

Peter Dimond's Wacky World of Theology-an examination

Written by William Albrecht

This is a response to an article that Peter Dimond has written that was directed towards me

Mr. Dimond's original article portions will be posted in italics, followed by my response

In the debate, William Albrecht claimed that "all" was acceptable in the form of consecration. He made reference to a prayer from St. Ephrem. I refuted this argument with numerous points, and they are discussed more below. These serve to show that not only does the St. Ephrem homily prove nothing, but it was another dishonest distortion on Albrecht's part. After I refuted Albrecht's false argument about "all" in the consecration, he was clearly searching for a response.

Peter Dimond is once again confused. We can expect nothing else of a man who has no formal training in matters of theology. Mr. Dimond seems to not know an ounce of the Biblical languages. He may reply with, "Oh but I told you I knew SOME Latin!" That's fine and dandy Mr. Dimond, but Latin isn't a BIBLICAL LANGUAGE, it's an ECCLESIASTICAL LANGUAGE. Your knowledge of Latin, at that, is also quite faulty. During our debate, when referencing the Latin of the Catechism of the Council of Trent, Mr. Dimond simply had no response to the logical conclusions derived therein on the words needed to accomplish TRANSUBSTANTIATION. Furthermore, my usage of Ephraim wasn't that of the dogmatic nature. My pointing out Ephraim was to show that this usage of "ALL" HAS been used before in the Church. Furthermore, my analysis of the Patristic texts shows that "FOR MANY" was NEVER an integral part of the Eucharistic institution. If anyone was "searching for a response", it was surely Mr. Dimond--because he not only accused me of using SPURIOUS QUOTATIONS--but he claimed my quotations on the Fathers were spurious! As we will see later on in this examination, Mr. Dimond was so desperate in our debate--that he had no choice but to resort to such accusations.

There's no way around the fact that the Church did not approve as valid every ancient text that is floating around, especially all ancient liturgies and anaphoras.

the Mass of Justin Martyr and Hippolytus have long been viewed as valid within the Catholic world. In Justin's Mass he is CLEAR that THIS IS MY BODY and THIS IS MY BLOOD are what brings about a change of the elements. Examining Hippolytus we see that

the requirements for Peter's position are also lacking!

Nor is there any way to avoid the fact that the Church has clearly and repeatedly taught that "all" is not acceptable in the consecration, which it would not have done if it had previously approved "all" in the consecration.

Mr. Dimond has failed again with his logic. The Church has REPEATEDLY taught that "all" is SURELY not acceptable, if one were to say that "ALL ARE SAVED" or "ALL HAVE THEIR SINS REMITTED". There is no such condemnation against what the NOVUS ORDO MISSAE is saying, and we will see that clearly as we further examine Peter Dimond's egregious errors.

In response, Albrecht stated, in an excited and almost giddy fashion, that St. Jerome specifically confirmed St. Ephrem's homily on the Eucharist as a valid form of consecration!

See VOCES ANTIGUAS and LA FE CATOLICA, both editions that I have copies of that I am willing to photocopy and send to anyone interested.

This claim is rather surprising and implausible on its face. One doctor of the Church (a Western father, in fact) confirmed the prayer of another doctor of the Church (a Syrian father) as a valid form of consecration? It doesn't make sense. He gave no reference. I did not believe his claim, and so after the debate I asked Mr. Albrecht for the reference. Even if the claim had been true, it still would not have proven his point or refuted the ones I made. It would simply have been an error on St. Jerome's part, one which contradicts divinely revealed truth.

Mr. Dimond finds it confusing that a Western Father could approve a prayer(s) from a Syrian father? I don't understand HOW this doesn't make sense. If you listen to our debate, you will see how I offered to STOP our debate and send Mr. Dimond the Patristic words of consecration in the ancient languages that I had compiled--including my commentary. Peter Dimond was so confused and nervous about having to deal with the Fathers that instead of having to deal with them--he tries to eliminate them in one fell swoop by claiming that my quotations are SPURIOUS!

In response to my demand for the quote from St. Jerome, which supposedly confirmed St. Ephrem's homily and prayer as a valid form of consecration, Albrecht told me to find it myself. I then told him that he would be exposed for having completely fabricated and invented out of thin air a "quote" from St. Jerome; for I was convinced it did not exist.

If I were to post the voicemails that Peter Dimond has left to me on my cell phone and paste the emails that he has sent me here so that the public could view them--you would SERIOUSLY wonder if Peter Dimond was mentally ill. Peter Dimond demanded I send him a quote from Jerome, a quote I never OFFERED HIM. I don't readily share work that I have spent MONTHS and MONTHS working on with an individual that tells me I am a "liar", a "heretic", says I am "spiritually blind", and says that I am going to "hell". I don't take Peter Dimond seriously. The reason I debated him and have been tearing his ministry's arguments to shreds for a few months now is because I am stunned at the fact that people are taken in by these arguments. The Dimonds have bragged about brain washing a youtube Catholic by the name of Glenn and numerous others. I will say this again--ANYONE THAT IS IMPRESSED BY THE ARGUMENTS OF MERE LAYMEN THAT CANNOT EVEN READ AN OUNCE OF THE BIBLICAL TEXT--AREN'T FAMILIAR WITH TRENT--OR THEOLOGY MANUALS---REALLY MUST EXAMINE THEMSELVES.

He was very concerned; he assured me that it would come within a week. What's so interesting is that Albrecht was clearly more concerned that I would expose him for his outrageous lie, and thus further destroy his already damaged credibility, than he was about the fact that he lied.

What I find incredibly humorous, is the fact that Mr. Dimond thinks that his smear campaign against me is actually going to affect me negatively. The last time I checked, I still have over 35 talks set for 2010 and over 15 debates scheduled. The people that are my opponents and even debate MODERATORS have expressed their concern over me debating Mr. Dimond because of his hateful antics. A very close friend of mine that will not be mentioned has even told me that he was astonished that Mr. Dimond had no idea what the historical Biblical meaning of a heretic was! The only one that is being made look foolish here is Mr. Dimond. His desperation after our last debate has gone all out. He's accused me of lying, of being blind, and of being on my way to hell! If Mr. Dimond were content with his performance in our last debate, there would be no need to be so angry.

He was more concerned about what people were going to think of him than about what God thinks of him and what he did. He was more concerned about keeping up a false appearance than he was about the fact that he had sinned mortally, perverted a matter of sacred theology, and falsified a Catholic reference in a debate on God's holy faith. This reveals quite a bit about the very dark state of Mr. Albrecht's soul. He's so consumed with keeping up a façade of false pride that he will do and say almost anything to maintain it.

As we have already seen, I lied about nothing. Furthermore, whether or not Mr. Dimond thinks I am in mortal sin or not is of no importance to me. A person that repeatedly labels anyone that doesn't think as he thinks a heretic and spiritually blind really has no credence in my eyes.

Over a week has passed since our debate, and the quote from St. Jerome has not arrived. Providing the quote is the condition for Albrecht receiving another debate with us, and he has still failed to provide it.

I want you to read this and I want you to read this carefully. I have provided Peter Dimond with not only ONE quote, but with multiple quotes in regards to Jerome on this issue. After that, I noted that Peter Dimond now had no excuse to be avoiding me on another debate. Peter Dimond now says that his followers want him to debate a "stronger opponent." He says that he won't debate me anymore. If anyone is dishonest and lying, we should look to Peter Dimond--who said that once he had received a quotation he would debate me on the Validity of Vatican II. We realize that it wouldn't benefit Peter or his ministry to keep battling people that not only know their position, but that know the Biblical languages. So now Peter has come up with yet ANOTHER EXCUSE to avoid me and to not debate me.

*It will never arrive because it doesn't exist. We know what he did. Here it is, and it's quite despicable. We know that St. Jerome praised St. Ephrem (or Ephraim). St. Jerome did so in his work *On Illustrious Men*. Here's the quote (with a verifiable reference):*

*St. Jerome, *On Illustrious Men (De Viris Illustribus)*, Chap. 115: "Ephraim, deacon of the church at Edessa, composed many works in the Syriac language, and became so distinguished that his writings are repeated publicly in some churches, after the reading of the Scriptures. I once read in Greek a volume by him *On the Holy Spirit*, which some one had translated from the Syriac, and recognized even in translation, the incisive power of lofty genius. He died in the reign of Valens."*

Peter Dimond has no idea what he is talking about. As I have already shown, Jerome's reference was not even from a work of his that is extant in English. But Peter claims to "KNOW" what I did. If Peter Dimond had any idea about what the PG and PL were, he'd know that the references to this could be found within BOTH of these catalogues!

Albrecht turned the above quote, in which St. Ephrem is generally praised and his writing is generally mentioned as having been read in churches, into: St. Jerome declared St. Ephrem's specific homily on the Eucharist (which contains the word "all") to be a valid form of consecration! The distortion is appalling and unspeakable. It is without question a monstrous lie. It's interesting that when you listen carefully to how he uttered this lie, you can detect a certain hesitation (combined with the aforementioned excitement) when he declares it. That's because he's deciding whether to go through with it, while he's in the process of fabricating it. You can hear it in [this video](#).

What made me giddy during our debate, was the ease at which I worked at refuting Mr. Dimond's claims. I didn't have any worry about getting a reply to the Latin of the Catechism of Trent--cause Mr. Dimond didn't know the Latin of the Catechism. I had no worries about Mr. Dimond trying to fight me at the Biblical Greek of the passages that Trent FORMALLY defined--cause Mr. Dimond doesn't know an ounce of Biblical Greek. I was excited because the debate wasn't looking very bright for Mr. Dimond. Peter was so upset and flustered that he began accusing me of using SPURIOUS quotations. Indeed, all of my Patristic quotations are REAL and most exist in Schaff's edition of the Church Fathers.

The alleged quote from St. Jerome was one of Albrecht's primary arguments, and it has been proven to be a bold fabrication. This should completely discredit William Albrecht in the eyes of any person who considers himself an honest Catholic. He blatantly lies about Catholic teaching. That's one reason why he is such a spiritually blind heretic.

A bold fabrication? Unfortunately, as we can see, the only one that is fabricating things is Mr. Dimond--when he says he will debate me once he gets hold of the quote. Mr. Dimond tosses the word "heretic" around so much, you would think he KNOWS what the word actually means! As can be seen, he couldn't deal with the meaning of the term in our VERY FIRST DEBATE! The whole debate on SEDEVACANTISM centered around whether or not the Popes were heretics and whether or not his criteria would be fulfilled in the Biblical and Historical reality of the word. As can be seen, the meaning of a "heretic" is not applicable to the past Popes that Mr. Dimond thinks are either in hell or on their way to hell.

What's additionally outrageous is that Albrecht continues to lie about this after the debate. He continues to posture as if he has the reference, yet he keeps coming up with excuses for why he can't provide it. He's just digging his pit deeper and deeper. I wouldn't put it past him to forge a quote and a reference.

I have provided the quotes AND references. How about you quadruple check, to see if I have "forged" anything.

He also told me that he's fluent in Latin

Fluent in Latin? I said I was FLUENT in BIBLICAL GREEK, NOT LATIN. I specifically TOLD Mr. Dimond, that I knew LATIN, but was NOT fluent in Latin over the telephone. Mr. Dimond is simply being dishonest here.

He also told me that he has a personal driver.

Mr. Carlos Ortiz drives me to and from the Churches that I speak and debate at in Mexico. It's hard to get around Mexico if you are NOT from Mexico. I never said he was my "personal driver". I said he was my "driver". This may be difficult for Peter Dimond to understand, since Mr. Dimond couldn't understand how I was going to be "BUSY" one day and yet I was emailing him back and forth. The existence of "smart phones" may be something alien to Mr. Dimond's world.

The impression created is that he's such a big-time "apologist" that there's someone dedicated to chauffeuring him around from talk to talk; he's just too important to drive himself.

I never said I was a "big time apologist" and that someone is dedicated to driving me around. I have a driver that takes me to my talks at Churches when I am in Mexico. It has been like that for years. Is that so difficult to fathom? Mr. Dimond really gives himself too much credit in unearthing his "conspiracy theories" and the "dishonesty" of certain individuals.

He also told me that he has a webmaster and an editor, the former who makes the changes to his webpage, and the latter who edits his debates, for he "doesn't have time."

My webmaster is Matthew Ortiz, who also runs a music band and a Youtube site and can readily be reached. I do have an editor. His name is LAURENCE GONZAGA and he is the webmaster of Robert Sungenis of Catholic Apologetics International. He edited my last debate against Peter Dimond. I don't have the time to do it myself or the ability to do it as well as my friend Laurence. Is that so difficult to comprehend?

The webmaster, he says (or perhaps it's another one), is the one responsible for the now infamous, obstinate and stubborn grammatical error – not Albrecht, of course.

I made the error during our debate, but the defense of the error during our debate was

clearly me. I have admitted that. It was a grammatical error. If you can show me having erred on Catholic doctrine--I'd clearly admit my fault and correct it. I can show LOADS of grammatical errors from your book as well as Biblical and Historical errors. What is glaringly worse? ONE misspelled word, or errors on the Catholic faith that pertain to our very salvation? You judge for yourself.

Needless to say, Albrecht has been proven to be a monumental fraud and an outrageous and consistent liar, besides being a total heretic who believes anti-Catholic Protestants, who spend their time figuring out how to attack Catholic dogmas, are not even heretics.

The difference between Mr. Dimond and myself is that I understand what the Biblical and Historical Catholic meaning of a heretic is. I am no one to label someone a heretic. I leave that to the Catholic Church. I, like Peter Dimond, am a mere layman with an opinion. At least I can recognize that.

ALBRECHT PERVERTS THE COUNCIL OF TRENT

One of the other major points of dishonesty in Albrecht's debate performance concerned the Council of Trent. Mr. Albrecht first stated that the words given in the New Testament for the Institution of the Eucharist (Mk. 14, Lk. 22, Mt. 26, and 1 Cor. 11) must be valid forms of consecration simply because they are in the New Testament.

This is a silly argument on its face. The words given in the New Testament are INSPIRED by GOD himself

2 Timothy 3:16

All Scripture is God-breathed and is useful for teaching, rebuking, correcting and training in righteousness

--->and my claim is that Trent FORMALLY defined these passages. If Trent FORMALLY defines a passage and says this shows a true Eucharistic institution, you can be sure it IS a valid Eucharistic formula. Trent is NOT going to define a passage that has an incorrect institution formula. That is outrageous!

I refuted this by quoting St. Thomas, Pope Innocent III, etc.

St. Thomas came before Trent, so how can Thomas be refuting Trent? That makes no sense. Furthermore, whatever Thomas says is NOT dogma. Thomas said a lot of good things, but he also made errors. Pope Innocent III also doesn't go against what Trent has formally defined. This is illogic at it's best!

I also explained how this displays his Protestant, Sola Scriptura mentality.

But how can this display a mentality of Sola Scriptura? Mr. Dimond clearly doesn't understand Protestant theology! If this were a Protestant mentality, I would be hearkening to the necessity of the Scripture alone. But as anyone that has heard our debate knows--I hearkened to the fact that these Scriptural verses are defined by the Catholic Church at the Council of Trent! That is right, the VERY same Council that denounced Sola Scriptura! How can an advocate of Sola Scriptura hearken to a Council that condemns the very notion? Simply put, such logic would only work in the wacky world of Peter Dimond.

One could also make reference to The Catechism of The Council of Trent on this point. I explained that St. Thomas took a specific objection to this effect, and refuted it. St. Thomas emphasized that the Gospel writers did not intend to hand down the forms of the sacraments, but had it as their object to write the story of Christ.

I responded to Mr. Dimond DURING our debate in specific reference to this. Thomas Aquinas is NOT the magisterium of the Church, and what he says is NOT akin to that of a Dogmatic decree of some sort. Furthermore, Thomas Aquinas said a lot of good things--but he also erred. Another point, what St. Thomas puts forth is a mere THEOLOGICAL OPINION. It's quite obvious, because you don't find the opinion of the "secret" appearing until much later in the history of the Church. The Church never adopted this form of thinking, and Trent FORMALLY defined these passages as Eucharistic and Sacrificial. If a Catholic is to hold to the validity of Trent, then a Catholic will also have to agree that Trent would not formally define a passage that contains something erroneous. This is an odd argument indeed.

St. Thomas Aquinas, Summa Theologica, Pt. III, Q. 78, A. 3, Reply to Obj 9: "The Evangelists did not intend to hand down the forms of the sacraments, which in the primitive Church had to be kept concealed, as Dionysius observes at the close of his book on the ecclesiastical hierarchy; their object was to write the story of Christ. Nevertheless nearly all these words can be culled from various passages of the Scriptures. Because the words, "This is the chalice," are found in Luke 22:20, and 1 Corinthians 11:25, while Matthew says in 26:28: "This is My blood of the New Testament, which shall be shed for many unto the remission of sins." The words added, namely, "eternal" and "mystery of faith," were handed down to the Church by the apostles, who

received them from our Lord, according to 1 Corinthians 11:23: "I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you."

As we can see (and as I mentioned in the debate), St. Thomas specifically addresses and refutes what Albrecht argued. It was also refuted by the following:

It is impossible for St. Thomas Aquinas to have addressed and refuted what I argued! I argued that Trent formally defined these passages as TRULY Eucharistic and Sacrificial. How could Aquinas have gone against Trent if Trent came after Thomas was long gone?! Furthermore, if Mr. Dimond's argument would be valid, then we'd have to say that "FOR MANY" simply isn't important at all--because the "FORMS" were NOT handed down by the Church but were concealed. But if we read Mark and Matthew--they had down the form that includes "For many"! Mr. Dimond is refuted by his own logic.

*Pope Innocent III, Cum Marthae circa, Nov. 29, 1202, in response to a question about the form of the Eucharist and the inclusion of "mysterium fidei" (found in Denz. 414-415): "You have asked (indeed) who has added to the form of words which Christ Himself expressed when He changed the bread and wine into the Body and Blood, that in the Canon of the Mass which the general Church uses, which none of the Evangelists is read to have expressed... **In the Canon of the Mass that expression, "mysterium fidei," is found interposed among His words... Surely we find many such things omitted from the words as well as from the deeds of the Lord by the Evangelists, which the Apostles are read to have supplied by word or to have expressed by deed... Therefore, we believe that the form of words, as they are found in the Canon, the Apostles received from Christ, and their successors from them.**" (Denzinger 414)*

There is no doubt that Mysterium Fidei comes from the Tradition of the Church. But as far as needing Mysterium Fidei in order to bring about a valid Sacrament, one would find themselves in a bind to prove such. The term appears once in the Greek New Testament, and not in explicit reference to the Eucharist. If we examine the Fathers, none of them view those words as necessary to bring about the Body and Blood of Christ. Surely something such as "Mysterium Fidei" is important because it comes to us directly from Christ--but to claim that it's removal or it's placement in another portion of the Missae would then invalidate the Sacrament is absurdity at it's best.

After his argument had been refuted by the citations from St. Thomas, etc., Albrecht resorted to claiming that the Council of Trent backed him up. That was an interesting claim, especially since I have studied the Council of Trent and I know it made no such statement.

Mr. Dimond repeatedly called me a "liar" after our debate and claimed I was saying false

things DURING our debate as well. For someone that has "studied" the Council of Trent, we would like to know why Mr. Dimond had no idea about these formally defined texts. What interests us even more is that after the debate Mr. Dimond did his best attempt to make a video with the DENZINGER source from Trent. The only problem? Mr. Dimond put the WRONG one up!

Albrecht's claim also contradicts his favorite "go to guy," Mike Duddy (whose arguments I refuted in the debate), who doesn't even agree with him. If Trent had taught what Albrecht claimed, then obviously Duddy wouldn't be forced to make long and involved arguments from The Catechism of The Council of Trent; he could just cite the Council itself to end the debate. But he doesn't do that because he acknowledges, unlike Albrecht, that there is nothing in Trent which proves the validity of the short form.

What Mr. Duddy does in his articles, is argue that the short form is all that is needed to bring about a valid Eucharistic sacrifice. Mr. Duddy doesn't go into detail on the Scriptures or the Early Church Fathers. Mr. Duddy sticks to the Catechism of the Council of Trent. If Mr. Dimond had understood what Mr. Duddy was saying, I would find it difficult to believe that he'd make such statements.

Nevertheless, in the debate, Albrecht stated approximately ten times, in various ways, that the Council of Trent solemnly defined the biblical accounts of the words of Institution (Mk. 14, Lk. 22, Mt. 26, and 1 Cor. 11) to be valid forms of consecration.

I can state it 100 times if Mr. Dimond would understand. Mr. Dimond's enemy is Trent--not myself. Furthermore, Mr. Dimond CONTINUES to make error after error in regards to Trent. Mr. Dimond claims that I said Mark 14 was defined by Trent. Mark 14 is one of the texts that was NOT FORMALLY defined by Trent! If anyone would listen carefully to the debate and to my examination afterwards--one would see that I never list Mark 14 as having been defined by Trent. Mr. Dimond, the expert of Trent, should know that important detail.

I clearly called him out and stated that this is a lie, an outrageous one.

I don't know anyone that opposes Peter's wacky movement that he wouldn't call a "heretic", a "liar", or "spiritually blind". Name calling and judgment akin to damnation are all fine in the world of the Dimond brothers.

He provided no specific reference to Trent, as usual. I further exposed this after the debate.

During a debate it's rather difficult for an individual to provide all source material as the time restraints are a problem. If Mr. Dimond would have asked me for specific references after the debate, I would have been glad to give them to him. Instead, Mr. Dimond told me I was going to hell and that I was a liar and that he was going to expose me. Unfortunately for Mr. Dimond, the best EXPOSING he could do was to list incorrect Denzinger references.

That's rather interesting logic, wouldn't you say? What's perhaps more amazing than Albrecht's dishonest illogic (i.e., blatant lying) is the stupidity of the very few who might buy what this guy says. Are they alive? In body, but not in soul.

After my debate against Peter Dimond on the Novus Ordo Missae, the very next day my inbox was flooded with emails from Catholics and Sedevacantists. A number of Sedevacantists told me that they do not support Peter Dimond or his ministry and that his performance was simply awful. They challenged me to a debate in hopes of releasing a better performance from a Sedevacantist. A certain man by the name of WILLIAM TAVARIS, who is a Youtube user, found himself abandoning the mindset of the Dimond sect after the debate as well. Mr. Dimond's response to me was that if anyone thought he had lost the debate, they were

"SPIRITUALLY BLIND" or "DISHONEST"

The implication is, that if you don't agree with the Dimond cult, you're on your way to hell. I don't know anyone that is a staunch Dimond supporter and that think they speak for the Church--other than a 15 year old boy that always sends me damning messages on Youtube. It's clear that he is a Dimond supporter because his language echoes theirs nearly word for word.

Well, after I continued to expose his Trent fabrication, he finally coughed up – or more precisely, vomited forth – a reference.

Mr. Dimond loves using such hate filled language when referring to me. It's clear that Mr. Dimond is so lost on this issue of Trent, that his best defense is to attack my character, call me names, insult me, and tell people I'm a liar. This all is coming from the same person who claimed that once I provided a reference to Saint Jerome on Ephraim's homily to him that he'd debate me on the validity of Vatican II. After Mr. Dimond got his reference, he then had to find more excuses to continue dodging me. His next tactic was to send 8 Debate conditions down. Basically, "If you don't comply to all these conditions, I won't debate

you!"

For anyone interested in reading the ridiculous conditions Peter Dimond put forth, I direct them to the video "Dimond Brothers Wacky Theology". In this video we can see that one of the conditions Peter Dimond sets forth is the right to be able to DELETE portions of our debate out if I say something that he thinks is unrelated to the debate or a LIE in his eyes! How outrageous is that? If such were a condition during our previous debate, he would have deleted my WHOLE section on the Church Fathers--because he accused me of lying there also! This is outrageous behavior.

As we can see in the above text, this passage of Trent most certainly does not even address what words are necessary for a consecration, let alone declare that these passages are sufficient sacramental forms of consecration.

Mr Dimond is correct, Trent does NOT address the words of consecration in the Eucharistic sacrifice. I never claimed that. What Trent DOES DO, is FORMALLY define these passages. What is a formal definition? It's akin to saying that these verses are PROOF that the EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE is brought about here. These FORMALLY defined passages SHOW TRUE SACRIFICES. If these passages are INSUFFICIENT forms, then a formal definition was proclaimed on a passage that has an INSUFFICIENT consecration formula. Are you following this type of logic? In order to further defend his position, Mr. Dimond has stated that Trent defined passages that have INSUFFICIENT forms for the Eucharist! This is simply outrageous. The burden of proof is on Mr. Dimond to prove that such an assertion is correct.

Rather, the passage simply says that the words recorded in those verses of the New Testament testify that Jesus gave them His body and blood, as the fathers say, and that it is disgraceful for some to say that they don't refer to His body and blood. Yes, of course the words in those verses signify and testify that Jesus gave them His body and blood! No one denies that; but they do not all constitute valid forms of the sacrament. A sacramental form must not only signify the reality of the body and blood, but they must also signify the grace proper to the sacrament (the union of the faithful with Christ).

Mr. Dimond has further buried himself into his hole with his statements here. The passages don't "simply say" that the words testify that Christ gave his body and blood--they SHOW US THE CONSECRATION formula! Paul says he received his consecration formula from GOD himself! Each and every formally defined passage is from GOD. The passages show us the FORMULA that brings about the BODY and the BLOOD of Christ. Trent defined these as TRUE Eucharistic Sacrificial passages. It would not be possible to define a passage

that contains an INVALID form. Mr. Dimond concludes this argument by saying that the passages must be invalid because they don't signify the "Grace proper to the Sacrament(the union of the faithful with Christ)". But Mr. Dimond doesn't know what he's talking about. The grace proper to the Sacrament, in Mr. Dimond's twisted world of theology-MUST BE brought about with the words "FOR MANY"! In the Gospel of Matthew, we DO have the words "FOR MANY"! Even though we DISAGREE with his statement in regards to the "Grace proper..", Mr. Dimond is merely contradicting himself--because at least ONE of the defined passages has the criteria he demands for the "union of the faithful" to be brought about with Christ. This all makes sense, in the wacky world of Sedevacantism.

Pope Leo XIII, Apostolicae Curae, Sept. 13, 1896: "All know that the sacraments of the New Law, as sensible and efficient signs of invisible grace, must both signify the grace which they effect and effect the grace which they signify. Although the signification ought to be found in the whole essential rite, that is to say, in the "matter and form", it still pertains chiefly to the "form"; since the "matter" is the part which is not determined by itself, but which is determined by the "form"."

Pope Leo XIII, Apostolicae curae, Sept. 13, 1896, ex cathedra: "It is then impossible for a form to be suitable and sufficient for a sacrament if it suppresses that which it ought distinctively to signify."

What is the grace proper to the Sacrament of the Eucharist, which must be signified in the form? It is the union of the faithful with Christ. Here's a specific reference:

Pope Eugene IV, Council of Florence, "Exultate Deo," On the Eucharist, 1439: "Finally, this is a fitting way to signify the effect of this sacrament, that is, the union of the Christian people with Christ." (Denz. 698)

I don't quite understand why Mr. Dimond would copy and paste all of this. No one argues that one of the EFFECTS of the sacrament is not the union of the faithful with Christ. The contention is the necessity of the words "FOR MANY" to BRING about that union of the faithful. There is a huge difference.

As Pope Leo XIII solemnly taught, the form must signify the grace which the sacrament effects. That grace is the union of the faithful with Christ, in other words, for you and for many unto the remission of sins. That is why "all," as it is in the New Mass, is not valid in the consecration. It is not sufficient if the form just signifies the body and blood of Christ; for that is the real presence, not the grace proper to the sacrament. The Eucharist is God, and God is not grace. He creates grace, but He is not the grace proper to the sacrament.

Mr. Dimond is only partially right. The grace IS the UNION of the FAITHFUL with Christ, but "FOR YOU AND FOR MANY UNTO THE REMISSION OF SINS" is hardly necessary to bring this grace about. If this was a needed constituent to bring about the union of the faithful, then the Council of Trent would have erred for formally defining passages that lack this formula and the Fathers would have been from another planet with their theology on this topic.

The citation from Trent is therefore irrelevant, and provides no support for Albrecht's unsubstantiated claim, as I repeatedly pointed out in the debate. Since Albrecht has identified this passage in Trent as the one to which he was referring – the one which supposedly backs up his refrain that Trent solemnly defined the biblical accounts as valid forms – and it clearly doesn't say what he claimed, it proves, once again, that he lied when he said, about ten different times, that Trent formally defined those passages as sufficient for a consecration.

If Mr. Dimond is going to try and win points after our debate, he is going to have to do better than this. I've already pointed out how ridiculous it would be to assert that Trent would FORMALLY define a passage as a TRUE EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICIAL passage and that passage have an INVALID form of consecration. Mr. Dimond is going to have to now show us that Trent defined these passages and at the same time ACKNOWLEDGED that the form within was erroneous. The burden of proof is squarely on Mr. Dimond's shoulders. I stand by what Trent says. I don't have to ADD anything to Trent. Mr. Dimond concludes that Trent DID formally define the passage--but that the passage nevertheless contained an INVALID form of consecration! I'd like to know where, other than his wacky world of Theology, that he can find such a proof. In order to refute what Trent has said, we'd like an authority akin to Trent for Mr. Dimond to put forth.

WILLIAM ALBRECHT'S DISTORTION OF ST. EPHREM'S HOMILY

In the debate with William Albrecht on the New Mass, I made the point that not one approved form of consecration has contained the word "all." Mr. Albrecht responded by contradicting me and declaring that an approved form of consecration from St. Ephrem in the 300s contained "all" in the consecration. I responded by referencing Pope Benedict XIV and The Catholic Encyclopedia under "West Syrian Rite." Specifically, The Catholic Encyclopedia points out that there are many ancient consecration prayers (Anaphoras) which exist and which were never approved by the Church.

I still don't understand this. Why would Peter Dimond refer to "West Syrian Rites" or "Corrupted Anaphoras"? The Homily from Ephraim is neither "corrupted" or a "west syrian rite"! I still can't wrap my mind around this. I assume it makes sense in the wacky world of theology--which is headed by Mr. Dimond.

Fr. Adrian Fortescue, 20th century liturgist, “West Syrian Rite,” The Catholic Encyclopedia: “Brightman (pp. lviii-lix) mentions sixty-four Liturgies as known, at least by name. Notes of this bewildering number of Anaphoras will be found after each in Renaudot. In most cases all he can say is that he knows nothing of the real author; often the names affixed are otherwise unknown. Many Anaphoras are obviously quite late, inflated with long prayers and rhetorical expressions, many contain Monophysite ideas, some are insufficient at the consecration so as to be invalid. Baumstark (Die Messe im Morgenland, 44-46) thinks the Anaphora of St. Ignatius most important, as containing parts of the old pure Antiochene Rite. He considers that many attributions to later Jacobite authors may be correct, that the Liturgy of Ignatius of Antioch (Joseph Ibn Wahib; d. 1304) is the latest. Most of these Anaphoras have now fallen into disuse.”

Please, someone that supports the Sedevacantist camp--explain to me how this is RELEVANT to our debate? I don't quite understand. NONE Of the Patristic texts I used were "CORRUPTED" or "WEST SYRIAN RITES" or contained "HERETICAL" ideas condemned by the Church. I think Mr. Dimond anticipated that I would actually use corrupted anaphoras, as some opponents of Sedevacantism have done before in the past. Sadly, for Peter, I didn't use a single corrupt anaphora or anything that Father Fortescue is referencing.

Therefore, citing an ancient text which contains “all” does not prove the point. One must show that it has been approved by the Church.

Why? My point was to show that members of the Church DID indeed approve of this portion from Ephraim. This text was widely spread and never was it spoken out against by any Father or by any Council of the Church.

It was at this point that Albrecht, desperate for verbal ammunition, proceeded to invent the appalling lie about St. Jerome's alleged quote – discussed and proven above to be a fabrication. I supplemented my point on the “all” issue by explaining that we know Albrecht's claim cannot be true, for St. Thomas Aquinas, The Catechism of the Council of Trent, Pope Benedict XIV and St. Alphonsus all teach that “all” is not acceptable in the consecration. They do so precisely because the consecration (as is dogmatically defined) is expressing the efficacy of Christ's blood, not the sufficiency. On that basis, they teach that Jesus deliberately used “many” and avoided “all.” These quotes will be appended below. Obviously they would not teach such if the Church itself had previously approved “all” in the consecration. The notion is absurd.

Back to the wacky world of theology. The consecration formula is NOT dogmatically defined by the Church! This is outrageous. As I showed in our debate, "FOR ALL" is not acceptable, if what was being condemned were part of the Ordinary Rite of Mass. The

Ordinary Rite of Mass speaks of the fact that Christ shed his blood for "ALL" as this verse of Scripture evinces:

There is no way on earth that the Catechism of Trent, Benedict XIV, or Alphonsus would be condemning the notion that Christ shed his blood "FOR ALL". This is a Scriptural truth!

Well, upon checking the quote from St. Ephrem after the debate, it turns out that not only was my point of course confirmed, but Mr. Albrecht's claim was, like the others, proven to be false and fraudulent. The so-called "consecration form or prayer" from St. Ephrem is not even a consecration prayer or form at all. It's a homily.

Ephraim has provided his own form of a consecration, a formula seemingly extant in other Patristic sources as well. Simply because it is contained in a work entitled "HOMILIES", (In Greek, Spanish, and Latin it has a different title!) Mr. Dimond then thinks this is not a "consecration prayer"? This is a clear distortion of common sense. As we can see, various Fathers included the consecration form in their "HOMILIES"! What's more, the title "HOMILIES" which is attached to this work of Ephraim, is a title that varies, depending on the language his work is translated into. If we read the Greek to Spanish translation of Ephraim's work--it is called "ORACIONES"--ORACIONES translated into English means "PRAYERS"!

That's a crucial difference. Note: even if it had been an Anaphora or consecration prayer, that would not have proven his point. As quoted above, there are many of those in circulation which were never approved. The point here is that Albrecht's argument from St. Ephrem doesn't even get to first base: it's not even a form of consecration, but rather it's a homily summarizing what Jesus did.

On the contrary, it did indeed prove my point. My whole position, from the outset, is that whether or not the Church uses "For Many" or "For All", such interchangeability of the words ALL and MANY can be found not only WITHIN Scripture but amongst the writings of the Fathers as well. This then shows that this argument of "FOR MANY" needing to be in the consecration for it to be valid, is worthless.

Here's the quote:

St. Ephrem, Homilies 4:4; 4:6: "Our Lord Jesus took in His hands what in the beginning was only bread; and He blessed it, and signed it, and made it holy in the name of the Father and in the name of the Spirit; and He broke it and in His gracious kindness He distributed it to all His disciples one by one. He called the bread His living Body, and did Himself fill it with Himself and the Spirit. And extending His hand, He gave them the Bread which His right hand had made holy: "Take, all of you eat of this, which My word has made holy. Do not now regard as bread that which I have given you; but take, eat this Bread [of life], and do not scatter the crumbs; for what I have called My Body, that it is indeed. One particle from its crumbs is able to sanctify thousands and thousands, and is sufficient to afford life to those who eat of it. Take, eat, entertaining no doubt of faith, because this is My Body, and whoever eats it in belief eats in it Fire and Spirit. But if any doubter eat of it, for him it will be only bread. And whoever eats in belief the Bread made holy in My name, if he be pure, he will be preserved in his purity; and if he be a sinner, he will be forgiven." But if anyone despise it or reject it or treat it with ignominy, it may be taken as a certainty that he treats with ignominy the Son, who called it and actually made it to be His Body.

"After the disciples had eaten the new and holy Bread, and when they understood by faith that they had eaten of Christ's body, Christ went on to explain and to give them the whole Sacrament. He took and mixed a cup of wine. Then He blessed it, and signed it, and made it holy, declaring that it was His own Blood, which was about to be poured out...Christ commanded them to drink, and He explained to them that the cup which they were drinking was His own Blood: "This is truly My Blood, which is shed for all of you. Take, all of you, drink of this, because it is a new covenant in My Blood. As you have seen Me do, do you also in My memory. Whenever you are gathered together in My name in Churches everywhere, do what I have done, in memory of Me. Eat My Body, and drink My Blood, a covenant new and old."

In examining this quote, a few things become readily apparent. First, this is synopsis of what Christ did, not a form of consecration.

Maybe the falsely called "traditionalists" are pleased with such an argument, but those that can actually study the Fathers in their language and context find it weak. Ephraim indeed DOES give us a SYNOPSIS of what Christ did, but he then continues by saying,

Then He blessed it, and signed it, and made it holy, declaring that it was His own Blood, which was about to be poured out...Christ commanded them to drink, and He explained to them that the cup which they were drinking was His own Blood: "This is truly My Blood, which is shed for all of you.

What Ephraim does, is tell us what Christ did and then gives us the FORM OF

CONSECRATION that he considers came from Christ!

In other words, it's a sermon or instruction on the Eucharist and its institution.

Ephraim also includes what he views as a valid consecration formula.

While it's true that some ancient consecration prayers come in the context of instruction, there is nothing to demonstrate that this is anything but a homily and summary.

Why? Because Mr. Dimond says so? Mr. Dimond can't read an ounce of the Greek extant in this homily or the languages that house the other manuscripts of this pastristic textual tradition. As we have already seen, this is not always dubbed a "HOMILY". Even if it was aptly called "HOMILIES", it doesn't change the fact that Ephraim uses a consecration formula widespread in his time that does indeed have "FOR ALL"!

Let us compare Ephraim's consecration formula, with that of the Novus Ordo Missae section:

The Novus Ordo Missae reads

TAKE THIS, ALL OF YOU AND DRINK FROM IT THIS IS THE CUP OF MY BLOOD, **THE BLOOD** OF THE NEW AND EVERLASTING COVENANT IT **WILL BE SHED FOR YOU AND FOR ALL** MEN SO THAT SINS ARE FORGIVEN. DO THIS IN MEMORY OF ME.

Let us then notice the similarity found in St. Ephraim when he tells us

"This is truly My Blood, which is shed for all of you"

What can CLEARLY be shown is that Ephraim tells us that Christ SHED HIS BLOOD FOR ALL! This is a historical and Biblical fact! Ephraim echoes what the Ordinary Rite of Mass tells us. Christ shed his blood for all. The New Mass says that THE BLOOD--WILL BE SHED FOR YOU AND FOR ALL!

St. Ephrem is teaching by explaining and recapping Christ's institution of the Blessed Sacrament. He's also emphasizing people's obligation to receive it well. That's why he says things like: "But if anyone despise it or reject it or treat it with ignominy, it may be taken as a

certainty that he treats with ignominy the Son, who called it and actually made it to be His Body.” It’s not an approved consecration form, as Albrecht falsely claimed, but a homily.

On the very same level of argumentation we could say that every single Father used a form of consecration not "approved". This is a fallacious and weak argument. The Church never sought out to label any consecration formula used in the Early Church as valid or invalid! If Mr. Dimond were to be consistent then we'd have to say that EVERY SINGLE CONSECRATION FORMULA amongst the Fathers that didn't have "FOR MANY" was invalid! The Church has never made such a statement nor has the Church spoken out against the UNANIMOUS consensus of the Fathers that shows that "THIS IS MY BODY" and "THIS IS MY BLOOD"/"THIS IS THE CHALICE OF MY BLOOD" was all that is needed to bring about a valid sacrament.

Second, it contains theological error. Notice that St. Ephrem says: “But if any doubter eat of it, for him it will be only bread.” This is not correct.

What Ephraim is saying is, that the Body will simply be BREAD for HIM. Catch that? Read it again. He is showing us that since the person is a doubter, when he eats of this real and true sacrifice, that it will be mere bread to him since he doesn't believe. He doesn't say

"But if any doubter eat of it, IT REMAINS ONLY BREAD."

Third, we notice something very important about the now infamous one-line to which Albrecht made reference.

St. Ephrem’s homily: “He explained to them that the cup which they were drinking was His own Blood: "This is truly My Blood, which is shed for all of you. Take, all of you, drink of this, because it is a new covenant in My Blood."

Let's compare the Ordinary Rite of Mass and Ephraim's Consecration formula once more to see if the present day Catholic Church is teaching a novelty

The Novus Ordo Missae reads

TAKE THIS, ALL OF YOU AND DRINK FROM IT THIS IS THE CUP OF MY BLOOD, THE BLOOD OF THE NEW AND EVERLASTING COVENANT IT WILL BE SHED FOR YOU AND FOR ALL MEN SO THAT SINS ARE FORGIVEN. DO THIS IN MEMORY OF

ME.

Let us then notice the similarity found in St. Ephraim when he tells us

"This is truly My Blood, which is shed for all of you"

Notice that St. Ephrem doesn't even say "This is truly my blood, which is shed for all so that sins may be forgiven," as the New Mass does.

Why would Ephraim need to say this if that's clearly the meaning? Why else would Christ have shed his BLOOD for all men? So that sins MAY BE forgiven! This then does NOT entail that ALL will have their sins remitted. Mr. Dimond is confused on simple Biblical and Historical Catholic theology.

Rather, St. Ephrem says: "shed for all of you," meaning the faithful. In fact, he's simply quoting Luke 22:19 with his own personal emphasis. Look at the similarity:

Luke 22:19- "This is the chalice, the new testament in my blood, which shall be shed for you."

St. Ephrem, in a HOMILY, summarizing the institution and Lk. 22:19 in his own way: ""This is truly My Blood, which is shed for all of you. Take, all of you, drink of this..."

How can Ephraim be quoting Luke 22:19 if the majority of the words found in Luke are absent in Ephraim? This is highly unusual. But let's take it for granted that Ephraim IS quoting Luke 22:19; he has now seen it fit and perfectly fine to use a consecration formula which says "FOR ALL" and not "FOR MANY"--which I may add is ALSO missing from Luke 22:19!

Mr. Albrecht would have spoken much more truthfully, which is exceedingly difficult for him to do, as we have seen, if he had said that St. Ephrem simply quotes Luke 22:19 in one of his homilies.

If we compare Ephraim's consecration and that of Luke 22 in the Greek--the parallelism is simply lacking. Am I lying because I find it strikingly odd that someone would say Ephraim is merely quoting Luke's consecration formula with their "OWN" emphasis even though they aren't of the similar nature?

But telling the truth would not have served his false argument very well. Upon close examination, we can see that his argument from St. Ephrem's HOMILY is, just as I said in the debate, a false argument which proves nothing. All it demonstrates is that St. Ephrem gave a homily about the Eucharist and summarized Luke 22:19 in his own words.

Actually, upon close examination, we see that Ephraim not only used a consecration formula strikingly similar to that of the NOVUS ORDO MISSAE, but that Peter Dimond clearly doesn't know what he's talking about.

SUMMARY

We have now proven that Albrecht repeatedly lied in the debate on the New Mass. In addition, all the other claims he made were refuted; and he had no response to the dogmatic arguments which were brought forward, in particular those with regard to the papal pronouncements on the form and the grace proper to the Sacrament of the Eucharist. Among his outrageous claims in the debate was that "not one doctor" of the Church denied that This is My Body, This is My Blood (the so-called "short form") is all you need for a consecration. I quickly refuted this by citing St. Thomas himself.

I suggest people hear the debate for themselves. If you listen to the debate, we will see that afterwards Peter Dimond is STILL doing damage control! Since our debate has passed, I have not bothered doing ONE video trying to answer arguments I didn't "understand" in our debate. I stand by EVERYTHING I said. I've done videos and talks that analyze JUST what it was I was saying so that Peter could BETTER understand. I reject Peter's READING into these documents and I also rejected Thomas and his position on the long form vs. the short form. When I said "NOT ONE DOCTOR", I was pitting the doctors against Thomas--NOT INCLUDING HIM among the doctors that held to the long form!

It's worth noting that even Mike Duddy, Albrecht's friend, concedes that St. Thomas Aquinas rejected the short form. In other words, Duddy agrees with me on this point, not Albrecht. If Albrecht had been as familiar as I am with his own points of argumentation (e.g., what his "go to guy" says), he never would have made such a ridiculous claim.

I am very aware of the errors Thomas has made. The Catechism of Trent clearly went against Thomas on this issue.

This quote is interesting because in it St. Thomas acknowledges, up to his time, a twofold opinion on whether the short form or long form is sufficient. Obviously, St. Thomas was familiar with the

various opinions of the fathers and the theologians who came before him.

Thomas never touches upon the Patristic sources. As we saw during the debate, NOT A SINGLE Father gave ANY importance to the necessity of "FOR MANY" in order to bring about a valid sacrament.

He says that some believed that This is My Body, This is My Blood is all you need, while others did not. Therefore, as I emphasized in the debate, this puts to rest Albrecht's other lie, that the fathers were unanimous in favor of This is My Body, This is My Blood. They obviously were not.

How is this a lie? Every single thing that Peter Dimond notices goes against his position must be a "lie". Are we seeing a pattern here? If there is something squarely against Mr. Dimond, simply DISMISS it as a lie and all will be fine! Maybe that would work, in the WACKY WORLD OF Peter Dimond-but it won't work for Catholics. Not only were the Fathers UNANIMOUS on this issue, but the ones I listed have STILL not been answered away by Mr. Dimond.

Examining the various opinions on the issue, St. Thomas opted for the long form, not the short form; and, most importantly, his position is proven true by dogmatic teaching on the grace proper to the sacrament and by the papal pronouncements that the form is the long form: all the words down to and including "unto the remission of sins." This is not even to discuss what was also demonstrated in the debate, without response from my opponent, that even if the short form did suffice (which it does not), the New Mass would still be invalid because of the additional words which give it a false signification.

Thomas Aquinas was wrong on his opinions regarding the soul, he was wrong on our Lady's Immaculate Conception, and he was wrong on this, among other issues. Thomas was NOT the magisterium of the Church--nor does he put his OPINIONS forth as if they are DOGMATIC truths that the faithful must hold to. Let's get this clear, the Church has NEVER "solemnly defined" that the long form is needed to bring about a valid Sacrament.

APPENDIX

THE PAPAL MAGISTERIUM ON THE FORM OF CONSECRATION

*Pope Eugene IV, Council of Florence, Session 11, Feb. 4, 1442, "Cantate Domino":
"However, since no explanation was given in the aforesaid decree of the Armenians in respect to **THE FORM OF WORDS** which the holy Roman Church, **relying on the teaching and authority of the apostles Peter and Paul**, has always been wont to use in the consecration of the Lord's **Body and Blood**, we concluded that it should be inserted in this present text. It uses this form of*

*words in the consecration of the Lord's Body: **FOR THIS IS MY BODY. And of His blood: FOR THIS IS THE CHALICE OF MY BLOOD, OF THE NEW AND ETERNAL TESTAMENT: THE MYSTERY OF FAITH, WHICH SHALL BE SHED FOR YOU AND FOR MANY UNTO THE REMISSION OF SINS.**"(Denzinger 715)*

Where, if I may ask a well intentioned Sedevacantist, is Florence "defining" the words of consecration here? We are told that the Church "USES THIS FORM". Where is Florence "solemnly defining" the words of consecration? Florence wasn't "solemnly" defining anything. It was merely reiterating the fact that this is the ROMAN RITE. This is a weak argument and an argument that shows that Mr. Dimond doesn't know how to read Denzinger OR the Council of Florence. I hereby challenge Peter Dimond to debate me on the Council of Florence and it's teaching regarding the words of consecration.

*Pope St. Pius V, De Defectibus, chapter 5, Part 1: "The words of Consecration, which are the FORM of this Sacrament, are these: **FOR THIS IS MY BODY. And: FOR THIS IS THE CHALICE OF MY BLOOD, OF THE NEW AND ETERNAL TESTAMENT: THE MYSTERY OF FAITH, WHICH SHALL BE SHED FOR YOU AND FOR MANY UNTO THE REMISSION OF SINS.** Now if one were to remove, or change anything in the FORM of the consecration of the Body and Blood, and in that very change of words the [new] wording would fail to mean the same thing, he would not consecrate the sacrament."*

READ clearly what Pius V is saying. If one were to remove, or change ANYTHING in the FORM, which would cause it to "fail to mean the same thing, he would NOT CONSECRATE the sacrament." This very portion in and of itself shows us that the FORM CAN be changed, as long as the new wording does NOT FAIL to mean the same thing. This very portion from De Defectibus is the portion that is the most telling. If the NOVUS ORDO MISSAE were indeed saying what the Sedevacantists' distortion of it really was, then it WOULD fail to mean the same thing. But as we examine below

IT WILL BE SHED FOR YOU AND FOR ALL MEN SO THAT SINS ARE FORGIVEN

IN REMISSIONEM PECCATORUM

This DOES NOT MEAN that ALL will have their sins forgiven because the blood was SHED FOR ALL. It means that his blood was shed for ALL humanity so that SINS MAY BE FORGIVEN. This is a Biblical truth.

IT IS NOT saying that ALL PEOPLE will have their sins remitted!

We can conclude this by saying that Peter Dimond and his position is completely fallacious. Peter Dimond has SOME valid points, no doubt. But his points are valid in so much as they are teaching Catholic truths and NOT opposing what the Ordinary Rite of Mass says. The Catholic authorities that Mr. Dimond quotes over and over that reject the usage of "FOR ALL" are doing so in the very sense of the rejection of Universalism. That is a fact.

We hope Mr. Dimond can realize just what it is that the Catholic Church is saying. Enough nonsense of name-calling and enough of the anger and the heat. I urge Mr. Dimond to not be such an angry person. This is a very important issue and I can only hope and pray for his ministry. I hope Peter Dimond abandons his crusade against the Catholic faith and embraces the love that Christ has left us.