

IS CATHOLIC BAPTISM VALID?

While [Jesus] was speaking, a Pharisee asked him to dine with him; so he went in and sat at table. The Pharisee was astonished to see that he did not first wash before dinner (Luke 11:37-38). Jesus might have thought washing was a good idea on the human level but because the washing signified a prayer to God for purification he would not wash to stress that washing is spiritually useless. He said elsewhere that it is what is in your heart makes you sinful not food or drink. It is hard to believe he would accept Catholic baptism with its connotations of cleansing a baby from sin.

The Catholic Church claims that salvation or your pass into eternal life in Heaven is a gift from God that you take by baptism. The Church compares getting baptised to going to the casino to get your prize. It is not the same thing for you have to go somewhere to get your prize but God does not need to restrict the gift to baptism. The Bible says that those who think their good works earn salvation are in fact arrogantly trying to buy from God and insulting his generosity. The Church insults its God by requiring baptism for salvation. Would you really want any salvation from a God like the Catholic version of God? If you as a grown up would not want it you cannot assume that a child should be baptised into the service of such a god.

The lack of concern for whether baptism works and the clear evidence that it fails to make people who meet the high Jesus standard point to one thing. If original sin is true then baptism is a scam for keeping you in it. No problem is worse than one that ceases to be seen as a problem or seen as fixed when it is not. Christian quacks peddle cures for the evil in the human heart. If nothing happens they blame Jesus or say Jesus can't do it for the person doesn't want healing. No medical quack is that brazen.

Code of Canon Law, Can. 865 §1, decrees:

For an adult to be baptized, the person must have manifested the intention to receive baptism, have been instructed sufficiently about the truths of the faith and Christian obligations, and have been tested in the Christian life through the catechumenate. The adult is also to be urged to have sorrow for personal sins.

The Roman Church has taught for centuries that baptism can be performed invalidly. When that happens the baptism has to be repeated and done right. Until that happens, the baptism is without effect. The person isn't baptised until she or he is baptised correctly and by a person who intends to do at least what the Church does. Baptism is an external ceremony that does internal spiritual changes. If it is merely an external ceremony then it is no more valid than the baptisms we see in movies.

The notion of invalid baptism may be inspired by Acts 19:1-5 which says that though John baptised people for repentance and as a prayer for help from God to live a better life and in view of the coming of the Messiah Jesus, these people had to be baptised again in the name of the Lord Jesus.

If a person is baptised with olive oil the baptism is invalid for it requires water. It seems crazy to hold that having water is more important than saying, "I cleanse or baptise you in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit". It is clearly superstition. Oil can clean as well. Water on its own isn't very good.

If a person is baptised in the name of God and Mary the baptism is invalid for it has to be done in the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. Many priests used to make a mistake when baptising babies. They did not know enough about the Latin language to realise that they were baptising, "In the Name of the Father, Daughter and Holy Spirit".

If a person is baptised and the person baptising is only miming then the baptism is invalid. The intention for the rite to give grace is essential. The Church of Rome says an Atheist can have this intention when his attitude is that he wants the baptism to work if there is a God. He intends to do what the Church does.

If you baptise yourself the baptism is invalid. So it is better then to be baptised by an atheist than to baptise yourself no matter how holy you are and how much faith you have! This shows the absurdity of baptism.

The Church of Rome officially declared in 2001 that Mormon baptism was and is invalid for the Mormons meant two exalted men and one ghost by the Father, Son and Holy Spirit though they baptised and baptise in water in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. So for baptism to work you must have the Catholic idea of what the Father, Son and Holy Spirit are, three divine beings who are all good and omnipotent and all-knowing. The Mormon belief differs too much from Catholicism to allow its baptism to work.

Catholic baptism is null and void because that religion thinks that the formula, "I baptise thee in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit", is a magical charm. Baptism is to be a prayer to God to save that person from everlasting suffering in Hell and from sin and cause the birth of a relationship with God and the Catholic Church cannot mean this prayer for it has the wrong God and means the wrong things.

Rome teaches that the saints influence God which means that the saints are better than God and are the real Gods. A perfect God cannot be influenced by his creatures. Rome then cannot mean to baptise in the name of the Father - it just mouths the words. The Bible describes Christ as pre-eminent in all things. That means he is the pre-eminent intercessor with God. Praying to Mary and the angels and saints downgrades that. You don't need them to pray for you if you have him and you don't need to talk to them as if they can hear you and understand your heart and see into it. You don't go before a king to plead for your life and talk to one of his friends instead. Such behaviour would be disrespectful and distrustful. The baptism isn't sincerely given in the name of the Father, Son and Spirit. They are not the real God of Catholicism. Catholic baptism cannot work. Mary and the saints must know all things to be able to hear prayers. They are certainly gods for even the pagan gods didn't have that amount of power and knowledge. Romanism is more pagan than paganism.

If the saints are more powerful than God and better than what he is, then it is hypocrisy and degrading to baptise a child in the name of God.

And Rome says you can be holy while wallowing in venial sin without regrets even though the holiness is just offering God rotten scraps off the table as it were. Is that not saying, "God, I do this good but I refuse to let go of the evil I like." That is not real good any more than St Paul would have been good if he did every good work but without love or holiness of heart (1 Corinthians 13:3).

I baptise you in the name of the Father, and of the Son and the Holy Spirit says the priest. By Son the priest will usually mean the wafer god that he calls Jesus Christ and not the real Jesus Christ. The Jesus Christ that is named is a piece of bread not just a person in Heaven. Nor he is God for the Church claims it forces him into bread and wine even when it is intended by all present to commit the sacrilege of eating him in a state of serious sin. It is no answer to say that Jesus consented to this abuse and it's his choice. God is so sternly opposed to idolatry in the Bible that he will not accept worship offered to the real Jesus if idols are thought to be Jesus in another form. He said he was a jealous God and that he will not share his glory with another. He asks us to be as jealous as he was for his sake. He wants us to be jealous for him.

Christians believe that just baptising in the name of the Father and the Spirit is invalid. If that is true then the same thing happens if you mean the wrong thing say by God or by Jesus. The water might be there and the formula might be right but the meaning is wrong and baptism in the name of a false Jesus cannot work. The Bible speaks of baptism in the name of Jesus. Perhaps that was just for brevity and perhaps in the name of Jesus means that the washing and the words of the Father, Son and Spirit were done and said in the authority of Jesus. Catholic baptism is not baptism.

Protestant baptism is more likely to be valid than Catholic baptism for they don't have saint worship for the real Gods in Catholicism are the saints and God in Protestantism promises you holiness by imputation without good works. That is, that Jesus has become holy for you so you don't have to be perfect.

Baptism can only be conferred by a believer. Atheists are acting against their own beliefs if they baptise even if they intend to give grace if they are wrong and there is a God after all that gives grace through baptism. You are expected to do what you believe is right but you can't always be taking the safe side or that is not logical or practical and besides there is no evidence that baptising is the safe side. Would the Catholic praise a Catholic who during his prayers said, "If I have the wrong God then whatever God exists or gods or whatever then I praise you and apologise if I am mistaken and have had the wrong God"? Most certainly not. The Atheist cannot give grace through baptism because he or she is acting against her or his own convictions. Their intention isn't good so it cannot confer baptism.

Since when could an Atheist intending to give baptismal grace in case it works be counted as an intention? After all it is offset with his intention, "I hope this doesn't work for I don't think there is a God?" This is the strongest intention so the first one isn't an intention at all but only a pretence.

The Atheist's intention is invalid if they wilfully let down Atheism or if they do not know any better. If they knew they would not baptise. The Atheist does wrong and since sin prevents genuine good works the Atheist cannot validly baptise for the rite is just blasphemy coming from the likes of an Atheist. Sin is the complete rejection of God so there can be no true intention for saving.

Protestants sometimes say that since Rome sees baptism as a sacrament that physically causes grace it is invalid. Rome responds that God has freely chosen to cause grace in a person at baptism the same as Protestants believe that God has freely decided to confer grace on a person who trusts in Christ alone for salvation. The water and the words do not bring the

grace to birth, God does. He just chooses to work through this sign.

The idea of baptism giving grace in this way sounds so much like magic that Protestants are often unconvinced. Magicians could say that their spells work because the divine has inspired them to do the spells and has intended to give power and blessings through them.

When God can give the same grace to somebody who wants it a lot as to somebody who is less keen on it through baptism it shows that its power is based on a rite or magic and not on the person's suitability.

Some Protestants have the notion that the Roman Church thinks that God puts power into the water of baptism that passes on to the child or person who is being baptised. It's like holy radioactive water! Rome doesn't teach this and is horrified at the suggestion that it does. But if God puts grace directly in the recipient why can't he put it in the water and give it to the child through the water? This point shows how close baptism is to superstition if it's not actually superstition. The rite does not honour God so how could it be valid? How can the Church complain? How can it split hairs?

The Catholic Church cannot have it both ways. It cannot say that it is absurd for God to put the grace into the water when he does as good as that by refusing the grace until water is poured on the person.

Baptism is the sign of the covenant of grace. If the Bible view of predetermination (that God sets it up so that those who want in Heaven will come to him and be saved while the rest will be lost forever in Hell) is true then to be valid, baptism has to be a sign that one is supposed to have been predestined for salvation by God regardless of what one has done or will do. Catholic baptism is not a sign of this but the cult believes you have to cooperate with God in God and it denies that salvation is God's choice and not ours.

Some Protestants argue that even heretical baptism is valid and the baptism should not be repeated. Because baptism pictures salvation and you can only be saved once you can only be baptised once. But when there is much dispute over whether or not you can be saved once or over and over again it is clear they should re-baptise just in case. They object then that the heretical baptism picturing the removal of sin by Jesus' blood is enough. For baptism to picture salvation properly the baptism has to recognise cleansing by the blood of Jesus properly. The Catholic Jesus cannot cleanse sins for he is the wrong one so it follows that baptism into the Catholic Church is invalid for it pictures salvation from sin through heresy and doctrines that would make God weep for they are offensive. The Catholics mean the wrong thing by Jesus and so their Jesus is another Jesus and they might as well baptise in the name of the Father, Joseph Smith and the Holy Spirit. When God would reject a baptism performed with oil though the most important thing is the wording, he will surely more hastily reject a baptism in which the wording is correct but abused. The Protestants then reply that baptism is valid despite the unbelief of the minister. So it is the recipient that counts but that cannot solve anything when the recipient is being entered into a heretical and apostate faith by the baptism. St Paul wrote that the table of the Lord has nothing in common with that of demons (1 Corinthians 10). The same would surely be true of his baptism. God could not accept a baptism that is supposed to confer a new birth when it does no such thing.

The words used in baptism, "I baptise you in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit", mean you baptise in their authority. To accept baptism means you are submitting yourself to the authority of the Trinity in all things. Baptism then is meant to unite people under one faith and one authority (page 53, *The Institutes of Christian Religion*). The baptiser says he baptises you which means he is declaring that his doctrine really respects God and there is no serious error in his teaching. For example, if salvation is by faith alone and not by faith and good works like you have in the Roman Church then to be baptised into a sect that teaches the latter is a grave departure from the authority of God which is about saving you. God cannot accept the faith of a person who makes grave errors simply because that person is following not the gospel but his perception of it. The person would probably not accept God if he knew better for most people do not obey God or like him much except when they want something so God has to be fair to himself and not accept this faith for he deserves the best.

It could be argued that since Jesus said to baptise in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, he meant in their authority and not to suggest what wording should be used. If I ask junior staff to talk to a client in my name I do not mean they have to say they are me. Jesus didn't say any words needed to be said. But you get the impression from Acts that baptism should be performed in the name of Jesus. Acts wasn't saying about baptism in the name of Jesus for brevity – Acts never worried about brevity. If words are needed then baptism must be done with this wording, "I baptise you in the name of Jesus", and not, "I baptise you in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit." The latter wording can be used by a non-believer in Jesus who believes God is three people Father, Son and Spirit. Jesus and God the Son are not necessarily the same person. The Church says that if there had never been a Jesus there would still have been a God the Son. Catholic baptism is invalid for assuming Jesus commanded water baptism, it had to be done in his name only.

Baptism is meant to unite the baptised in one faith and who help each other live under the authority so it follows that sectarian baptism is invalid. If the sect that deliberately and without sufficient cause breaks away from the sect that has the

truth or the most truth is not absolutely right Church then it loses the power to baptise validly for it simply does not mean what the words say.

Authority is only exercised through the word of God. If the Bible alone is the word of God then it follows that baptism is only valid if you believe the Bible only. This would invalidate baptism by the Catholic Church which does not let the Bible speak for itself but interprets it through tradition which it considers to be the word of God as well. Again the reason the baptism is invalid is because the words are not meant in the required and proper sense.

Baptism cannot be valid then if it puts you under the wrong authority – even if you are partly under the wrong authority in some grave matters and especially if you are totally under the wrong authority. Baptism into a deceiving sect in which a cult-leader dictates to you what to believe about God is baptism into divine authority in name only. The baptism is no good for this authority pretends to be speaking for God and is actually taking his place. Baptism into a sect that follows an unusual form of Bible interpretation is silencing the word of God though it looks as if it is not and is equally invalid. The worst kind of deception is one that uses the truth and seems to be devoted to it for it is more spiritually dangerous and harder to see through which is why baptism should only be undergone when you are sure the sect giving it to submits as well as possible to the word of God. It means also that you need to be an adult to be baptised and to know what you are doing. Infant baptism is invalid and those baptised as infants are not really baptised at all. They need to be baptised as adults. Infant baptism is a serious sin because you need to find God's truth for yourself before you can consent to be baptised. It puts religion before spirituality.

If you find your sect is wrong you have to find another sect and get baptised again in it to be on the safe side. The Catholic practice is totally in opposition to people finding the truth of God.

Some say that since baptism is a sign (that is a symbol) of regeneration even a Catholic baptism will do and it does not need to be repeated if the baptised person enters a Christian denomination. If it is that, then it is meant to be an expression of the new birth and now to receive it. This means the Catholic baptism is no good because it opposes the new birth by falsely claiming to be the new birth. Catholics regard baptism as symbolic of regeneration but they deny that it is just a symbol. But it is a symbol of the wrong rebirth so it is invalid.

Roman Catholic baptism is invalid and any Christian Church that accepts it as valid is denying itself.

WORKS CONSULTED

- 12 Church of Christ Doctrines Compared with the Holy Scriptures, Homer Duncan, Missionary Crusader, Texas, 1984
- All One Body – Why Don't We Agree? Erwin W Lutzer, Tyndale, Illinois, 1989
- Baptism, Meaning, Mode & Subjects, Michael Kimmitt, K & M Books, Trelawnyd, 1997
- But the Bible Does not Say So, Rev Roberto Nisbet, Church Book Room Press, London, 1966
- But What About the Thief on the Cross? Cecil Willis, Guardian of Truth, Bowling Green, Kentucky
- Christian Baptism, Philip Crowe, Mobray, Oxford, 1980
- Covenant Reformed News, Volume 7, Number 13, Ballymena, Northern Ireland
- Four Great Heresies, John R Rice, Sword of the Lord, Murfreesboro, 1975
- Handbook to the Controversy with Rome, Vol 1, Karl Von Hase, The Religious Tract Society, 4 Bouverie Street, 1906
- Is it necessary for you to be baptised to be saved? Hoyt H Houchen, Guardian of Truth, Bowling Green, Kentucky
- Is Water Baptism Essential to Salvation? Curtis Hutson, Sword of the Lord, 1988
- Jesus and the Four Gospels, John Drane, Lion, Herts, 1984
- Objections to Roman Catholicism, Edited by Michael de la Bedoyere, Constable, London, 1964
- Radio Replies, Vol 3, Frs Rumble and Carty, Radio Replies Press, St Paul, Minnesota 1942
- Reason and Belief, Bland Blanshard, George Allen & Unwin Ltd, London, 1974
- Regeneration or the New Birth, A W Pink, Evangelical Press, Welwyn, Herts, England, undated
- The Documents of Vatican II, Edited by Walter M Abbott SJ, Geoffrey Chapman Ltd, London, 1967
- The Institutes of the Christian Religion, John Calvin, Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1986
- The Only Way of Salvation, H. A. Twelves, Christadelphian ALS, Birmingham
- Vicars of Christ, Peter de Rosa, Corgi, London, 1993
- When Critics Ask, Norman Geisler and Thomas Howe, Victor Books, Scripture Press Publications, Illinois, 1992
- Why Baptism Really Matters, Fred Pearce, Christadelphian Publishing Office, Birmingham
- Why Does God? Domenico Grasso SJ, St Paul Publications, Bucks, England, 1970
- Why you Should be Baptized, Herbert W Armstrong, Worldwide Church of God, Pasadena, California, 1991

The WWW

Doctrinal Summary by Br Thomas Mary MICM. This page informs us that Catholic teaching is that if you hear of the Catholic Church and don't join it or study it your damnation is guaranteed. It affirms that babies that die without baptism

will be banned from Heaven forever.

BIBLE QUOTATIONS FROM:
The Amplified Bible