

Billy Graham and Rome

David Cloud



Billy Graham and Rome
Copyright 2006 by David Cloud
This edition October 26, 2014
ISBN 1-58318-098-2

This book is published for free distribution in eBook format.
It is available in PDF, Mobi (for Kindle, etc.), and ePub
formats from the Way of Life web site. We do not allow
distribution of this book from other web sites.



Published by Way of Life Literature
PO Box 610368, Port Huron, MI 48061
866-295-4143 (toll free) - fbns@wayoflife.org
www.wayoflife.org

Canada: Bethel Baptist Church
4212 Campbell St. N., London Ont. N6P 1A6
519-652-2619

Printed in Canada by
Bethel Baptist Print Ministry

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
Has Rome Changed?.....	2
Evangelical Catholics.....	8
The Great Change in Evangelicalism.....	10
The New Evangelicalism.....	14
The Last Days.....	20
When Did Graham’s Compromise Begin?.....	23
A Year by Year Survey.....	35
Franklin Graham and Anne Graham Lotz.....	105
Conclusion.....	110
The Council of Trent Reaffirmed.....	111
About Way of Life’s eBooks.....	120
Powerful Publications for These Times.....	121

Introduction

“It is one thing to invite unconverted Roman Catholics to a gospel meeting to hear the gospel preached, but it is quite another matter to go to a meeting where Roman Catholics, and Roman Catholic priests that are still firmly in Rome, are preaching from the platform.” --
Christian News, June 26, 1988

Nothing more plainly evidences the bankruptcy of today's evangelicalism than its flirtations with Rome, and no man epitomizes this bankruptcy more than Billy Graham.

Billy Graham has been evangelicalism's foremost personality since the middle of the twentieth century.

Harold Ockenga said that Graham “on the mass level is the spokesman of the convictions and ideals of the New Evangelicalism” (cited from John Ashbrook, *New Neutralism II: Exposing the Gray of Compromise*).

An article in *Christianity Today* for Oct. 5, 1992, entitled “Can Evangelicalism Survive Its Success?” noted:

“IT WOULD BE DIFFICULT TO OVERESTIMATE BILLY GRAHAM'S IMPORTANCE IN THE LAST 50 YEARS OF EVANGELICALISM. ... Graham personally embodied most of the characteristics of resurgent evangelicalism. ... de-emphasizing doctrinal and denominational differences that often divided Christians. ... For evangelicalism, Billy Graham has meant the reconstitution of a Christian fellowship transcending confessional lines--a grassroots ecumenism that regards denominational divisions as irrelevant rather than pernicious.”

Thus, when we look at Billy Graham, we are looking at today's evangelicalism, and for fifty years Graham and evangelicalism have associated with the Roman Catholic Church in an ever deepening affiliation.

Has Rome Changed?

Some claim that Rome has changed and we can no longer say it is heretical. While the declarations of the Second Vatican Council of the 1960s did bring changes to the Catholic Church, it did not change its foundational dogmas. Not only did Vatican II uphold Rome's false teachings, it actually strengthened them.

The 2,400 bishops attending Vatican II reaffirmed such Roman heresies as salvation through the sacraments, papal supremacy, the Roman priesthood, the mass as a re-sacrifice of Christ, Catholic tradition on equal par with Scriptures, Mary as the Queen of Heaven and co-redemptress with Christ, auricular confession (confession of one's sins into the ear of a priest), pilgrimages to "holy shrines," purgatory, and prayers to and for the dead.

All of these were reaffirmed by the Vatican II Council, which produced one of most authoritative statements of Catholic teaching in modern times. At the opening of Vatican II, Pope John XXIII stated, "The greatest concern of the Ecumenical Council is this: that the sacred deposit of Christian doctrine should be guarded and taught more efficaciously."

Thus the Second Vatican Council did not change the doctrinal foundation of the Roman Catholic Church.

Billy Graham said that he preaches the same gospel as Rome, but this is a statement either of grave ignorance or willful duplicity. Graham preached salvation by grace alone through faith alone without works solely on the merit of Christ. The Roman Catholic Church denies this doctrine.

Since there have been ecumenical statements in recent decades stating that Catholics and Protestants have agreed on justification by faith alone, let us document some of the ways that this flies in the face of Rome's official teaching.

In the following statements, we are not depending on some lone spokesman or apologist for Rome. These are Rome's most official doctrinal statements.

Salvation by Grace Alone Denied by Trent

At the Council of Trent (1545-1563), the declarations of which are still in force, the Roman Catholic Church formally condemned the biblical doctrine of salvation by grace alone through faith alone without works or sacraments. Consider the following declarations of Trent:

“If anyone says that justifying faith is nothing else than confidence in divine mercy, which remits sins for Christ's sake, or that it is this confidence alone that justifies us, LET HIM BE ANATHEMA” (Sixth Session, Canons Concerning Justification, Canon 12).

“If anyone says that the justice received is not preserved and also not increased before God through good works, but that those works are merely the fruits and signs of justification obtained, but not the cause of its increase, LET HIM BE ANATHEMA” (Sixth Session, Canons Concerning Justification, Canon 24).

Salvation by Grace Alone Denied by Vatican II

In its most formal and authoritative statements since Trent, Rome has continued to deny that salvation is by grace alone through faith alone because of Christ's atonement alone without works or sacraments. Consider the following statements of the authoritative Second Vatican Council of the mid-1960s:

“... [Christ] also willed that THE WORK OF SALVATION which they preached SHOULD BE SET IN TRAIN THROUGH THE SACRIFICE AND SACRAMENTS, AROUND WHICH THE ENTIRE LITURGICAL [RITUALISTIC] LIFE REVOLVES. Thus by Baptism men are grafted into the paschal mystery of Christ. ... They receive the spirit of adoption as

sons” (Vatican II, Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, Chap. 1, I, 5, 6, pp. 23-24).

“FOR IT IS THE LITURGY THROUGH WHICH, ESPECIALLY IN THE DIVINE SACRIFICE OF THE EUCHARIST, 'THE WORK OF OUR REDEMPTION IS ACCOMPLISHED,' and it is through the liturgy, especially, that the faithful are enabled to express in their lives and manifest to others the mystery of Christ and the real nature of the true Church” (Vatican II, Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, Introduction, para. 2).

“FROM THE MOST ANCIENT TIMES IN THE CHURCH GOOD WORKS WERE ALSO OFFERED TO GOD FOR THE SALVATION OF SINNERS, particularly the works which human weakness finds hard. Because the sufferings of the martyrs for the faith and for God's law were thought to be very valuable, penitents used to turn to the martyrs to be helped by their merits to obtain a more speedy reconciliation from the bishops. INDEED, THE PRAYERS AND GOOD WORKS OF HOLY PEOPLE WERE REGARDED AS OF SUCH GREAT VALUE THAT IT COULD BE ASSERTED THAT THE PENITENT WAS WASHED, CLEANSED AND REDEEMED WITH THE HELP OF THE ENTIRE CHRISTIAN PEOPLE” (Vatican II, Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, Apostolic Constitution on the Revision of Indulgences, chap. 3, 6, pp. 78, 79).

Rome Denies Salvation by Grace Alone in Its Definition of Justification

Rome's gospel is a confused combination of faith plus works, grace plus sacraments, Christ plus the church. It redefines grace to include works. It confuses justification with sanctification. It confuses imputation with impartation. It views justification not as a once-for-all legal declaration whereby the sinner is declared righteous before God and is

granted eternal life as the unmerited gift of God solely on the basis of Christ's cross-work, but as a PROCESS whereby the sinner is gradually saved through participation in the sacraments. There is no eternal security in the Roman gospel because salvation always depends partially upon an individual's works. According to Roman Catholic theology, Christ purchased salvation and gave it to the Catholic Church to be distributed to men through its sacraments. This is not only a false gospel, it is a blasphemous usurpation of Christ's position as only Lord and Savior and Mediator.

The authoritative *Addis and Arnold Catholic Dictionary*, with the imprimatur (ecclesiastical authorization for printing) of E. Morrough Bernard, 1950, says justification "consists, not in the mere remission of sins, but in the sanctification and renewal of the inner man by the voluntary reception of God's grace and gifts." This dictionary plainly states that the Roman Catholic doctrine of justification is contrary to that of the Reformation, noting that "the Council of Trent was at pains to define most clearly and explicitly the Catholic tradition on the matter, placing it in sharp opposition to the contrary tenets of the Reformers."

Our Sunday Visitor's Catholic Encyclopedia, published in 1991, defines justification as "THE PROCESS by which a sinner is made righteous, pure and holy before God." This encyclopedia says: "Justification in the Catholic Tradition comes about by means of faith in Christ, AND in a life of good works lived in response to God's invitation to believe. ... That works are clearly required in the New Testament for union with Christ is seen in the many parables such as the Good Samaritan, Lazarus and Dives, and others" (emphasis added).

Rome Denies Salvation by Grace Alone in Dozens of Other Ways

In dozens of other ways Rome denies the once-for-all sufficiency of Christ's atonement, His sole Mediatorship, and

the doctrine of salvation by grace alone through faith alone without works.

Rome denies justification by grace alone BY ITS DOCTRINE OF BAPTISMAL REGENERATION. The New Catholic Catechism (1994) dogmatically declares: “The Church does not know of any means other than Baptism that assures entry into eternal beatitude; this is why she takes care not to neglect the mission she has received from the Lord to see that all who can be baptized are ‘reborn of water and the Spirit.’ God has bound salvation to the sacrament of Baptism...” (1257).

Rome denies justification by grace alone BY ITS DOCTRINE OF THE MASS. “As often as the sacrifice of the cross by which ‘Christ our Pasch is sacrificed’ ... is celebrated on the altar, the work of our redemption is carried out” (Vatican II, “Dogmatic Constitution on the Church,” Chapter 1, 3, p. 324).

Rome denies justification by grace alone BY ITS DOCTRINE OF THE SACRAMENTS: “The Church affirms that for believers the sacraments of the New Covenant are necessary for salvation. ... The fruit of the sacramental life is that the Spirit of adoption makes the faithful partakers in the divine nature by uniting them in a living union with the only Son, the Saviour” (New Catholic Catechism, 1129).

Rome denies justification by grace alone BY ITS DOCTRINE OF PURGATORY, claiming that “the doctrine of purgatory clearly demonstrates that even when the guilt of sin has been taken away, punishment for it or the consequences of it may remain to be expiated or cleansed” (Vatican II, “Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy”).

Rome denies justification by grace alone BY ITS DOCTRINE OF CONFESSION. “One who desires to obtain reconciliation with God and with the Church, must confess to a priest all the unconfessed grave sins he remembers after having carefully examined his conscience” (New Catholic Catechism, 1493).

Rome denies justification by grace alone BY ITS DOCTRINE OF THE PAPACY: “For ‘God’s only-begotten Son ... has won a treasure for the militant Church ... he has entrusted it to blessed Peter, the key-bearer of heaven, and to his successors who are Christ’s vicars on earth, SO THAT THEY MAY DISTRIBUTE IT TO THE FAITHFUL FOR THEIR SALVATION” (ellipses are in the original) (Vatican II, “Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy,” Apostolic Constitution on the Revision of Indulgences, Chap. 4, 7, p. 80).

Rome denies justification by grace alone BY ITS DOCTRINE OF MARY: “... Taken up to heaven she did not lay aside THIS SAVING OFFICE but by her manifold intercession continues to BRING US GIFTS OF ETERNAL SALVATION. ... Therefore the Blessed Virgin is invoked in the Church under the titles of Advocate, Helper, Benefactress, and Mediatrix” (New Catholic Catechism, 969).

Rome denies justification by grace alone BY ITS DOCTRINE OF THE SAINTS: “Thus recourse to the communion of saints lets the contrite sinner be more promptly and efficaciously purified of the punishments for sin” (*New Catholic Catechism*, 1475).

There are Catholics today who claim they don’t believe Rome’s heresies, but this does not change the fact that Rome holds them. If one does not believe official Catholic dogma, he should be honest enough to leave the Catholic Church.

The fact is that the Catholic Church does deny salvation by grace alone and teaches the vilest of other heresies, and God commands that the believer separate from such things. When evangelical leaders fellowship with Romanism, they are acting in direct disobedience to the Word of God.

“Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them” (Romans 16:17).

“Having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof: from such turn away” (2 Tim. 3:5).

“Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness?” (2 Cor. 6:14).

“Your glorying is not good. Know ye not that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump? Purge out therefore the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump, as ye are unleavened. For even Christ our passover is sacrificed for us: Therefore let us keep the feast, not with old leaven, neither with the leaven of malice and wickedness; but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth” (1 Cor. 5:6-8).

“But I fear, lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtilty, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ. For if he that cometh preacheth another Jesus, whom we have not preached, or if ye receive another spirit, which ye have not received, or another gospel, which ye have not accepted, ye might well bear with him” (2 Cor. 11:3-4).

Evangelical Catholics

Some who acknowledge that Rome as an institution hasn't changed, believe there is a “renewal” occurring within the Catholic Church that is bringing Catholics into an “evangelical” experience and faith.

The 1991 book *Evangelical Catholics* by Keith Fournier (with a foreword by Charles Colson) puts forth this thinking. Fournier contends that he is truly Catholic and truly evangelical, and Colson, who was an “evangelical,” seconded that. But the term “evangelical Catholic” turns language on its head and denies the historical definition of both terms.

Further, the evangelical Catholic phenomenon is nothing more than a clever ruse. Consider an interview that Dennis Costella of the Fundamental Evangelistic Association had

with Keith Fournier at Notre Dame '88, a large charismatic Catholic conference. When Costella asked about Catholics who are using D. James Kennedy's Evangelism Explosion materials, Fournier replied:

"... some of the early planning of our program had a lot to do with a Catholic parish that had James Kennedy's program ... The gospel is the gospel and everybody knows what the basic gospel truth is ... denominational differences [are] in the follow-up ... there were a couple of things in James Kennedy's process that we as Catholics couldn't accept because it wasn't Catholic teaching. FOR EXAMPLE, TOO OBVIOUS WAS THE TOTAL ASSURANCE OF SALVATION ... AND THE OTHER ONE IS SALVATION BY FAITH ALONE. FOR CATHOLICS WE ARE SAVED BY FAITH AND ALSO THROUGH OBEDIENCE TO CHRIST. We don't earn our salvation but we believe that there are acts of obedience and cooperation in God's Spirit that are tied up with salvation" (Interview by Dennis Costella with Keith Fournier and Chris Noble, 1988 National Conference on the Charismatic Renewal in the Catholic Church, Friday-Sunday, May 27-29, 1988, Notre Dame Campus, South Bend, Indiana).

Do you see the tremendous deception in this? Fournier says the gospel is the gospel, implying that we are all preaching the same gospel, yet he goes on to deny the very heart of the gospel which is salvation by the grace of Christ ALONE by His Blood ALONE through faith ALONE. Fournier would call this difference merely a matter of "interpretation" or perhaps an issue of semantics, but that is not the case. To add any kind of works to Christ's grace is a matter of heresy and blasphemy, and brings God's curse upon anyone who preaches it (Gal. 1:8-10). Nothing could be more serious.

Fournier claims that he believes in salvation by God's grace, but by adding works and sacraments to grace he corrupts grace. "And if by grace, then is it no more of works:

otherwise grace is no more grace. But if it be of works, then is it no more grace: otherwise work is no more work” (Rom. 11:6).

Fournier says “we are saved by faith AND ALSO through obedience to Christ,” yet he claims he doesn’t believe in earning salvation. This is Jesuit sophistry at its diabolic best.

There is no excuse for today’s evangelical leaders to be deceived by this kind of duplicity. If a man is not doctrinally strong enough to see through Rome’s deceptions, he is not qualified to be a Christian leader.

“Holding fast the faithful word as he hath been taught, that he may be able by sound doctrine both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers. For there are many unruly and vain talkers and deceivers, specially they of the circumcision: Whose mouths must be stopped, who subvert whole houses, teaching things which they ought not, for filthy lucre’s sake” (Titus 1:9-11).

Today’s evangelical leaders often have impressive scholarly qualifications, but they have little spiritual discernment. The latter does not come from an institution of higher learning. It comes from regeneration and submission to the indwelling Holy Spirit and the Word of God.

“At that time Jesus answered and said, I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes” (Mat. 11:25).

The Great Change in Evangelicalism

Evangelicalism today is a different thing from what it was prior to the 1940s. Fifty years ago the term “evangelical” was a word that referred to firm, Bible-believing Christianity. Though the term “evangelical,” like fundamentalism, has always incorporated a wide latitude of belief, as a rule it traditionally described Protestants who believed the Bible without reservation, who preached the new birth, and who

were stridently opposed to Rome. Generally speaking (and certainly in contrast to the mushy evangelicalism of today), the evangelicals of bygone generations were soldiers for Christ.

Evangelicalism of old was dogmatic and militant. It was old-fashioned Protestantism. All of the Protestant denominations once identified Rome as the Revelation 17 whore of Babylon. Anyone familiar with the old Lutheran, Methodist, and Presbyterian creeds knows this. Though we Baptists have never seen eye to eye with Protestants on many important points, old-line Protestants stood staunchly for what they believed to be the truth. Not only did old-line evangelicals define what they believed the Bible teaches, they defined it in contradiction to error. They were militant for the truth as they saw it.

This is exactly what today's New Evangelical is not.

Consider examples of this from the old Methodist Articles of Religion:

“Transubstantiation, or the change of the substance of bread and wine in the Supper of our Lord, cannot be proved by Holy Writ, but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of the ordinance, and hath given occasion to many superstitions. ... The Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshiped.”

“...the sacrifice of Masses in the which it is commonly said that the priest doth offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, is a blasphemous fable, and dangerous deceit.”

Consider the late evangelist James Stewart. He was used in a mighty way in revivals in Eastern Europe before the fall of the Iron Curtain and his published sermons were characterized by uncompromising declaration of Bible truth. Not only did he preach the gospel and the “positive” truths of the Word of God, he also preached against error and

compromise. In sermons such as “Potpourri Evangelism,” Stewart witnessed mightily against ecumenical evangelism. Consider a quotation from that sermon, first preached in the 1940s and ‘50s:

“We must be more afraid of flattery from the camp of the enemy than persecution. Read the pages of Church history. Persecution never did the Church of God any harm, but compromise with the world has always robbed it of the power of its purity. ...

“‘Potpourri Evangelism’ consists of two features: mixed evangelistic campaigns and mixed Christianity. By mixed evangelistic campaigns I mean the alliance of Modernistic and Evangelical churches together in an evangelistic effort. ...

“When religion gets up a revival, it must have from five to twenty churches of heterogeneous creeds and sectarian bodies to go into a great union effort; it must have a mammoth choir with great musical instruments, and many preachers and multiplied committees, and each committee headed by some banker, judge, mayor, or millionaire’s wife. It signs cards as a substitute for the broken-hearted cry of scriptural repentance. It must count its converts by the hundreds in a few days’ meeting. It must apologize for natural depravity. ...

“Human religion’s enterprises have an atmosphere of earthliness about them. It despises the day of small things and scorns little humble people and lonely ways. It is eager to jump to the height of prosperity. Its music has no pathos in it, its laughter lacks divine cheerfulness, its worship lacks supernatural love, its prayers bring down no huge answers, it works no miracles, calls forth no criticism from the world, and has no light of eternity in its eyes. It is a poor, sickly thing, born of the union of the heart of the world with the head of Christian theology—a mongrel, bastard thing with a backslidden church for its mother and the world for its father. Oh, my dear brother and sister,

never forget that this unnatural monster will be destroyed at the coming-again of our Blessed Lord Jesus Christ” (James Stewart, *Evangelism*, Asheville, NC: Gospel Projects, pp. 25-28).

How popular would James Stewart be in evangelical circles today? Would his sermons appear in *Christianity Today*? Would he be published by Zondervan and InterVarsity Press? Would they be sold at LifeWay bookstores?

Baptist Charles Haddon Spurgeon (1834-1892) is another example of what “evangelical” meant in generations past. Spurgeon’s ministry was characterized by faithfulness to the truth, holiness of life, a gospel of pure grace, and unhesitating exposure of error. Though maligned and misunderstood, Spurgeon did not hesitate to separate from the Baptist Union because of the false doctrine that was being countenanced. He also stood unhesitatingly against Roman Catholicism. Consider this excerpt from one of Spurgeon’s sermons:

“It is impossible but that the Church of Rome must spread, when we who are the watchdogs of the fold are silent, and others are gently and smoothly turfing the road, and making it as soft and smooth as possible, that converts may travel down to the nethermost hell of Popery. We want John Knox back again. Do not talk to me of mild and gentle men, of soft manners and squeamish words, we want the fiery Knox, and even though his vehemence should ‘ding our pulpits into blads,’ it were well if he did but rouse our hearts to action” (C.H. Spurgeon, *Sermons*, Vol. 10, pgs. 322-3).

When was the last time you read something like that in *Moody Monthly*? Spurgeon hit the nail on the head and the situation is much worse in our day. Today’s evangelicalism is very busy indeed with the business of turfing the road of Roman Catholicism to make it smooth for those traveling thereon to hell.

Many other examples could be given to show that evangelicalism of past generations involved a bold contention

for the truth. Evangelical warriors of a bygone age did not fail to label Rome that “Mother of Harlots,” and would have considered it unthinkable to fellowship with her.

The New Evangelicalism

During the first half of the Twentieth Century, evangelicalism in America was identified with fundamentalism.

Many historians make this connection, including Mark Ellingsen (*The Evangelical Movement*) and George Marsden (*Reforming Fundamentalism*). Marsden says, “There was not a practical distinction between fundamentalist and evangelical: the words were interchangeable” (p. 48).

When the National Association of Evangelicals (NAE) was formed in 1942 participants included such fundamentalist leaders as Bob Jones, Sr., John R. Rice, Charles Woodbridge, Harry Ironside, and David Otis Fuller.

By the mid-1950s, though, a clear break between separatist fundamentalists and non-separatist evangelicals occurred. This was occasioned largely by the ecumenical evangelism of Billy Graham. Most of the stronger men dropped out of the National Association of Evangelicals.

The terms evangelicalism and fundamentalism began “to refer to two different movements” (William Martin, *A Prophet with Honor*, p. 224).

In those days a new mood began to prevail among the sons of evangelical-fundamentalist preachers. They determined to create a “New Evangelicalism.” They would not be fighters; they would be diplomats; they would be positive rather than militant, infiltrators rather than separatists. They would not be restricted by a separationist mentality.

The same mood is found today among the new generation of fundamental Baptists.

The term “New Evangelicalism” defined a new type of evangelicalism to distinguish it from those who had

heretofore borne that label. Thus, in the very name “New Evangelicalism” is the witness that evangelicalism of old, regardless of any weaknesses (and there were many), was biblically dogmatic and militant.

The term “New Evangelicalism” was possibly coined by the late Harold Ockenga (1905-1985), one of the most influential evangelical leaders of the past generation. He was the pastor of Park Street Church (Congregational) in Boston, founder of the National Association of Evangelicals, co-founder and one-time president of Fuller Theological Seminary, first president of the World Evangelical Fellowship, president of Gordon College and Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary, a director of the Billy Graham Evangelistic Association, and chairman of the board and one-time editor of *Christianity Today*.

In the foreword to Harold Lindsell’s book *The Battle for the Bible*, Ockenga stated the philosophy of New Evangelicalism:

“Neo-evangelicalism was born in 1948 in connection with a convocation address which I gave in the Civic Auditorium in Pasadena. While reaffirming the theological view of fundamentalism, this address repudiated its ecclesiology and its social theory. The ringing call for a REPUDIATION OF SEPARATISM and the summons to social involvement received a hearty response from many Evangelicals. ... It differed from fundamentalism in its REPUDIATION OF SEPARATISM and its determination to engage itself in the theological dialogue of the day. It had a new emphasis upon the application of the gospel to the sociological, political, and economic areas of life.”

Ockenga may or may not have coined the term “New Evangelicalism,” but it is certain that the movement itself was not “born” with his convocation address. He did not create the movement; he merely labeled and described the new mood of positivism and non-militancy that characterized his generation.

Ockenga and the new generation of evangelicals, Billy Graham figuring most prominently, determined to abandon a militant Bible stance. The New Evangelical would stay within apostate denominations rather than practice separation. He would dialogue with those who teach error rather than proclaim the Word of God boldly and without compromise. He would meet the proud humanist and the haughty liberal on their own turf with human scholarship rather than follow the humble path of being counted a fool for Christ's sake by standing humbly and simply upon the Bible.

New Evangelical leaders determined to start a "rethinking process" whereby the old paths were to be reassessed in light of new goals, methods, and ideology.

Dr. Charles Woodbridge, a professor at Fuller Theological Seminary in its early days, a founding member of the National Association of Evangelicals, and a friend of men such as Harold Ockenga and Carl Henry, rejected New Evangelicalism and spent the rest of his life warning of its dangers. For his efforts he was maligned and ignored, though his warnings have come to pass.

In his 1969 book, *The New Evangelicalism*, Woodbridge traced the downward path of New Evangelical compromise:

"The New Evangelicalism is a theological and moral compromise of the deadliest sort. It is an insidious attack upon the Word of God. ... The New Evangelicalism advocates TOLERATION of error. It is following the downward path of ACCOMMODATION to error, COOPERATION with error, CONTAMINATION by error, and ultimate CAPITULATION to error!" (Woodbridge, *The New Evangelicalism*, pp. 9, 15).

Each passing decade witnesses more plainly to the truth of Dr. Woodbridge's observations. Toleration of error leads to accommodation, cooperation, contamination, and capitulation.

In 1958, William Ashbrook wrote *Evangelicalism: The New Neutralism*, which began with the following warning:

“This is the age of ‘isms,’ some good, mostly bad! One of the youngest members of Christendom’s fold is called The New Evangelicalism. It might more properly be labeled The New Neutralism. This new ‘Evangelicalism’ boasts too much pride, and has imbibed too much of the world’s culture to share the reproach of fundamentalism. It still has enough faith and too much understanding of the Bible to appear in the togs of modernism. IT SEEKS NEUTRAL GROUND, being neither fish nor fowl, neither right nor left, neither for nor against—it stands between! ...

“Bible-believing Christians would do well to beware of the New Evangelicalism for four valid reasons. First, it is a movement BORN OF COMPROMISE. Second, it is a movement NURTURED IN PRIDE OF INTELLECT. Third, it is a movement GROWING ON APPEASEMENT OF EVIL; and finally it is a movement DOOMED BY THE JUDGMENT OF GOD’S HOLY WORD.”

In *A History of Fundamentalism in America*, Dr. George Dollar observed:

“It has become a favorite pastime of new-evangelical writers, who know so little of historic Fundamentalism, to call it offensive names, as if to bury it by opprobrium. THE REAL DANGER IS NOT STRONG FUNDAMENTALISM BUT A SOFT AND EFFEMINATE CHRISTIANITY--EXOTIC BUT COWARDLY. It is sad that these men would not heed the warning of W.B Riley about the menace of ‘middle-of-the-roadism”’ (*A History of Fundamentalism in America*, 1973, p. 208).

God says, “Walk ye in the old paths,” but the New Evangelical reassesses the old paths. God says, “Remove not the ancient landmarks which thy fathers have set,” but the

New Evangelical has removed them one by one. God says, “Have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness,” but the New Evangelical reasons that such fellowship is necessary. God says, “A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump,” but the New Evangelical thinks he can reform the leavened lump. God says, “Evil communications corrupt good manners,” but the New Evangelical thinks good manners can uplift evil communications. God says, “I resist the proud but give grace to the humble,” but the New Evangelical thinks the way to reach the world is by meeting them on their own proud territory, matching them scholarly degree with degree.

New Evangelical Philosophy Has Permeated Evangelicalism

The New Evangelical leaven spread rapidly. Its philosophy was adopted by such well-known Christian leaders as Bill Bright, Harold Lindsell, John R.W. Stott, Luis Palau, E.V. Hill, Leighton Ford, Charles Stanley, Bill Hybels, Warren Wiersbe, Chuck Colson, Donald McGavran, Tony Campolo, Arthur Glasser, D. James Kennedy, David Hocking, Charles Swindoll, and a host of others.

New Evangelicalism was popularized through pleasant personalities and broadcast through powerful print, radio, and television media. *Christianity Today* was founded in 1956 to voice the new philosophy. Through publishing houses such as InterVarsity Press, Zondervan, Tyndale House Publishers, Moody Press, and Thomas Nelson—to name a few—New Evangelical thinking was broadcast across the world.

New Evangelicalism became the working principle of large interdenominational organizations such as the National Association of Evangelicals, National Religious Broadcasters, Youth for Christ, Campus Crusade for Christ, Back to the Bible, InterVarsity Christian Fellowship, World Vision, Operation Mobilization, the Evangelical Foreign Mission Association, World Evangelical Fellowship, the National Sunday School Association, etc.

It was spread through educational institutions such as Fuller Theological Seminary, Wheaton College, Gordon-Conwell, BIOLA, and Moody Bible Institute, to name a few.

Countless conferences have promoted New Evangelicalism and spread it far and wide. Two of the largest and most influential were Amsterdam '83 and Amsterdam '86, which were sponsored by Billy Graham and attended by thousands of preachers from across the world.

Because of the tremendous influence of these men and organizations, New Evangelical thought has swept the globe. Today it is no exaggeration to say that almost without exception those that call themselves evangelicals are New Evangelicals; the terms have become nearly synonymous. Old-line evangelicals, with rare exceptions, have either aligned with the fundamentalist movement or have adopted New Evangelicalism.

The evangelical movement today is the New Evangelical movement. For all practical purposes, they are the same.

“Part of the current confusion regarding New Evangelicalism stems from the fact that there is now little difference between evangelicalism and New Evangelicalism. The principles of the original New Evangelicalism have become so universally accepted by those who refer to themselves as evangelicals that any distinctions which might have been made years ago are all but lost. It is no doubt true to state that Ockenga’s designation of the new movement as ‘New or Neo-Evangelical’ was abbreviated to ‘Evangelical.’ ... Thus today we speak of this branch of conservative Christianity simply as the Evangelical movement” (Ernest Pickering, *The Tragedy of Compromise*, p. 96).

NEW EVANGELICALISM IS NOT A DENOMINATION OR A GROUP. IT IS A SPIRIT OF DISOBEDIENCE. IT IS A MOOD OF COMPROMISE. It is a rejection of many of the

“negative” aspects of New Testament Christianity. IT IS AN ATTITUDE OF POSITIVISM.

Old-line Presbyterians and Methodists can be New Evangelical. Fundamentalist Bible churches can be New Evangelical. INDEPENDENT FUNDAMENTAL BAPTISTS CAN BE NEW EVANGELICAL. In fact, many are New Evangelical already, and the number is growing rapidly.

Beware, friends. Don't be deceived by the label. Examine the content, and avoid that which is contrary to the Word of God. Call it what you please, an attitude of positive-emphasis, an attitude of neutrality rather than militancy for the truth, is not New Testament Christianity.

The Last Days

The fact that the wall between truth and error is being torn down in one generation, though grievous, should not surprise us. Did the apostles not prophesy of apostasy, compromise, spiritual decline, doctrinal confusion, and religious duplicity? Note passages such as Matthew 24; 2 Thessalonians 2; 1 Timothy 4; 2 Timothy 3-4; 2 Peter 2-3; Jude; and Revelation 13 and 17. “But evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse, deceiving, and being deceived” (2 Tim. 3:13). These prophecies paint a picture of the course of the church age, and it is one of deepening religious apostasy that will grow throughout the age and will come into full blossom just prior to Christ's return.

We see the fulfillment of this in the past 1,900 years of church history, and this present generation has witnessed a tremendous increase in the pace of the apostasy. Not only are the Protestant denominations moving back toward the Roman fold, but those who had never before affiliated with Rome are beginning to associate with her.

Nothing better illustrates the downfall of evangelicalism than its increasingly close relationship with Roman Catholicism. The evangelical warriors of past generations

considered Rome the Mother of Harlots. This doesn't mean they hated Roman Catholics. Far from it; it was their love for souls that motivated them to preach the gospel to Catholics that some might be saved and plucked as brands from the fire.

Roman Catholicism, as noted earlier, has changed since the 1900s, but it has not changed its basic heretical nature. The changes have been cosmetic with the design of furthering its ecumenical goals.

It is impossible to conceive of Charles Haddon Spurgeon calling the Pope of Rome a "great evangelist" as Billy Graham said of John Paul II. It would be impossible to picture evangelist James A. Stewart inviting a Catholic bishop to stand with him on a platform to "bless" those coming forward at a gospel service, as Billy Graham did in Sao Paulo, Brazil, in 1963.

Today's New Evangelicals are a different breed. Rome hasn't changed, but evangelicalism certainly has.

Before we go any further, let me reply to the charge that those who warn of Graham's compromise hate him. By no means do we hate Dr. Graham. I grew up in a Southern Baptist home and always loved to hear Billy Graham preach on the radio and television during my youth. I still get a thrill when I hear his voice. I often prayed for the man, and I often asked the Lord why a man who has preached the gospel to so many people would so compromise the gospel so that he refused avoid false teachers.

Dr. Graham's preaching was partially instrumental in the salvation of my wife and her mother. They heard Graham preach on television in Alaska in the early 1960s, were stirred to seek the Lord, found a little Baptist church, and were led to Christ by the pastor of that church.

The Lord knows that I do not hate Billy Graham. I am brokenhearted over his compromise. I have shed tears over the confusion that has resulted from his unscriptural methodology, but I refuse to keep my mouth shut when the

very gospel of Jesus Christ is at stake. It is better to obey God than man. This is serious business. Paul did not hesitate to rebuke Peter publicly for his compromise and hypocrisy because he was confusing the gospel in the minds of the observers (Gal. 2:11-14).

And this was only a case of refusing to eat with Gentiles. Graham's case is far, far more serious. I realize that I am not Paul, but God has commanded me to earnestly contend for the faith (Jude 3), and that is what I intend to do.

When Billy Graham first began his evangelistic ministry, he preached against modernism, Catholicism, and Communism, but he soon dropped the negative content of his preaching and adopted a neutral position toward error and a positive approach to the ministry.

In so doing, he rejected the Bible, because the Bible has no such approach.

Jude 3 is a command to Billy Graham as much as it is to any preacher:

“Beloved, when I gave all diligence to write unto you of the common salvation, it was needful for me to write unto you, and exhort you that ye should earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints” (Jude 1:3).

When Did Graham's Compromise Begin?

Billy Graham's compromise and disobedience began very early in his ministry. He was born in 1918 into a Presbyterian home. He claims that he was saved under the preaching of Baptist evangelist Mordecai Ham in 1934.

He graduated from high school in May 1936 and that fall attended Bob Jones College (which later became Bob Jones University).

After only one semester he had tired of the strict discipline and switched to Florida Bible Institute. He notes in his biography that "one thing that thrilled me [about Florida Bible Institute] was the diversity of viewpoints we were exposed to in the classroom, a wondrous blend of ecumenical and evangelical thought that was really ahead of its time" (Graham, *Just As I Am*, p. 46).

It was during his time in Florida that Graham felt the call to preach. In late 1938 he was baptized by immersion into a Baptist church; and in early 1939, he was ordained to preach by a Southern Baptist congregation. He has been a member of Southern Baptist churches ever since and has been supported enthusiastically and non-critically by the Southern Baptist Convention.

Graham graduated from the Florida Bible Institute in May 1940 and joined Wheaton College that September, graduating from there in 1943.

He pastored the Western Springs Baptist Church during his last year at Wheaton and for about a year after graduation.

In May 1944, Graham began preaching for the newly formed Chicagoland Youth for Christ, and in January 1945 he was appointed the first full-time evangelist for Youth for Christ International.

From December 1947 to February 1952 Graham was president of Northwestern Schools (founded by the famous fundamentalist leader William Bell Riley), though he continued to travel and preach for Youth for Christ and then independently with his own organization.

The Billy Graham Evangelistic Association was formed in 1950 and the Hour of Decision radio broadcasts began the same year.

Graham conducted his first citywide crusade in Grand Rapids, Michigan, in September 1947.

His October 1948 crusade in Augusta, Georgia, marked the beginning of an ecumenical program. It was the first crusade that was sponsored by the city ministerial association, and the Graham organization began demanding broad denominational support for his meetings.

During Graham's 1949 Los Angeles crusade, his ministry began to receive national press coverage. Billy Graham became a household name and his evangelistic crusades were attended by massive crowds.

Graham's final rift with fundamentalist leaders occurred in 1957. This was brought about by the open sponsorship of a Graham crusade by the liberal Protestant Church Council in New York City. The crusade committee in New York included 120 theological modernists who denied the infallibility of Scripture and other cardinal doctrines of the New Testament faith. The wife of modernist Norman Vincent Peale headed up the women's prayer groups for the Crusade. Modernists like Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., sat on the platform with Graham and led in prayer. In the *National Observer*, Dec. 30, 1963, King said the virgin birth of Christ was "a mythological story" created by the early Christians. In *Ebony* magazine, January 1961, King said: "I do not believe in hell as a place of a literal burning fire."

Graham was influenced immensely by theological modernists in those days. In a lecture to the Union Theological Seminary in February 1954, Graham said that in

1953 he had locked himself into a room in New York City for an entire day with Jesse Bader and John Sutherland Bonnell in order to ask questions and receive their counsel. By this action, Graham was actually locking himself into a room with the devil, because these theological modernists were certainly the devil's ministers (2 Cor. 11:13-15).

Thirty years later, Graham admitted to the Religious News Service that Bader was one of his "very close advisers and friends" (*Christian News*, March 31, 1986).

Bader and Bonnell were both rank liberals who denied the doctrines of the New Testament faith. Bader was secretary of the radical National Council of Churches. In an article in *Look* magazine (March 23, 1954), Bonnell stated that he and most other Presbyterian ministers did not believe in the virgin birth and the bodily resurrection of Christ, the inspiration of Scripture, a literal heaven and hell, and other doctrines.

God had instructed Graham to mark and avoid those who teach contrary to apostolic truth (Rom. 16:17). He had warned him that error is like a canker (2 Tim. 2:16-18) and leaven (Gal. 5:9) and that "evil communications corrupt good manners" (1 Cor. 15:33), but Graham disobeyed God's instruction and ignored His warning.

In an interview with the Religious News Service in 1986, the 67-year-old Billy Graham admitted that his ministry was deliberately ecumenical even in its early days (*Christian News*, March 31, 1986).

From that time, Graham moved ever closer in fellowship with Roman Catholicism and theological Modernism. As John Ashbrook, author of *New Neutralism II: Exposing the Gray of Compromise*, noted, "Compromise takes a man farther than he intends to go."

The Bible warns that "evil communications corrupt good manners" (1 Cor. 15:33).

How did Graham's ecumenical relationships affect him?

The January 1978 issue of *McCall's* magazine contained an interview with Graham by James Michael Beam. Graham admitted his change in thinking:

“I am far more tolerant of other kinds of Christians than I once was. My contact with Catholic, Lutheran and other leaders—people far removed from my own Southern Baptist tradition—has helped me, hopefully, to move in the right direction. I’ve found that my beliefs are essentially the same as those of orthodox Roman Catholics, for instance. They believe in the Virgin Birth, and so do I. They believe in the Resurrection of Jesus and the coming judgment of God, and so do I. We only differ on some matters of later church tradition.”

This is strange talk. The errors of the Roman Catholic Church are not mere matters of “later church tradition.” Roman Catholicism is the perversion of the gospel and the corruption of the New Testament church by the intermingling of biblical truth with paganism and Judaism. Rome’s false sacramental gospel of grace plus works requires that we label it cursed of God (Gal. 1:6-10); but Dr. Graham long ago determined to look upon Roman Catholicism as true Christianity, and he has led multitudes astray by that decision.

Graham’s ecumenical associations made him incredibly broadminded and tolerant. As we will see, he even came to the position that the mode of baptism is not important, that infant baptism equals regeneration, and that people can be saved without trusting in the name of Jesus Christ.

Graham Was Warned Many Times

Some have asked if I have personally warned Billy Graham about his disobedience. The answer is no, I have not, and I had no means of doing so. All of Graham’s correspondence was filtered through his massive organization. I have never had the ear of Billy Graham, but I don’t need to warn him.

That has been done repeatedly by men who had the opportunity to do so.

We need to state emphatically that Dr. Billy Graham was warned many times for his disobedience to God's Word. In the early days of his compromise, Graham was warned repeatedly by prominent Christian leaders such as Bob Jones, Sr., John R. Rice, Robert Shuler, G. Archer Weniger, James Bennet, Carl McIntire, Bryce Augsburger, Charles Woodbridge, and Robert Ketcham.

It must be understood that Billy Graham plainly identified himself as a fundamentalist when he began preaching. As already noted, he attended the fundamentalist Bob Jones College and counted himself one of Dr. Bob Jones, Sr.'s preacher boys. Graham associate Cliff Barrows was a Bob Jones graduate. Graham interviewed Dr. Bob Jones, Jr., on his Hour of Decision radio broadcast in December 1951, and concluded by saying:

“It's wonderful in these days of secular and materialistic education to see a great University that stands for the gospel of Jesus Christ, not only old-fashioned Americanism that we so desperately need today, but is injecting into our society your men and women that take their stand for the gospel of Jesus Christ” (Billy Graham, radio broadcast, Bob Jones University, Dec. 1951).

Graham, who has been called “Mr. Facing Both Ways,” was already moving in a diametrically different direction from Bob Jones even as he was uttering this effusive praise.

Graham was also on the Cooperating Board of Dr. John R. Rice's *The Sword of the Lord*.

From December 1947 to 1952, Graham was president of Northwestern Schools (founded by fundamentalist leader William Bell Riley) and was editor of that school's fundamentalist publication, *The Pilot*, the masthead of which boldly proclaimed a “militant stand against modernism in every form.”

During his early years, Graham was awarded honorary doctorates from Northwestern and Bob Jones.

Consider some of the men who personally pleaded with Graham to turn from his unscriptural path:

James E. Bennet was a prominent New York attorney and Bible teacher who knew Billy Graham from the time he graduated from Wheaton. Bennet encouraged him during the early years of his ministry, and when the evangelist began openly yoking together with modernists and Roman Catholics, Bennet tried to turn him from this error. He met with Graham in New York City before the 1954 crusade and pleaded with him not to proceed with his ecumenical plans. When Graham refused, Bennet resigned from the campaign invitation committee and wrote a public warning about the direction Graham was pursuing. It was entitled *The Billy Graham New York Crusade: Why I Cannot Support It*.

James Bennet lovingly warned Billy Graham.

John R. Rice, editor of the influential *Sword of the Lord* weekly fundamentalist Baptist paper, also supported Graham during his early years. In fact, Graham was on the *Sword's* Cooperating Board. Dr. Rice was a gracious Christian gentleman, and he pleaded with the young Billy Graham to turn from his ecumenical adventures. In her biography of the evangelist, Viola Walden, who was Rice's faithful secretary for 46 years, testified that Dr. Rice greatly loved Graham and repeatedly tried to reason with him (Walden, *John R. Rice*, pp. 164-167).

Graham and Rice met in Scotland in 1955, and Graham assured the elder evangelist:

“I have promised God I will never have on my committee working in an active way in any of my campaigns men who do not believe in the virgin birth of Christ, who do not believe in the blood atonement of Jesus Christ, who do not believe in the verbal inspiration of the Bible—these men will never be on my committee. I have promised God” (Graham, cited by

Pastor Roland Rasmussen, *Reasons Why I Cannot Support Billy Graham*, chapel message delivered at Bob Jones University, Feb. 15, 1966).

As it became obvious that Graham was not following his own counsel but was pursuing an ecumenical course, Rice met with him again and urged him to obey the Bible. Dr. Rice referred to this occasion in an article a couple of years later, saying, "I visited Dr. Graham in his own home in Montreat, North Carolina, by his invitation, and we talked earnestly on such matters" (John Rice, *Sword of the Lord*, June 20, 1958).

Graham, of course, did not listen, and John Rice publicly disassociated himself and the *Sword of the Lord* from the young evangelist in 1957. Viola Walden observes that far from having an unkind attitude toward Billy Graham, Dr. Rice "prayed regularly [for him] even long after denouncing his compromise" and "rejoiced over the many saved in Dr. Graham's crusades" (Walden, *John R. Rice*, pp. 166, 167).

John R. Rice lovingly warned Billy Graham.

Bob Jones, Sr., first met Billy Graham when the elder evangelist came to Charlotte, North Carolina, for a gospel meeting during Graham's senior year in high school. Billy's father, Frank, was impressed with Jones and wanted his son to attend Bob Jones College in Tennessee. (The school moved to Greenville, South Carolina, in 1946, and the name was changed to Bob Jones University.) Billy did attend Bob Jones the fall after he graduated from high school (1936), but he did not fit in well with the strict disciplinary atmosphere and he moved on to the Florida Bible Institute and then to Wheaton in 1940, from whence he graduated with a degree in anthropology.

Dr. Bob Jones supported Graham during the early years of his evangelistic ministry, and Graham even wrote to Jones to say that he got his evangelistic burden at Bob Jones College and wanted to be called one of Dr. Jones's "preacher boys" (Bob Jones, Sr., letter to a supporter, March 6, 1957).

As Graham began to launch out on his career of yoking together with false teachers, Dr. Jones corresponded with him and reproved him for his compromise. At first, Graham claimed that he had no intention of working with modernists or Roman Catholics. On June 3, 1952, Graham told Jones, “The modernists do not support us anywhere.”

It was not long, though, before Graham openly practiced what he privately denied. His 1957 New York Crusade included 120 theological modernists on the committee.

Bob Jones, Sr. lovingly warned Billy Graham.

Charles Woodbridge was another prominent Christian leader who attempted to correct Billy Graham. Woodbridge was a professor at Fuller Theological Seminary and a member of the National Association of Evangelicals before he rejected New Evangelicalism and separated himself from this unscriptural philosophy.

Woodbridge was a highly educated Presbyterian, with an MA from Princeton, a Ph.D. from Duke, and further studies at Berlin and Marburg Universities in Germany and the Sorbonne in Paris. In his classic book *The New Evangelicalism*, Woodbridge relates a visit that Graham made to his home in 1958:

“Dr. Graham came to my home in Altadena, California, in 1958 to chat with me about these things. We talked for two hours. I pointed out to him Romans 16:17. I did my best to persuade him to come out from among unbelievers, so far as the conduct of his campaigns was concerned. But to no avail” (Woodbridge, *The New Evangelicalism*, 1970, p. 44).

Charles Woodbridge lovingly warned Billy Graham.

Jack Wyrzten, founder of Word of Life, also warned Graham. The following testimony is from a pastor who witnessed one of the meetings in which fundamentalist leaders tried to correct Billy Graham:

“In 1957, I sat in a meeting where Jack Wyrzten and Dr. Woodbridge spoke face to face with Billy Graham about his compromise and the direction he was heading away from fundamentalism. Billy Graham was at Word of Life Inn for two days of meetings near Schroon Lake, New York. That fall was the ‘great New York Crusade.’ It was following that meeting that both Dr. Woodbridge and Jack Wyrzten stopped all support and fellowship with Billy Graham. Dr. Wyrzten spoke to the staff of Word of Life regarding his reasons for pulling away from Graham. I was a young Christian at the time (saved at Word of Life on June 24, 1956, at 19 years of age). It was the next year that Dr. Woodbridge broke fellowship with Dr. Graham for the same reasons” (E-mail to David Cloud, Feb. 27, 1999, from Pastor Bob Welch, D.Min, Collegiate Baptist Church, Anchorage, Alaska).

Jack Wyrzten lovingly warned Billy Graham. (Later, Wyrzten would travel the New Evangelical path himself.)

Robert Ketcham was the leader of the General Association of Regular Baptist Churches in 1950 when he saw some news clippings stating that Graham was working with Catholics in his meetings and was turning decision cards over to Catholic parishes. Ketcham wrote immediately to Graham and asked if the reports were true. The reply from Graham’s executive secretary, Jerry Beavan, included the following:

‘For example, you asked if Billy Graham had invited Roman Catholics and Jews to cooperate in the evangelistic meetings. SUCH A THOUGHT, EVEN IF THE REPORTER DID SUGGEST IT AS HAVING COME FROM MR. GRAHAM, SEEMS RIDICULOUS TO ME. SURELY YOU MUST KNOW THAT IT IS NOT TRUE. ... FURTHER, THAT YOU SHOULD GIVE ANY CREDENCE TO THE IDEA THAT MR. GRAHAM WOULD EVER TURN OVER ANY DECISION CARDS TO THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH SEEMS INCONCEIVABLE’ (John Ashbrook, *The New Neutralism II*).

It was not long until Beavan's reply was proven to be a deception. Graham was intent upon working with modernistic and Catholic and Jewish leaders, and he did intend to turn decision cards over to the same. The point here, though, is that Dr. Ketcham approached Billy Graham directly about this matter.

Robert Ketcham lovingly warned Billy Graham.

Another Christian leader who warned Graham was the late **Wilson Ewin**, longtime missionary to Roman Catholic-dominated Quebec. Graham could not say that Ewin did not understand Roman Catholicism or Catholic evangelism. Unlike Graham, who traveled from place to place and preached largely in formal, organized settings, then returned to the seclusion of his hotel suite, Ewin lived among Roman Catholics and worked with them as a pastor and evangelist day by day, month by month, decade after decade. He dedicated his book *You Can Lead Roman Catholics to Christ* to "the salvation of dear Roman Catholics whom I love and for whom our Saviour died and shed His Blood."

"For twenty years, I have watched the crusades and ministry of Dr. Billy Graham. In fact, Ruth [Ewin's wife] and I sang in the choir and were counselors in one of the Graham crusades. Many letters were written to Billy expressing grave concern about his illicit affair with the Roman Catholic system. I even visited his evangelistic headquarters in Minneapolis to alert the Graham Organization about its overt compromise with Roman Catholicism. Graham has indeed allowed the truth to fall into the street through his ecumenical ministry" (Wilson Ewin, prayer letter announcing his book *The Assimilation of Evangelist Billy Graham into the Roman Catholic Church*, January 1993).

Wilson Ewin lovingly warned Billy Graham.

These are only a few of the men who have attempted to reprove Graham for his error. In fact, Graham mentions these warnings in his biography.

“Much more painful to me, however, was the opposition from some of the leading fundamentalists. Most of them I knew personally, and even if I did not agree with them on every detail, I greatly admired them and respected their commitment to Christ. Many also had been among our strongest supporters in the early years of our public ministry. Their criticisms hurt immensely, nor could I shrug them off as the objections of people who rejected the basic tenets of the Christian faith or who opposed evangelism of any type” (Graham, *Just As I Am*, p. 302).

Graham characterized the criticism as “harsh” and claimed that the men who criticized him demonstrated “a lack of love,” but the disobedient and unrepentant always say this. Regardless of how tender and loving the rebukes are, correction is almost always confused with persecution.

It is human nature to do this, and it raises a smokescreen to hide the real issues. Reproof is never an easy thing to give nor to receive, and typically it seems to be unloving to those who refuse to accept it.

Further, one can always find some fault in the reprover, because he or she is also a sinner, but Proverbs teaches that one’s attitude toward biblical reproof exposes the condition of the heart.

“He is in the way of life that keepeth instruction: but he that refuseth reproof erreth” (Prov. 10:17).

“The ear that heareth the reproof of life abideth among the wise. He that refuseth instruction despiseth his own soul: but he that heareth reproof getteth understanding” (Prov. 15:31-32).

Billy Graham did not have a godly attitude toward biblical reproof. He refused to turn from the path of plain disobedience against God’s Word. He slandered those who loved him and who loved God’s Word enough to attempt to correct him.

Billy Graham was warned. He had many opportunities to repent. Sadly, he clung steadfastly to the course of disobedience to God's Word.

A Year by Year Survey

We will look now at the history of Billy Graham's love affair with Rome. No other man in this generation is more responsible for breaking down the walls between true churches and false and for building up the ecumenical movement.

1944-1954

Billy Graham's sad and fearful compromise with Roman Catholicism began as early as 1944. In that year he was befriended by Fulton Sheen, one of the most influential Catholic leaders in America.

When Sheen died in December 1979, Graham testified that he had "known him as a friend for over 35 years" (Religious News Service, Dec. 11, 1979).

Sheen was a faithful son of Rome. In his book *Treasure in Clay*, a copy of which is in my library, Sheen said that one of his spiritual secrets was to offer Mass every Saturday "in honor of the Blessed Mother to solicit her protection of my priesthood."

Sheen devoted an entire chapter of his autobiography to Mary, "The Woman I Love." He said, "When I was ordained, I took a resolution to offer the Holy Sacrifice of the Eucharist every Saturday to the Blessed Mother ... All this makes me very certain that when I go before the Judgment Seat of Christ, He will say to me in His Mercy: 'I heard My Mother speak of you.' During my life I have made about thirty pilgrimages to the shrine of Our Lady of Lourdes and about ten to her shrine in Fatima" (Fulton Sheen, *Treasure in Clay*, p. 317).

Thus by his own testimony, Fulton Sheen's hope of eternal life and acceptance before God was in Mary.

In his autobiography, Billy Graham described his first meeting with Sheen. Graham was an evangelist with Youth

For Christ. He said he was traveling on a train from Washington to New York and was just drifting off to sleep when Sheen knocked on the sleeping compartment and asked to “come in for a chat and a prayer” (Graham, *Just As I Am*, p. 692).

Graham said: “We talked about our ministries and our common commitment to evangelism, and I told him how grateful I was for his ministry and his focus on Christ. . . . We talked further and we prayed; and by the time he left, I felt as if I had known him all my life.”

Thus Graham plainly said that he accepted Fulton Sheen’s sacramental gospel as the truth even in those days.

There was a serious deception in this, because while Graham was befriending a Catholic cardinal as a fellow evangelist, he was assuring fundamentalist leaders such as Bob Jones, Sr. and John R. Rice that he was opposed to Catholicism and that he was a separatist and a fundamentalist.

Why would a Catholic leader as famous as Fulton Sheen go out of his way to befriend a young Baptist preacher like Billy Graham? When Graham met Sheen in 1944, it was three years before his first citywide crusade. Graham was a relatively unknown evangelist.

Was Rome’s faithful son not seeking to influence Graham’s thinking toward Catholicism?

In his autobiography, Graham acknowledged that he began to draw close to Rome in the early 1950s:

“At that time [March 1950], Protestantism in New England was weak, due in part to theological differences within some denominations, the influence of Unitarian ideas in other denominations, and the strength of the Roman Catholic Church. In spite of all that, a number of Roman Catholic priests and Unitarian clergy, together with some of their parishioners, came to the meetings along with those from Evangelical churches. With my limited Evangelical background, this was a further

expansion of my own ecumenical outlook. I NOW BEGAN TO MAKE FRIENDS AMONG PEOPLE FROM MANY DIFFERENT BACKGROUNDS AND TO DEVELOP A SPIRITUAL LOVE FOR THEIR CLERGY” (Graham, *Just As I Am*, p. 167).

Need I remind my readers that the Roman Catholic and Unitarian and modernist “clergy” that Graham learned to love in the 1940s and 1950s were men who denied the very Christian faith that Graham claimed to believe?

Catholic clergy deny that salvation is through the grace of Christ alone, by faith alone, without works or sacraments. They deny, further, that the Bible is the sole authority for faith and practice. Modernist clergy deny that the Bible is the infallible Word of God and question or openly deny the virgin birth, miracles, vicarious atonement, and resurrection of Jesus Christ. The Unitarian clergy that Dr. Graham loved are men who deny the Godhead and blood atonement of Jesus Christ, and who scoff at the infallible inspiration of the Holy Bible.

Why did Graham not rather love those who are in danger of being deceived by these false teachers? Why did he not rather love God’s Word enough to stand against its enemies? Why did he not rather love the Christ of the Bible enough to reject those who had hold to false christs and false gospels?

Graham’s love was motivated in the wrong direction. He loved the wolves more than the sheep that are led to eternal ruin by them.

Boston’s Archbishop Richard Cushing “exercised a special influence” over Billy Graham beginning in 1950. Cushing printed “BRAVO BILLY” on the front of his diocesan paper during the January 1950 campaign. In an interview in 1991, Graham referred to this as one of the highlights of his ministry:

“Another significant thing happened in the early ‘50s in Boston. Cardinal Cushing, in his magazine, *The Pilot*, put ‘BRAVO BILLY’ on the front cover. That made news

all over the country. He and I became close, wonderful friends. That was my first real coming to grips with the whole Protestant/Catholic situation. I began to realize that there were Christians everywhere. They might be called modernists, Catholics, or whatever, but they were Christians” (*Bookstore Journal*, Nov. 1991).

By 1950, Billy Graham had so fallen under the power of Roman Catholicism that he turned to it for solace during an illness. During his New England campaign, Graham fell sick for several days in Hartford, Connecticut. Executive Secretary Gerald Beavan “stayed at his bedside and read to him from Bishop Fulton Sheen’s *Peace of Soul*” (Wilson Ewin, *The Assimilation of Evangelist Billy Graham into the Roman Catholic Church*).

We have seen that Sheen was a great lover of the false Mary who is exalted by Rome as co-redemptrix and Queen of Heaven, and he was certain of God’s mercy only because of his devotion to this Mary.

Why would a young Baptist preacher turn to the writings of such a man for comfort?

It is obvious that false teachers like Fulton Sheen and Richard Cushing had a strong influence on the young Baptist evangelist.

By the end of 1950, Graham had formed a permanent team of staff members who arranged his meetings, and they were instructed to liaison with the Roman Catholic churches. Willis Haymaker was the front man who would go into cities and set up the organizational structure necessary to operate the crusades. One of his duties even in those early days was as follows:

“He would also call on the local Catholic bishop or other clerics to acquaint them with Crusade plans and invite them to the meetings; they would usually appoint a priest to attend and report back. This was years before Vatican II’s openness to Protestants, but WE WERE CONCERNED TO LET THE CATHOLIC BISHOPS

SEE THAT MY GOAL WAS NOT TO GET PEOPLE TO LEAVE THEIR CHURCH; rather, I wanted them to commit their lives to Christ” (Graham, *Just As I Am*, p. 163).

As early as 1950, in fact, there were already rumors that Graham was cooperating with Roman Catholics in his citywide crusades.

“In 1950 Dr. Robert Ketcham of the General Association of Regular Baptist Churches came across a newspaper article indicating that Graham expected Catholics and Jews to cooperate in a revival in Oregon and another which reported that Graham had turned over decision cards to Roman Catholic churches. Ketcham promptly sent a letter of inquiry to Billy himself. His letter brought him a strong rebuke from Graham’s executive secretary, Jerry Beavan. Part of Beavan’s reply was as follows:

“For example, you asked if Billy Graham had invited Roman Catholics and Jews to cooperate in the evangelistic meetings. SUCH A THOUGHT, EVEN IF THE REPORTER DID SUGGEST IT AS HAVING COME FROM MR. GRAHAM, SEEMS RIDICULOUS TO ME. SURELY YOU MUST KNOW THAT IT IS NOT TRUE. ... FURTHER, THAT YOU SHOULD GIVE ANY CREDENCE TO THE IDEA THAT MR. GRAHAM WOULD EVER TURN OVER ANY DECISION CARDS TO THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH SEEMS INCONCEIVABLE” (John Ashbrook, *The New Neutralism II*).

Graham was soon openly doing what Mr. Beavan labeled “ridiculous” and “inconceivable.” On September 6, 1952, reporter William McElwain, writing for the *Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph*, remarked on Graham’s ecumenical activities with Rome:

“Graham stressed that his crusade in Pittsburgh would be interdenominational. He said that he hopes to hear

Bishop Fulton J. Sheen at one of the Masses at St. Paul's Cathedral tomorrow. Graham said, 'MANY OF THE PEOPLE WHO HAVE REACHED A DECISION FOR CHRIST AT OUR MEETINGS HAVE JOINED THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AND WE HAVE RECEIVED COMMENDATIONS FROM CATHOLIC PUBLICATIONS FOR THE REVIVED INTEREST IN THEIR CHURCH FOLLOWING ONE OF OUR CAMPAIGNS. This happened both in Boston and Washington. After all, one of our prime purposes is to help the churches in a community.'"

In light of this information, it doesn't sound like Dr. Ketcham's aforesaid questions were ridiculous. Graham was already turning seekers over to the Catholic Church in the early 1950s.

1955

On December 29, 1955, Billy Graham met in his hotel suite with James Bennet and Jack Wyrzten, who were urging him not to pursue the path of ecumenical compromise. He confirmed his intention of sending converts back to the Roman Catholic Church (Wilson Ewin, *Evangelism: The Trojan Horse of the 1990's*).

1956

A banquet was held on September 17, 1956, at the Hotel Commodore, New York City, attended by 1,100 people. Graham was guest of honor and main speaker. He stated that he wanted Jews, Catholics, and Protestants to attend his meetings and then go back to their own churches. This statement was confirmed by the New York Evening Journal on Sept. 18, 1956, as follows:

"Graham said: 'THEN WE'LL SEND THEM TO THEIR OWN CHURCHES—ROMAN CATHOLIC, PROTESTANT OR JEWISH. We hope this way to see

the forces of crime at least lose a skirmish. The rest will be up to God” (The Church League of America).

Protestant Church Life, the official organ of the Protestant Council, confirmed this statement in its issue of September 29, 1956: “Referring to the Billy Graham New York Crusade scheduled for May, 1957, Dr. Graham said: ‘We’re coming to New York not to clean it up, but to get people to dedicate themselves to God and to send them on to their own churches--Catholic, Protestant or Jewish ... The rest is up to God.’”

This is also cited in William Martin, *A Prophet with Honor: The Billy Graham Story*, p. 223.

1957

In the May 6, 1957, issue of *Newsweek* magazine, Graham stated:

“I have many friends among Catholic priests, and a number of New York Catholic leaders have written me stating that they believe New York needs a spiritual awakening, and have promised me their prayers and interest even though they could not officially support the meetings. The Catholic Church has always been as friendly and as tolerant as their church law will allow them toward our crusades.”

In an interview with the *San Francisco News*, Graham team member Walter Smyth admitted that seekers at the San Francisco crusade were referred to Catholic churches. He said, “EVEN IF THE PENITENTS ARE NON-PROTESTANT, THEY ARE REFERRED TO THE CHURCH OF THEIR CHOICE. ... San Francisco is a heavily concentrated Roman Catholic City” (Sept. 21, 1957).

When Smyth later denied this, the paper stood by its report, and when Graham arrived in town, the paper asked the evangelist himself whether inquirers were sent to Catholic churches. His answer was duly published in the newspaper:

“ANYONE WHO MAKES A DECISION AT OUR MEETINGS IS SEEN LATER AND REFERRED TO A LOCAL CLERGYMAN, PROTESTANT, CATHOLIC OR JEWISH” (*San Francisco News*, Nov. 11, 1957).

As we have seen, James E. Bennet, a prominent New York attorney and Bible teacher, resigned from the committee of Graham’s New York Crusade when he saw that Graham was committed to working with theological modernists and other heretics. In his summary of Graham’s 1957 New York Crusade, “Final Analysis—A Ministry of Disobedience,” Bennet gave this interesting bit of information:

“Furthermore, a friend of mine (a minister of a church on Long Island) went into the inquiry room as an inquirer, and when the counselor asked him what church, he said, ‘To be saved, must I have a church?’ The counselor answered, ‘Yes, you must have a church.’ ‘Can I have a Catholic Church?’ ‘Certainly, if you want to,’ said the counselor. So he gave the name of a Catholic Church in his own locality. Two days later the priest of that church called him up; said he had the card, and would be glad to interview him as a prospective member of that church. I could cite many instances which came to my personal notice. It was one of the most sinful acts of the whole crusade, and will continue to cause inestimable damage. THERE IS NO DOUBT THAT THOUSANDS OF PEOPLE HAVE BEEN ASSIGNED TO ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCHES, SYNAGOGUES, MODERNISTIC, LIBERAL AND OTHER FORMS OF UNBELIEVING CHURCHES” (James Bennet, “Final Analysis—A Ministry of Disobedience,” citing a letter from G. Archer Weniger to Mr. Walter Smyth, Billy Graham Evangelistic Association, Dec. 20, 1957).

1958

The Graham organization and the co-operating churches in the San Francisco Crusade appointed Dr. Charles Farrah to

create a follow-up report on the converts. His findings were announced on December 16. According to the Oakland Tribune, “of the roughly 1,300 Catholics who came forward, PRACTICALLY ALL REMAINED CATHOLIC, CONTINUED TO PRAY TO MARY, GO TO MASS, AND CONFESS TO A PRIEST” (*Oakland Tribune*, Wed., Dec. 17, 1958).

No wonder the Catholic Church has often supported Graham’s crusades.

1960

In a report in *Newsweek* magazine in October 1960, Graham stated that he would not lead Catholics out of their denomination:

“Despite their probable Roman Catholic background, some 50 percent of Spanish-speaking New Yorkers have no current church affiliation of any kind, according to Protestant churchmen. DR. GRAHAM MADE IT CLEAR THAT HE AND HIS FELLOW CRUSADERS HAVE NO INTENTION OF DOING ANY PROSELYTING. He emphasized: “The important thing to us is that these people are unchurched. We want them to accept Christ and they can do that whether they think of themselves as Catholics or Protestants” (*Newsweek*, October 17, 1960).

1961

The Bible warns that “evil communications corrupt good manners” (1 Cor. 15:33), and Graham’s close affiliation with heretics over the years has certainly corrupted his spiritual discernment.

In a 1961 interview with the *Lutheran Standard* of the liberal American Lutheran Church, Graham testified that all of his children except the youngest were baptized as infants. (Graham grew up Presbyterian and joined a Southern Baptist congregation after he started his evangelistic career; his wife,

Ruth, remained a Presbyterian). Graham then made the following amazing statement:

“I have some difficulty in accepting the indiscriminate baptism of infants without a careful regard as to whether the parents have any intention of fulfilling the promise they make. But I DO BELIEVE THAT SOMETHING HAPPENS AT THE BAPTISM OF AN INFANT, particularly if the parents are Christians and teach their children Christian Truths from childhood. We cannot fully understand the miracles of God, but I BELIEVE THAT A MIRACLE CAN HAPPEN IN THESE CHILDREN SO THAT THEY ARE REGENERATED, THAT IS, MADE CHRISTIAN, THROUGH INFANT BAPTISM. If you want to call that baptismal regeneration, that’s all right with me” (Graham, interview with Wilfred Bockelman, associate editor of the *Lutheran Standard*, American Lutheran Church, *Lutheran Standard*, October 10, 1961).

1962

Graham conducted crusades in Latin America in 1962. He observed that they had to “move with great caution” because of divisions and controversies between Protestants and Catholics in that part of the world. In his 1997 autobiography, he refers to that division as the fault of both Catholics and Protestants.

“Nor was the fault always on the Catholic side, I knew. Often Latin American Protestants were guilty of intolerance, negative preaching, and inflammatory language. I had no intention of adding fuel to the fire. In fact, whenever possible during our trip south (as well as on other tours), I tried to meet with local Catholic leaders, to the occasional consternation of some of our hosts. MY GOAL, I ALWAYS MADE CLEAR, WAS NOT TO PREACH AGAINST CATHOLIC BELIEFS OR TO PROSELYTIZE PEOPLE WHO WERE

ALREADY COMMITTED TO CHRIST WITHIN THE
CATHOLIC CHURCH” (Graham, *Just As I Am*, p. 357).

In charging Latin American Protestants of “intolerance, negative preaching, and inflammatory language” Graham was guilty of slander. They were guilty, not of intolerance, but of loving the truth and hating error. If their preaching was “negative” it is only because the Bible contains a lot of negative doctrine. If their preaching was “inflammatory,” it is only because unrepentant heretics hate the truth and react against it.

Graham’s charge could also be made against the Lord Jesus Christ and the apostles. Christ’s sermon against the Pharisees in Matthew 23 sounds very intolerant and negative, and there is no doubt that the Pharisees considered it inflammatory. The same is true for Paul’s sermon against the Galatian heretics in Galatians chapter 1. He said they were cursed of God. That statement is entirely intolerant, very negative, and most definitely inflammatory.

Preachers who are faithful to the Word of God are always intolerant of error. “Therefore I esteem all thy precepts concerning all things to be right; and I hate every false way” (Psalm 119:128).

The Roman Catholic bishop of Sao Paulo, Brazil, stood beside Graham during his 1962 crusade in that city, and blessed those who came forward at the invitation. Amazingly, Graham said this illustrated that “something tremendous, an awakening of reform and revival within Christianity” was happening (*Daily Journal*, International Falls, Minnesota, October 29, 1963, cited by the *New York Times*, Nov. 9, 1963).

The man who paved the way for Graham to visit Latin America was Ken Strachan, whose father founded the Latin America Mission. Strachan was a dedicated ecumenist who shared Graham’s view “that there needed to be a coming together in some way and some form between Catholics and Protestants” (*Just As I Am*, p. 357).

By 1962, the Billy Graham Evangelistic Association edited the *Halley Bible Commentary* (subtitled *The Pocket Bible Handbook*) to remove references to Rome's murderous Inquisition (Wilson Ewin, *Today's Evangelicals Embracing the World's Deadliest Cult*, p. 57). The Graham organization acquired the printing rights of the book but was not supposed to change it. Pastor Jimmy Robbins of Mt. View Baptist Church, Cowpens, South Carolina, told me on Nov. 22, 1998, that Henry Halley's widow was upset at the way the Graham organization changed her husband's work by removing pages 676 to 705 which had described the martyrdom of millions through the Papal Inquisition.

1963

When Graham spoke at a breakfast at the Park Sheraton Hotel, held to prepare for his New York World's Fair pavilion, he spoke on increasing cooperation between Protestants and Roman Catholics. He said that if Pope Paul asked him to go out and preach the gospel, he would do it (*New York Times*, October 25, 1963, cited from Wilson Ewin, *Evangelism: The Trojan Horse of the 1990's*).

The problem with such a statement is that it fails to make any distinction between false gospels and the true. Pope Paul did not preach the gospel of the grace of Christ. He preached Rome's sacramental grace-works gospel that lies under the curse of Galatians 1. Why, then, did Graham say he would preach the gospel if asked by Pope Paul? What gospel would he preach under such circumstances: Pope Paul's gospel or the Bible's gospel? Graham pretended that they are the same, but they definitely are not.

It was also in 1963 that Graham first spoke at a Roman Catholic institution, the Belmont Abbey College.

“Evangelist Billy Graham will speak at Belmont Abbey College Monday night marking the first time the world-famed Baptist has preached at a Roman Catholic school. Graham said the speaking invitation came about after he

was introduced to the head of the school recently by Harry Golden of Charlotte, a widely read Jewish author and editor. 'It is evidence of the ecumenical spirit in the world today,' Graham said after accepting the invitation. Belmont Abbey, run by the religious order of St. Benedictine, counts Protestants as well as Catholics among its students" ("Billy Graham to Speak at Belmont Abbey," *Herald-Journal*, Spartensburg, SC, Nov. 19, 1963).

Graham was scheduled to speak at other Catholic colleges that year. In the *New York Times* for October 25, 1963, Graham acknowledged that he had preaching engagements scheduled at five Roman Catholic institutions.

The Catholic priest who invited Graham, Cuthbert Allen, Executive Vice-President of the college, made the following interesting observation of Graham's ministry:

"I am the one who, being acquainted with Billy Graham, invited him to speak to the Fathers, the Nuns, students and invited guests, and I am pleased to reply to your inquiries.

"Billy Graham gave an inspiring and a theologically sound address that may have been given by Bishop Fulton J. Sheen or any other Catholic preacher. I HAVE FOLLOWED BILLY GRAHAM'S CAREER AND I MUST EMPHASIZE THAT HE HAS BEEN MORE CATHOLIC THAN OTHERWISE, and I say this not in a partisan manner but as a matter of fact.

"Knowing the tremendous influence of Billy Graham among Protestants and now the realization and acknowledgment among Catholics of his devout and sincere appeal to the teachings of Christ ... I WOULD STATE THAT HE COULD BRING CATHOLICS AND PROTESTANTS TOGETHER IN A HEALTHY ECUMENICAL SPIRIT.

"I was the first Catholic to invite Billy Graham; I know he will speak at three other Catholic universities next

month; I believe he will be invited to more Catholic colleges in the future than Protestant colleges.

“So I am well pleased, then, to answer your question: BILLY GRAHAM IS PREACHING A MORAL AND EVANGELICAL THEOLOGY MOST ACCEPTABLE TO CATHOLICS” (Letter of May 19, 1965, from Cuthbert E. Allen to Mr. Julius C. Taylor, reprinted in *The Christian News*, October 1, 1984).

Speaking at Belmont Abbey, Graham commented on Rome’s Second Vatican Council, which was in its second year of sessions. The Council convened in October 1962 under Pope John XXIII and concluded December 1965 under Pope Paul VI.

The Council purposefully concluded on the Feast of the Immaculate Conception, which is held in celebration of Rome’s heresy that Mary was immaculately conceived and was therefore sinless.

Graham commented on the Catholic Council as follows:

“Evangelist Graham said Monday night that the work of the Roman Catholic Ecumenical Council ‘could change all of Christendom.’ He told students of Belmont Abbey College the council, meeting in Rome, had ‘brought a new dialogue and a new understanding and might bring a Christian revolution’” (“Graham Thinks Council Can Be Revolutionary,” *Palm Beach Daily News*, Palm Beach, Florida, UPI, Apr. 27, 1963).

Upon the death of Pope John XXIII in June 1963, Graham made this amazing remark from Bonn, Germany:

“I admire Pope John tremendously. I felt he brought a new era to the world. It is my hope that the Cardinals elect a new Pope who will follow the same line as John. IT WOULD BE A GREAT TRAGEDY IF THEY CHOSE A MAN WHO REACTED AGAINST JOHN, WHO RE-ERECTED THE WALLS” (*Chicago Tribune*, June 8, 1963).

1964

In 1964, Graham spent forty-five minutes with Richard Cardinal Cushing, Catholic Archbishop of Boston, and Cushing gave unqualified support for Graham. *The Cleveland Plain Dealer* for October 8, 1964, reported Cushing's words:

“I am 100% for the evangelist. I have never known a religious crusade that was more effective than Dr. Graham's. I have never heard the slightest criticism of anything he has ever said from a Catholic source.”

Graham returned the favor by saying:

“I feel much closer to Roman Catholic tradition than to some of the more liberal Protestants” (*Evening Bulletin*, Philadelphia, May 24, 1966).

This is popular ecumenical jargon, but what does it mean to feel closer to Catholic tradition than to liberal Protestantism when both are unscriptural? Both must be rejected! It is not an either-or situation. The Bible believing Christian is taught by the Word of God to reject all forms of error.

“Therefore I esteem all thy precepts concerning all things to be right; and I hate every false way” (Psalm 119:128).

1966

In July 1966, following his crusade in London, England, Graham met with an apostolic delegate from the Vatican (Graham interview with Edward B. Fiske, *New York Times*, July 17, 1966).

In October 1966, Graham was honorary chairman of the “World Congress on Evangelism” in Berlin, Germany. The congress was funded by the Billy Graham Evangelistic Association. Observers included representatives from the Roman Catholic Church and the World Council of Churches. Paulist priest John B. Sheerin, special correspondent for the

Religious News Service and editor of the *Catholic World*, spoke of Graham's ability to create ecumenical unity:

“The delegates had come from all over the world and from disparate backgrounds and theologies which were reflected in their diverse and dissonant interpretations of the Bible. Only the Holy Spirit, working through Billy Graham as the human instrument, could have welded together so quickly so many men of different creeds. The spirit of Pope John hovered over the council. Billy Graham was physically, palpably and inescapably present at the Congress speaking admirably and HOLDING TOGETHER FORCES THAT WOULD UNQUESTIONABLY HAVE EXPLODED IN ALL DIRECTIONS SAVE FOR HIS PRESENCE.”

A month after the Berlin Congress, the *Toronto Daily Star* of November 19, 1966, quoted priest William Manseau, one of the Catholic observers, as follows:

“Father Manseau noted approvingly that a Catholic publication in England recently suggested that some day the Catholic Church may canonize the Baptist evangelist, making him ‘St. Billy’” (M.L. Moser, Jr., *Ecumenicalism Under the Spotlight*).

1967

On November 21, 1967, an honorary degree was conferred on Graham by the Catholic priests who operated Belmont Abbey College in North Carolina. *The Gastonia Gazette* reported:

“In this decade of the 20th century, ‘in the midst of our generation,’ the world is experiencing a ‘final shaking,’ evangelist Billy Graham told an audience of 1700 Protestants and Catholics at Belmont Abbey College Tuesday night...

“After receiving the honorary degree of doctor of humane letters (D.H.L.) from the Abbey, Graham noted the significance of the occasion—‘a time when

Protestants and Catholics could meet together and greet each other as brothers, whereas 10 years ago they could not,' he said.

"The evangelist's first sermon at a Catholic institution was at the Abbey, in 1963, and his return Tuesday was the climax to this week's Institute for Ecumenical Dialogue, a program sponsored in part by the Abbey and designed to promote understanding among Catholic and Protestant clergymen of the Gaston-Mecklenburg area.

"Graham, freshly returned from his Japanese Crusade, said he 'knew of no greater honor a North Carolina preacher, reared just a few miles from here, could have than to be presented with this degree. I'm not sure but what this could start me being called 'Father Graham,' he facetiously added.

"In a serious tone, Graham said we are living in a 'critical and crucial period in a busy world. And, I want to speak especially to the students tonight.' Many students from Belmont Abbey and Sacred Heart College turned out to hear the Southern Baptist evangelist. ... 'There are five definite things which will not be shaken, and will serve as mountains on which to hold,' Graham said. ... 'Finally, the way of salvation has not changed. I know how the ending of the book will be. THE GOSPEL THAT BUILT THIS SCHOOL AND THE GOSPEL THAT BRINGS ME HERE TONIGHT IS STILL THE WAY TO SALVATION'" ("Belmont Abbey Confers Honorary Degree," Paul Smith, *Gazette* staff reporter, *The Gastonia Gazette*, Gastonia, North Carolina, Nov. 22, 1967).

This is simply amazing. Did Billy Graham really believe that the sacramental grace-works gospel that built Belmont Abbey is the way of salvation? If so, why did Graham preach that salvation is by grace alone through faith alone without works or sacraments? Why did he remain a Baptist rather than joining the Catholic Church? On the other hand, if

Graham did not believe Rome's gospel is true, why did he say that, and why did he fellowship with Rome?

This is why Billy Graham has been called "Mr. Facing Both Ways"! The evangelist tried to have it both ways, but it is impossible.

1969

Graham's 1969 crusade in New Zealand pleased modernistic, Jewish, and Catholic leaders. Writing on March 8, 1969, the Moderator Elect of the Presbyterian Church in New Zealand, theological modernist O.T. Baragwanath, stated:

"THIS IS THE GREATEST ECUMENICAL OCCASION THAT NEW ZEALAND HAS EVER KNOWN. Thousands of ordinary Christian people have been studying and praying with those of other traditions for many months. This friendship is not going to disappear. There is a completely new atmosphere between the Churches. Roman Catholic and Jewish leaders, though not participating in the crusade, attended the opening session of the school of evangelism and listened with evident respect to a quiet and scholarly address by Mr. Graham" (Winston G. Broadbent, *Roman Catholicism and Billy Graham*, p. 6).

The June 19, 1969, issue of the *New York Times* contained a half-page article on Graham's follow-up techniques:

"After inquirers are dealt with by 'counselors' and cards on each are filled out, a 'Co-Labor Corps' sits at long tables until midnight each night counting and sorting the cards and licking envelopes that will go out in the morning mail to ministers of about 1,000 churches. The 'Corps' sifts through maps and phone books, FINDING THE CHURCH NEAREST THE ADDRESSES ON THE CARDS, REGARDLESS OF WHETHER OR NOT THEY ARE LIBERAL, CONSERVATIVE, PROTESTANT, CATHOLIC OR JEWISH" (quoted

from *Billy Graham*, *The Church League of America*, pp. 67-68).

The United States Congress of Evangelism was held in Minneapolis, September 8-13, 1969. Billy Graham was the sponsor and Roman Catholics were included on the program. A Catholic priest, John J. Okeefe, led the Thursday morning devotions (*The Baptist Bulletin*, Nov. 1969).

1970

The Graham-sponsored Euro 70 was a technological marvel. Graham's messages were broadcast to venues across Europe by means of closed-circuit television, but as always, one of the aims and products of the crusade was ecumenical unity. The chairman of one of the Norwegian relay sites testified, "There has been a marked closing of ranks of all Christian associations in the towns and surrounding areas" (John Pollock, *Billy Graham*, p. 80). A professor at a Roman Catholic divinity school in Zagreb, Yugoslavia, said Euro 70 awoke the hope "in many hearts that ecumenism in our region will not remain just an empty word."

From 1970 to 1972 Jesuit priest Charles Dullea, Superior of the Pontifical Biblical Institute in Rome, researched the message and methodology of Billy Graham's crusades for a doctoral dissertation written for the Gregorian University. Dullea was granted interviews with Graham and his staff and was allowed to study the follow-up at crusades in New York and Los Angeles. Dullea's doctoral dissertation was published in 1973 in a book entitled *A Catholic Looks at Billy Graham*. I have a copy of this in my library.

Dullea's description of the follow-up at Graham crusades is fascinating, and he made an amazing discovery: When Catholic churches do not actively participate in Graham crusades "there is no follow-up on Roman Catholics" (p. 47).

Dullea wrote:

“In the follow-up room in Shea Stadium in June 1970 I saw a thick packet of decision cards designated ‘No follow-up.’ These were ‘Catholic and Cultists.’ ... There is no follow-up on these cases. They are simply dropped. I was told that the percentage of Catholic decisions for Christ reached almost 20% of the whole” (Dullea, *A Catholic Looks at Billy Graham*, Paulist Press, 1973, p. 47).

This unconscionable practice was the result of Graham’s incredible ecumenical zeal. Apparently he would rather have no follow-up of Catholic inquirers than risk offending Catholic leaders by sending the names of inquirers to non-Catholic churches. (Dullea’s treatise was read in manuscript form by Dr. Robert Ferm of the Graham Evangelistic Association prior to publication.)

1971

When Graham brought the concluding message at the 29th annual convention of the National Association of Evangelicals, April 22, 1971, in Los Angeles, he described the prayer groups which were formed the last time he had gone to New York City: “Some of them were Jewish, some were Roman Catholic, in fact hundreds were Roman Catholic, meeting to pray” (cited by D.A. Waite, *What’s Wrong with the N.A.E.? - 1971*).

Donald Waite remarks, “If [these were] true Jews and true Roman Catholics, thus unsaved, how in the world could they pray and get through to God without coming through the blood of Calvary’s cross and personal faith in Jesus Christ? Such ecumenicity on Graham’s part is serious indeed.”

1972

In January 1972 an article appeared in the Catholic magazine *Homiletic & Pastoral Review* by the aforementioned Charles W. Dullea, Superior of the Pontifical Biblical Institute

in Rome. Entitled “A Catholic Looks at Billy Graham,” this article explains why the Vatican has supported Graham.

“The Catholic will hear no slighting of his Church’s teaching authority, nor of Papal or Episcopal Prerogatives, no word against the Mass or sacraments or Catholic practices. Graham has no time for that ... THE CATHOLIC, IN MY OPINION WILL HEAR LITTLE, IF ANYTHING, HE CANNOT AGREE WITH.”

In June 1972, Billy Graham was honorary chairman of Campus Crusade’s International Student Congress on Evangelism known as Explo 72, in Dallas, Texas. Roman Catholic parishes participated.

Mr. Paul Eshelman, director for Explo 72 said, “Roman Catholics have been involved in arrangements. ... Sisters helped with advance registrations; young men studying for the priesthood worked in Explo’s Dallas office.”

Catholic literature distributed at the congress read in part, “True Catholics believe that under the appearance of bread and wine, achieved at the consecration of the Mass, the very real body of Christ is present in the tabernacle of their Churches” (*Logos*, May-June 1972).

This is Rome’s heresy of transubstantiation. *The Catechism of the Catholic Church* describes it as follows:

“The signs of bread and wine become, in a way surpassing understanding, the Body and Blood of Christ” (Catechism, 1333).

On April 21, 1972, Billy Graham accepted the International Franciscan Award from the Catholic Franciscan friars for “his contribution to true ecumenism” and “his sincere and authentic evangelism” (*Minneapolis Star*, April 22, 1972, quoted from *F.E.A. News & Views*, Jul.-Aug. 1972, Fundamental Evangelistic Association, Los Osos, California). In acknowledging the award, Graham said: “While I am not worthy to touch the shoe laces of St. Francis [a Roman Catholic ‘saint’ who believed in salvation by works and

preached to animals], yet this same Christ that called Francis in the 13th century also called me to be one of His servants in the 20th century” (*The Gospel Standard*, Feb. 1986).

At the Greenville, Missouri, crusade with Billy Graham associate Ralph Bell, a local Roman Catholic priest was on the platform to read the Scripture (D.A. Waite, *What’s Wrong with the N.A.E. - 1972?*).

At the Graham crusade in Charlotte, North Carolina, “the monks of Belmont Abbey sent their ‘felicitations, good wishes and, more important, fervent prayers.’ ... We accept you as a friend, brother and alumnus” (John Pollock, *Billy Graham*, p. 129).

When Graham was invited in 1972 to conduct a crusade in Central Italy, “he learned from a very high source that the Vatican did not object” and that “his attitude was deeply appreciated” (Pollock, *Billy Graham*, p. 130).

Billy Graham associate evangelist Ralph Bell’s 1972 crusade in Papua, New Guinea, was “strongly supported by the Roman Catholic archbishop as well as by all Protestant churches” (John Pollock, *Billy Graham*, p. 152). This Billy Graham Evangelistic Crusade ecumenical venture paved the way for a seminar in June 1976 that included Roman Catholics (Pollock).

Graham visited Ireland in 1972. He did not conduct a crusade in Ulster (Northern Ireland), but he visited Belfast and met with Catholic and Protestant church leaders. He had a private meeting in Armagh at the palace of Cardinal Conway, head of the Catholic Church in Northern Ireland. Protestant leaders were also present. Graham spoke to students at Queen’s University under the sponsorship of both Catholic and Protestant chaplains (Graham, *Just As I Am*, p. 429). In Dublin, in the Irish Republic, he met with “clergy from all denominations” at Milltown Park, the headquarters for the Jesuits.

1973

Graham was one of the leaders of the ecumenical Key 73 evangelistic crusade held across North America, and he was involved in the decision to bring Catholics into the program.

“Opening his ecumenical North American Key 73 Crusade, Graham commented on a biography of Pope John XXIII. Speaking of the book’s presentation of the Pope’s devotion to Mary and the saints, the evangelist called this ‘a classic in devotion’” (Wilson Ewin, “The Chilling Significance of Pope John Paul’s October 22, 1996 Address: The One World Church,” Quebec Baptist Mission, 1996, p. 14).

In Milwaukee on October 21, 1973, Graham said, “This past week I preached in a great Catholic Cathedral a funeral sermon for a close friend of mind who was a Catholic [publisher James Strohn Copley], and they had several bishops and archbishops to participate, and as I sat there going through THE FUNERAL MASS THAT WAS A VERY BEAUTIFUL THING AND CERTAINLY STRAIGHT AND CLEAR IN THE GOSPEL, I believe, there was a wonderful little priest that would tell me when to stand and when to kneel and what to do” (*Billy Graham*, Church League of America, p. 84).

Graham said that the Catholic mass is clear about the gospel. Does he really think that a priest re-sacrificing Christ is the gospel? The Catholic mass is not a memorial of Christ’s sacrifice on the cross; it is an alleged re-offering of that sacrifice. The Second Vatican Council reaffirmed that the Mass is “a sacrifice in which the sacrifice of the cross is perpetuated” and that through the unbloody sacrifice of the Mass Christ offers “himself to the Father for the world’s salvation through the ministry of priests” (Vatican II, “The Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy,” Instruction on the Worship of the Eucharistic Mystery, Introduction, C 1, 2, p. 108).

This is not the gospel that Paul and the other apostles preached. They preached that Christ was “once offered to bear the sins of many” (Heb. 9:28). The biblical gospel is 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 Cor. 15:3-4). The biblical gospel says Christ was sacrificed once, was buried once, and was resurrected once, and that one offering takes away the believer’s sin.

There is absolutely no instruction in the New Testament for the formation of a special priesthood in the churches (every believer is a priest, 1 Peter 2:5, 9) or for the offering of a sacrifice. There is no need. Christ, our High Priest, has done that for us. In the Roman Catholic Church, Christ hangs on the cross perpetually in the crucifix. The pope’s staff features a carving of Christ hanging on the cross. The symbolism of the crucifix is derived from Rome’s heretical view of the gospel. Instead of an empty cross depicting a once-for-all, completed sacrifice, they have a perpetually crucified Christ depicting their doctrine of the Mass.

At the end of October 1973, Graham held a crusade in St. Louis, Missouri. Catholic Archbishop John T. Byre said in the St. Louis Review, the Catholic Archdiocesan weekly:

“St. Louis is fortunate to have the presence of the Rev. Billy Graham. During a Graham crusade, the participants are asked to make a decision for Christ. In Catholic circles this is referred to as a ‘commitment to Christ.’ Catholics have little reason to disagree with Dr. Graham as far as the theology of his crusade is concerned. He makes a determined effort to keep them non-sectarian and **THUS AVOIDS THE MORE CONTROVERSIAL ISSUES OF THE SACRAMENTS AND THE CHURCH.** Some 50 nuns served as counselors and others sang regularly in the choir” (Wilson Ewin, *Evangelism: The Trojan Horse of the 1990s*).

1974

In August 1974, Graham chaired the influential International Congress on World Evangelization at Lausanne, Switzerland. Bishop A. Jack Dain, chairman of the Congress Planning Committee, publicly acknowledged that “this Congress would have been impossible without Billy Graham.” Though all participants were supposed to be Evangelicals, they came from every sort of compromised and apostate denomination: Church of England, Free Methodist, Church of South India, etc. In addition, it was announced that five administrators of the World Council of Churches and three Roman Catholic priests had been invited to attend (*F.E.A. News & Views*, Jul.-Aug. 1974, Fundamental Evangelistic Association, Los Osos, California).

1976

In September 1976, it was reported that the St. Madelaine Sophie Catholic parish of High Springs, Florida, purchased and refurbished a drive-in theater and was under contract with Billy Graham’s World Wide Pictures to show religious films. Proceeds went to build up Roman Catholicism through the parish building fund (*BFT #565*, Hayes Minnick, Orlando, Florida).

In October 1976, Graham was quoted in the *Southern Cross*, a Catholic paper: “I think that Protestants, in reaction to the Catholic position, have made far too little of Mary. Mary was the most remarkable and most blessed of all women” (*BFT #565*, Hayes Minnick, Orlando, Florida).

By not condemning the Catholic heresies surrounding Mary, Graham played right into the hands of Rome.

1977

During Graham’s crusade in Asheville, South Carolina, in early 1977, one of the overflow halls was located at St. Laurence Catholic Church.

Graham held a crusade on the campus of Roman Catholic Notre Dame University in May 1977. He said, “I have no quarrel with the Catholic Church” (William Martin, *Prophet with Honor: The Billy Graham Story*, p. 223).

Christianity Today said Graham’s sermons at Notre Dame “were of the type that audiences around the world have heard, with only a few more references to such Catholics as Bishop Fulton Sheen and Mother Teresa of Calcutta” (*Christianity Today*, June 3, 1977).

The invitation Graham gave at Notre Dame played right into the hands of the Catholic hierarchy. He said to the crowd, “Many of you want to come tonight and reconfirm your confirmation. You want to reconfirm the decision that you made when you joined the church” (Wilson Ewin, *The Assimilation of Evangelist Billy Graham*).

Graham’s goal apparently was to make better Catholics of his hearers. It is no wonder that he was praised by Catholic leaders. A preacher who truly loves Roman Catholics will tell them plainly that Rome’s gospel is false, that the Catholic sacraments have nothing to do with salvation, that they are not born again through baptism, and that unless they repent of Rome’s false gospel and receive the gospel of the grace of Christ they will perish.

In November 1977, Graham held a crusade in Manila, the Philippines. *Christianity Today* editor Harold Lindsell quoted the Graham team: “We didn’t know what to expect when we came here because the Protestant population in the Philippines is very small. But during the crusade we have seen some of the greatest unity among churches that we’ve ever experienced, and we have received marvelous support from the Catholic Church” (*Christianity Today*, Dec. 30, 1977).

1978

In an interview with *McCall’s Magazine*, Graham said: “I’ve found that my beliefs are essentially the same as those of

orthodox Roman Catholics ... we differ on some matters of later church tradition” (*McCalls*, January 1978).

This is one of the most ridiculous statements that Dr. Graham ever made. In fact, all of the Bible believer’s differences with Rome have to do with “matters of later church tradition,” but Jesus Christ forbade such tradition.

“And he said unto them, Full well ye reject the commandment of God, that ye may keep your own tradition” (Mark 7:9).

Rome’s heresies consist of the additions and corruptions that it made to the New Testament faith between 300 and 1500 A.D.

Before Graham’s Milwaukee crusade in August 1978, Roman Catholic Archbishop Rembert Weakland sent a letter to priests throughout his archdiocese telling them they could support the meetings. These gave Graham “some of the most loyal support,” not only in attendance but also as campaign workers. *Christianity Today*, September 7, reported,

“Graham had these Catholic ... churchgoers in mind during his sermons ... At each meeting he repeated a recent statement attributed to Pope John Paul II, ‘The priority of the Church ought to be to evangelize those who have already been baptized.’ He followed this statement at the concluding service on Sunday with, ‘Perhaps many people need to come and reconfirm their confirmation’” (Wilson Ewin, *The Assimilation of Evangelist Billy Graham*).

To “reconfirm their confirmation” is not the gospel and is not biblical salvation. The Catholic Church teaches that salvation is a process that begins at baptism, is strengthened through confirmation, and is fed by the other sacraments throughout one’s life. For a Catholic to reconfirm his confirmation would mean he is still trusting in the Catholic sacraments for his eternal salvation, instead of repenting of

those dead, man-made works and trusting the finished work of Jesus Christ alone.

In October 1978, Graham held a crusade in Catholic Poland, and it was an occasion for unprecedented ecumenical alliances. The *Chicago Sun-Times* for October 7, 1978, gave this report on Graham's arrival in Warsaw:

“AMERICAN EVANGELIST BILLY GRAHAM WAS WELCOMED FRIDAY BY THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH, WHICH IS OPENING ITS DOORS FOR THE FIRST TIME TO HIS CRUSADE for Christ. ‘We are happy that you will preach in several cities in Catholic churches, where the overwhelming majority of listeners will be Catholics,’ Bishop Wladyslaw Miziolek told Graham at Okecie Airport. Bishop Miziolek is chairman of the Committee on Ecumenism of the Polish Catholic Church.”

Bishop Miziolek welcomed Graham at the airport and brought greetings from Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski, the head of the Catholic Church in Poland. Graham replied that this adventure represented a new spirit of cooperation that was a constructive example for Christians in other nations (John Pollock, *Billy Graham*, p. 308).

Roman Catholic authorities allowed Graham to preach in their cathedrals, knowing that he would not say anything against the Church of Rome or anything to make Catholics want to leave the church. Four of the rallies were held in Catholic churches, with priests participating on the platform with Graham. Masses were conducted immediately before and after the rallies.

In his remarks at Catholic churches, Graham praised the greatness of Pope Paul VI (*Christianity Today*, Nov. 3, 1978).

Cardinal Karol Wojtyla, soon to be Pope John Paul II, offered his 700-year-old St. Anne's Church in Cracow to Graham. Wojtyla had intended to meet Graham for tea, but just before Graham's arrival in Poland Wojtyla was unexpectedly called away to the conclave in Rome to meet

with the College of Cardinals, and a few days later he was elected pope. As Graham's plane touched down in Warsaw, Wojtyla's plane was at the end of the runway, ready to take off for Rome.

While in Poland, Graham visited the Marian shrine of Jasna Gora (featuring an icon of the Black Madonna) in Czestochowa. A photo in *Decision* magazine for February 1979 showed Graham welcoming Mary pilgrims to the shrine. He did not have one word of warning about this wicked practice. In the minds of his Catholic observers, this ill-advised visit put Graham's stamp of approval upon the idolatrous Mary veneration that is featured at this influential shrine.

During his years as a child, and later as a Catholic leader in Poland, Pope John Paul II visited this shrine frequently to venerate Mary and to pray to her. These blasphemous and heretical practices have no authority in the Word of God.

In his book *Crossing the Threshold of Hope*, the Pope testified that his personal devotion to Mary was developed at Marian sites "in my town, then in the shrine of Kalwaria, and finally at Jasna Gora" (p. 220). The Pope had "Totus Tuus" (All Yours) embroidered on his papal garments, designating his "abandonment to Mary" (*Crossing the Threshold of Hope*, p. 215).

After the Pope was shot during an assassination attempt in May 1981, he attributed his subsequent recovery to Mary, and it was at shrines such as Jasna Gora and Fatima that he expressed his thankfulness to the "Queen of Heaven."

1979

In May 1979, Graham held a crusade in Australia. Reporter Alan Nichols made the following observation in *Christianity Today*:

"Prior to the crusade, there had been a controversy over Roman Catholic involvement ... when the crusade

executive committee announced that inquirers would be referred to participating Catholic churches. ... Finally, a compromise was reached: any Catholic inquirers would be directed to nondenominational nurture groups where they would be encouraged to make up their own minds about church membership” (*Christianity Today*, June 29, 1979).

Note that the Graham team’s objective was to deliver inquirers over to the Catholic churches, which was their normal mode of operation, but they were somewhat stymied in this instance by protests from participating Protestants. In spite of the statement about “nondenominational nurture groups,” it is still probable that inquirers were turned over to Catholic counselors, because a report in the Church Scene for March 8, 1979, stated that Graham was training Roman Catholics in follow-up techniques so that R.C. inquirers at the crusade may be referred to them” (reprinted in *Evangelical Action*, April-May 1979, p. 4).

At Graham’s Milwaukee crusade in 1979, a Roman Catholic mass was conducted as part of the follow-up for new converts (*F.B.F. News Bulletin*, May-June 1986).

In September 1979, *The Christian Courier* of Milwaukee, Wisconsin, published the following report on the Milwaukee Crusade:

“Sister Maureen Hopkins, Director of the Ecumenical and Interfaith Commission of the Milwaukee Roman Catholic Archdiocese, and a liaison member of the Crusade committee, reported that 120 PEOPLE HAVE VOLUNTEERED WITHIN THE CATHOLIC COMMUNITY TO HELP HER WITH THE TASK OF CONTACTING EACH OF THE 3,500 INQUIRIES. SR. MAUREEN RECEIVED THE NAMES AND TELEPHONE NUMBERS FROM THE CRUSADE COMMITTEE, based upon the inquirer’s indication of having a Catholic background on his inquiry card. ... All 3,500 were immediately invited to a Eucharistic celebration which was held on August 16 at St. Theresa’s

Church in Milwaukee. The Mass was attended by more than 400 people. The primary purpose for the Mass was to remind the inquirers that their commitments to Christ should be nurtured within the sacramental framework of the church.”

Christianity Today for September 7, 1979, pointed out that almost a year before the Crusade, Graham had sent a team member to conduct a seminar explaining the crusade enterprise for Milwaukee priests and lay workers.

John Ashbrook observed, “It is a tragedy that 3,500 decision cards were turned over to the Roman Catholic Church, but it is a worse tragedy when you realize that it did not ‘just happen.’ It was planned by the world’s best-known evangelist” (Ashbrook, *The New Neutralism II*).

When Pope John Paul II made his first visit to the United States in October 1979, Graham made the following startling statement:

“No other man in the world today could attract as much attention on moral and spiritual subjects as John Paul. HE IS ARTICULATING WHAT CATHOLIC AND PROTESTANT CHURCHES HAVE TRADITIONALLY HELD, the moral values from the Ten Commandments and the Sermon on the Mount. The country is responding in a magnificent way. It shows there’s a great spiritual hunger. THE POPE HAS REACHED MILLIONS OF PROTESTANTS. The organized ecumenical movement seems to be on the back burner and ecumenicity is now taking place where Roman Catholics and Protestants share beliefs in matters like the Virgin Birth and the Resurrection of Christ” (Billy Graham, *Time*, October 15, 1979).

Graham appeared on the *Phil Donahue Show* on October 11, 1979, and made the following statement in regard to the Pope’s visit:

“I think the American people are looking for a leader, a moral and spiritual leader that believes something. And

the Pope does. He didn't mince words on a single subject. As a matter of fact, HIS SUBJECT IN BOSTON WAS REALLY AN EVANGELISTIC ADDRESS IN WHICH HE ASKED THE PEOPLE TO COME TO CHRIST, to give their lives to Christ. I said, "Thank God, I've got somebody to quote now with some real authority" (*The Gospel Standard*, Feb. 1986).

Sure, the Pope asked the people to come to Christ--through the Catholic Church!

On December 9, 1979, popular Catholic Archbishop Fulton Sheen died. Sheen upheld Rome's heretical dogmas and was a staunch enemy of the New Testament faith. When questioned about Sheen's death, Graham called it "a great loss to the nation and both the Catholic and Protestant churches. He broke down walls of prejudice between Catholics and Protestants ... I count it a privilege to have known him as a friend for over 35 years. I mourn his death and look forward to our reunion in heaven" (Religious News Service, Dec. 11, 1979).

As noted earlier, Sheen's hope was in Mary, not in Christ's completed atonement. Unless he repented and turned to Christ on his deathbed, we have no biblical cause to believe that Fulton Sheen is in heaven.

1980

In an interview that appeared in the January-February 1980 issue of *The Saturday Evening Post*, Graham made the following comments about the Catholic Pope:

"Since his election, Pope John Paul II has emerged as the greatest religious leader of the modern world, and one of the greatest moral and spiritual leaders of this century. ... The Pope came [to America] as a statesman and a pastor, but I believe he also sees himself coming as an evangelist, forthrightly urging those who have perhaps given little thought to spiritual matters to realize the truth of the Christian message and commit

their lives to Christ. ... THE POPE SOUGHT TO SPEAK TO THE SPIRITUAL HUNGER OF OUR AGE IN THE SAME WAY CHRISTIANS THROUGHOUT THE CENTURIES HAVE SPOKEN TO THE SPIRITUAL YEARNINGS OF EVERY AGE—BY POINTING PEOPLE TO CHRIST. ... Also, in countless ways many evangelical Protestants and Roman Catholics are discovering they share a common bond through their mutual commitment to the Christian faith. ...

“Recently I learned that the word ‘pontiff,’ (a title by which the Pope is often known) comes from the Latin words which originally meant ‘bridge builder.’ During his visit to America, POPE JOHN PAUL II WAS INDEED A BRIDGE BUILDER, AND THAT IS SOMETHING OUR DIVIDED WORLD DESPERATELY NEEDS. In a world which often seems to have lost its way, his voice will continue to remind us of our responsibilities to each other—and to God” (Billy Graham, “The Pilgrim Pope: A Builder of Bridges,” *The Saturday Evening Post*, Jan.-Feb. 1980).

Pope John Paul II did not preach Christ only. He did not preach Christ in any biblical sense; he preached Christ plus the Church of Rome.

As for the word “pontiff,” it refers to the papal title of Pontifex Maximus, which was used by the high priests of ancient heathen religion in the Roman Empire and was adopted by the early popes (*Webster’s Deluxe Unabridged Dictionary*, second edition, 1979).

The word “pontiff” in Latin and Italian means “bridge.” On the maps of Rome that I have purchased on visits there, the word “pontiff” is used for the bridges over the river Tiber. The term “pontiff” points to the Pope’s blasphemous claim to be a bridge between man and God.

“The title of Supreme Pontiff was reserved in ancient Rome to the emperor, who as head of the principal college of priests in Rome was seen as the bridge or bridge-builder between men and the gods. The title was

given to the Pope by Gratian in A.D. 375..." (*Our Sunday Visitor's Catholic Encyclopedia*, p. 758).

1981

On January 13, 1981, Graham had his first audience with a Roman Catholic Pope. Graham gave the following account of this historic meeting:

"I spent about a half-hour with the Pope in very private, intimate conversation. He was extremely warm and interested in our work. We discussed the Christian faith, both our agreements and some of our differences. When I was at the Vatican, I spoke at a vesper service at the North American College, which is a seminary for students from North America. I understand I was the first Protestant to speak there. It was a very inspirational and Christocentric service, with much contemporary music" (*Christianity Today*, July 17, 1981).

Graham gave the Pope a wooden carving of a shepherd with his sheep, thus symbolically fortifying the false papal claim to be the shepherd of all Christians.

In July 1981, Graham's Lausanne Committee for World Evangelization held a four-day American Festival of Evangelism in Kansas City, Missouri. Wilson Ewin published the following report on the ecumenical aspects of that meeting:

"Any doubts regarding the Committee's true attitude toward Roman Catholicism and the needs of its people were dispelled by facts emanating from this 1981 Missouri Festival. INSTEAD OF PRESENTING THE NEED OF ROMAN CATHOLICS FOR EVANGELISM AND HOW TO DO THIS, THE MEETINGS STRESSED UNITY AND COOPERATION WITH ROMAN CATHOLICISM. The festival emphasized that Lausanne Committee participants no longer believe in the evangelism of Roman Catholics. Instead, they believe in Roman Catholicism's own evangelization to

produce Roman Catholics for the strengthening of the papacy. This was shown through the fact that several Roman Catholic workshops were included in the Festival. EVANGELICALS WERE SHOWN HOW TO BECOME AND HOW TO MAKE GOOD ROMAN CATHOLICS.

“... the Lausanne Committee’s American Festival placed a stamp of absolute acceptance upon authentic, medieval and historic Roman Catholicism. By association and official participation in the Kansas City Festival, 150 RELIGIOUS DENOMINATIONS AND ORGANIZATIONS HAVE PROCLAIMED THEIR WILLINGNESS TO COOPERATE WITH AND ACCEPT ROMAN CATHOLICISM” (Wilson Ewin, *Charismatic Control*).

1982

Graham prepared for the spring 1982 New England campaign in heavily Catholic territory with a visit to Boston’s Cardinal Medeiros. The cardinal called the March meeting “a discussion of mutual interest and concerns.” This was followed by a strategy consultation on May 25. The cardinal said, “I was delighted to receive Dr. Graham and a few of his colleagues into my home for dinner” (*The Pilot*, May 28, 1982). Reporting on this, Priest Conley, Coordinator of Communications for the Archdiocese, stated:

“The Crusade’s purpose is not proselytizing—or sheep stealing ... 100 PRIESTS, RELIGIOUS AND LAITY ARE BEING TRAINED TO FACILITATE THE FULL RECONCILIATION TO THE CHURCH [OF ROME] OF THOSE MEN AND WOMEN WHO WILL HAVE BEEN MOVED BY DR. GRAHAM’S PREACHING” (*The Pilot*, May 11, 1982).

Wilson Ewin reported,

“Each step of the campaign saw the evangelist engaged in consultation with the bishop of the individual state.

Following the crusade, meetings took place between the Graham Association and Catholic clergy. PEOPLE WHO CAME FORWARD DURING THE CAMPAIGN WERE THEN TRANSFERRED BACK TO THE CATHOLIC CHURCH. One such occasion took place at Pope John XXIII Seminary in Weston, Mass. on the evening of June 9, 1982. OVER 2,100 INQUIRIES WERE GIVEN TO PRIESTS AND NUNS” (Wilson Ewin, *Evangelism: The Trojan Horse of the 1990s*).

When Graham made a six-day trip to the Soviet Union in May 1982, he admitted that he had sought advice of Vatican officials on the most effective approach in dealing with the Soviets during his trip (*Arkansas Democrat*, May 24, 1982).

In August 1982, Graham held a crusade in Spokane, Washington. The September 2, 1983, issue of *The Florida Catholic* noted the large Catholic response: “When the time came [the altar call], more than 1,700 Catholics REDEDICATED themselves. And in Milwaukee, where the archbishop also allowed Catholic participation, more than 4,000 Catholics responded.”

All of these people were turned over to Catholic parishes.

1983

In Graham’s 1983 crusade in Orlando, Florida, more than 600 names of those who came forward during the altar call were given to Roman Catholic churches for follow-up. This was reported in *The Florida Catholic*, a publication of the Roman Catholic Church. I have this periodical before me as I write:

“About 180,000 persons attended the Crusade and some 600 of the Catholics who attended went forward for Dr. Graham’s altar call and were counseled about their commitment to the Lord. ... Although the Orlando diocese was not a sponsor of the eight-day event, some 150 Catholic people and educators rallied to an April 20 meeting at St. James Cathedral offering their services in

the follow-up. NAMES OF CATHOLICS WHO HAD MADE DECISIONS FOR CHRIST WERE PROVIDED AT THAT MEETING BY RICK MARSHALL OF THE GRAHAM ORGANIZATION” (*The Florida Catholic*, Sept. 2, 1982).

In 1983, Graham held his first meeting for itinerant evangelists in Amsterdam. It was thoroughly ecumenical. Speaking at this meeting, Graham noted: “Those who came here were from over thirty religious denominations, including Reformed, Baptist, Methodist, Anglican, Lutheran, Orthodox, Pentecostal, and many other groups, including the Vatican and a very high level delegation from the Orthodox Churches of the Soviet Union, including two Metropolitans” (*Foundation*, Vol. IV, Iss. IV, 1983).

It was in 1983 that Graham counseled American President Ronald Reagan to pursue formal diplomatic ties with the Vatican. The following account is from *The New Neutralism II: Exposing the Gray of Compromise* by John Ashbrook:

“A spokesman for Billy Graham confirms that the evangelist played a behind-the-scenes role in President Reagan’s decision to establish formal diplomatic relations with the Vatican, a newspaper reported yesterday.

“Early in 1983, Graham was asked by the president and adviser William Clark to make informal, private inquiries among evangelical Protestant leaders about likely response to such an action, said Donald Baily, media director for the Billy Graham Evangelistic Association in Minneapolis.

“A copy of the seven-page letter that the Baptist evangelist sent to Clark was obtained by the Chicago Sun-Times, which quoted Graham as saying, ‘If anyone can do it and get away with it, it is Mr. Reagan’” (“Graham’s Help on Vatican Ties,” Associated Press, *Lake County News Herald*, Feb. 9, 1984, quoted from Ashbrook, *The New Neutralism II*).

1984

October 14-21, 1984, found Graham conducting a crusade in Vancouver, British Columbia. David Cline of Bringhouse United Church, a vice-chairman of the organizing committee of the Graham Crusade, stated the policy regarding Catholic inquirers:

“IF CATHOLICS STEP FORWARD THERE WILL BE NO ATTEMPT TO CONVERT THEM AND THEIR NAMES WILL BE GIVEN TO THE CATHOLIC CHURCH NEAREST THEIR HOMES” (*The Sun*, Vancouver, B.C., October 5, 1984).

Catholic Archbishop James Carney asked his priests and congregations to offer prayers for Graham’s ministry in Vancouver (*The Sun*, October 9, 1984).

Billy Graham came to Vancouver less than a month after Pope John Paul II’s visit; thus, he had a wonderful opportunity to expose the Pope’s false gospel. Instead, Graham endorsed him. Graham reported that during his trip to Russia he had been awakened early one morning by his son, Franklin, to hear the Pope’s message given at Vancouver. Billy Graham was quoted as saying: “I’ll tell you--THAT WAS JUST ABOUT AS STRAIGHT AN EVANGELICAL ADDRESS AS I’VE EVER HEARD. It was tremendous. Of course, I’m a great admirer of his. He gives moral guidance in a world that seems to have lost its way” (*Foundation* magazine, Vol. V, Issue 5, 1984).

In 1983, Pastor Randal Gilmore wrote to the Graham organization and received the following answers to questions in regard to a showing of Graham film *The Prodigal* in his town:

Q. What do you intend to do with unchurched people who make a decision?

A. We will refer them back to the local committee. They in turn will refer them to a Bible-teaching church. They,

of course, will not be referred to a church like the 'Church of Scientology.'

Q. What about Roman Catholics who get saved? What will you do then?

A. We will tell the Father [the Catholic priest].

Q. Will you direct them into another church?

A. DEFINITELY NOT!

Q. You mentioned the 'Church of Scientology' as an example of a church that does not teach the Bible. Do you consider the Roman Catholic Church to be a Bible-teaching church?

A. Our philosophy is this: A new believer is like a live chick, and a live chick will not go to a dead hen.

Q. Are you trying to say your organization believes the Roman Catholic Church is a dead hen?

A. NOT AT ALL. A DEAD HEN COULD BE A FUNDAMENTAL CHURCH THAT TEACHES YOU HAVE TO WEAR YOUR HAIR A CERTAIN LENGTH. THAT'S WORKS SALVATION (*Baptist Bulletin*, June 1984).

Ecumenists are tolerant and non-judgmental toward almost everyone and everything except the dreaded "fundamentalist." The Graham organization has long called good evil and evil good. The Roman Catholic Church, which teaches a works salvation (under the guise of "grace"), is considered a safe place to send a new Christian. On the other hand, a fundamentalist church, which teaches that salvation is solely by the grace of Christ through faith, is considered dangerous because it preaches that believers, once saved by grace, are under obligation to obey God's Word (including 1 Corinthians 11), not in order to be saved but because we are saved (Ephesians 2:8-10)!

In May 1984, Graham pointed to Mother Teresa as a role model for American youth (*Calvary Contender*, Nov. 15,

1985), and did not have one word of warning about her false gospel.

1985

Graham preached in Protestant, Roman Catholic, and Orthodox churches in Romania on September 7-17, 1985.

After leaving Romania, Graham preached in Hungary. *Christianity Today*, Nov. 22, 1985, reported that Roman Catholic and Protestant church leaders sat on the platform with Graham. In Budapest, Cardinal Laszlo Lekai, primate of the Roman Catholic Church, was seated on the platform. In Pecs, Catholic Bishop Jozsef Cserhati co-hosted Graham and introduced him to the crowd. Weeks earlier, Cserhati had sent letters to be read in all the Catholic churches in the area, urging parishioners to attend the Graham rally. Catholic and Protestant clergy worked together, and both Catholic and Protestant choirs sang at the meeting. Graham's visit was sponsored jointly by the Baptist Union and an alliance that included Seventh-day Adventists, Pentecostals, and Methodists. The meetings were said to be the most ecumenical ones ever held in Hungary (*National Christian Council Review*, National Christian Council of India, May 1986).

It was also in 1985 that the Paulist National Catholic Evangelization Association and Tyndale House Publishers jointly issued a book containing a chapter by Billy Graham. The book, *What Christians Can Learn from One Another about Evangelizing Adults*, called for greater cooperation between Protestants and Catholics in so-called evangelism, and included articles by Cardinal Joseph Cardinal Bernardin, Robert Schuller, Bill Bright, Jack Wyrzten, and others.

1987

In his 1987 Denver crusade, Graham had the full backing of the regional Catholic hierarchy, trained dozens of Catholics as "counselors," and sent the names of hundreds of

those who had responded to the altar calls each night to local Catholic churches.

Before his sudden death in March of that year, Roman Catholic Archbishop James V. Casey of Denver pledged cooperation with the crusade and said Catholics were “free to take part in it.” He said, “My concern is that when you make a commitment to Christ, especially when you are an adult, you need support from the Christian community. Of course, I want people to be able to find that support among the believers in our Catholic community” (*Moody Monthly*, May 1986).

Roman Catholic prelates need have no fear from the Graham organization in that regard.

A Catholic nun, Macrina Scott, director of the Catholic Biblical School in Denver, “says she trained about 80 counselors and Bible teachers to assist Billy Graham’s Rocky Mountain Crusade” (*Christian Beacon*, July, 1987).

Further, a Catholic priest, Donald Willette of St. Jude’s Roman Catholic Church, was a supervisor of the trained counselors. Thus Catholic support for Graham’s Denver crusade was significant and the resulting dividends were handsome. Willette reported that from one service alone 500 cards of individuals were referred to St. Thomas More Roman Catholic Church in Englewood, a suburb of Denver (Wilson Ewin, *Evangelism: The Trojan Horse of the 1990’s*).

What did the Catholic churches do with the hundreds of people who were referred to them? According to the July 25, 1987, issue of Denver’s largest daily newspaper, the *Rocky Mountain News*, “Catholics were waiting to help Catholics express their new and renewed faith in their mother church.”

Catholic leaders have learned that they have nothing to fear from the Graham crusades. They use the crusades to revive non-practicing Catholics and even to gain proselytes to Romanism just because they were invited to a Graham crusade by a Catholic. Graham’s call to “receive Christ,” or “make the step of faith,” or “come to Christ tonight,” is vague

enough to allow Catholic leaders to insert their sacramental gospel, and the fact that Graham worked with Catholic churches and never sounded any clear warnings about Romanism, gave people the idea that he accepted their theology.

Catholic priests simply teach the inquirers that they are born again at baptism and renewed in Christ through all sorts of religious activities--the mass, the other sacraments, family duties, the rosary, even coming forward at evangelistic rallies. Salvation, by Roman Catholic definition, is a process, not a one-time event.

Consider another report from the 1987 Denver Crusade:

“The 5,000-member Rocky Mountain Billy Graham Crusade choir softly sang the evangelical classic ‘Just As I Am’ as a counselor called for help from the Rev. Donald Willette. Hundreds streamed forward Monday in response to Graham’s call to become Christians or to rededicate their lives to the faith. One Roman Catholic worshiper walked the aisle but had trouble expressing his feelings. [Catholic priest] Willette, a supervisor among the 6,600 trained crusade counselors, was standing about 30 yards from the evangelist’s pulpit, waiting to help out in just this situation. ‘Catholics have trouble with the expression “Born again,”’ Willette said, moments before the Tuesday service. ‘I TRY TO HELP PEOPLE UNDERSTAND WHAT THIS EXPERIENCE MEANS, IN LIGHT OF THE TEACHING OF THE CHURCH’” (“Counselors Help Brethren Heed Graham Call,” *Rocky Mountain News*, July 25, 1987).

According to this and other reports that could be cited, Graham allows Roman Catholic laymen and priests to stand before his pulpit and to reinterpret what he has preached “in light of the teaching of the church,” meaning the Catholic Church. He then sends their names to the Catholic Church for “follow-up.” What could be more foolish and wicked?

The Catholic churches reap immense benefits, not only because their membership is enlarged by those who return to the Roman fold but by the increased acceptance they gain in the eyes of the community through Graham's endorsement.

1988

In August 1988, the Billy Graham Evangelistic Association co-sponsored A National Festival of Evangelism called Congress 88 in Chicago. The congress was cosponsored by the Catholic Archdiocese of Chicago, and Joseph Cardinal Bernardin, Catholic Archbishop of Chicago, was a plenary speaker.

The Congress 88 Committee refused an application by the Bible Baptist Church of Nashua, New Hampshire, to display books and literature for the evangelism of Roman Catholics. Their letter stated:

“In view of the fact that Congress ‘88 is supported by both Protestant denominations and the National Catholic Evangelization Association, it would be inconsistent with our goals to single out one of our supporting groups to be a target for evangelism. Since we are working together with Roman Catholics who believe in evangelism, we do not feel that we can grant your request to exhibit at Congress ‘88” (Wilson Ewin, *Evangelism: The Trojan Horse of the 1990's*).

This is the evil fruit of Billy Graham's ecumenical practices.

The November 18, 1988, issue of *Christianity Today* featured articles praising Graham on the occasion of his 70th birthday. Kenneth Kantzer observed, “And today Roman Catholics usually make up the largest single denominational group attending his citywide crusades.”

Martin Marty, a theological modernist in the Evangelical Lutheran Church of America, said:

“Graham would refuse to come to your town unless there was broad church federation backing. He would

not like to be on stage unless the United Methodist bishop or even, he has hoped since 1965, the Catholic bishop was there” (Marty, *Christianity Today*, November 18, 1988).

1989

In 1989 Graham went to London for his Mission '89 Crusade. British Catholic Cardinal Basil Hume made the following statement:

“We are, as the Catholic Church in this country, working as closely as we can with Billy Graham in his Mission '89 ... The view I take is that I believe the grace of God is at work in the Mission and, if it helps people return to their own churches, then that is good” (*Foundation*, Nov.-Dec. 1989).

Michael Seed, Ecumenical Advisor to Cardinal Hume, wrote about recruiting Catholics to take part in the Billy Graham Group Leaders Training Courses:

“The idea behind this is that those who come forward for counseling during a Mission evening in June, IF THEY ARE ROMAN CATHOLIC, WILL BE DIRECTED TO A ROMAN CATHOLIC ‘NURTURE-GROUP’ UNDER ROMAN CATHOLIC COUNSELORS IN THEIR HOME AREA. If certain people present themselves for counseling at a Mission and have no church roots at all then they are asked ‘which church brought you’ and are asked to contact that church. ...

“The Cardinal has already sent greetings to Dr. Graham and will be meeting Dr. Graham before the Mission. We know Dr. Graham to be a truly ecumenical evangelist.”

In July 1989, Seed wrote the following:

“Dr. Graham called on Cardinal Hume the day before his Mission on June 13th and the Cardinal attended with myself the Mission at Earls Court on Monday, June

26th. SOME 2100 CATHOLICS ‘WENT FORWARD’ AT MISSIONS EVENINGS IN LONDON WHICH WAS EXCELLENT--FROM NEARLY ALL OUR PARISHES IN WESTMINSTER. ... BILLY GRAHAM HAS HELPED OUR CHURCH GREATLY and many have ‘renewed’ their faith under his great ministry” (John Ashbrook, *The New Neutralism II*).

Roman Catholic singer Dana appeared with Graham at London’s Wembley Stadium (*Seattle Post-Intelligencer*, Jul. 10, 1989).

When Graham held a crusade in Little Rock, Arkansas, in September 1989, the Roman Catholic Archbishop fully cooperated, trained personal workers, and expected at least 600 referrals to the Catholic Church (*Baptist Challenge*, Aug. 1989).

1990

Graham spent January 8-13, 1990, in Rome meeting with a number of Vatican officials. He had a private audience with Pope John Paul II.

“Reporting on this the Boston Archdiocese stated that ‘Dr. Graham said it is particularly evident in the Pope’s speeches that his attitudes and decisions are based on his great personal spiritual life ... He bases His work and messages and vision on biblical principles.’ A Religious News Service photograph showed Graham presenting the Pope with a handmade quilt from a place near his home in North Carolina. Using the phrase ‘bridge builder’ from his close friend, Cardinal Cushing, Graham referred to Pope John Paul II as ‘indeed a bridge builder, and that is something our divided world desperately needs’” (Wilson Ewin, *The Assimilation of Evangelist Billy Graham*).

This was Graham’s second audience with a Roman pontiff.

In April 1990, Graham held a crusade in Albany, New York. The following is the description that appeared in a Catholic publication:

“About 20,000 persons are busy making ready for Billy Graham’s 1990 Capitol District Crusade, including representatives from 18 Protestant denominations in the area and A DELEGATION OF TOP CATHOLIC OFFICIALS APPOINTED BY BISHOP HOWARD J. HUBBARD.

“THE GRAHAM CRUSADE, scheduled for April 22-29 at the Knickerbocker Arena in Albany, COMES IN RESPONSE TO A REQUEST MADE BY BISHOP HUBBARD AND OTHER RELIGIOUS LEADERS, who three years ago formally invited the world renowned evangelist to preach here. ‘THERE ARE NINE CATHOLICS ON THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE SET UP TO DIRECT THE CRUSADE. ... Diocesan officials view the Graham Crusade as a tool for evangelization,’ explained an executive committee member, Rev. James Kane, director of the diocesan ecumenical commission. ...

“As for the specific dogmatic content of Mr. Graham’s sermons, Father Kane said, ‘THERE IS NOTHING THAT THE CATHOLIC SHOULD FEEL UNCOMFORTABLE WITH OR BE LEERY OF’ ... ‘However,’ he added, ‘we would, of course, emphasize the importance of the Eucharist and the Mass, the sacraments, and the importance of the structure and organization of the Church and its bishops and the Pope’” (*The Evangelist*, Roman Catholic Diocese paper of Albany, New York, cited in *Foundation* magazine, Jan.-Feb. 1990).

Evangelist Wilson Ewin’s prayer letter for July 6, 1992, reported the following regarding Graham’s June 1990 crusade in Quebec:

“Rick Marshall, mission director and a member of the Minneapolis-based staff, said in an interview, ‘IT IS BEING MADE CLEAR TO ALL STAFF AND VOLUNTEERS THERE IS TO BE NO PROSELYTIZING’ (*The Gazette*, Montreal, Mar. 17, 1990).

1991

Two Roman Catholic churches (Sacred Heart and St. Ann’s in Rochelle Park and Garwood) hosted counselor training sessions for the September 1991 Northern New Jersey Billy Graham Crusade (*The BDM Letter*, Dec. 1993, Biblical Discernment Ministries).

From September 22-29, 1991, the Billy Graham Evangelistic Association held a crusade in St. Louis, Missouri, co-sponsored by the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of St. Louis. Graham associate Ralph Bell was the speaker. Priest Vincent A. Heier, director of the Archdiocesan Office for Ecumenical and Interreligious Affairs and a member of the crusade executive committee, “stressed that although the effort is ecumenical, PEOPLE WHO ATTEND THE CRUSADE AND ARE INTERESTED IN THE CATHOLIC FAITH WILL BE DIRECTED TO CATHOLICS. ‘Billy Graham has always been very ecumenical ... Billy Graham has not necessarily pushed people into one denomination or another but he’s tried to encourage whatever denominations that want to cooperate’” (*Australian Beacon*, May 1991).

In a letter encouraging the priests to attend training seminars, Catholic Archbishop John May said: “Catholics will be needed to receive those who approach seeking out information on the Catholic Church during the actual crusade” (*Australian Beacon*, May 1991).

Graham’s own Central Park Rally in New York City, September 23, 1991, was endorsed by Catholic Cardinal John O’Connor who said “the Billy Graham organization has asked our help in providing people to counsel and to welcome back

those who wish to practice their Catholic faith” (Christian News, Sept. 2, 1991). “A Seventh-day Adventist ‘jazz/gospel group’ performed” (*Calvary Contender*, Oct. 1, 1991). “Graham thanked O’Connor and the area archbishops for their support and also expressed appreciation to the Jewish rabbis in New York City. When extending the invitation at the close of his message, Graham invited individuals to ‘come back to the Lord’ by ‘renewing’ their ‘vows of baptism or confirmation’ (*The Fundamentalist Digest*, March-April 1992).

The *Detroit Free Press* for September 29, 1991, quoted Graham as saying, “THE ROMAN CATHOLICS KNOW THAT I’M NOT AGAINST THEM, and in my thinking, rightly or wrongly, I represent all the churches.”

1992

In April 1992, Graham paid a five-day visit to Communist North Korea under the auspices of the government-controlled Korean Christian Federation and the Korean Catholic Association and preached in a Protestant church and a Catholic one. “He delivered a message from the Pope to communist President Kim, and Kim entrusted him with a return message for the Pope (*Christianity Today*, May 18, 1992).

Regarding the Graham crusade in Philadelphia in June 1992, Cardinal Anthony J. Bevilacqua, archbishop of Philadelphia, sent out a letter with the following comments:

“As Catholics, in union with our Holy Father, the Pope, we are completely committed to our Church’s ecumenical work. ... THE ARCHDIOCESE ... HAS DEVELOPED AN UNDERSTANDING WITH THE GREATER PHILADELPHIA BILLY GRAHAM CRUSADE THAT IS FULLY IN ACCORD WITH CATHOLIC ECUMENICAL PRINCIPLES.”

According to the *Philadelphia Inquirer*, the archdiocese sent forty trained counselors for the Crusade. After each crusade session, Catholics coming forward were linked up with Catholic counselors and referred to the Catholic Church (*Calvary Contender*, Jul. 1, 1992).

For the Graham crusade in Portland, Oregon, September 1992, Roman Catholic churches set a goal to supply 6,000 of the 10,000 counselors expected to attend the training classes. "Those who respond to the altar call will be directed to Catholic parishes" (*Catholic Sentinel*, April 24, 1992, cited in *Christians Evangelizing Catholics*, June 1992).

1993

In March 1993, Billy Graham traveled to the Vatican and met with Pope John II for the third time. Graham said, "I'm always impressed by the Pope's warmth and friendship." He said the Pope showed a special interest in his crusade in Essen, Germany, "and well he should, given the number of converts Graham crusades refer Romeward" (*Calvary Contender*, April 15, 1993).

Graham's June 1993 crusade in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, brought together 1,050 churches representing 65 denominations. The crusade chairman was Episcopalian Fred Fetterolf, and there were six Roman Catholics on the executive committee.

1994

Graham's June 1994 crusade in Cleveland, Ohio, featured an alliance between Catholic and Protestant churches and secular rock stations, two of which were co-sponsors of the crusade (*Calvary Contender*, Sept. 15, 1994). Of the 1,005 churches that participated, more than 100 were Roman Catholic, which was a 60% representation of the Catholic churches in the area. Catholic Bishop Pilla conducted a Mass at St. John's Cathedral "to welcome back the fallen-away and the freshly recruited from the Graham Crusade."

In December 1994, Graham praised Pope John Paul II in an interview with *Time* magazine: “He’ll go down in history as the greatest of our modern Popes. He’s been the strong conscience of the whole Christian world” (Paul Gray, “Empire of the Spirit,” *Time*, Dec. 26, 1994, p. 54).

1995

Graham’s October 1995 crusade in Sacramento, California, brought together 38 Catholic parishes and 303 Protestant churches. The Catholic parishes provided many of the counselors. The Catholics in attendance were no doubt impressed when on the opening night Graham paid tribute to Pope John Paul II, saying, “Thank God that he has the voice to speak out courageously on the moral issues of our day” (*Christianity Today*, Dec. 11, 1995).

Since Graham gave his listeners the idea that the Pope is a dependable religious leader, the Roman Catholics in the crowd had no reason to suspect that the Pope had taught them a false way of salvation or that he headed up a false “church.”

1996

Graham’s June 1996 crusade in Minneapolis-St. Paul, brought the participation of 119 Catholic parishes and 269 Lutheran congregations (*Christianity Today*, July 15, 1996).

This is a dramatic change from the 1973 Minneapolis crusade, when no Catholic churches and only a few Lutheran ones participated. Archbishop Harry Flynn, head of the Catholic archdiocese of St. Paul and Minneapolis, urged priests to get involved in the crusade “in an effort to reach alienated Catholics” (Morphew Clark, *St. Paul Pioneer Press*, Jan. 13, 1996). Priest Robert Schwartz of the St. John Neumann Catholic parish told reporters that about 60 members of his parish had been trained to counsel those that came forward during the crusade. Some of the training sessions, both for Protestant and Catholic counselors, were

held at his parish. He said that some [non-Catholics] were apprehensive when they first arrived, but the ecumenical activity broke down those apprehensions: “They have to tell me how strange it is to be in a Catholic church and how hard it was to come inside. The good thing is they are there, sitting there in a Catholic church” (*St. Paul Pioneer Press*, May 12, 1996).

He further said: “I haven’t heard anything I would disagree with, but there are some things I would add, such as a social justice component, the Eucharist and liturgy, the importance of sacraments—those kinds of things.”

In other words, he would add works and sacraments to the gospel of the grace of Christ, thus corrupting it.

Why didn’t Billy Graham care that the churches to which he sent his converts preach a false gospel and thus pervert the minds and hearts of his “converts”?

Former Minnesota governor Al Quie, who was the chairman for the Minneapolis crusade, said Catholics had been “very involved in recent crusades in Miami, Cleveland and other cities” (“Crusade Schedule,” *St. Paul Pioneer Press*, June 17, 1996).

Graham’s 1996 Carolinas Crusade involved “Jewish, Catholic, Protestant and other denominations on the committee” (Graeme Keith, crusade chairman, *Charlotte Observer*, March 1, 1996).

1997

In a January 1997 interview with Larry King, Graham said that he has wonderful fellowship with Rome, is comfortable with the Vatican, and agrees with the Pope on almost everything.

KING: What do you think of the other [churches] ... like Mormonism? Catholicism? Other faiths within the Christian concept?

GRAHAM: Oh, I think I have a wonderful fellowship with all of them. For example ...

KING: You're comfortable with Salt Lake City. You're comfortable with the Vatican?

GRAHAM: I am very comfortable with the Vatican. I have been to see the Pope several times. In fact, the night--the day that he was inaugurated, made Pope, I was preaching in his cathedral in Krakow. I was his guest ... [and] when he was over here ... in Columbia, South Carolina ... he invited me on the platform to speak with him. I would give one talk, and he would give the other ... but I was two-thirds of the way to China...

KING: You like this Pope?

GRAHAM: I like him very much. ... He and I agree on almost everything.

The March-April 1997 issue of *Promise Keepers New Man* magazine contained an interview with Graham. (This magazine later stopped officially representing *Promise Keepers*, but it did at that time.) Following is Graham's statement on Catholicism:

"Early on in my life, I didn't know much about Catholics. But through the years I have made many friends within the Roman Catholic Church. In fact, WHEN WE HOLD A CRUSADE IN A CITY NOW, NEARLY ALL THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCHES SUPPORT IT. And when we went to Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn., for the crusade [last year], we saw St. Paul, which is largely Catholic, and Minneapolis, which is largely Lutheran, both supporting the crusade. That wouldn't have happened 25 years ago" ("Billy Graham in His Own Words: What the Evangelist Has Learned from a Lifetime of Ministry to the World," *New Man*, March-April 1997, pp. 32, 33).

In a May 30, 1997, interview with David Frost Graham said:

“I feel I belong to all the churches. I’M EQUALLY AT HOME IN AN ANGLICAN OR BAPTIST OR A BRETHREN ASSEMBLY OR A ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH. ... TODAY WE HAVE ALMOST 100 PERCENT CATHOLIC SUPPORT IN THIS COUNTRY. That was not true twenty years ago. And the bishops and archbishops and the Pope are our friends” (David Frost, *Billy Graham in Conversation*, pp. 68, 143).

Obviously, Graham did not think Rome’s doctrinal heresies are a serious problem. He did not get such an attitude from the Bible, though. When the apostle Paul wrote to the preacher Timothy, he instructed him not to allow ANY OTHER DOCTRINE (1 Tim. 1:3). In contrast to this, Rome has added to and corrupted many apostolic doctrines. Timothy was warned about false teachers by name and was told that false teaching is wrong and dangerous and must be avoided.

“But shun profane and vain babblings: for they will increase unto more ungodliness. And their word will eat as doth a canker: of whom is Hymenaeus and Philetus; who concerning the truth have erred, saying that the resurrection is past already; and overthrow the faith of some” (2 Tim. 2:16-18).

That same month Graham went even farther out on a limb in his interview with self-esteem guru Robert Schuller:

SCHULLER: Tell me, what do you think is the future of Christianity?

GRAHAM: Well, Christianity--and being a true believer, you know -- I think there’s the Body of Christ. This comes from all the Christian groups around the world, outside the Christian groups. I think everybody that loves Christ, or knows Christ, whether they’re

conscious of it or not, they're members of the Body of Christ. And I don't think that we're going to see a great sweeping revival that will turn the whole world to Christ at any time. I think James answered that, the Apostle James in the first council in Jerusalem, when he said that God's purpose for this age is to call out a people for His name. And that's what God is doing today; He's calling people out of the world for His name, WHETHER THEY COME FROM THE MUSLIM WORLD, OR THE BUDDHIST WORLD, OR THE CHRISTIAN WORLD OR THE NON-BELIEVING WORLD, THEY ARE MEMBERS OF THE BODY OF CHRIST BECAUSE THEY'VE BEEN CALLED BY GOD. THEY MAY NOT EVEN KNOW THE NAME OF JESUS but they know in their hearts that they need something that they don't have, and they turn to the only light that they have, AND I THINK THAT THEY ARE SAVED, and that they're going to be with us in heaven.

SCHULLER: What, what I hear you saying that it's possible for Jesus Christ to come into human hearts and soul and life, even if they've been born in darkness and have never had exposure to the Bible. Is that a correct interpretation of what you're saying?

GRAHAM: Yes, it is, because I believe that. I've met people in various parts of the world in tribal situations, that THEY HAVE NEVER SEEN A BIBLE OR HEARD ABOUT A BIBLE, AND NEVER HEARD OF JESUS, BUT THEY'VE BELIEVED IN THEIR HEARTS THAT THERE WAS A GOD, and they've tried to live a life that was quite apart from the surrounding community in which they lived.

SCHULLER: [trips over his tongue for a moment, his face beaming, then says] I, I'm so thrilled to hear you say this. There's a wideness in God's mercy.

GRAHAM: There is. There definitely is.

The previous part of Schuller's interview with Graham was broadcast in southern California on Saturday, May

31, 1997. The second part of the interview was shown on June 8, 1997, and the following is an excerpt:

SCHULLER: You knew ... Fulton Sheen. You knew these men. Your comments on both of these men [Fulton Sheen and Norman V. Peale].

GRAHAM: The primary way of communicating is to live the life, let people see that you're living what you proclaim.... [comments on his friendship and conversations with Fulton Sheen] I lost a very dear friend, and since that time, the whole relationship between me and my work, and you and your work, and the Roman Catholic Church has changed. They open their arms to welcome us and we have the support of the Catholic Church almost everywhere we go. And I think that we must come to the place where we keep our eyes on Jesus Christ, not on what denomination or what church or what group we belong to.

Roman Catholic parishes, joining 49 Protestant denominations, played an important role in Graham's June 1997 crusade in San Antonio, Texas. Graham praised the cooperation of Hispanics and Catholics, including an early endorsement from Archbishop Patrick Flores, the top Catholic official in Texas. "Flores met with Graham and taped radio spots in English and Spanish encouraging Catholics to attend the crusade to help bring them to a closer commitment to their faith" (*Christianity Today*, May 19, 1997, p. 51).

Graham said: "The devil has separated us, and a crusade like this is used of God to bring people of all denominations together" (*Calvary Contender*, June 1, 1997).

Scripturally speaking, Graham should have said: "God has separated Bible-believing Christians from false systems such as Roman Catholicism and liberal Protestantism, and a crusade like this is used of the devil to bring people of all denominations together."

The *Houston Chronicle* noted that the Roman Catholic Church participated in every aspect of the Graham crusade: “As a Christian leader, Billy Graham has earned a respect that so transcends theological differences that Baptists, Catholics and Presbyterians come together for planning, meetings and training sessions months in advance to prepare for a Graham crusade” (*Houston Chronicle*, March 30, 1997).

When Mother Teresa died in September 1997, Graham called her a saint. He ignored the fact that she worshipped the wafer of the Catholic mass as Jesus Christ by her own testimony, believed that Rome’s sacraments are necessary for salvation, and taught her Hindu patients merely to pray to their pagan gods in preparation for death. (See *Was Mother Teresa a True Christian?*, a free eBook at the Way of Life web site, www.wayoflife.org.)

“It was my privilege to be with her on several occasions. The first time was at the Home of Dying Destitutes in Calcutta. I had a wonderful hour of fellowship in the Lord with her just at sunset, and I will never forget the sounds, the smells and the strange beauty of that place. When she walked into the room to greet me, I felt that I was, indeed, meeting a saint” (Graham, cited by David Briggs, “Mother Teresa Hailed as Saint,” Associated Press, Sept. 6, 1997).

In his 1997 autobiography, Graham said his goal was not to lead people out of Roman Catholicism:

“MY GOAL, I ALWAYS MADE CLEAR, WAS NOT TO PREACH AGAINST CATHOLIC BELIEFS OR TO PROSELYTIZE PEOPLE who were already committed to Christ within the Catholic Church. Rather, it was to proclaim the gospel to all those who had never truly committed their lives to Christ” (Graham, *Just As I Am*, p. 357).

1998

The June 1998 Graham crusade in Ottawa, Ontario, witnessed the highest proportion of Catholic churches that had ever participated in a Graham crusade to that time. Forty-six of the 56 English-speaking parishes participated (Bob Harvey, "Billy Graham's Catholic crusaders," *Ottawa Citizen*, May 5, 1998, p. A1). Archbishop Marcel Gervais was on the platform with Graham during the meetings. Gervais said: "This will be a good, positive ecumenical experience that will convince people we can work with other churches."

Rosemary Gauthier, one of the Catholics who served on the general committee for the Graham crusade, said, "We hope a lot of Catholics will re-commit themselves and return to the church during the Mission."

Seven hundred and fifty Catholics were trained as counselors.

The Graham crusade in Albuquerque, New Mexico, was called Festival '98. *Christianity Today* reported, "The neutral university location of Festival '98 and ecumenical appeal of the Grahams [Franklin joined his father in this crusade] attracted an ethnic cross-section that churches in New Mexico struggle to achieve. The crusade also helped to break down barriers between Protestant and Catholic churches, which historically have not worked together. 'The Catholic diocese here had been very much in favour and even wrote a letter to every one of their parishes recommending that they get involved,' says festival director Herb McCarthy. 'If we're really honest, the things that divide us are small in comparison to the things we hold in common'" (*Christianity Today*, June 15, 1998).

As is typical for ecumenists, McCarthy was deeply confused about the nature of Roman Catholicism. The things that divide Bible believers from Rome are not "small." They are things such as whether salvation is by grace alone, whether the Bible is the sole authority for faith and practice, whether Jesus Christ is the sole Mediator between God and

men, whether the Pope is the head of all churches, whether there is a special priesthood operative today, and whether Mary is the Queen of Heaven. These are not small things.

1999

Graham's crusade in Indianapolis, Indiana, in June 1999 won the endorsement of Catholic Archbishop Daniel M. Buechlein, who encouraged his parishes to participate (*The Indianapolis Star*, June 3, 1999).

When Graham conducted a crusade in St. Louis, Missouri, in October 1999, he told the press that baptism is not his concern and not his business. The following is the amazing statement from a "Baptist" evangelist:

"Baptism is very important because Jesus taught that we are to believe and to be baptized. But THAT IS UP TO THE INDIVIDUAL AND THE CHURCH THAT THEY FEEL LED TO GO TO. THE CHURCHES HAVE DIFFERENT TEACHINGS ON THAT. I know that in the Lutheran or the Episcopal or Catholic Church it is a very strong point, and in the Baptist church. But there are some churches that would not insist on baptism. So, I GIVE THEM THE FREEDOM TO TEACH WHAT THEY WANT. I am not a professor. I am not a theologian. I'm a simple proclaimer. ... I'm announcing the news that God loves you and that you can be forgiven of your sins. And you can go to heaven. MY JOB FROM GOD IS NOT TO DO ALL THESE OTHER THINGS. ... I am not a pastor of a church. That's not my responsibility. MY RESPONSIBILITY IS TO PREACH THE GOSPEL TO EVERYONE AND LET THEM CHOOSE THEIR OWN CHURCH, WHETHER IT IS CATHOLIC OR PROTESTANT OR ORTHODOX OR WHATEVER IT IS" (Billy Graham interview with Patricia Rice, *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, October 10, 1999).

This is an amazing statement and shows how openly disobedient Dr. Graham was to the Bible. He pretended that

any baptism is acceptable--infant baptism, baptismal regeneration, even no baptism. Statements like this and the evidence from 50 years of his crusades speak volumes. Graham did not appear to care what happened to those who respond to his message. It wasn't his business, he said.

This is absolute nonsense. Where in the Bible did God tell Billy Graham that he was at liberty merely to preach the gospel and not to be concerned with baptism and other aspects of biblical discipleship?

This is not what Jesus Christ told the apostles as the representatives of the churches, and it is not what the apostles told the first churches. The same passages that command the gospel to be preached, command the baptism and training of believers. Consider the following passage:

“And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, BAPTIZING THEM in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: TEACHING THEM TO OBSERVE ALL THINGS whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world. Amen” (Matthew 28:18-20).

This is Christ's Great Commission. The gospel is to be preached AND believers are to be baptized AND believers are to be discipled. Billy Graham had no authority to divide the Great Commission so that he could ignore two-thirds of it.

Philip is the biblical example of a true evangelist, and Philip not only preached the gospel but he also baptized those who believed.

“But when they believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men and women” (Acts 8:12).

Furthermore, the gospel itself requires that baptism be practiced biblically. False baptisms corrupt the gospel. Graham mentioned, for example, that Catholic baptism is acceptable. The following statements from the New Catholic Catechism explain what the Roman Catholic Church believes about baptism:

“The Lord himself affirms that Baptism is necessary for salvation. ... The Church does not know of any means other than Baptism that assures entry into eternal beatitude; this is why she takes care not to neglect the mission she has received from the Lord to see that all who can be baptized are ‘reborn of water and the Spirit.’ God has bound salvation to the sacrament of Baptism...” (*New Catholic Catechism*, 1992, # 1257).

“By Baptism all sins are forgiven, original sin and all personal sins, as well as all punishment for sin” (*New Catholic Catechism*, # 1263).

“Baptism not only purifies from all sins, but also makes the neophyte ‘a new creature,’ an adopted son of God, who has become a ‘partaker of the divine nature,’ member of Christ and co-heir with him, and a temple of the Holy Spirit” (*New Catholic Catechism*, 1992, # 1265).

This is what Rome teaches about baptism. Is this what Billy Graham believed? Did he believe salvation is bound to the sacrament of baptism, that baptism purifies sin and makes the person a new creature and imparts the Holy Spirit? If Billy Graham believed what Rome teaches about baptism, he should have been honest and should have joined the Catholic Church.

On the other hand, if he didn’t believe what Rome teaches, if he believed what the Southern Baptist Convention teaches about baptism (he was an ordained Southern Baptist preacher), he should have condemned Rome’s doctrine as heresy and should have warn his converts to have nothing to do with Roman Catholicism.

Of course, that would have severely narrowed his “ministry.”

Following is what the Southern Baptist Convention teaches about baptism:

“Christian baptism is the immersion of a believer in water in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. It is an act of obedience SYMBOLIZING the believer’s faith in a crucified, buried, and risen Savior, the believer’s death to sin, the burial of the old life, and the resurrection to walk in newness of life in Christ Jesus. It is a TESTIMONY to his faith in the final resurrection of the dead” (*Baptist Faith and Message*, Southern Baptist Convention, May 1963).

There is no common ground here.

Rome teaches that baptism is a sacrament or channel or grace, and that it purifies sins and makes one a new creature in Christ.

Baptists teach that sin is purified through repentance and faith in Jesus Christ alone and that baptism merely SYMBOLIZES and TESTIFIES TO the salvation the believer has already received through faith in Christ.

Rome teaches that salvation comes from Christ to the sinner through the mediation of Rome’s sacraments.

Baptists teach that salvation comes directly from Christ to the believing sinner. Baptist churches have no sacraments or channels of grace. They have the simple ordinances of baptism and the Lord’s Supper to symbolize and memorialize the complete salvation that believers possess in Christ as soon as they are born again.

The difference between Roman Catholic doctrine and Baptist doctrine is the difference between heaven and hell. The apostle Paul said there is only one true gospel, and those who change the gospel are cursed of God. “But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed” (Galatians 1:8).

The Roman Catholic Church teaches a different gospel from the one preached by Baptists. One or the other is cursed, and the ecumenical philosophy cannot change these solemn facts.

In the St. Louis interview, Graham also said that the Catholic Jesuits who came to St. Louis centuries ago were “doing evangelism.”

“That’s the responsibility that Jesus left us, to go to all the world and proclaim the Gospel to every creature. That’s evangelism. That is what the Jesuits did when they came to St. Louis. They were doing evangelism” (Graham, interview with Patricia Rice, *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, October 10, 1999).

Again, Graham says nothing about the false sacramental, grace-works gospel the Jesuits proclaimed. What confusion! The apostles spent much of their time warning about false gospels and false christ.

“Would to God ye could bear with me a little in my folly: and indeed bear with me. For I am jealous over you with godly jealousy: for I have espoused you to one husband, that I may present you as a chaste virgin to Christ. But I fear, lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtilty, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ. For if he that cometh preacheth another Jesus, whom we have not preached, or if ye receive another spirit, which ye have not received, or another gospel, which ye have not accepted, ye might well bear with him” (2 Cor. 11:1-4).

“For such are false apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into the apostles of Christ. And no marvel; for Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light. Therefore it is no great thing if his ministers also be transformed as the ministers of righteousness; whose end shall be according to their works” (2 Cor. 11:13-15).

“I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ unto another gospel: Which is not another; but there be some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ. But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed” (Gal. 1:6-8).

“Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ” (Col. 2:8).

“Whosoever transgresseth, and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God. He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son. If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed: For he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds” (2 John 1:9-11).

“Beloved, when I gave all diligence to write unto you of the common salvation, it was needful for me to write unto you, and exhort you that ye should earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints. For there are certain men crept in unawares, who were before of old ordained to this condemnation, ungodly men, turning the grace of our God into lasciviousness, and denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ” (Jude 1:3-4).

But Billy Graham didn't warn about anything. He pretended that all who preach the “gospel” are preaching the same gospel.

In an interview with the Associated Press in December 1999, Graham said he would pick Pope John Paul II as the “man of the century.” According to Graham, this pope “has brought the greatest impact of any pope in the last 200 years.”

Graham further said: “I admire his courage, determination, intellectual abilities and his understanding of Catholic, Protestant and Orthodox differences, and the attempt at some

form of reconciliation” (Associated Press, December 17, 1999).

Sadly, Graham had no warning about the false gospel that John Paul II preached and whereby multitudes were led astray to eternal damnation, and he had no warning about the Pope’s veneration of Rome’s false Mary or any of his other heresies.

2000

Graham’s close relationship with Rome was in evidence at Amsterdam 2000, the third international conference for itinerant evangelists sponsored by the Billy Graham Evangelistic Association. (The first was held in 1983, and the second, in 1986.)

More than 10,000 delegates from 209 nations congregated from July 29 to August 6, 2000. Graham was unable to attend that year’s conference due to ill health, but there were three hundred other speakers, including Franklin Graham, Billy Kim of Korea, Ravi Zacharias, Chuck Colson, Luis Palau, Bill Bright, J.I. Packer, John Stott, and George Carey, the Archbishop of Canterbury.

The sub-theme of the conference was “unity in diversity,” emphasizing its ecumenical thrust.

Deception at Amsterdam 2000 about unity with Rome. We have seen by extensive and irrefutable documentation that Billy Graham worked closely with the Roman Catholic Church since the 1950s. At Amsterdam 2000, though, the Roman Catholic connection was kept low key because many of the evangelists from Hispanic and other Catholic-dominated countries know that Rome is a false church.

When Catholic Archbishop Adrianus Johanus of Utrecht welcomed the delegates to Amsterdam, a statement was given to those listening to the Spanish translation of the conference that Johanus’ beliefs did not represent those of Billy Graham or his Association. This warning was not given to the general audience listening in English without translation.

Thus, the conference leaders were attempting to make the Spanish-speaking evangelists think that the Catholic leader was not acceptable to them, that he was only invited out of courtesy, and was not necessarily considered to be a sound Christian man.

Christian honesty and candor would have demanded that the Graham organization explain to the Spanish-speaking evangelists that Graham loved Rome and has worked hand-and-hand with her throughout most of his career, that he has often praised Catholic leaders such as the Pope and the archbishops, and that he has treated these wolves in sheep's clothing as sincere brethren in Christ.

This type of duplicity has long been practiced by the Billy Graham Evangelistic Association. They have downplayed their close relationship with Rome in the reporting to the average evangelical supporters. This was especially true from 1950 to 1980.

Only since the 1980s did Graham become more forthright in interviews to admit his love for Rome, but even then most of his supporters did not know the extent of this relationship and how many of his “converts” have been turned over to Catholic churches.

2001

While spending a day at Wheaton College in July 2001 doing research in the college library and the Billy Graham Library, I made a tour of the Billy Graham Museum.

I expected to see Graham's ecumenical exploits featured at the museum, and I was not disappointed. Among the photo displays was one of a smiling Graham visiting a smiling Pope John Paul II. Graham never warned the world that the Roman Catholic Pope preaches a false gospel that will bring eternal damnation to those who follow it. Through his close and non-critical relationship with Rome and by turning over thousands of his converts to Catholic churches, Graham left

observers with the impression that Roman Catholicism is a friend of the truth.

It is not really surprising, then, that the Billy Graham Museum honors the first Roman “Pope” as a great evangelist. This is in the Rotunda of Witnesses which is at the beginning of the tour. It consists of a circular room containing nine 20-foot tall banners or tapestries depicting various alleged “fathers of evangelism.” Museum literature says, “Each banner bears an individual witness selected from Christian history and was chosen on the merit of its revelation of Christ as Lord and Savior.”

The banners begin with the apostle Paul and end with Oswald Chambers. Two of the men featured in this evangelistic hall of fame are Gregory the Great and Francis of Assisi. Both, of course, are Roman Catholics who preached a false sacramental gospel of grace-works.

Gregory VII, or Gregory the Great (540-604), was “the first of the proper popes” and with him began “the development of the absolute papacy” (Schaff’s *History of the Christian Church*, I, p. 15). Gregory held to the standard Catholic heresies such as infant baptism, baptismal regeneration, prayers to Mary, veneration of relics, etc. It was Gregory who sent Augustin (or Austin) to England to convert the Anglo Saxons from apostolic Christianity to the unscriptural Roman Catholic faith. Those who refused to convert were persecuted. Gregory also persecuted the Donatists in Africa. (See *A History of the Donatists* by David Benedict, 1875, and *A History of the English Baptists* by Joseph Ivimey, 1811; electronic editions of these are in the Fundamental Baptist Digital Library, available from Way of Life Literature, www.wayoflife.org.)

Francis of Assisi (1182-1226) is another of Rome’s “saints.” He was the founder of the Franciscans, an order of monks that, together with the Dominicans, brutally persecuted Bible believers during the Inquisition. The Pope to whom Francis pledged his allegiance was Innocent III, the father of the

wretched Inquisition. While Innocent III sent out his henchmen to hunt out and torment the “heretical” Albigenses, Francis of Assisi was his loyal subject. Before his death, Francis raised up an army of 5,000 spiritually-blind papal loyalists.

It was not Rome and its popes and saints who evangelized the world during the Dark Ages. Rome’s “missionaries” did not preach the gospel of the free grace of Jesus Christ; they offered a false promise of salvation through baptism and sacraments and indulgences and the intercession of the saints; they exalted the Pope as a worldly lord and often planted Catholicism at the point of a sword.

It was rather the persecuted Bible-believing groups such as the ancient Waldenses who carried the torch of gospel truth during the Dark Ages. At incredible cost they sent missionaries to every corner of Europe and even to England from their homes in the mountains of northern Italy and France.

It is sad and frightful that the Billy Graham Center has chosen to honor rank heretics alongside true evangelists.

2004

Preparing for the November 2004 crusade in Los Angeles the Billy Graham organization promised the Roman Catholic archdiocese that Catholics would not be “proselytized.” A letter from Cardinal Roger Mahony, dated October 6, 2004, and posted at the archdiocese web site, stated:

“When the Crusade was held in other locations, many Catholics responded to Dr. Graham’s message and came forward for Christ. Crusade officials expect the same for the Los Angeles area. These officials have assured me that, IN KEEPING WITH DR. GRAHAM’S BELIEF AND POLICY, THERE WILL BE NO PROSELYTIZING, AND THAT ANYONE IDENTIFYING HIM OR HERSELF AS CATHOLIC WILL BE REFERRED TO US FOR REINTEGRATION

INTO THE LIFE OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH. We must be ready to welcome them.”

Roman Catholic actor Jim Caviezel was featured on the platform the second night of the Los Angeles Crusade, which lasted from November 18-21. Caviezel starred as “Jesus” in Mel Gibson’s *The Passion of the Christ*. He says he prayed to St. Genesius of Arles and St. Anthony of Padua for help in his acting career. He has visited Medjugorje to witness the site where Mary allegedly appeared to six young people. Of *The Passion of the Christ*, Caviezel said, “This film is something that I believe was made by Mary for her Son.” Caviezel prayed the Rosary to God and Mary every day during the filming.

Is it that Graham believed Caviezel’s gospel, or is it that Caviezel believes Graham’s gospel, or is it that the biblical truth that two must be agreed before they walk together is no longer in force today? What confusion and open disobedience!

“Can two walk together, except they be agreed?” (Amos 3:3).

On November 14, 2004, Billy Graham accepted the Prince of Peace Award from the Prince of Peace Foundation. He donated the \$500,000 prize to the Los Angeles evangelistic crusade. Graham is the fourth recipient, after Anwar Sadat of Egypt, King Hussein of Jordan, and Mother Teresa. The award was presented by Harald Bredesen, founder and chairman of the foundation. In his acceptance speech, Graham said:

“I remember we were in Calcutta ... we went to see Mother Teresa and when we got there at her House of Charity, she was holding a dying man in her arm and she could[n’t] see us right then but about 15 or 20 minutes later she came in and she was so gracious and so spiritual that I FELT LIKE KNEELING DOWN IN HER PRESENCE. I was so overwhelmed” (“Billy

Graham Is Honored with the Prince of Peace Prize,”
Assist News Service, Nov. 18).

Mother Teresa preached a false gospel and did not even make an effort to win Hindus to Catholicism, merely encouraging them, instead, to trust in their Hindu gods. My wife and I interviewed one of the nuns working with Mother Teresa’s organization in Nepal who told us this. (See the free eBook *Was Mother Teresa a True Christian?*, available from www.wayoflife.org.)

2005

On *Larry King Live*, aired April 2, 2005, Billy Graham said the late Pope John Paul II was “the most influential voice for morality and peace in the world in the last 100 years.” When Larry King asked, “There is no question in your mind that he is with God now?” Graham replied:

“Oh, no. THERE MAY BE A QUESTION ABOUT MY OWN, BUT I DON’T THINK CARDINAL WOJTYLA, OR THE POPE--I THINK HE’S WITH THE LORD, because he believed. He believed in the cross. That was his focus throughout his ministry, the cross, no matter if you were talking to him from personal issue or an ethical problem, he felt that there was the answer to all of our problems, the cross and the resurrection. And he was a strong believer.”

This is a most amazing statement by the man who was considered the world’s foremost Baptist evangelist and the most prominent voice of evangelical Christianity. Graham expressed less than certainty about his own salvation but complete certainty about the Pope’s, even though he preached a false gospel of grace mixed with works and sacraments and put his faith in Mary.

Graham should have known that John Paul II did not believe in the cross in any scriptural sense. Rather he believed

in the cross PLUS baptism PLUS the mass PLUS confession to a priest PLUS Mary PLUS the saints.

Speaking in Harare on September 11, 1988, John Paul II said to the crowd gathered in Borrowdale Park: “You have thus become a new people, reborn in the Sacrament of Baptism, nourished by the Holy Eucharist, living in loving communion with God and with one another with the Successor of Peter and the Catholic Church throughout the world” (*L'osservatore Romano*, N. 38, Sept. 19, 1988, p. 2).

The pope's focus was especially on Mary. He had “Totus Tuus” (All Yours) embroidered on his papal garments, designating his “abandonment to Mary” (*Crossing the Threshold of Hope*, p. 215), and after he was shot during an assassination attempt in May 1981 he attributed his recovery to Mary. A large M, for Mary, was engraved on the pope's coffin, and speaking on the occasion of the first anniversary of the death of John Paul II, Pope Benedict XVI said: “John Paul II died as he always lived, animated by the indomitable courage of faith, abandoning himself to God and ENTRUSTING HIMSELF TO HOLY MARY” (Nicole Winfield, “Pope Recalls Legacy,” Associated Press, April 1).

Franklin Graham and Anne Graham Lotz

Billy Graham is old and feeble and doesn't have long for this world, but he has two children that are preachers and they are walking in his ecumenical footsteps.

He once called his daughter Anne Graham Lotz "the best preacher in the family" (*Christianity Today*, April 5, 1999).

Anne echoed her father's philosophy when she told the press on April 9, 2005, that she is certain that Pope John Paul II is in heaven.

Billy's son Franklin has taken over the Billy Graham Evangelistic Association.

In an April 5, 2005, appearance on *Hannity & Colmes* on the Fox News television network, Franklin Graham said the pope preached the same gospel as he does.

Anne Graham represented her father at the pope's funeral, and Franklin attended the coronation of the new Pope, Benedict XVI.

Speaking on *Larry King Live* on April 2, 2005, Billy Graham said:

"I don't have the physical strength to go, and I have been invited. I was invited about six or seven months ago by the Vatican ahead of time. And they've asked that I come. So I'm asking my daughter, Anne Lotz, to go. ... And then my son, Franklin, will be going to the enthronement of the new Pope."

In an interview with Kyra Phillips of CNN on April 8, 2005, Anne Graham Lotz indicated that she believes that Pope John Paul II is in heaven. She applauded the pope's efforts "to bridge the gaps between Protestants and Catholics and Jews and Catholics" (CNN.com, transcripts). She said, "The wonderful thing, in Rome I've heard people say the Holy Father is in heaven and everybody is so confident that

the pope is in heaven. And I think it's because he was such a good man.”

This is in spite of the fact that the spiritually-blind pope held to a false gospel of salvation through Rome’s sacraments and devoted himself 100% to Mary. Anne represented her father at that pope’s funeral. How could a true Bible believer praise Rome’s pope? It is great confusion.

It has been said of Billy Graham that he is “facing two ways,” and the same can be said of the entire Graham family, yea, the entire evangelical world. This is because they have renounced “separatism.”

Franklin Graham told the *Indianapolis Star* that his father’s ecumenical alliance with the Catholic Church and all other denominations “WAS ONE OF THE SMARTEST THINGS HIS FATHER EVER DID. ... In the early years, up in Boston, the Catholic church got behind my father’s crusade. That was a first. It took back many Protestants. They didn’t know how to handle it. But it set the example. ‘If Billy Graham is willing to work with everybody, then maybe we should too’” (“Keeping it simple, safe keeps Graham on high,” *Indianapolis Star*, Thurs., June 3, 1999, p. H2).

Franklin Graham’s evangelistic crusade in Adelaide, Australia, January 30 - February 1, 1998, left no question about his direction. Present at the crusade’s media launch in June 1997 were Catholic Archbishop Leonard Faulkner and Anglican Archbishop Ian George. The Festival South Australia News said, “The Archbishops agreed that Festival SA with Franklin Graham next January would be the greatest event the churches have seen in this State’s history.”

Roughly 400 churches registered for Franklin Graham’s Christian Life & Witness Course, which was conducted in preparation for the crusade. Churches from twenty-three denominations were represented, including 49 Roman Catholic, 82 liberal Uniting Church in Australia, 30 Churches of Christ, 42 Lutheran, 25 Anglican, one Greek Orthodox, and three Seventh-day Adventist.

These churches, taken as a whole, represent a veritable hodgepodge of apostasy and doctrinal error, and God plainly forbids His people to yoke together with such confusion.

“Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them” (Romans 16:17).

“Having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof: from such turn away” (2 Timothy 3:5).

The Uniting Church in Australia, for example, is very liberal. For example, the Uniting Church in Paddington, Australia placed a 12-foot-square banner over its entrance declaring that the church is a SAFE PLACE for homosexuals, a place they are accepted and can be open “about their sexuality” (*Australian Beacon*, Feb. 1998, p. 2).

Those who responded to the gospel invitation at the Franklin Graham crusade were sent to the aforementioned sponsoring churches for “discipleship” with no regard for what they would be taught.

The vice-chairman for the Franklin Graham Festival in Lubbock, Texas, April 28-30, 2000, was Paul Key, evangelism director for the Catholic Diocese of Lubbock (E.L. Bynum, “Franklin Graham Festival,” *Plains Baptist Challenger*, April 2000, p. 1). Key was a Presbyterian minister for 18 years before converting to Catholicism. He wrote a book entitled *95 Reasons for Becoming and Remaining a Catholic*.

Roman Catholics participated in Franklin Graham Festivals in Corpus Christi, Texas, in 2005, and in Halifax, Nova Scotia, in 2004 (“Central Canada 2006 Franklin Graham Festival Background and Pastoral Notes for Catholic Clergy and Workers,” by Luis Melo, Director of Ecumenical and Inter-Religious Affairs, Archdiocese of Saint Boniface, n.d.).

Many Roman Catholics were trained as counsellors for the Franklin Graham Festival in Baltimore, Maryland, July 7-9, 2006. Catholic priest Erik Arnold of the Church of the

Crucifixion in Glen Burnie, Maryland, led the team of 225 Catholics who participated in the crusade. He said, "It was a great opportunity for the Christian churches to show their unity in leading people to Christ" ("Catholic Counselors Attend Billy Graham Festival," *The Catholic Review*, July 12, 2006).

The Graham organization delivered the names of 300 people to the Roman Catholics for "follow-up," and these received a letter from Cardinal William Keller "encouraging them in their faith and inviting them to get involved in the church." They will be taught, among a multitude of other heresies, that it is acceptable to pray to Mary. In fact, some of the counsellors are from the blasphemously-named Cathedral of Mary Our Queen in Baltimore.

Roman Catholics also participated in the Franklin Graham Festival in Winnipeg, Canada, in October 2006. The previous year the Graham team approached the Catholic bishops in Winnipeg soliciting their support and involvement ("Central Canada 2006 Franklin Graham Festival Background and Pastoral Notes for Catholic Clergy and Workers," by Luis Melo, Director of Ecumenical and Inter-Religious Affairs, Archdiocese of Saint Boniface, n.d.).

In response, each archdiocese in central Canada had official representation on the Festival Executive Committee, and various parishes provided workers to be trained as counsellors and to be involved in follow-up. The Catholics were told,

"FOLLOWING IN THE FOOTSTEPS OF HIS FATHER, FRANKLIN GRAHAM WILL PRESENT BASIC CHRISTIANITY. THE CATHOLIC WILL HEAR NO SLIGHTING OF THE CHURCH'S TEACHING ON MARY OR AUTHORITY, NOR OF PAPAL OR EPISCOPAL PREROGATIVE; NO WORD AGAINST THE MASS/DIVINE LITURGY OR SACRAMENTS, NOR OF CATHOLIC PRACTICES OR CUSTOMS" (Ibid.).

A Roman Catholic bishop delivered the opening prayer for Franklin Graham's Festival of Hope in Pittsburg, August 15-17, 2014. Bishop David Zubik rejoiced in the ecumenical spirit and the variety of Christian denominations that helped organize the event ("Festival of Hope attendees enjoy final day of worship, music, Graham," *Pittsburg Tribune Review*, Aug. 17, 2014).

Zubik prayed, "Lord, how good it is for us to be here: Orthodox, Presbyterian, Baptist, Methodist, Lutheran, Pentecostal, Catholic, and many more. Despite our differences, what draws us here is your Son Jesus Christ."

This is a prayer for the end-time, one-world "church," and no one has done more to build it than Billy Graham.

Conclusion

The previous facts exemplify Billy Graham's philosophy and methodology through the years. For half a century the Billy Graham Evangelistic Association has turned inquirers over to Catholic churches. Graham accepted honorary degrees from Catholic schools, flattered the popes with amazing accolades, and visited Pope John Paul II to seek his counsel.

In the evangelical world, Billy Graham has no equal, nor does he have an equal in the building up of Roman Catholicism. More than any other individual, Billy Graham paved the way for the widespread acceptance of a Catholic Pope by Protestants and Baptists.

His groundbreaking but unscriptural ecumenical evangelism has downplayed doctrine and exalted experiential religious unity.

Billy Graham had the opportunity to preach to more people than any other man in this generation, probably in history.

When he stands before God, he will give account for the souls of those who were deceived by his false ecumenical message and were turned over to false gospels such as Rome's.

The alarm must be raised against associating with error and against following disobedient Christian leaders who are involved in these activities. The error of New Evangelicalism does not consist so much the error that it preaches, but of the truth it neglects and the illicit spiritual fellowship in which it engages.

If we don't lift a voice against compromise of this magnitude, surely we must be branded as traitors.

Brethren, "Keep thee far from a false matter" (2 Kings 10:10).

The Council of Trent Reaffirmed

The Council of Trent was a Catholic council held from 1545 to 1563 in an attempt to destroy the progress of the Protestant Reformation. This council denied every Reformation doctrine, including Scripture alone and grace alone. Trent hurled 125 anathemas (eternal damnation) against Bible-believing Christians, including these:

FOURTH SESSION: DECREE CONCERNING THE CANONICAL SCRIPTURES: “If anyone does not accept as sacred and canonical the aforesaid books in their entirety and with all their parts [the 66 books of the Bible plus 12 apocryphal books, being two of Paralipomenon, two of Esdras, Tobias, Judith, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Baruch, Sophonias, two of Macabees], as they have been accustomed to be read in the Catholic Church and as they are contained in the old Latin Vulgate Edition, and knowingly and deliberately rejects the aforesaid traditions, LET HIM BE ANATHEMA.”

SIXTH SESSION, CANONS CONCERNING JUSTIFICATION: “If anyone says that justifying faith is nothing else than confidence in divine mercy, which remits sins for Christ’s sake, or that it is this confidence alone that justifies us, LET HIM BE ANATHEMA” (Canons Concerning Justification, Canon 12).

SIXTH SESSION, CANONS CONCERNING JUSTIFICATION: “If anyone says that the justice received is not preserved and also not increased before God through good works, but that those works are merely the fruits and signs of justification obtained, but not the cause of its increase, LET HIM BE ANATHEMA” (Canons Concerning Justification, Canon 24).

SIXTH SESSION, CANONS CONCERNING JUSTIFICATION: “If anyone says that the Catholic doctrine of justification as set forth by the holy council in the present

decree, derogates in some respect from the glory of God or the merits of our Lord Jesus Christ, and does not rather illustrate the truth of our faith and no less the glory of God and of Christ Jesus, LET HIM BE ANATHEMA” (Canons Concerning Justification, Canon 33).

SEVENTH SESSION, CANONS ON BAPTISM: “If anyone says that in the Roman Church, which is the mother and mistress of all churches, there is not the true doctrine concerning the sacrament of baptism, LET HIM BE ANATHEMA” (Canons on Baptism, Canon 3).

SEVENTH SESSION, CANONS ON BAPTISM: “If anyone says that baptism is optional, that is, not necessary for salvation, LET HIM BE ANATHEMA” (Canons on Baptism, Canon 5).

SEVENTH SESSION, CANONS ON BAPTISM: “If anyone says that children, because they have not the act of believing, are not after having received baptism to be numbered among the faithful, and that for this reason are to be rebaptized when they have reached the years of discretion; or that it is better that the baptism of such be omitted than that, while not believing by their own act, they should be baptized in the faith of the Church alone, LET HIM BE ANATHEMA” (Canons on Baptism, Canon 13).

SEVENTH SESSION, CANONS ON CONFIRMATION: “If anyone says that the confirmation of those baptized is an empty ceremony and not a true and proper sacrament; or that of old it was nothing more than a sort of instruction, whereby those approaching adolescence gave an account of their faith to the Church, LET HIM BE ANATHEMA” (Canons on Confirmation, Canon 1).

THIRTEENTH SESSION, CANONS ON THE MOST HOLY SACRAMENT OF THE EUCHARIST: “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” (Canons on the Most Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist, Canon 1).

THIRTEENTH SESSION, CANONS ON THE MOST HOLY SACRAMENT OF THE EUCHARIST: “If anyone says that Christ received in the Eucharist is received spiritually only and not also sacramentally and really, LET HIM BE ANATHEMA” (Canons on the Most Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist, Canon 8).

FOURTEENTH SESSION, CANONS CONCERNING THE MOST HOLY SACRAMENT OF PENANCE: “If anyone says that in the Catholic Church penance is not truly and properly a sacrament instituted by Christ the Lord for reconciling the faithful of God as often as they fall into sin after baptism, LET HIM BE ANATHEMA” (Canons Concerning the Most Holy Sacrament of Penance, Canon 1).

FOURTEENTH SESSION, CANONS CONCERNING THE MOST HOLY SACRAMENT OF PENANCE: “If anyone denies that sacramental confession was instituted by divine law or is necessary to salvation; or says that the manner of confessing secretly to a priest alone, which the Catholic Church has always observed from the beginning and still observes, is at variance with the institution and command of Christ and is a human contrivance, LET HIM BE ANATHEMA” (Canons Concerning the Most Holy Sacrament of Penance, Canon 7).

FOURTEENTH SESSION, CANONS CONCERNING THE MOST HOLY SACRAMENT OF PENANCE: “If anyone says that the confession of all sins as it is observed in the Church is impossible and is a human tradition to be abolished by pious people; or that each and all of the faithful of Christ or either sex are not bound thereto once a year in accordance with the constitution of the great Lateran Council, and that for this reason the faithful of Christ are to be persuaded not to confess during Lent, LET HIM BE

ANATHEMA” (Canons Concerning the Most Holy Sacrament of Penance, Canon 8).

FOURTEENTH SESSION, CANONS CONCERNING THE MOST HOLY SACRAMENT OF PENANCE: “If anyone says that God always pardons the whole penalty together with the guilt and that the satisfaction of penitents is nothing else than the faith by which they perceive that Christ has satisfied for them, LET HIM BE ANATHEMA” (Canons Concerning the Most Holy Sacrament of Penance, Canon 8).

TWENTY-SECOND SESSION, CANONS ON THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS: “If anyone says that in the Mass a true and real sacrifice is not offered to God; or that to be offered is nothing else than that Christ is given to us to eat, LET HIM BE ANATHEMA” (Canons on the Sacrifice of the Mass, Canon 1).

TWENTY-SECOND SESSION, CANONS ON THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS: “If anyone says that by those words, Do this for a commemoration of me, Christ did not institute the Apostles priests; or did not ordain that they and other priests should offer His own body and blood, LET HIM BE ANATHEMA” (Canons on the Sacrifice of the Mass, Canon 2).

TWENTY-SECOND SESSION, CANONS ON THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS: “If anyone says that the sacrifice of the Mass is one only of praise and thanksgiving; or that it is a mere commemoration of the sacrifice consummated on the cross but not a propitiatory one; or that it profits him only who receives, and ought not to be offered for the living and the dead, for sins, punishments, satisfactions, and other necessities, LET HIM BE ANATHEMA” (Canons on the Sacrifice of the Mass, Canon 3).

TWENTY-SECOND SESSION, CANONS ON THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS: “If anyone says that it is a deception to celebrate Masses in honor of the saints and in order to obtain their intercession with God, as the Church

intends, LET HIM BE ANATHEMA” (Canons on the Sacrifice of the Mass, Canon 5).

TWENTY-THIRD SESSION, CANONS ON THE SACRAMENT OF ORDER: “If anyone says that there is not in the New Testament a visible and external priesthood, or that there is no power of consecrating and offering the true body and blood of the Lord and of forgiving and retaining sins, but only the office and bare ministry of preaching the gospel; or that those who do not preach are not priests at all, LET HIM BE ANATHEMA” (Canons on the Sacrifice of the Mass, Canon 1).

TWENTY-THIRD SESSION, CANONS ON THE SACRAMENT OF ORDER: “If anyone says that the bishops who are chosen by the authority of the Roman pontiff are not true and legitimate bishops, but merely human deception, LET HIM BE ANATHEMA” (Canons on the Sacrifice of the Mass, Canon 8).

TWENTY-FIFTH SESSION, DECREE ON PURGATORY: “Since the Catholic Church, instructed by the Holy Ghost, has, following the sacred writings and the ancient tradition of the Fathers, taught in sacred councils and very recently in this ecumenical council that there is a purgatory, and that the souls there detained are aided by the suffrages of the faithful and chiefly by the acceptable sacrifice of the altar, the holy council commands the bishops that they strive diligently to the end that the sound doctrine of purgatory, transmitted by the Fathers and sacred councils, be believed and maintained by the faithful of Christ, and be everywhere taught and preached.”

TWENTY-FIFTH SESSION, ON THE INVOCATION, VENERATION, AND RELICS OF SAINTS, AND ON SACRED IMAGES: “The holy council commands all bishops and others who hold the office of teaching and have charge of the cura animarum, that in accordance with the usage of the Catholic and Apostolic Church, received from the primitive times of the Christian religion, and with the unanimous

teaching of the holy Fathers and the decrees of sacred councils, they above all instruct the faithful diligently in matters relating to intercession and invocation of the saints, the veneration of relics, and the legitimate use of images, teaching them that the saints who reign together with Christ offer up their prayers to God for men, that it is good and beneficial suppliantly to invoke them and to have recourse to their prayers, assistance and support in order to obtain favors from God through His Son, Jesus Christ our Lord, who alone is our redeemer and savior; and that they think impiously who deny that the saints who enjoy eternal happiness in heaven are to be invoked, or who assert that they do not pray for men, or that our invocation of them to pray for each of us individually is idolatry, or that it is opposed to the word of God and inconsistent with the honor of the one mediator of God and men, Jesus Christ, or that it is foolish to pray vocally or mentally to those who reign in heaven.”

Pope Pius IV (1559-1565) issued a summary of the decisions of the council under the title “Pope Pius’s Creed.” We will quote part of this creed, which has never been abrogated and has ever since been regarded as an authoritative summary of the Catholic faith:

“I profess also, that there are truly and properly seven sacraments of the new law ... namely, baptism, confirmation, eucharist, penance, extreme unction, orders, and matrimony, and that they confer grace. ...

“I profess likewise, that in the Mass is offered to God a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead; and that, in the most holy sacrifice of the Eucharist, there is truly, really, and substantially, the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ...

“I constantly hold that there is a purgatory, and that the souls detained therein are helped by the suffrages of the faithful.

“Likewise, that the saints reigning together with Christ, are to be honoured and invoked; that they offer prayers to God for us; and that their relics are to be venerated.

“I most firmly assert, that the images of Christ, and of the mother of God, ever virgin, and also of the other saints, are to be had and retained; and that one honour and veneration are to be given to them.

“I also affirm that the power of indulgences was left by Christ in the church, and that the use of them is most wholesome to Christian people.

“I acknowledge the holy Catholic and Apostolic Roman church, the mother and mistress of all churches. And I promise to swear true obedience to the Roman bishop, the successor of St. Peter, the prince of the apostles, and vicar of Jesus Christ.

“I also profess, and undoubtedly receive all other things delivered, defined, and declared, by the sacred canons and general councils, and particularly by the holy Council of Trent. And likewise, I also condemn, reject, and anathematize, all things contrary thereto, and all heresies whatsoever condemned, rejected, and anathematized by the church.

“This true Catholic faith, out of which none can be saved...” (Miller’s Church History, pp. 1081-1082).

These proclamations and anathemas were fleshed out in the murderous persecutions vented upon true Christians by Rome, and Trent has never been annulled.

The Second Vatican Council of the 1960s referred to Trent dozens of times, quoted Trent’s proclamations as authoritative, and reaffirmed Trent on every hand.

At the opening of the Council, Pope John XXIII stated, “I do accept entirely all that has been decided and declared at the Council of Trent.” Every cardinal, bishop and priest who attended the Council also signed that document (Wilson Ewin, *You Can Lead Roman Catholics to Christ*, Quebec Baptist Mission, 1990 edition, p. 41).

Consider a few examples of how Vatican II looked upon Trent:

“The dogmatic principles which were laid down by the Council of Trent [remain] intact...” (Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, p. 37).

“This sacred council accepts loyally the venerable faith of our ancestors in the living communion which exists between us and our brothers who are in the glory of heaven or who are yet being purified after their death; and it proposes again the decrees of the Second Council of Nicea, of the Council of Florence, and of the Council of Trent“(Constitution on the Church, p. 377).

“The Fathers of the Council, continuing the work begun by the Council of Trent, confidently entrust to superiors and professors in seminaries the duty of training Christ’s future priests in the spirit of that renewal promoted by the Council itself” (Decree on the Training of Priests, p. 654).

The *New Catholic Catechism* of 1997 cites Trent no less than 99 times, by my own count.

There is not the slightest hint that the proclamations of the Council of Trent have been abrogated by Rome.

Since it is plain that the Roman Catholic Church continues to uphold doctrines that are heretical and blasphemous, it is therefore inexcusable for Billy Graham and other evangelicals to affiliate with it or to speak of it in a positive fashion.

The Word of God commands us to separate from those who teach error.

“Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them” (Romans 16:17).

“Having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof: from such turn away” (2 Tim. 3:5).

“Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: for what fellowship hath righteousness with

unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness? And what concord hath Christ with Belial? or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel? And what agreement hath the temple of God with idols? for ye are the temple of the living God; as God hath said, I will dwell in them, and walk in them; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people. Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing; and I will receive you, And will be a Father unto you, and ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty” (2 Corinthians 6:14-18).

About Way of Life's eBooks

Since January 2011, Way of Life Literature books have been available in eBook format. Some are available for purchase, while others are available for free download.

The eBooks are designed and formatted to work well on a variety of applications/devices, but not all apps/devices are equal. Some allow the user to control appearance and layout of the book while some don't even show italics! For best reading pleasure, please choose your reading app carefully.

For some suggestions, see the reports "iPads, Kindles, eReaders, and Way of Life Materials," at www.wayoflife.org/database/ebook.html and "About eBooks, eReaders, and Reading Apps" at www.wayoflife.org/help/ebooks.php.

Powerful Publications for These Times

Following is a selection of the titles published by Way of Life Literature. The books are available in both print and eBook editions (PDF, Kindle, ePub). The materials can be ordered via the online catalog at the Way of Life web site -- www.wayoflife.org -- or by phone 866-295-4143.

BIBLE TIMES AND ANCIENT KINGDOMS: TREASURES FROM ARCHAEOLOGY. ISBN 978-1-58318-121-8. This is a package consisting of a book and a series of PowerPoint and Keynote (Apple) presentations which are a graphical edition of the book. The PowerPoints are packed with high quality color photos, drawings, historic recreations, and video clips. Bible Times and Ancient Kingdoms is a course on Bible geography, Bible culture, and Bible history and has a two-fold objective: to present apologetic evidence for the Bible and to give background material to help the student better understand the setting of Bible history. We cover this fascinating history from Genesis to the New Testament, dealing with the Table of the Nations in Genesis 10, the Tower of Babel, Ur of the Chaldees, Egypt, Baal worship, the Philistines, the Canaanites, David's palace, Solomon and the Queen of Sheba, Ahab and Jezebel, the fall of the northern kingdom of Israel, the Assyrian Empire, Hezekiah and his times, Nebuchadnezzar and his Babylon, the Medo-Persian Empire, Herod the Great and his temple, the Roman rule over Israel, and the Roman destruction of Jerusalem. Many of the archaeological discoveries from the past 200 years, which we relate in the course, are so fascinating and improbable that they read like a novel. It is easy to see God's hand in this field, in spite of its prevailing skepticism. The course also deals with Bible culture, such as weights and measures, plant and animal life, Caesar's coin, the widow's mite, ancient scrolls and seals, phylacteries, cosmetics, tombs, and the operation of ancient lamps, millstones, pottery wheels, and olive presses. The course begins with an overview of Israel's geography and a timeline of Bible history to give the student a framework for better understanding the material. Each section includes maps to help the student place the events in their proper

location. The course is packed with important but little-known facts that illuminate Bible history and culture. The preparation for the book is extensive, the culmination of 40 years of Bible study, teaching, and research trips. In this context the author built a large personal library and collected information from major archaeological museums and locations in North America, England, Europe, Turkey, and Israel. We guarantee that the student who completes the course will read the Bible with new eyes and fresh enthusiasm. 500 pages book + DVD containing 19 PowerPoint presentations packed with more than 3,200 high quality color photos, drawings, historic recreations, and video clips.

THE BIBLE VERSION QUESTION ANSWER DATABASE. ISBN 1-58318-088-5. This book provides diligently-researched, in-depth answers to more than 80 of the most important questions on this topic. A vast number of myths are exposed, such as the myth that Erasmus promised to add 1 John 5:7 to his Greek New Testament if even one manuscript could be produced, the myth that the differences between the Greek texts and versions are slight and insignificant, the myth that there are no doctrines affected by the changes in the modern versions, and the myth that the King James translators said that all versions are equally the Word of God. It also includes reviews of several of the popular modern versions, including the Living Bible, New Living Bible, Today's English Version, New International Version, New American Standard Version, The Message, and the Holman Christian Standard Bible. 423 pages

THE FOREIGN SPIRIT OF CONTEMPORARY WORSHIP MUSIC. This hard-hitting multi-media video presentation, published in March 2012, documents the frightful spiritual compromise, heresy, and apostasy that permeates the field of contemporary worship music. By extensive documentation, it proves that contemporary worship music is impelled by "another spirit" (2 Cor. 11:4). It is the spirit of charismaticism, the spirit of the latter rain, the spirit of the one-world church, the spirit of the world, the spirit of homosexuality, and the spirit of the false god of *The Shack*. The presentation looks carefully at the origin of contemporary worship in the Jesus Movement of the 1970s,

examining the lives and testimonies of some of the most influential people. Nearly 60 video clips and hundreds of photos are featured. It is available on DVD and as an eDownload from the Way of Life web site.

THE FUTURE ACCORDING TO THE BIBLE. ISBN 978-1-58318-172-0. New for November 2012. One of the many reasons why the Bible is the most amazing and exciting book on earth is its prophecies. The Bible unfolds the future in great detail, and *The Future According to the Bible* deals in depth with every major prophetic event, including the Rapture, the Judgment Seat of Christ, the Tribulation, the Antichrist, Gog and Magog, the Battle of Armageddon, the Two Witnesses, Christ's Return, Muslim nations in prophecy, the Judgment of the Nations, the resurrection body, the conversion of Israel, the highway of the redeemed, Christ's glorious kingdom, the Millennial Temple, the Great White Throne judgment, and the New Jerusalem. The first two chapters deal at length with the amazing prophecies that are being fulfilled today and with the church-age apostasy. Knowledge of these prophecies is essential for a proper understanding of the times and a proper Christian worldview today. The 130-page section on Christ's kingdom describes the coming world kingdom in more detail than any book we are familiar with. Every major Messianic prophecy is examined. Prophecy is a powerful witness to the Bible's divine inspiration, and it is a great motivator for holy Christian living. In this book we show that the Lord's churches are outposts of the coming kingdom. The believer's position in Christ's earthly kingdom will be determined by his service in this present world (Revelation 2:26-27; 3:21). The book is based on forty years of intense Bible study plus firsthand research in Israel, Turkey, and Europe.

INDEPENDENT BAPTIST MUSIC WARS. ISBN 978-1-58318-179-9. This book is a warning about the transformational power of Contemporary Christian Music to transport Bible-believing Baptists into the sphere of the end-time one-world "church." The author is a musician, preacher, and writer who lived the rock & roll "hippy" lifestyle before conversion and has researched this issue for 40 years. We don't believe that good

Christian music stopped being written when Fanny Crosby died or that rhythm is wrong or that drums and guitars are inherently evil. We believe, rather, that Contemporary Christian Music is a powerful bridge to a very dangerous spiritual and doctrinal world. The book begins by documenting the radical change in thinking that has occurred among independent Baptists. Whereas just a few years ago the overwhelming consensus was that CCM is wrong and dangerous, the consensus now has formed around the position that CCM can be used in moderation, that it is OK to “adapt” it to a more traditional sacred sound and presentation technique. The more “conservative” contemporary worship artists such as the Gettys are considered safe and their music is sung widely in churches and included in new hymnals published by independent Baptists. As usual, the driving force behind this change is the example set by prominent leaders, churches, and schools, which we identify in this volume. The heart of the book is the section giving eight reasons for rejecting Contemporary Christian Music (it is built on the lie that music is neutral, it is worldly, it is ecumenical, it is charismatic, it is experienced-oriented, it is permeated with false christs, it is infiltrated with homosexuality, and it weakens the Biblicist stance of a church) and the section answering 39 major arguments that are used in defense of CCM. We deal with the popular argument that since we have selectively used hymns by Protestants we should also be able to selectively use those by contemporary hymn writers. There are also chapters on the history of CCM and the author’s experience of living the rock & roll lifestyle before conversion and how the Lord dealt with him about music in the early months of his Christian life. The book is accompanied by a DVD containing two video presentations: *The Transformational Power of Contemporary Praise Music* and *The Foreign Spirit of Contemporary Worship Music*. 285 pages.

KEEPING THE KIDS: HOW TO KEEP THE CHILDREN FROM FALLING PREY TO THE WORLD. ISBN 978-1-58318-115-7. This book aims to help parents and churches raise children to be disciples of Jesus Christ and to avoid the pitfalls of the world, the flesh, and the devil. The book is a collaborative effort. It contains testimonies from hundreds of individuals who provided feedback to our questionnaires on this subject, as well as

powerful ideas gleaned from interviews with pastors, missionaries, and church people who have raised godly children. The book is packed with practical suggestions and deals with many issues: Conversion, the husband-wife relationship, the necessity of permeating the home with Christian love, mothers as keepers at home, the father's role as the spiritual head of the home, child discipline, separation from the pop culture, discipleship of youth, the grandparents' role, effectual prayer and fasting. Chapter titles include the following: "Conversion," "The Home: Consistent Christian Living and the Husband-Wife Relationship," "Child Discipline," "The Church," "Unplugging from the Pop Culture," "Discipleship," "The Grandparents," "Grace and the Power of Prayer." 531 pages.

MUSIC FOR GOOD OR EVIL. This video series, which is packed with photos, video and audio clips, has eight segments. **I. Biblical Principles of Good Christian Music.** **II. Why We Reject Contemporary Christian Music.** It is worldly, addictive, ecumenical, charismatic, shallow and man-centered, opposed to preaching, experience-oriented, and it weakens the strong biblicist stance of a church. **III. The Sound of Contemporary Christian Music.** In this section we give the believer simple tools that he can use to discern the difference between sensual and sacred music. We deal with syncopated dance styles, sensual vocal styles, relativistic styles, and overly soft styles that do not fit the message. **IV. The Transformational Power of Contemporary Worship Music.** We show why CCM is able to transform a "traditional" Bible-believing church into a New Evangelical contemporary one. It's transformational power resides in its enticing philosophy of "liberty" and in its sensual, addictive music. We use video and audio to illustrate the sound of contemporary worship. **V. Southern Gospel.** We deal with the history of Southern Gospel and its the current character and influence and the role of the Gaithers in the renaissance of Southern Gospel. This section is packed with audio, video, and photos. **VI. Marks of Good Song Leading.** There is a great need for proper training of song leaders today, and in this segment we deal with the following eight principles: Leadership, preparation, edification, spirituality, spiritual discernment, wisdom in song selection, diversity. One

thing we emphasize is the need to sing worship songs that turn the people's focus directly to God. We give dozens of examples of worship songs that are found in standard hymnals used by Bible-believing churches, but typically these are not sung properly as "unto God." **VII. Questions Answered on Contemporary Christian Music.** We answer 15 of the most common questions on this subject, such as the following: Is rhythm wrong? Isn't this issue just a matter of different taste? Isn't the sincerity of the musicians the important thing? Isn't some CCM acceptable? Didn't Luther and the Wesleys use tavern music? What is the difference between using contemporary worship hymns and using old Protestant hymns? **VIII. The Foreign Spirit of Contemporary Worship Music.** This presentation documents the frightful spiritual compromise, heresy, and apostasy that permeates the field of contemporary praise. Through extensive documentation, it proves that contemporary worship music is controlled by "another spirit" (2 Cor. 11:4). It is the spirit of charismaticism, the spirit of the "latter rain," the spirit of Roman Catholicism and the one-world "church," the spirit of the world that is condemned by 1 John 2:16, the spirit of homosexuality, and the spirit of the false god of *The Shack*. The presentation looks carefully at the origin of contemporary worship in the Jesus Movement of the 1970s, examining the lives and testimonies of some of the most influential people. 5 DVDs.

ONE YEAR DISCIPLESHIP COURSE, ISBN 978-1-58318-117-1. (new title for 2011) This powerful course features 52 lessons in Christian living. It can be broken into sections and used as a new converts course, an advanced discipleship course, a Sunday School series, a Home Schooling or Bible Institute course, or for preaching outlines. The lessons are thorough, meaty, and very practical. There is an extensive memory verse program built into the course, and each lesson features carefully designed review questions. Following are some of the lesson titles (some subjects feature multiple lessons): Repentance, Faith, The Gospel, Baptism, Eternal Security, Position and Practice, The Law and the New Testament Christian, Christian Growth and Victory, Prayer, The Armor of God, The Church, The Bible, The Bible's Proof, Daily Bible Study, Key Principles of Bible

Interpretation, Foundational Bible Words, Knowing God's Will, Making Wise Decisions, Christ's Great Commission, Suffering in the Christian Life, The Judgment Seat of Christ, Separation - Moral, Separation - Doctrinal, Tests of Entertainment, Fasting, Miracles, A Testing Mindset, Tongues Speaking, The Rapture, How to Be Wise with Your Money, The Believer and Drinking, Abortion, Evolution, Dressing for the Lord. 8.5X11, coated cover, spiral-bound. 221 pages.

THE PENTECOSTAL-CHARISMATIC MOVEMENTS: THE HISTORY AND THE ERROR. ISBN 1-58318-099-0. The 5th edition of this book, November 2014, is significantly enlarged and revised throughout. The Pentecostal-charismatic movement is one of the major building blocks of the end-time, one-world "church," and young people in particular need to be informed and forewarned. The author was led to Christ by a Pentecostal in 1973 and has researched the movement ever since. He has built a large library on the subject, interviewed influential Pentecostals and charismatics, and attended churches and conferences with media credentials in many parts of the world. The book deals with the history of Pentecostalism beginning at the turn of the 20th century, the Latter Rain Covenant, major Pentecostal healing evangelists, the Sharon Schools and the New Order of the Latter Rain, Manifest Sons of God, the charismatic movement, the Word-Faith movement, the Roman Catholic Charismatic Renewal, the Pentecostal prophets, the Third Wave, and recent Pentecostal and charismatic scandals. The book deals extensively with the theological errors of the Pentecostal-charismatic movements (exalting experience over Scripture, emphasis on the miraculous, the continuation of Messianic and apostolic miracles and sign gifts, the baptism of the Holy Spirit, the baptism of fire, tongues speaking, physical healing guaranteed in the atonement, spirit slaying, spirit drunkenness, visions of Jesus, trips to heaven, women preachers, and ecumenism). The final section of the book answers the question: "Why are people deluded by Pentecostal-Charismatic error?" David and Tami Lee, former Pentecostals, after reviewing a section of the book said: "Very well done! We pray God will use it to open the eyes of many and to help keep many of His children out of such deception." A former charismatic, said,

“The book is excellent and I have no doubt whatever that the Lord is going to use it in a mighty way. Amen!!” 487 pages.

A PORTRAIT OF CHRIST: THE TABERNACLE, THE PRIESTHOOD, AND THE OFFERINGS. ISBN 978-1-58318-178-2. (new for 2014) This book is an extensive study on the Old Testament tabernacle and its priestly system, which has been called “God’s masterpiece of typology.” Whereas the record of the creation of the universe takes up two chapters of the Bible and the fall of man takes up one chapter, the tabernacle, with its priesthood and offerings, takes up 50 chapters. It is obvious that God has many important lessons for us in this portion of His Word. Speaking personally, nothing has helped me better understand the Triune God and the salvation that He has purchased for man, and I believe that I can guarantee that the reader will be taken to new heights in his understanding of these things. Everything about the tabernacle points to Jesus Christ: the design, the materials, the colors, the court walls and pillars, the door into the court, the sacrificial altar, the laver, the tabernacle tent itself with its boards and curtains and silver sockets, the tabernacle gate, and veil before the holy of holies, the candlestick, the table of shewbread, the incense altar, the ark of the covenant, the high priest, and the offerings. All is Christ. The tabernacle system offers brilliant, unforgettable lessons on Christ’s person, offices and work: His eternal Sonship, His sinless manhood, His anointing, His atonement, His resurrection glory, His work as the life and sustainer and light of creation, His eternal high priesthood and intercession, and His kingdom. In addition to the studies on every aspect of the tabernacle, *A Portrait of Christ* features studies on the high priest, the Levitical priests, the five offerings of Leviticus, the day of atonement, the ransom money, the red heifer, the cherubims, strange fire, the golden calf, leprosy, the Nazarite vow, the pillar of cloud and pillar of fire, and the transportation of the tabernacle through the wilderness. The tabernacle is very practical in its teaching, as it also depicts believer priests carrying Christ through this world (1 Pet. 2:5, 9). Like the Israelites in the wilderness, believers today are on a pilgrimage through a foreign land on the way to our eternal home (1 Pet. 2:11). Don Jasmin, editor of the *Fundamentalist Digest* says, “This new book on the

Tabernacle constitutes the 21st-century classic treatise of this rich theme.” 420 pages.

SEEING THE NON-EXISTENT: EVOLUTION’S MYTHS AND HOAXES. ISBN 1-58318-002-8. This book is designed both as a stand alone title as well as a companion to the apologetics course *AN UNSHAKEABLE FAITH*. The contents are as follows: Canals on Mars, Charles Darwin and His Granddaddy, Thomas Huxley: Darwin’s Bulldog, Ernst Haeckel: Darwin’s German Apostle, Icons of Evolution, Icons of Creation, The Ape-men, Predictions, Questions for Evolutionists, Darwinian Gods, Darwin’s Social Influence. The **ICONS OF EVOLUTION** that we refute include mutations, the fossil record, homology, the peppered moth, Darwin’s finches, the fruit fly, vestigial organs, the horse series, the embryo chart, the Miller experiment, Archaeopteryx, bacterial resistance, the big bang, and billions of years. The **ICONS OF CREATION** that we examine include the monarch butterfly, the trilobite, the living cell, the human eye, the human brain, the human hand, blood clotting, the bird’s flight feather, bird migration, bird song, harmony and symbiosis, sexual reproduction, living technology, the dragonfly, the bee, and the bat. The section on **APE-MEN** deals with Cro-Magnon, Neanderthal, Java Man, Piltdown Man, Nebraska Man, Peking Man, Lucy, Ardi, Ida, among others. The section on **PREDICTIONS** considers 29 predictions made by Biblical creationism, such as the universe will behave according to established laws, the universe will be logical, and there will be a vast unbridgeable gulf between man and the animal kingdom. **DARWINIAN GODS** takes a look at inventions that evolutionists have devised to avoid divine Creation, such as panspermia and aliens, self-organization, and the multiverse. 608 pages.

SOWING AND REAPING: A COURSE IN EVANGELISM. ISBN 978-1-58318-169-0. This new course (for 2012) is unique in several ways. *It is unique in its approach.* While it is practical and down-to-earth, it does not present a formulaic approach to soul winning, recognizing that individuals have to be dealt with as individuals. The course does not include any sort of psychological manipulation techniques. It does not neglect repentance in soul

winning, carefully explaining the biblical definition of repentance and the place of repentance in personal evangelism. It explains how to use the law of God to plow the soil of the human heart so that the gospel can find good ground. *The course is unique in its objective.* The objective of biblical soul winning is not to get people to “pray a sinner’s prayer”; the objective is to see people soundly converted to Christ. This course trains the soul winner to pursue genuine conversions as opposed to mere “decisions.” *The course is also unique in its breadth.* It covers a wide variety of situations, including how to deal with Hindus and with skeptics and how to use apologetics or evidences in evangelism. There is a memory course consisting of 111 select verses and links to a large number of resources that can be used in evangelism, many of them free. The course is suitable for teens and adults and for use in Sunday School, Youth Ministries, Preaching, and private study. **OUTLINE:** The Message of Evangelism, Repentance and Evangelism, God’s Law and Evangelism, The Reason for Evangelism, The Authority for Evangelism, The Power for Evangelism, The Attitude in Evangelism, The Technique of Evangelism, Using Tracts in Evangelism, Dealing with Skeptics. 104 pages, 8x11, spiral bound.

THINGS HARD TO BE UNDERSTOOD: A HANDBOOK OF BIBLICAL DIFFICULTIES. ISBN 1-58318-002-8. This very practical volume deals with a wide variety of biblical difficulties. Find the answer to the seeming contradictions in the Bible. Meet the challenge of false teachers who misuse biblical passages to prove their doctrine. Find out the meaning of difficult passages that are oftentimes overlooked in the Bible commentaries. Our objective is to help God’s people have confidence in the inerrancy of their Bibles and to protect them from the false teachers that abound in these last days. Jerry Huffman, editor of *Calvary Contender*, testified: “You don’t have to agree with everything to greatly benefit from this helpful book.” Fourth edition April 2006, 385 pages.

AN UNSHAKEABLE FAITH: A CHRISTIAN APOLOGETICS COURSE. ISBN 978-1-58318-119-5. (new title for 2011) The course is built upon nearly 40 years of serious Bible study and 30 years of apologetics writing. Research was done in the author’s

personal 6,000-volume library plus in major museums and other locations in America, England, Europe, Australia, Asia, and the Middle East. The package consists of an apologetics course entitled *AN UNSHAKEABLE FAITH* (both print and eBook editions) plus an extensive series of Powerpoint/Keynote presentations. (Keynote is the Apple version of Powerpoint.) The 1,800 PowerPoint slides deal with archaeology, evolution/creation science, and the prophecies pertaining to Israel's history. The material in the 360-page course is extensive, and the teacher can decide whether to use all of it or to select only some portion of it for his particular class and situation. After each section there are review questions to help the students focus on the most important points. The course can be used for private study as well as for a classroom setting. Sections include The Bible's Nature, The Bible's Proof, The Dead Sea Scrolls, The Bible's Difficulties, Historical Evidence for Jesus, Evidence for Christ's Resurrection, Archaeological Treasures Confirming the Bible, A History of Evolution, Icons of Evolution, Icons of Creation, Noah's Ark and the Global Flood.

WAY OF LIFE ENCYCLOPEDIA OF THE BIBLE & CHRISTIANITY. ISBN 1-58318-005-2. This lovely hardcover Bible Encyclopedia contains 640 pages (8.5X11) of information, with more than 6,000 entries, and 7,000 cross-references. It is a complete dictionary of biblical terminology and features many other areas of research not often covered in Bible reference volumes. Subjects include Bible versions, Denominations, Cults, Christian Movements, Typology, the Church, Social Issues and Practical Christian Living, Bible Prophecy, and Old English Terminology. An evangelist in South Dakota wrote: "If I were going to the mission field and could carry only three books, they would be the Strong's concordance, a hymnal, and the *Way of Life Bible Encyclopedia*." Missionary author Jack Moorman says: "The encyclopedia is excellent. The entries show a 'distilled spirituality.'" A computer edition of the Encyclopedia is available as a standalone eBook for PDF, Kindle, and ePub. It is also available as a module for *Swordseacher*.

Way of Life Literature

P.O. Box 610368, Port Huron, MI 48061

866-295-4143, fbns@wayoflife.org

www.wayoflife.org

This book is published for free distribution in eBook format.

It is available in PDF, MOBI (for Kindle, etc.), and ePUB formats from the Way of Life web site. See the Free Book tab - www.wayoflife.org. We do not allow distribution of this book from other web sites.

Billy Graham and Rome

Copyright 2006 by David W. Cloud