a man may be justified, by faith and by works? The explanation is to be found in the context of what James is saying. Context is something you have paid scant heed to, Don, regarding your interpretation of the verse you quote.

Before we proceed any further, it is best if I state what I mean by justification.

"Justification is an act of God's free grace, wherein he pardoneth all our sins, and accep-



The Burning Bush—Online article archive

teth us as righteous in his sight, only for the righteousness of Christ imputed to us, and received by faith alone." (Shorter Catechism, Answer to question 33.) The proof texts of this statement are as follows. *In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace*, Ephesians 1:7. *For he hath made him [to be] sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him*, 2 Corinthians 5:21. *Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ*, Galatians 2:16.

Now, to continue with our thoughts on James 2:24-26. James is writing about those graces which will accompany true faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. To say you have faith in Christ and yet act so as to favour the rich and despise the poor, verses 1-9, then your faith is not genuine. Faith without holy works is no true faith at all. It is dead, verse 17. It is as the body without the spirit, a dead thing, a corpse. The offering of Isaac upon the altar by Abraham, verse 21, was a justifying work in that it demonstrated his faith in God. It marked his faith as genuine so that it can be said that his work, springing as it did from real faith, declared that he was a justified man. When Paul wrote, *Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight: for by the law is the knowledge of sin* (Romans 3:20), he was not contradicting James. The two statements complement each other. A man is not justified before God by the mere empty declaration of faith in Christ. Nor is he justified by his attempts to keep the law of God. The faith that justifies a man before God is always accompanied by holy works which demonstrate the genuineness of his conversion before men. The inward work of grace which is seen alone by God, is evidenced before men by an outworking of the new holy nature implanted by God. *A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you: and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh. And I will put my spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments, and do them*, Ezekiel 36:26-27. Paul stated the same truth when he said: *Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new*, 2 Corinthians 5:17.

Thus both Paul is correct when he says *by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified* and James is equally correct when he says *by works a man is justified*. True faith, which is always accompanied by genuine holy works, justifies a man in God's sight and true holy works, which spring from genuine faith in Christ as He is revealed in the gospels, justify a man from the charge of hypocrisy and declare him to be a genuine believer.

Upon these two truths hangs the outcome of any debate between Protestants and Romanists. For that reason I will not reply to the other comments you make. If you can show from the Holy Scriptures that Protestantism is wrong in its view of the authority of the Bible and justification by faith in Christ's atoning death alone, then I will hardly be able to answer the other points you make. If, on the other hand, you cannot disprove these two doctrines, I do not need to bother with your other comments; your case is lost.

I urge upon you to consider these matters, not in a partisan spirit, but in the fear of God before Whom we must all give an account one day, and with the awareness that we have an eternal soul that must be redeemed by Christ if we are to enter heaven.

My best wishes to you.



The Burning Bush—Online article archive

Ivan Foster.

Hi Rev.

Thanks for thing about me and my questions.

After sending you my previous e-mail I was sort of struck by lightning. It never dawned on me as to where you live. You see I am an American living in the USA. As you well know we have a melting pot of nationalities as well as many different religious groups. In the USA we have religious freedom and for the most part are non partial to a persons religious convictions. However, there have been many forms of discrimination in various parts of the country. On the whole, bigotry is not rampant. So, when I see web pages that condemn another Protestant denomination or the Catholic Church I become a little leery. I realized that Northern Ireland has been a powder keg for a long time. Most people in the States get a kick out of the fact that Catholics and Protestant are at each others throats. Both are Christians, and yet the people of Northern Ireland don't act like Christians. My intention is not to blame anyone, just to get people in the right places to think a little bit about their actions. I believe Scripture says that you will know a Christian by his actions. From the news and what I see on the internet, I would say that Northern Ireland is void of Christianity entirely. My request of you would be for you to examine your conscience and compare your actions with Scripture. You be the judge. And then take some action.

Over the past few years there have been many changes in the Catholic Church, especially in the USA. The Catholic Church is starting to appear more Protestant while still holding to it's basic doctrines. The Protestant Churches as well have been changing. Protestants are no longer finding the Catholic Church in error. Most Protestant Ministers in the USA have been doing a lot of Scriptural research and have found that Catholic Doctrine is very Biblical, and that the basic tenants of Protestantism are not supported by Scripture. As a result the way that salvation is preached by Protestant has changed.

The basic tenants I am referring to are:

First, Scripture alone. No where in the Bible can this be found or substantiated. It does not exist. Prominent Protestant theologians have issued statements to this effect.

Second, Salvation by Faith alone. The Epistle of James flatly states that faith without works is dead. Now lets use our heads a little on this one. In no way can anyone perform any act or deed to save themselves. Faith is paramount and comes first. Faith is obtained through grace. If you do not receive the grace necessary to obtain faith, then all the works in the world will not save you. Salvation is through faith. However, works are a necessary part of salvation. You just can't say I believe and you are saved. Scripture is loaded with statements to back this up. And of course the basic Biblical teaching is that you can't save yourself. Only Jesus can. When Jesus was on the Cross one of the thieves was told that he would see Jesus in heaven that day. In cases that mirror this situation, of course a person can declare himself a believer in Jesus and die and be saved without any works. But what



The Burning Bush—Online article archive

of the person who lives for 50 years after excepting Jesus as his Lord and Savior. In this instance the saved person will be held accountable for his works. It's in the Bible.

I realize that the Protestant position on works is largely do to indulgences. But it seems as if Protestants threw out the baby with the bath water.

If you feel it necessary I can obtain the actual Scriptural passages that will back up the statement I have made.

My intention is not to debate you in a formal debate but to create a dialogue whereby we can express our differences. God knows that many intelligent and scholarly men have debated these very issues over the last 4 centuries and seemed to have failed. The difference is that today, we look at Scripture differently, we are open minded, and we can work together to come up will common beliefs.

I look forward to future correspondence with you. Perhaps I can learn a lot from you and you can learn a little from me.

I wish you and your loved ones a very Happy and Holy Christmas

Dan Swartz.

Editor's Second Response

Dear Dan,

Thank you for your greetings.

I have been visiting the south of Ireland, preaching in Limerick and Cork to converted Roman Catholics so I have been away from my study. That is the reason I did not respond sooner.

I will respond first of all to your brief reference to my first reply and then comment on some of the other things you write.

In response to my scriptural answer to your assertion that the Bible is not the sole authority of the people of God you say:

First, Scripture alone. No where in the Bible can this be found or substantiated. It does not exist. Prominent Protestant theologians have issued statements to this effect.

So that is considered an answer to what the Bible has to say!! I gave you verses that sustain the orthodox Protestant position and refute Rome's view. Why did you not examine them in detail and show me where I am wrong in my interpretation of the views I have formed from them? The "prominent Protestant theologians" are Protestant in name only and prominent simply because of their rejection of the Bible.

Your response to my answer to your second point of discussion: that salvation is not by faith in Christ alone, is similarly short and does not refer to the arguments I based upon various portions of God's Word. But then, since you do not believe that the Bible is the au-



The Burning Bush—Online article archive

thoritative rule of the Church, why should you regard its teaching?

However, it is vain for you to attempt to show that the Bible teaches that salvation is by a mixture of faith and works.

You acknowledged that works had no part to play in the salvation of the dying thief. That, of course, demolishes your whole position. There is only one way of salvation and that is the way by which the dying thief was saved. You are saying that for everyone else who do not die and go to heaven shortly after they are saved, the way to heaven is by faith and works. The problem for an evangelist, were your notion to be true, is knowing to whom to address the salvation by faith message and to whom to address the salvation by faith plus works message, since I would not know who was soon to die and who was not!!! Ludicrous, is it not?

In truth, and here I repeat what I said the first time, but which you completely ignored, works are the FRUIT of salvation not the AUTHOR. The saved shall be judged according to their works, BUT not to decide whether they did enough to enter heaven, but to decide upon the rewards they will receive in heaven. Here is where you make a major mistake. *For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ. Now if any man build upon this foundation gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble; every man's work shall be made manifest: for the day shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire; and the fire shall try every man's work of what sort it is. If any man's work abide which he hath built thereupon, he shall receive a reward. If any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss: but he himself shall be saved; yet so as by fire*, 1 Corinthians 3: 11-15.

Christ is the foundation of our faith and upon that foundation we build a life of good works after we trust in Him alone for salvation. Those good works will be rewarded. But notice that even he who wastes his Christian life and builds only hay, wood and stubble which will not stand the fiery examination of Christ, is not lost but is still saved, albeit loses all rewards.

According to your notion, Paul was wrong to say of him whose life did not bring forth acceptable works, *he himself shall be saved*.

The arguments of my first reply on this subject stand, for you have not addressed them at all.

I would like to comment briefly on some other things you say which are not connected to the main points under discussion.

1. You say: I realized that Northern Ireland has been a powder keg for a long time. Most people in the States get a kick out of the fact that Catholics and Protestant are at each others throats. Both are Christians, and yet the people of Northern Ireland don't act like Christians.

You are wrong about Northern Ireland, and that in a big way. Might I say first of all, and here I return to the second main point under discussion, why do you call those who are "at



The Burning Bush—Online article archive

each others throats" Christians? Surely if good works are required to get a person to heaven, those engaged in murder hardly qualify as candidates for glory?

In truth, Protestants and Roman Catholics are not "at each others throats" as you put it. My nearest neighbour (I live in a part of Northern Ireland where Roman Catholics are in the majority) is a Roman Catholic and neither of us has ever had a cross word.

The truth is, a handful of terrorists, Roman Catholic and loyalist, are at the throats of any who get in their way. That is what has been happening in Northern Ireland. However, since the governments of the United Kingdom, the Irish Republic and the USA have all joined together to cajole and deceive the majority of our feeble-minded politicians into conceding to the terrorists, it is likely that such tactics will stop, at least until they come up with some more demands.

2. You also say: Over the past few years there have been many changes in the Catholic Church, especially in the USA. The Catholic Church is starting to appear more Protestant while still holding to it's basic doctrines. The Protestant Churches as well have been changing. Protestants are no longer finding the Catholic Church in error. Most Protestant Ministers in the USA have been doing a lot of Scriptural research and have found that Catholic Doctrine is very Biblical, and that the basic tenants of Protestantism are not supported by Scripture. As a result the way that salvation is preached by Protestant has changed.

Inadvertently, Dan, you have given us a very fitting and concise analysis of the Ecumenical Movement and what has taken place in the Roman Catholic and the ecumenical Protestant churches. I seriously doubt, however, if you really intended to be so candid.

You are absolutely correct when you say The Catholic Church is starting to appear more Protestant while still holding to it's basic doctrines. At heart, Rome is sticking to its basic doctrines, all those doctrines which the Reformers exposed as unbiblical and antichristian and because of which many died as martyrs. On the outside, she is giving the appearance of changing. Here in Ulster, we call it window-dressing with the same old corrupt goods on sale inside.

On the other hand, you are equally right in stating that The Protestant Churches as well have been changing. Protestants are no longer finding the Catholic Church in error. Most Protestant Ministers in the USA have been doing a lot of Scriptural research and have found that Catholic Doctrine is very Biblical, and that the basic tenants of Protestantism are not supported by Scripture. As a result the way that salvation is preached by Protestant has changed.

This is not window-dressing. There have been real and substantial changes amongst some Protestant denominations. They have changed their message of salvation. They have abandoned the Bible and adopted Rome's evil message of works. That is apostasy.

The debates over the centuries have failed only in so far as to alter Rome's opinions. Christ did not change the opinion of the Pharisees and Sadducees. That does not mean that He failed or that what He said was wrong. My objective in debating is not, as you suggest, to come up with a common definition of doctrine that we both agree to, but rather to uphold what the Bible says as the only definition of faith and practice.

I recognise I have an uphill struggle since you have stated from the outset that you do not



The Burning Bush—Online article archive

accept what the Bible says as authoritative.

I sincerely hope that you change your mind for your soul's salvation depends upon it.

Sincerely yours
Ivan Foster.