'Should Protestants and Roman Catholics Worship Together'? 20th anniversary of public debate organised by "Take Heed"

Just over 20 years ago I ventured to stage my first major public debate under the banner of 'Take Heed' Ministries. Earlier that year I had invited Bart Brewer (former Roman Catholic priest with a ministry called 'Mission to Catholics International') and Dave Hunt ('The Berean Call') to come to Northern Ireland and undertake a programme of meetings that I had arranged for them. It occurred to me that having both of them in the Province at the same time might be a good opportunity for them, as a team, to debate with an ecumenical Church of Ireland (Anglican) minister called Brendan McCarthy and a Jesuit priest called John McDade on the subject of 'Should Protestants and Roman Catholics Worship Together'?

The debate took place in Belfast on 28th July 1994 and was attended by over 300 people. I had invited a fellow professing Christian called **David Hewitt** to act as chairman for the evening. Unlike me, David was well-known to be supportive of the ecumenical viewpoint but, as I knew him through both sporting and business connections, I invited him to chair the event so that I would not be viewed as having loaded the event in favour of the view that people knew that I held. **I had hoped that David would, in all that he said and did, refrain from in any way promoting the views that he subscribed to**. Sadly that was not to be the case and so in the video that you will shortly be able to go to you can hear his early remarks which give a flavour of his position but you will not hear his closing comments which basically gave his 'vote' on the motion. I was not pleased by his handling of things and subsequently wrote to him to express my disappointment. Since then we have had occasional polite interaction with each other but we would still be holding to very differing views on this issue.

On the evening of the debate I was of course strictly 'neutral' and was there really very much as the 'gong' man – one minute before each speaker's time was about to run out I would gently 'gong' once and then when their time was fully up I would give a series of slightly louder 'gongs'. Following on from these opening remarks and observations you can now watch the debate by going to the following three links –

PART ONE

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TPVo8Q32TH0

PART TWO

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BeKDL-Q-SQ8

PART THREE

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DZfuPTQ9JoY

20 years on from that event I would like to share a few reflections about the people and events of that evening (by no means an exhaustive critique of the evening) and I shall begin with **Brendan McCarthy.** Whilst his 'team-mate' that evening, **John McDade**, was a bona-fide '**Jesuit**' the truth is that **Brendan McCarthy** actually presented himself as even more '**Jesuitical**' that night than Mr McDade. He was without doubt very articulate and 'convincing' to the unwary but his presentations that evening played very much upon great use of "double-speak" and misuse of scripture.

I actually was very conscious that night of his oft repeated phrase in his opening remarks of 'a sinner saved by grace' and in an article written later in 1999 on http://www.takeheed.net/Assorted_Articles/Contemporary/dec.htm I wrote -

"I think it would be helpful for people to know a few things about Mr McCarthy. By his own testimony he was raised as a Roman Catholic who in his teenage years had a 'charismatic' experience. He has told publicly of how people from the Protestant churches appeared sceptical at times concerning his 'conversion'. He studied for the Church of Ireland ministry and back in 1994 was the rector of St Columba's Church of Ireland church in Omagh. In July of that he year he partnered JESUIT priest John McDade in the Public Debate I organised on the topic 'Should Protestants and Catholics Worship Together'? Mr McCarthy and Mr McDade were arguing in favour of joint worship and their opponents [arguing against the concept] were Dave Hunt and Bart Brewer [ex Roman Catholic priest].

Mr McCarthy in his opening submission repeatedly stated 'how can one sinner saved by grace not worship with another sinner saved by grace'? In pursuing this line of argument he was ignoring the great differences between Roman Catholicism and Protestantism when it comes to their understanding of (1) 'a sinner' (2) 'saved' and (3) 'grace' for these terms do not have the same meanings in both religious systems.

Many people expressed the view after the debate that they were baffled as to why Mr McCarthy had actually left the Roman Catholic church [he has a wife and family which of course would be taboo for a Roman Catholic priest so perhaps this had some bearing on his original decision and if so I would not fault him for that]. In June of 1996 he resigned from St Columba's after his desire to introduce aspects of worship then associated with the so-called 'Toronto Blessing' caused problems within the church and he went on to head up the new Omagh Community Church. He took a leading role in the public [ecumenical] service held in Omagh after the terrible bomb last year"

When you watch the debate you will notice that **Dave Hunt** also identified this disingenuous use of 'terminology'. On another occasion, when speaking in London I again made reference to **Brendan McCarthy's "double-speak"** and you can hear what I said by going to this link –

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cGUBPXfZ7-U

Another comment that I would make was about **Brendan McCarthy's** desire to convince people that to find out what Roman Catholicism teaches people should ask either a Roman Catholic priest or a Roman Catholic theologian. **Dave Hunt** was having none of that and quite rightly pointed out that to find out what Roman

Catholicism teaches you go to their authoritative written sources and he named sources like **Canon Law, The Council of Trent and Vatican II**.

A further comment concerning **Brendan McCarthy's** contribution relates to his very selective quoting of verses from **Romans 14** and his then misuse of them to seek to justify his claim that professing Christians should not judge what other professing Christians believe concerning 'the **gospel**' and 'salvation'. However **Dave Hunt** was able from scripture itself to identify this misuse and misapplication by **Brendan McCarthy**.

In closing, in relation to **Brendan McCarthy**, he was part of the audience that came to hear me speak in Omagh (on 3rd May 1996) on the subject of the '**Toronto Blessing'** which he was receptive to and which as you will have read above led to him being asked to leave St Columba's Church of Ireland Church in Omagh.

For any who may be interested in the talk I gave that night in Omagh it can be viewed on these links –

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-RM2A3sVYGU&list=UUY6K5SN-Z7IIOKmXcIB51jQ

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vTEEURiKzqw&list=UUY6K5SN-Z7IIOKmXcIB51jQ

Moving now to **John McDade** I think the best comment to make is that he was a **'Jesuit'** behaving as a **'Jesuit'** is meant to behave – to defend **'Mother Church'** at all costs and by any means. His main thrust was to deny the clear teaching and meaning of authoritative Roman Catholic sources and to claim that they were being quoted 'out of context'. Perhaps his most brazen misrepresentation was his answer to the question on **'The Ten Commandments'** – he was asked why the 2nd commandment is omitted in Roman Catholicism and the 10th commandment turned into 2 commandments?

His answer on that was to say that Rome had not reduced the commandments to '9' – the questioner hadn't asked or suggested that. The truth is (which John McDade failed to acknowledge) that Rome does omit the scriptural 2nd commandment from her list of 'The Ten Commandments' and to get the number back up to '10' divides up the 10th commandment thus making it into 2 separate commandments. Firstly we read the following in the Bible –

The 2nd commandment as found in Exodus 20:4-6 –

"Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of anything that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth: Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them: for I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of

them that hate me; And showing mercy unto thousands of them that love me and keep my commandments".

The 3rd commandment as found in Exodus 20:7 –

"Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain; for the Lord will not hold him guiltless that taketh his name in vain".

The 10th commandment as found in Exodus 20:17 -

"Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's house, thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife, nor his manservant, nor his maidservant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor any thing that is they neighbour's".

However, in 2 of Rome's officially approved Catechism's this is what we read.

Firstly from 'The Most Rev. Dr James Butler's Catechism: Revised, Enlarged, Approved and Recommended by the Four Catholic Archbishops of Ireland: New and Revised Edition, 1944'. Lesson XIV – page 34 –

Question: Say the Ten Commandments of God.

2nd. "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain".

(The 2nd Biblical commandment has been omitted and the 3rd listed as the 2nd)

3rd. "Remember that thus keep holy the Sabbath day".

(The 4th biblical commandment has been listed as the 3rd)

9th. "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife".

10th. "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's goods".

(The 10th Biblical commandment has been divided in 2 making it two separate commandments now listed as 9 & 10)

Secondly from 'Catechism of the Catholic Church': Approved by Pope John Paul II: 1995 Edition: 'The Ten Commandments' – pages 445-446:

A Traditional Catechetical Formula:

2nd "You shall not take the name of the Lord your God in vain".

(The 2nd Biblical commandment has been omitted and the 3rd listed as the 2nd)

3rd "You shall not take the name of the Lord your God in vain".

(The 4^{th} biblical commandment has been listed as the 3^{rd})

9th "You shall not covet your neighbour's wife". 10th "You shall not covet your neighbour's goods".

(The 10th Biblical commandment has been divided in 2 making it two separate commandments now listed as 9 & 10)

These official Roman Catholic source quotes demonstrate the 'Jesuitry' employed by John McDade when responding to the question put directly to him. One final comment about John McDade concerns the quote he gave at the end by John Calvin and to which he said 'Amen'. He was seeking to give the impression that

John Calvin was in agreement with Rome's teaching of 'transubstantiation' during their 'Sacrifice of the Mass'. Once more, like Brendan McCarthy, John McDade was highly selective in the words that he quoted.

They were taken from Calvin's 'The Institutes of Christian Religion'. Perhaps at this point I should state that there are many things about which I differ from John Calvin and that would include teaching and aspects of what he believed about both 'Baptism' and 'The Lord's Supper'. John McDade's partial and selective quote was taken from what John Calvin wrote about 'The Lord's Supper' so let me firstly give more substantial quotes of what John Calvin wrote on this subject —

"The SIGNS of course are bread and wine... Godly believers derive great assurance and joy from this sacrament, as proof that they are part of the body of Christ... It follows that we can confidently assure ourselves that eternal life IS ours (Cecil - Rome of course would teach that this is a 'mortal sin of presumption' that would take such a 'believer' straight to hell)... The sacrament of communion bears witness (Cecil - Rome of course teaches it is THE MEANS) to all these things, enabling us to understand that they are revealed to us AS IF Christ was physically present with us ... In stating that this body was given and his blood poured out he shows that he laid them down (Cecil - past tense - a finished and completed work on the Cross at Calvary), not for his own advantage but for our salvation... The distribution of the elements would be meaningless if his body and blood had not been given (Cecil - once more - past tense - a finished and completed work on the Cross) for our redemption. So they are REPRESENTED by bread and wine... So the bread broken and the wine outpoured REPRESENT what is communicated to us by his body and blood... I give my soul to him to be fed with such food. (Cecil - 'spiritual' nourishment) In the Lord's Supper he bids me take, eat and drink his body and blood UNDER THE SIGN of bread and wine".

I have to freely admit that I am not at all comfortable with how **John Calvin** expressed what he believed in some of the words I have quoted here BUT, a faithful Roman Catholic, such as **John McDade** would claim to be, should not be saying 'Amen' to these expressed beliefs of **John Calvin**. Why do I say that? Well, you will note that I have 'CAPITALISED in red' some words that **John Calvin** used in relation to the 'bread and wine' – words like 'SIGN' and 'REPRESENT' and as regards Christ being actually present Calvin described that as being 'AS IF'. These views/beliefs are contrary to what Rome teaches. One only has to go **The Council of Trent:** 13th Session: The Holy Eucharist and read the following under 'Canons of the Most Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist' –

Canon 1: If anyone denies that in the sacrament of the most Holy Eucharist ARE CONTAINED truly, really and SUBSTANTIALLY the body and blood together with the soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ and consequently THE WHOLE CHRIST, but says that He is in it only as in a SIGN, or FIGURE or FORCE, let him be ANATHEMA.

Canon 2: If anyone... denies that wonderful and singular change of the WHOLE substance of the bread into the body and the WHOLE substance of the wine into the blood of, the appearances only of bread and wine remaining, which change the Catholic Church most aptly calls transubstantiation, let him be ANATHEMA.

Canon 6: If anyone says that in the holy sacrament of the Eucharist, Christ, the only begotten Son of God is not to be adored with the worship of LATRIA (Cecil - this is the highest level of

'WORSHIP' reserved alone for God so a wafer of bread is to be worshipped as God)... or is not to be set publicly before the people (Cecil – usually displayed or paraded around in a Monstrance) to be adored, and that the adorers thereof are idolaters, let him be ANATHEMA.

Canon 8: If anyone says that Christ received in the Eucharist is received SPIRITUALLY only and not also sacramentally and REALLY, let him be ANATHEMA.

John McDade with his apparent endorsement of the words of John Calvin was simply being a faithful 'Jesuit', committed to the cause of 'Mother Church'.

I wonder how he would react to the following words by **John Calvin** that I quoted in an article back in 2010 – the article dealt with another attempt to portray **John Calvin** as really being 'ecumenically-favourable' towards Rome by the holding of a conference to jointly look at a tenuous connection between **John Calvin** and **Ignatius Loyola** who was of course the founder of **'The Jesuits'**. The article is located on

http://www.takeheed.net/Take Heed 2010/Current Concerns/Oct 2010/Mayno oth_conference_on_Calvin_and_Loyola.htm

Just before a closing **APPENDIX** to the article I wrote the following –

I'll leave the last word in this section to **John Calvin** himself when he wrote as follows in 'The Institutes of Christian Religion' [pp 241-242]

'Comparison of the false Church with the true... If the true Church is "the pillar and foundation of the truth" (1st Timothy 3:15) there can be no Church where lying and deception have taken over. Since they have taken over under the papacy, we must understand its effect on the Church there. Instead of the ministry of the Word, a corrupt government exists, concocted from lies, which partly exclude God's pure light.

In place of the Lord's Supper there is awful sacrilege and the worship of God is distorted by a mass of intolerable superstitions. Doctrine, without which Christianity cannot exist, is buried and exploded; public services are hotbeds of idolatry and profanity. Obviously when we refuse to take part in such wrong things we run no risk of being cut off from the Church of Christ. Membership of the Church was not meant to be a chain to keep us in idolatry, sacrilege, ignorance of God and other evils [Cecil – as in the case of Loyola], but rather to keep us in the fear of God and obedience of the truth [Cecil – as in the case of Calvin]...

I must point out how empty these (Papal) claims are so that good men and lovers of truth may not be caught up in them'

One final example of **John McDade's 'Jesuitry'** was his use of another 'selective' quote, this time from **Vatican II**, where he attempted to convince Protestants, **'the separated brethren'** as Rome calls them, that they are viewed by Rome as being recipients of the activity of the Holy Spirit and therefore a **'means of salvation'**. He

quoted what can only be regarded as the condescending words of **Vatican II: Volume 1: page 456** – (Cecil – no real surprise that **John McDade** did not quote the portion after where I write 'Vatican II continues uninterrupted')

'It follows that the separated Churches and communities as such, though we believe they suffer from the defects already mentioned, have been by no means deprived of significance and importance in the mystery of salvation. For the Spirit of Christ has not refrained from using them as means of salvation: Cecil – Vatican II continues uninterrupted - which derive their efficacy from the very fullness of grace and truth entrusted to the Catholic Church. Nevertheless our separated brethren, whether considered as individuals or as communities and Churches, are not blessed with that unity which Jesus Christ wishes to bestow on all those to whom he has given new birth (Cecil – according to Rome this of course happens through baptism) into one body and whom he has quickened to newness of life ... For it is through Christ's Catholic Church ALONE, which is the universal help towards salvation, that the FULLNESS of the means of salvation can be obtained'.

Moving on I just want to say a few words about both **Bart Brewer** and **Dave Hunt.** Both are now with the Lord in glory but I am deeply grateful to the Lord for bringing them 'across my path'. Both, in differing ways, were of blessing and benefit to me as I grew in the Lord and into the work the Lord called me to at '**Take Heed**'.

On one occasion (18 May 1996) when Margaret and I were at the home of **Bart Brewer** and his wife **Ruth** in San Diego, another former Jesuit priest, **Bob Bush**, (also now with the Lord in glory) phoned with a view to interviewing **Bart** as part of his regular radio broadcast called 'His truth is marching on'. However, when he heard that I was there, he instead interviewed me

Interestingly, during the programme, Bob was asked by a listener who had phoned in about 'The **Ten Commandments'** issue as you will hear – I have only been able to include extracts from my interview as not all that took place is on the tape I have - you can hear those extracts by going to –

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=o0_u4_IV3g4

As I mentioned earlier, **Bart** is now with the Lord in glory and when he died in 2005 I penned a short tribute to his memory and it can be read on –

http://www.takeheed.info/tribute-to-bart-brewer/

Finally, in relation to **Dave Hunt**, he also had a significant role to play in my 'journey' to becoming a Christian 'apologist'. Early in my Christian life I read his book '**The Seduction of Christianity**' and it, along with other factors, kindled a desire within me to serve the Lord in that capacity.

Margaret and I also had the privilege and joy of staying for a few days at the home of **Dave** and his wife **Ruth** (also now with the Lord in glory), in Bend, Oregon, and they were

wonderful and witty hosts. The photo at the close of this article reminds us of the happy times we had with all 4 of them back in 1994.

Returning briefly to the subject matter of that 1994 debate 'Should Protestants and Roman Catholics Worship Together' I can think of no better way to finish than by directing you to s statement recently issued by a number of 'evangelical' churches in Italy. I would believe this statement was prompted by the recent 'ecumenical goings-on' between Pope Francis and a number of 'charismatics' usually identified with the 'Word of Faith' heresy, as promoted by the likes of Kenneth and Gloria Copeland, and the so-called 'Toronto Blessing' heresy as orchestrated by the likes of John and Carol Arnott. This Italian statement can be viewed on

http://thegospelcoalition.org/article/roman-catholic-ecumenism-letthe-italian-evangelicals-speak

How good to read of these discerning brothers, albeit predominantly Pentecostal, putting out this statement in the very home and fortress of Roman Catholicism and which shows that the light of God's Truth has not been completely extinguished in the land of Italy. Here, by way of a 'taster', is a short section of what they stated –

"it is incompatible with the teaching of Scripture to have a church that operates as mediator of salvation and that presents other figures as mediators of grace since God's grace comes to us by faith alone in Jesus Christ alone (Ephesians 2:8) and without the agency of other mediators (1 Timothy 2:5)... it is incompatible with biblical teaching to have a church that took the liberty to add dogmas (such as the Marian dogmas) to the faith once and for all delivered to the saints (Jude 3; Revelation 22:18)."

I hope that those who read this article and watch, read and listen to the various links given, will be as blessed as I have been to take this brief trip down 'memory lane'.

Cecil Andrews - Take Heed' Ministries - 19 September 2014



Cecil and Margaret enjoying fellowship at
Carryduff [August 1994] with Dave and Ruth Hunt
and Bart and Ruth Brewer