

CHRIST WAS WISE AND TRUTHFUL

It can be assumed that all Christians, if asked, would say that they believe that Christ was “wise” and “truthful.” However, do they believe that in practice?

If Christ was “wise,” He would have set up a religion that would keep His teachings intact - all of them - from His Resurrection until the end of time. This religion would be led by the Holy Spirit to not change, water down, or misinterpret what was to be believed. Catholics believe that Christ was indeed “wise,” and did set up such a religion - and it has existed for almost 2000 years without any such change of its Dogmas, Doctrines, and moral standards all during that time.

Catholics have Obedience to an authority that goes back those 2000 years. That authority was set up by Christ when He said, *"And I say to thee, thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church."* {Matthew 16:18} If Christ was not talking about Peter being the leader of His Church on Earth, then why did He change his name to Peter - which means “rock”? Was Christ trying to confuse Peter? Was He trying to confuse His Apostles? And since Peter couldn’t live to the end of the world, there must be a way for Christ’s Church to continue to have a leader on Earth - and that is the Papacy.

If Christ was “truthful,” he meant when He added, *"And the gates of hell shall not prevail over it."*

Now let's examine the “reformers” - and it’s initiator first. Martin Luther was right that there certainly were elements in the Church at that time that needed reforming. However, his was a “revolution” - not a “reformation.” Christ would have approved of a reformation. Satan approved of the revolution. Luther evidently did not think Christ was “wise” or “truthful,” as he had to deny those in order to establish his own religion. This, of course, was a great example of Pride - the opposite of Humility. He had to come to believe that either Christ did not establish His Church, or if He did, the gates of hell did prevail against it. The result was denial and disobedience to most of the dogmas and doctrines that he professed when he made his first vows as a Catholic priest. And there is no limit to Pride when obedience is eliminated. We know that from Satan - the Father of Pride.

The extent of Luther’s Pride becomes self-evident to anyone

who does the research as to his beliefs. It is doubtful that those who honor him are aware of some of his quotes:

- "No sin will separate us from the lamb, even though we commit fornication and murder a thousand times a day."

- "If Moses should attempt to intimidate you with his stupid 10 Commandments, tell him right out: chase yourselves to the Jews. "

(In other words, forget about any moral law.)

- "If, in faith, adultery could be committed, it would be no sin."

(Again, no moral law.)

- "Thus even Christ, who was so righteous, must have been guilty of fornication before he died."

(If you personally do not believe the last statement - as well as the others - then you should not follow this "reformer" and his religion - or any other one formed in the 500 years since then.

Every non-Catholic Christian religion came into being by rejecting many or most of the teachings of Christ's Church. Does that mean that one is not a true follower of Christ if they do not believe all of what He taught? Is this what Christ meant when He said, *"Not everyone who cries Lord, Lord, shall enter the kingdom of Heaven." but he who does the will of my Father in Heaven shall enter into the kingdom of Heaven. Many will say to me in that day, 'Lord, Lord,' did we not prophesy in thy name, and cast out devils in thy name, and work many miracles in thy name? And then I will declare to them, 'I never knew you. Depart from me, you workers of iniquity!'* {Matthew 7:21-23} It seems that Christ, being the Son of God, was predicting the "reformation" and other Christian churches 15 centuries ahead of time.

The Apostle Paul basically said the same thing, *"But even if we or an angel from heaven should preach a gospel to you other than that which we have preached to you, let him be anathema!"* {Galatians 1:8} That obviously includes any new teaching - or any left out - by the so-called "reformers" which was different from what the Catholic Church had taught over those first 15 centuries - and still taught today.

Additional Bible passages: *"For there will come a time when they will not endure the sound doctrine: but having itching ears, will heap up to themselves teachers according to their own lusts, and they will turn away their hearing from the truth and turn aside rather to fables."* {2 Timothy 3:3-4}

"Beware of false prophets, who come to you in sheep's

clothing, but inwardly are ravenous wolves. By their fruits you will know them.” {Matthew 7:15-16} (Their “fruits” being Pride and Disobedience.) That would make anyone who starts their own religion a “major false prophet.” And would that make those who continue to lead those religions “minor false prophets”?

(While the vast majority of non-Catholic Christians are basically good people, and they have many social ministries which are positive, no amount of that can replace the Sacraments of Confession and Holy Communion that Christ instituted, and which the “reformers” rejected - and which they do not have today.)

So the “Bottom Line” is whether or not an individual will show up on their Judgement Day having believed Christ was “wise” and “truthful” as a member of the Catholic Church Christ founded. The only other option left is to believe that Christ was not “wise” and not “truthful” - not a good position to be in when having to answer for it on Judgement Day.

As always, It is a choice.