

Below is a transcription of the audio file of the Catechism Class given 05-29-11

I believe the last class ended by speaking about the proof that the Church was permanent, quoting what St. Paul wrote to Barnabas and so forth. When they had ordained to them priests in every Church and had prayed with fasting, they commended them to the Lord. Today, we will continue on speaking about the fourth mark and attribute of the Church, Apostolicity, and probably get into the infallibility of the Church.

From what has already been spoken about, we can certainly legitimately assume that the Church that Jesus Christ founded is still in the world, because as we have already proved, Jesus is God and He promised His Church will last until the end of time. So the vital point for us to understand and ascertain is which of all the existing churches in the world today is that apostolic Church founded by Jesus Christ? Again, we could ask, which of all the churches which uses the Apostles Creed and admits at least tacitly the words of Nicene Creed, "I believe in the one, holy, Catholic and apostolic Church," can actually prove for itself the apostolic title? This gets to be exceedingly important because we seem to be toward the last age when the Scriptures are fulfilled -- that there will be a great falling away.

The upstart of not too long ago of those who claim to be inspired of God to rule and regulate the world by their own was to teach things, which meant they could not claim apostolicity because they thought contrary to what the Church taught in the past. Never forget this truth -- those who invent doctrines unheard of before are not the successors of the Apostles. Remember that. Those who invent doctrines unheard of before are not the successors of the Apostles. Therefore, such sects and groups as those founded by Bishop des Lauriers and promoted in a special way by McKenna and the other followers of Sanborn teach the pope is both dead and alive, pope formally and materially and so forth. That is a new doctrine -- that those invent doctrines unheard of before are not the successors of the Apostles. The doctrines promoted by John Paul II and so forth... that the Lutheran church is a sister church of the Catholic Church is a new doctrine because the Catholic Church is the mother and mistress of all churches. Therefore, they are not successors of the Apostles in the Novus Ordo religion. The new concept that the Muslims worship the same God as the Catholics is a new doctrine. Therefore, the Novus Ordo religion and its leaders are not the successors of the Apostles. They have fallen into error.

Novelty and error are children of the same father, the father of lies. Those who have lost the line of valid ministers leading back to apostolic times cannot claim the possession of apostolicity. That is why the Old Roman Catholics and that is why the Anglican orders have been declared invalid because they have lost the line of valid ministers dating back to apostolic time. For that reason, they cannot plead the possession of apostolicity. Pope Leo XIII declared Anglican orders invalid, so they lost their apostolic succession when they broke away from the Catholic faith.

Where there is no ordination, no priesthood, no authority, no power, apostolicity is out of the question. Even if valid orders exist, where jurisdiction is lacking, there is no real apostolicity. In that sentence alone means that there is not one bishop or priest (at least that I know of) that functions in the Traditionalist Movement that carries on the fourth mark of the Church, apostolicity. They all admit (who are truthful) that jurisdiction is lacking. The reason being that jurisdiction comes from Jesus Christ to the pope. The Traditionalist Movement people (for the most part) conclude that the Novus Ordo popes are not the successors of St. Peter. Therefore, their new bishops never received jurisdiction. Even the Society of St. Pius X in its great contradictory doctrines that the Novus Ordo popes are the pope, still admit that they did not receive jurisdiction. Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre made the public statement when they were consecrating the four original bishops of his sect, that they would not be ordinary. That is, they would not have ordinary or delegated jurisdiction. He had no jurisdiction to give them. They could only receive it from the pope and they did not receive anything from John Paul II. They have no jurisdiction. Therefore, listen carefully: "Even if valid orders exist, where jurisdiction is lacking, there is no real apostolicity."

Schism, as well as heresy, destroys apostolic succession. That sums up a lot for us if we will only listen to the truth. This is what the Church has taught for all ages. What the Church has always taught is the Catholic faith. There is only one Church that can vindicate Its apostolic title, which ought to be done by showing its origin and unbroken succession of its orders AND mission from the Apostles, and by proving its doctrinal

identity with their teachings. Some of the sects might possibly still have valid orders, but they do not have a mission from the Apostles. They do not have jurisdiction, authority, or mission, therefore they are not part of the Catholic Church. In the early centuries even, Tertullian says about those separated from the Catholic Church -- let them, therefore, show forth the beginning of their churches. Let them unfold the order of their bishops. So, by a succession running from the beginning, each bishop may have for antecedent and author some one of the Apostles, or some apostolic man who persevered with the Apostles.

I have spoken about it before, but we learn more by hearing it again. Therefore, I will ask, does the Old Roman Catholic church have its mission from the Apostles? Absolutely not. This is where Francis Schuckhart came from – the Old Roman Catholics. They broke away from the Church in 1724. After that, they started this new religion that has no apostolic succession. Again, the McKenna heresy and all the rest are not what the Apostles taught, so they did not persevere with the Apostles and their doctrines. They are not the Catholic Church. In Canon 1258 (I believe it is) tells us, it is forbidden for Catholics to take part in non-Catholic services. St. Thomas Aquinas tells us -- you do not receive grace from those who are cut off from the Church. All these in schism, heresy, and apostasy are cut off from the Church. You do not receive grace by receiving their sacraments, according to St. Thomas Aquinas. St. Augustine worded it against the Donatists this way -- come brethren if you have a mind to be engrafted in the vine. It is a pity to see you lie in the manner lopped off from the stock. Reckon up the prelates and the very See of Peter and in that order the Fathers see which has succeeded which. This is the rock over which the proud gates of hell prevail not.

The Church which is called Catholic is the only Church whose line of pontiffs and prelates and priests run back to the beginning. From St. Peter to (I believe) Pope Pius XII there were 262 sovereign pontiffs, and these are the popes of the Church that Jesus Christ founded upon Peter. Upon this rock, I will build My Church and the gates of hell shall not prevail against It. When the Catholic Church has ordinations and consecrations, especially consecrations of bishops, She is very vigilant. That is one of the reasons why there are three bishops (one main consecrator and two co-consecrators) as part of the vigilance that these orders carry on apostolic succession to a true line back to the Apostles, where they are approved of by a Catholic pope who gives that new bishop a mission and the Church gives them jurisdiction, which they, in turn, can pass on to their priests (which never happens in the Traditionalist Movement).

All this should make it very evident that apostolicity is not only a property of that Church, but it stands out as a mark that identifies her with the Church founded by Jesus Christ. There have been people, though, who will say, though admitting the apostolic line of orders and authority, still the Catholic Church has fallen away from the faith and practice of the beginning, and consequently, ceased to be apostolic. To answer that objection thoroughly might require much time and space, but it will suffice (I hope) to compare briefly and show a few principle doctrines to show that the Church now teaches the SAME things that Christ and His Apostles taught. We can easily ascertain if these doctrines are held elsewhere and to satisfy ourselves as to whether the old Church is apostolic or not in doctrine.

For example, take the matter of fasting. Jesus Christ, Our Savior, fasted and He enjoined fasting upon His followers, describing rules for the observance of fasts. He, Jesus, had fasted 40 days and 40 nights and He later told us that when the bridegroom shall be taken away, then they shall fast. He also stated when you fast, be not as the hypocrites, sad. When thou fastest, anoint thy head and wash thy face. We read how the Apostles fasted. They were ministering to the Lord and fasting. When they had ordained to them priests in every church, they had prayed with fasting. Jesus Christ said -- if any man will come after Me, let him deny himself. St. Paul warns us -- mortify, therefore, your members which are upon the earth.

So of all of the churches (so to speak) that we see functioning in the world today, which ones of them follows this apostolic doctrine of fasting and bodily mortification? It is true that individual people in some of the sects fast occasionally, but do any of their churches prescribe something such as the Catholic Church (the Lenten fast, the Ember Day fasts, and so forth)? Not to my knowledge. It is the Catholic Church alone Who prescribes fasting. For many centuries, every priest had to be fasting from midnight when he offered Mass. Then it was a Church law that it was reduced only to three hours, but it is still a law of fasting. The people as well must fast especially at times of ordination and consecration. Especially of ordinations, the whole Catholic faithful are to be fasting. Ordinations normally speaking are taking place on Ember Saturdays -- the four ember

seasons of the year. That is why we have the Ember Days -- a special prayer and fasting that the Church will obtain holy priests and bishops. The bishop must be fasting who ordains him and the priest should be fasting when he receives Holy Orders and makes his retreat in preparation for that great blessing of being ordained a priest.

Outside of the Catholic Church, where do we find this practice? Again, I say, I do not know of any other religion that practices it the same way that the Catholic Church prescribes. Or come to the Sacrament of Confirmation. We read in the Scriptures by the imposition of the hands of the Apostles, the Holy Ghost was given. Elsewhere, we read that Peter and John laid their hands upon them and they received the Holy Ghost. When Paul had imposed his hands on them, the Holy Ghost came upon them. Do not our bishops do the same when they administer the Sacrament of Confirmation? None of the sects that I know of have a resemblance of Confirmation except the Episcopalians. With them, it is not a sacrament, but a ceremony. They no longer even have an ordaining priesthood. The bishops cannot ordain priests or consecrate other bishops because they lost the sacrament of Holy Orders. Therefore, they do not have the power to administer Confirmation even if they wanted to. What the Lutherans call confirmation is simply a renewal of baptismal vows. You hear the Pentecostals and Holy Rollers who are basically just a satanic practice in their ceremonies (certainly not the Catholic Confirmation).

Another example might be that of the Sacrament of Extreme Unction. We read in St. James's epistle -- is any man sick among you? Let him bring in the priests of the Church and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord, and the prayer of faith shall save the sick man, and the Lord shall raise him up and if he be in sins, they shall be forgiven him. We realize that when the Church is functioning in its full blossom, a very great part of the Catholic priests' time is taken up attending to the sick and administering Extreme Unction, visiting the sick in the hospitals and so forth. Outside of the Catholic Church, Extreme Unction is not considered a Sacrament. In fact, the practice of anointing is genuinely derided. This is what happened with the Apostles in the apostolic times. Only the Catholic Church carries on these doctrines.

Take again, the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist. St. Matthew describes how Our Lord instituted this Sacrament -- and whilst they were at supper, Jesus took bread and blessed and broke and gave to His disciples and said, take ye and eat, this is My Body; and taking the chalice, He gave thanks and gave to them saying, drink ye all of this for this is My Blood of the new testament which shall be shed for many unto remission of sins. St. Paul also instructs us -- for I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you that the Lord Jesus, the same night in which He was betrayed, took bread and giving thanks, broke and said, take ye and eat, this is My Body which shall be delivered for you; this do for the commemoration of Me. In like manner also the chalice after He had supped, saying -- this chalice is the new testament in My Blood. Before that, Jesus Christ Our Lord, said -- except you eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink His blood, you shall not have life in you. St. Paul again instructs us -- the chalice of benediction which we bless, is it not the communion of the Body of Christ, and the bread which we break, is it not the partaking of the Body of the Lord? Elsewhere, he writes -- therefore, whosoever shall eat this bread or drink the chalice of the Lord unworthily shall be guilty of the Body and of the Blood of the Lord.

So comparing the Catholic Church to all of the non-Catholic sects (the modern ones especially) not one believes in the Eucharist as a sacrifice or even as a sacrament, really containing the Body and Blood of Christ. Most of the sects try to prove that when Our Lord said, this is My Body, He meant this is not My Body. Catholics, on the contrary, believe Christ said what He meant and meant what He said. This is especially evident in the Novus Ordo religion by observing what goes on in their religions as seen in some YouTube movies. They certainly must not believe in the real presence of the Blessed Sacrament. They do not even keep the tabernacle where it can be seen. They feed their unconsecrated bread to their dogs and other pets. People receive the bread in their dirty hands, take it home in their purses or billfold, and desecrate what they sometimes think is the Blessed Sacrament, although thanks be to God, it really is not. They are idol worshippers, thinking they might be adoring the Blessed Sacrament when their priests do not consecrate it, for they do not have the sacrament of ordinations in the Novus Ordo religion.

Take again the doctrine of the sacrament of marriage. Jesus declared -- whosoever shall put away his wife and marry another commiteth adultery against her. If the wife shall put away her husband and be married to another, she commiteth adultery.

Every one that putteth away his wife, and marrieth another, committeth adultery: and he that marrieth her that is put away from her husband, committeth adultery.

St. Paul tells us -- to them that are married not I but the Lord commandeth that the wife depart not from her husband, and if she depart that she remain unmarried or be reconciled to her husband, and let not the husband put away his wife. The Catholic Church alone of all the thousands of sects in the world today is the only one teaching the indissolubility of the marriage tie. She alone opposes polygamy of every kind.

If you study the history of the world and different religions, you will soon realize that Protestantism sprang largely from a disregard for the unity of the marriage bond. One half million divorces yearly disgrace the records of our country in this pagan land in which we live. We need no other token to tell us how far the teaching of the sects has drifted from the standards of the Apostles. Shortly after the Novus Ordo new religion had begun, there were thousands of annulments given, showing it is a new religion. How many people who call themselves Catholics who belong to the Novus Ordo religion can you name who had been, so to speak, married, divorced, married and divorced, twice or three or four or five times or more? I certainly know of some, showing that they do not follow the teachings of the Apostles. They do not have the four marks of the Catholic Church in the Novus Ordo religion.

We might take the evangelical councils. Jesus Christ by word and example counseled perfection. He said -- I have given you an example. Be you therefore perfect as also your Heavenly Father is perfect. To attain perfection, Jesus recommended the states of virginity and holy poverty. When the young man asked Our Lord what he should do to be saved, he was answered -- if thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments. But, when he wished to know what he must do to be perfect, Our Lord said to him -- go sell what thou hast and give to the poor, and come follow Me. Saint Paul says -- I would that all men were even as myself. Speaking of his own life of virginity. He adds -- but everyone has his proper gift from God, but I say to the unmarried, it is good for them if they so continue even as I. Saint Paul counsels virginity, though he teaches that not all can receive this counsel. Our Lord, Jesus Christ, says -- all men take not this word, but they to whom it is given. He that can take it, let him take it. Like Jesus Christ, Our Lord and St. Paul, the Catholic clergy and many of the faithful bind themselves to a life of perpetual continency and many of them, to the practice of poverty. By their example, prove that man can be pure and women chaste, and that Heaven is higher than all of the wealth of the world.

Outside of the Catholic Church, those counsels are set at naught, while voluntary poverty is looked upon as insanity and virginity as an impossibility. If you read the book by St. Alphonsus Maria Liguori on *The Great Means of salvation and Perfection*, toward the end of that book, he gives advice to young men, and after that, advice to a young woman. I think you can hear it on the cassette tapes on my website. It is probably on tape #10 or maybe even on tape #11. St. Alphonsus Maria Liguori does not counsel marriage to anyone unless they have a problem with continency, which are few. In passing, I would just mention that during the reign of Pope Pius XI, 35 saints were canonized, and of those 35, thirty of them were religious during their lifetime, showing that it is easier to save your soul in the religious state when the Church was right and flourishing and we could have joined the religious life, than it was to save your soul in the married state. Although do not be discouraged, people can save their souls in every state of life as the innumerable number of saints in Heaven teach us.

So, you probably do not need to dwell much longer on the matter of apostolic doctrine. We can pass over the other things that the Catholic Church teaches, but the sects deny, such as predestination, good works, and the infallibility of the Church as these matters will be covered in different places if you read what the Church teaches. Today, we will get into the infallibility of the Church. Other such topics we could cover (but probably will not at this time) would be the divinity of Our Lord, the Holy Trinity, the future life, the eternity of hell, original sin, the necessity of baptism, and many other doctrines. But, on all these subjects, only one Church remains sound and unshaken. That is the Church which is truly apostolic, not only in doctrine, but in derivation.

Stand ye on the ways, and see, and ask of the old paths, which is the good way, and walk ye in it: and you shall find refreshment for your souls (as we read in the book of Jeremias, the prophet). Therefore, do not allow yourselves to be deceived and follow any church that does not have apostolic succession, both in orders and jurisdiction, whose priests and bishops do not have a mission coming down from the twelve Apostles, which mission only comes through a true successor of St. Peter. Do not belong to any church that teaches a new doctrine from what was taught throughout the centuries.

The infallibility of the Church is a matter of paramount importance. Infallibility is the key to the whole ecclesiastical situation. As soon as we have found the true Church, and have learned that it cannot teach us error, there remains nothing for us to do but to listen and obey. As soon as we find the true Church that is infallible, the state of anxiety and unrest betokening doubt of mind and unsettled convictions, at once vanishes, and peace and contentment and joy and faith abide. For whatever reasons, many people (it seems at least in actuality) persist in misunderstanding the dogma of infallibility. It is important then to understand, what is infallibility.

To understand it better, it might be well to understand what infallibility is not. Infallibility is not omniscience, nor revelation, nor inspiration, nor impeccability, nor inerrancy merely consequent. Infallibility is not omniscience. Omniscience means all-knowing. God is omniscient for He knows everything, past, present, and future. There were actually some people in the 1800s (when Pope Pius IX declared the dogma of papal infallibility) that raised their hands to Heaven and declared that the Church has clothed the pope with the attributes of God, because as they said, if the pope cannot error, he must know everything. He must be all-wise, like God. But note, my dear friends in Christ, that infallibility does not imply universal knowledge. It has nothing to do with mathematics, geography, history, philosophy, or the knowledge coming from any of these studies, or book learning. It is quite compatible with the infallibility of the Church and of the pope, that the sovereign pontiff be not even a learned man. Of these 262 popes, many of them were not that well educated, but they never taught error or heresy.

Again, we should note that infallibility is distinct and entirely different from revelation. Revelation discloses things hitherto unknown. Infallibility has to do with that which is already revealed. We do not believe that the Church receives a new revelation from Heaven to be communicated daily to the people. When the last of the Apostles, St. John the Evangelist, departed this life, the Book of Revelation was closed. That is why St. John can write at the end of the Apocalypse -- if any man shall add to these things, God shall add unto him the plagues written in this Book.

Again, let us note that infallibility differs widely from inspiration. Inspiration is a divine influence and a certain act as, for example, the writing of a book. Inspiration causes certain things to be done, but infallibility simply keeps one thing from being done. Note well what that one thing is. The prerogative of infallibility makes it impossible for the Church to teach error. That is the whole substance of infallibility. It makes it impossible for the Church that Jesus Christ founded to teach error.

Obviously, then, infallibility and impeccability are not the same thing. Impeccability is the inability not to observe all laws binding in conscience. It is freedom from the liability to sin. If the popes were actually impeccable, then they could do no wrong. That obviously has not been the case as we know some popes lived very wicked lives in their own moral standards in their own personal lives. Nevertheless, they were infallible and did not teach error through the Church. The inability to do wrong is an inerrancy in observing laws, whereas infallibility is the inerrancy in interpreting and expounding law. It is one thing to teach and quite another to observe and obey. Even the pope is free to disobey the laws of the Church, although when He speaks to the universal Church, He cannot teach us error on the matters of faith and morals.

Infallibility has nothing to do with whether the pope observes laws or not. Hence, all discussions of the lives of the popes is not to the point. It may be often brought up that some popes have lived a very wicked life. That has nothing to do with the fact that the Church is infallible and that it cannot teach error. The disposition to fight the dogma of papal infallibility by forging lies concerning the lives of certain popes, is unworthy of a mind capable of considering a great subject. In fact, it only proves more the truth of infallibility, that these bad men, although they reached the tiara and became sovereign pontiffs and lived wicked lives, that fact argues for the infallibility rather than against it (since even the bad popes never taught error in the chair of Peter).

That is one of the main proofs we have that the Novus Ordo religion and its leaders were not Catholic when they became the sovereign pontiffs in the eyes of the world (because they have taught error and contradiction to what the Church taught in the past). So, they could not teach that if they were truly the successor of St. Peter. If God could keep evil men from error, who should doubt the infallibility of the just. Let us not make a mistake. That fact also shows that infallibility in teaching does not spring from the holiness of men, but from the help of God. Infallibility differs from inerrancy merely consequent.

The fact that the Catholic Church never has erred, does not necessarily prove that it cannot error, because the fact that a man has never told a lie is no proof that he is unable to tell a lie. The infallibility of the Church and its inability to teach error, though, in asserting that the Church cannot teach error, we must hold that It has never done so. We know, then, as a dogma of the Church that the infallible Church does not and cannot teach error. Essentially, infallibility belongs to God, for God of His own essence and nature can neither deceive nor be deceived. God can never lead us astray or tell a lie anymore than He can cease to exist.

The infallibility of the Church is an infallibility by participation. Man of his own nature is not incapable of error, but by reason of a divine assistance and the circumstances and limitations and proper field of infallibility, he may participate in the divine prerogative and so be ensured against error. Hence, infallibility may be defined as a supernatural assistance by which the Church is preserved free from error. Obviously, the important part there is the supernatural assistance. It is God who preserves His Church free from error.

Reflecting from another angle, so to speak, even if we had no other source of proof, reason alone would demand the doctrine of infallibility of the Church. Since Jesus Christ is God, and God is true, the Church founded by Jesus Christ must teach the truth. Christ owes it to Himself not to authorize a lie. No man is bound to submit his intellect to error. That is why we have left the Novus Ordo religion and the Traditionalist Movement sects because no man is bound to submit his intellect to error and false teachings. The intellect was made to know and believe truth. In fact, it is bound only by the truth. If I am bound to hear the Church, that is, to believe the Church and obey the Church as Jesus Christ commanded under pain of condemnation, the Church must teach me the truth and command me to do only what is right.

Now, if we are bound to believe certain things and to do certain things in order to obtain salvation, we must only be bound to do what is true, and therefore, we know there is such a thing as infallibility. But, now we know that we are bound to believe certain things and to do certain things to obtain salvation. The Church is a society which Christ founded for teaching what is necessary for us to believe and what is necessary for us to do. Can we suppose that the Church is unable to do what It was founded for? Infallibility must, therefore, necessarily belong to the Church. It would be foolish to say that the Church has authority to declare dogmatic and doctrinal points, and yet that She can error. Dogmatic matters appeal to conscience, and conscience is only subject to truth in matters of belief. To say that the Church has authority and yet She may error in Her declarations would be to destroy authority of conscience, which everyone should hold sacred. It would be to substitute something else besides truth and sovereign lord of conscience, which would be tyranny. If the Church has authority in dogmatic matters, She must be the organ and representative of truth. Her teaching must be identified with truth. In one word I will say again, the Catholic Church that Jesus Christ founded must be infallible.

Again, we can consider that the infallibility of the Church is proved from the necessity of divine faith for salvation. Jesus Christ solemnly warned us -- He that believeth not, shall be condemned. This act of faith is a supernatural act. It is certainly absolute and unconditional. Faith precludes doubt. You may have an opinion, an inclination, a disposition, but can have no faith unless you have absolute certainty. We have that absolute certainty because of the promise of God through the infallible Church.

Even the fundamental truths, the explicit beliefs in which are necessary for salvation, are of such a nature that they transcend the powers of man's reason (although there is nothing against reason in anything the Catholic Church teaches). Sometimes, in basically all the dogmas of the Church, they are above reason, but not against reason. If, then, we must believe something (for example in the future life, the immortality of the soul, the existence of God and his attributes, the incarnation of Christ or the atonement) which cannot be proved with absolute certainty by natural reason alone, upon what will we base our absolute certain act of faith? Has God

given us any authority upon which to base our belief as certain? If He has, we have an infallible Church. If He has not, we have no saving faith. Therefore, we have an infallible Church.

Some people may ask you someday or say that the Bible is that authority and not the Church, but always remember, if the Bible is infallible, the Church is infallible because the Bible proves the infallibility of the Church. Secondly, if the Church is infallible, then it follows that the Bible, however excellent in itself, is not the infallible guide and authority of faith. So let those who question you on this matter choose which horn of the dilemma they like.

The Bible itself does not prove the infallibility of the Bible. Indeed, we all require some other guide to tell us even what is and what is not Scripture. You probably all know that the Catholic rejects certain books and certain passages that the others call divine. The Muslims accept the book of the Koran as their guide. Joseph Smith's production is gospel to a Mormon. If you read the Sacred Scriptures, the doxology of the Lord's prayer as Protestants repeat it, is not in the Catholic Bible. The Catholics claim it in interpolation. On the other hand, many books and parts of books which Catholics place in the Canon are rejected by the sects. Who, then, shall be the arbiter? Though the Bible does not prove itself, it does speak clearly for the Church and proves its prerogatives better than anything else. If it was not for the Catholic Church and the monks copying the Bible, Protestants (who base their whole religion on the Bible), would not even have their so-called rule of faith.

If we study Sacred Scripture, we will know that the Church is the infallible teacher of all men because the Scriptures prove that. St. Paul writing to Timothy calls the Church, the pillar and ground of the truth. Ask yourself then, can a church that is liable to error be the pillar and ground, the very foundation and support of truth? Absolutely impossible. Therefore, as we know from Scripture, if the Church is the pillar and ground of the truth, then It is what teaches the truth infallibly. In commissioning His Church, Our Lord said to His Apostles -- all power is given to Me in Heaven and in earth; going therefore, teach ye all nations. Jesus also said -- as the Father has sent Me, I also send you. Now ask yourself and all those who bring up these arguments, did the Father send the Son into the world, liable to lie? Did Jesus Christ, true God and true Man, tell a lie? If the Apostles received the same power to teach that Jesus Christ had, was not infallibility included? Does anyone truly believe that Jesus Christ taught error and heresy and told lies -- but, as the Father has sent Me, I also send you. Jesus Christ sent the Apostles to teach the truth just as the Father sent Him to teach the truth, which includes the prerogative of infallibility that It could not teach error. Infallibility is surely one of the powers of Heaven, but Jesus Christ told us -- all power is given to Me in Heaven and on earth. So, can you reasonably doubt that it was bestowed on earth?

St. Paul also tells us in his letter to the Ephesians -- And he gave some apostles, and some prophets, and other some evangelists, and other some pastors and doctors, for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ: until we all meet into the unity of faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the age of the fulness of Christ

Ask again, how can we become perfect if the Church were liable to teach us untruth and if we were bound to believe it? Therefore, how could the Church that Jesus Christ founded not be infallible? How could the Apostles call the Christians of Ephesus fellow citizens with the Saints if they were liable to be lead into error by the Church? How could the prophet, Zacharias, speaking of the Church call it the city of truth if error could find a home in It? How could Our Lord say as He does that the gates of hell should not prevail against His Church if It could be conquered by error? If the Church could teach the world a lie (if It could teach us error), the devil would laugh, for then he would have gotten God's instrument of salvation to do his work of damnation.

We also should realize that the Catholic Church is infallible because the Spirit of Truth is with It. When Jesus Christ sent the Apostles into the world, though of themselves they were men with the weaknesses of men, Jesus did not send them unequipped for their great work. He promised them the presence of the Holy Ghost. I will ask the Father and He shall give you another Paraclete that He may abide with you forever, the Spirit of Truth, whom the world cannot receive, but you shall know Him because He shall abide with you and shall be with you and in you. Can those who are actuated by the Spirit of Truth, teach lies? Again, Jesus promised to be with them (the Holy Ghost will be with you forever), so the Church will be perpetual in speaking and teaching the truth.

Again, Jesus told us -- the Paraclete, the Holy Ghost, Whom the Father will send in My name, He will teach you all things and bring all things to your mind whatsoever I have said to you. Once more, Our Lord says -- but when He, the Spirit of Truth, is come, He will teach you all truth. This is what infallibility is all about; the Holy Ghost teaching us all truth through the Catholic Church. There is no quibbling here. There is no room for a falsehood. The whole truth is to be taught for the salvation of the world. Whether people accept it or not, the Church always teaches the whole truth.

Again, we should realize that the Church is infallible because Christ is with His Church and working in It. Jesus sent His Apostles on the most difficult mission that any body of men could undertake. He sent them to make the world one-fold, to make men live in peace and harmony with themselves and with each other and with God. He sent them to teach the world what to believe and how to behave. Surely, you realize it is a most difficult thing to get even a small number of men to believe or act and think the same on any major question or decision. Take, for example, a jury case. You get twelve people on the jury. They all sit in the courtroom. They hear what the defendant and the plaintiff say. They hear what the judge questions in everything that goes on in that courtroom. Can these twelve men agree upon the decision? Generally, no, and yet Jesus Christ sent these twelve men to convert the whole world that everyone would believe what every other Catholic in every part of the world would believe concerning every dogma and article of our faith. What a mission and how greatly did God accomplish it through the infallible Catholic Church!

The twelve Apostles had to face a world steeped in vice, ignorance, superstition, and sin, and yet they were sent to convert that world to truth and purity and justice. Of themselves, they could do nothing, but with the presence and power of Christ, they could do all things, as St. Paul told us later. So, Christ promised His presence -- and behold I am with you. If God is with us, who is against us? If Christ is on the side of the Church, who is going to stand in opposition? The Apostles had reason to be timid and afraid because Christ was withdrawing His bodily presence from them, but they were reassured of His spiritual help -- behold I am with you.

Let us realize the importance of this phrase -- I am with you. It would be well to notice at least some of the other passages in Scripture where these words are found. We read in the Book of Exodus how God, wishing to send Moses to redeem the people of Israel from Egyptian bondage, said to him -- but come, and I will send thee to Pharaoh that thou mayest bring forth My people. Moses, considering only his own defects replied -- who am I that I should go to Pharaoh? Then, God assured him of success, saying -- I will be with you. In the next chapter in the book of Exodus we read how Moses complained to the Lord because of the impediment he had in speech -- and since Thou has spoken to Thy servant, I have more impediment and slowness of tongue. But again, God said to him -- go, therefore, and I will be in Thy mouth and I will teach thee what thou shalt speak. Did the mission of Moses fail? Obviously not. Again, his successor, Joshua who commanded the sun to stand still and the moon not to move toward the valley of Ajalon, was also assigned by God -- no man shall be able to resist you as I have been with Moses, so will I be with thee; I will not leave thee, nor forsake thee. Elsewhere we read in the book of Judges that when the Jews were in distress because of those who opposed them, God spoke to Gideon, their deliverer, and said -- go in this thy strength, and thou shalt deliver Israel out of the hand of Madian: know that I have sent thee. Gideon objected on the ground that he was the least in his father's house, but God said to him -- I will be with thee; and we know how Gideon prevailed.

So, again, we could examine many other passages in Scripture concerning this fact that when God says, I am with thee, it constitutes a pledge of success because He promised divine cooperation. That is the Catholic Church. That is the success in teaching all truth. That is what is implied in the claim for Her infallibility -- God is with Her. The Church teaches with God's authority and cannot lie.

Thank you for visiting <http://www.JMJsite.com>. Please tell others about this website and pray much more.